

THE  
CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

AUGUST, 1824.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE IX.

Without any recapitulation of what was said in the last lecture, on the Trinity of persons in the Unity of the Godhead, I proceed immediately to show—

II. That there are a number of passages of scripture which plainly represent, sometimes a plurality, and sometimes a Trinity of persons, in the one, only, living and true God.

Here, as in the former lecture, I can by no means introduce all the passages that bear on the point in discussion, but only select a few, out of a considerable number. And I shall begin with remarking—notwithstanding the sneers with which I know the remark has been treated—that one of the names of the true God, אֱלֹהִים (ALEIM, or ELOHIM) which is very frequently used in the Old Testament, is in the plural number. Some of the best and most erudite biblical and oriental scholars, have been clearly of the opinion, that the frequent use of this term, to denote the true God, does intimate, and was intended to intimate, that there is a plurality in the Godhead.\* It is, no doubt, true,

that this word is occasionally used to denote inferior beings, and even

*Aleim*, have lately affected to look down on the opinions of their opponents as the tenets only of ignorance or weakness. Yet Bishop HORSLEY, whose erudition and intellectual vigour he who questions will only implicate his own, is among those who maintain that a plurality in the Godhead is clearly intimated in this word. In "A Critical Disquisition on the Etymology and Import of the Divine Names, *Eloah*, *Elohim*, *El*, *Jehovah*, and *Jah*," he says, "that whatever may be the etymology of these two words (*Eloah* and *Elohim*—written without points *Alue* and *Aleim*) and whatever the true interpretation of either, it cannot be, without some reason,—it cannot be, as some have pretended from the mere caprice of language,—that the plural word is much oftener used in the scriptures as a name of God, than the singular. That the plural word is used with the design of intimating a plurality in the Godhead, in some respect or other, it is strange that any one should doubt, who has observed that it is used in places, in which, if there be in truth no plurality in the Godhead, the inspired writers must have been determined, by the principles of their religion, studiously to avoid the use of a plural; especially as they had singulars at command. The plural is used in that very precept, which prohibits the worship of any God but one. 'I *Jehovah* am thy *Gods*, that brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.' 'Be not unto thee, other *Gods* beside me;' and in every subsequent part of the decalogue, where God is mentioned, the plural word is introduced. In the second commandment, 'For I *Jehovah* am thy *Gods*.' In the third, 'Take not the name of *Jehovah* thy *Gods* in vain.' In the fourth, 'the Sabbath of *Jehovah* thy *Gods*.' In the fifth, 'The land which *Jehovah* thy *Gods* is giving thee.' Whoever will

\* Those who deny that any plurality of persons is intimated in the Hebrew word  
VOL. II.—Ch. Adv.

I deserved the stroke, and even more, if any thing could have wounded me more sensibly. Wealth, independence, honour and distinctions, were all within my grasp. Worldly prosperity was flowing in upon me. Blessed with a partner whose good sense and sprightliness enlivened domestic society, and whose elegant taste qualified her for sharing with me the gifts of fortune with dignity and grace, I was tempted to feel myself happy, independent of religion. In a moment my towering schemes of sublunary bliss are tumbled to the dust. Thus do they deserve to suffer, who place their happiness in any thing distinct from the supreme good. May my affections be recalled, and fixed on their proper object—never to wander any more!

My dear little infant lives, and enjoys good health. But so uncertain are all human comforts, that I dare not allow myself to build any expectations, even on this promising source of enjoyment. It gives me pleasure to think, that in every event which may befall him, he was devoted to God in the solemn ordinance of baptism, by one of the last acts of his pious mother. "The promise is to you and to your seed after you." I cannot but hope, that one so solemnly devoted to God by an expiring parent, "who had remembered her Creator in the days of her youth," will be blessed of Heaven. Grant, merciful Father! that he may live—not to dishonour the God of his mother, but to promote the cause of religion, the glory of his Maker, and the happiness of his fellow creatures— \* \*

I am, &c.

DAVID RAMSAY.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF JOHN V. 7.

"There are three that bear record in Vol. II.—*Ch. Adv.*

heaven—the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."

"We are unspeakably ashamed that any modern divines should have fought, *pedibus et unguibus*, for the retention of a passage so indisputably spurious."

*Eclectic Review.*

I take this up *purely* as a subject of criticism. The decisions which may be made by the critic on this verse, will assuredly not affect an article of doctrine. The characters, and faith of the respectable critics who have arranged themselves against this verse, will clearly indicate this.

The most strenuous opposers of the authenticity of the verse are, generally speaking, as decided in their faith in the most holy Trinity, and in the divinity of our Lord, as those are who advocate its authenticity. "There are,"—says Griesbach, one of the ablest opponents of this verse,—"there are so many arguments for the true Deity of Christ, that I see not how it can be called in question." See his Pref. vol. ii. First Crit. Edit. of the Greek Test.

And, indeed, such is the extent and force of the evidence of the Trinity, that were this verse relinquished and expunged, it would remain *unshaken* in all its beauty and vigour. For instance, nothing can be more clear than the scriptural evidence that there is one God. And nothing can be more clear than this, that the Father sent the Son; and that, therefore, the Father and the Son are distinct: that the Father and the Son sent the Holy Ghost: and that, therefore, the Father, and the Son, and Holy Ghost are distinct persons: that each of these distinct persons is *called* God: and being *called* God, in the language of inspiration, each of them is the *one* God.

That this is true of the Father, no one has yet expressed a doubt. He is true God: "*The only true*

God.\* But the Socinian quibble has no foundation here. It is not said, as they charge the text with saying, *he only* is the true God. But he is *the only true God*. For there is *only one God*.

Nor should the least doubt be expressed relative to the Son and the Holy Spirit, when we have these decisive texts. "The Word was God." "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us."† To "lie unto the Holy Ghost is to lie unto God." And the same One who is the "Jehovah" of the inspired Isaiah, is the Holy Ghost of the Inspired Paul. (Compare Is. v. 8 and 9, with Acts xxviii. 25.) So evidently is it taught that each of these persons is the one God. And this unity and trinity is distinctly recognised in 1 Cor. xii. 4—12. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit: there are diversities of ministrations, but the same Lord: there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God that worketh in all." No human intellect could devise language more plain to express this fact held out, that the *distinct persons, the Spirit and the Lord, are the same one God*.

And I would solicit my reader's attention to this fact. *There is no more difficulty in the phrase, "these three are one," than there is in another phrase, in a verse which no man has had the hardihood to challenge, "I and my father are one,"—or, I and my Father, we are one; ἵνα καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἕν ᾖ μετ' ἐμοῦ.*—If it be proper, at all, to use the word *difficulty* on such a subject, we must say that it is just as difficult to comprehend how two distinct persons (distinct in one sense) can be one in another sense, as it is to conceive three distinct persons to be one. And it is certain that there is no more mystery—no, nor any thing more *objectionable*, in *three distinct persons being one* in essence, than there can be in *two being one!*

We arrive now at this conclusion, that there is nothing more in the verse under discussion, to excite prejudice, than is to be found in other authentic passages of God's book.—Nay, it is worthy of our devout attention and serious consideration, that that which is compressed in 1 John v. 7, "there are three," &c. is contained in John's gospel—with this difference, that it is spread out at great length. The following contrast will show this.

1. "The Father bears record in heaven." Compare with this John v. 37, &c. "The Father himself hath borne witness of me."
2. "The Word beareth witness in heaven." Compare with this John viii. 14. 18. "I bear record of myself—my record is true." "I am one who beareth witness of myself."
3. "The Holy Ghost beareth record in heaven." Compare with this John xv. 26, "The Comforter—the Spirit—he shall testify of me."—And in reference to the last clause of our verse, Christ says, "*I and the Father are one.*"—Not *ἕν*—*unus*; but *ἕν ἐστιν*, one Deity—one substance: or in the words of Paul, "the same God."\*

The very learned men who have pronounced this text spurious, must have done it—every one anticipates—on the strength of the most complete argument, both as to matter and form—else being all of them *very modest men*, they could not have permitted themselves to use such triumphant and boasting language, as that which I have set down in my motto, in proof of their excessive modesty. They have pronounced our verse spurious on the weight of external evidence *exclusively*. And this *external evidence* has been deduced chiefly from Greek manuscripts.

And here permit me to say with all deference, that a serious difficulty must have met our modest

\* John xvii. 3.

† John i. 1—14.

\* 1 Cor. xii. 6. See Kettneri, Hist. Dicti Johannei, &amp;c. p. 149, 150.

opponents at the very threshold. The external evidence which they have produced is such, in our view, as ought to have been received with caution, and even jealousy. And I am only repeating what the most learned of our opponents have often said. I refer to Griesbach. He says—"The perfect critick is not he who can enumerate the codes, or distinguish the different revisions, corrections of the text, &c. But true critical acumen is chiefly required in weighing the *internal* marks of true, or false readings."\* And Wetstein has truly remarked, what must have struck every student of this controversy, "that so many things can be objected to the most ancient Greek and Latin codes (extant) which lessens the weight of their testimony, that scarcely any thing *certain* can be determined from them alone."† He means *critically*, of course, not *polemically*.

Now, if such a writer as Griesbach does offer, in the presence of his associates, such exceptions to *external evidence*, in its favourable form, I appeal to the learned, what we must say of *that form* of *external* evidence, on which our opponents have rested the *whole weight* of their argument against our text. We are now to examine this minutely.

*First.* The learned men have laid down this sweeping assertion: "*This verse is not found in a single Greek manuscript written before the 16th century.*"

This assertion has not only no argument to support it fairly—but, pardon me, it does bear on its front, as we shall show in the issue, the air of an absurdity! The manner in which the argument is conducted on the pages of Michaelis, and of Bishop Marsh, his translator, does fully show this. And the argument of the rest is the same. They find

a certain number of MSS.—they collate them; they find the verse only in 156\* of these MSS.—they find the most of these dubious, or interpolated, or mutilated. We have the most learned *assertions*. They condescend to admit *three* copies worthy of an argument; and again of these three, two are set aside; and one is made, in all its solitariness, to look extremely suspicious.

With respect to the Codex Guelpherbatanus, and, indeed, many of the rest, we are not disposed to advocate their antiquity—nor do we need to lay very great stress on them for our argument. We are willing also to lay not very much stress on even the Codex Montforlii, of the Dublin Univ. Library; though we do think that the learned men have by no means succeeded by their ingenious argument, in taking away its antiquity. It certainly must be referred to at least the 13th century; perhaps to an age long before this. Bishop Burgess, in our view, has the better of the argument. But I am not disposed to yield them the antiquity of the Codex Ravianus of Berlin. The argument of Griesbach, and the remarks of Papelbaum, which are supported by Dr. Marsh, do, it is true, exhibit all that *can* be said by most ingenious criticks. I feel their force. But the argument is, such on the other side, that I feel compelled to yield to it.—1. The character of Professor Ravius of Upsal, is entitled to the utmost respect. He brought it from the east: he believed it, and declared it to be an authentic and very ancient copy.—2. It is written in the *uncial* letters; and in their natural easy way; without any thing to indicate the hand of a *modern* forger of the *uncial letters*. And it is now ad-

\* Namely, 151 collated by Michaelis, Griesbach, &c., and since their time *five* more, first brought into England by Dr. Carlyle. See Horne's *Introd.* vol. iv. p. 436.

\* Symb. Crit. ii. p. 90.

† Prolog. ad. N. T. p. 296.

mitted by all scholars, that the Greeks ceased in the *ninth* century to write in the *uncial* letter.\*—3. It wants the accents—another mark of the great antiquity of the MS.—4. It is written on very ancient parchment. These were, in substance, the statements of the very learned Jablonsky, who, more than a hundred years ago, carefully examined the MS. with the eye of an able critick. And I will not yield his mode of examination to that of Griesbach, who pronounces dogmatically against it, after having said that he had, “*ex parte*,” compared it with the Complutensian copy.†

But without pursuing this subject further, or following them over their field of expatiating on MSS. let it be remarked, that were we even to grant all that they claim from their inferences from the collation of MSS. they have proved *nothing*. Nay, from the materials which they have, *they can prove nothing really in point*. Here are the proofs of this.—

It is admitted by the learned, that of all the Greek manuscripts, about 400 only have been collated.‡ Griesbach, who plays off his argument with the air of a critick, who felt that he had every material at command, had *actually no more than 355 MSS. to collate*.§ Michaelis and Marsh do indeed reckon up 469. But they do not say that they had collated all these. They had “*described 469 MSS.*”

But do these illustrious scholars mean to insinuate that there are no other MSS. in the world? Do their confidence and boasting demand our faith that they had left no manuscript uncollated? The fact is, that the number of MSS. collated, or even examined, bear a very small proportion to the rich treasures remaining to be examined. Bishop

Marsh tells us that Blanchini has, in his book, described many MSS. hitherto *unnoticed* in the editions of the New Testament; and *unnoticed*, or not collated by Marsh himself.\* The Paris Library has 80 MSS. of the Greek Testament: 65 Catenæ and 57 Lectiones, in all 202; and of all these only 49 have been collated.† The number in the Vatican Library, it is allowed by all the learned, is very great. And, indeed, such have been the facilities existing through so many centuries, to augment the collection, that the treasures of MSS. must be great and valuable. Burnet,‡ who had tried to explore this library, does indeed lament “that there are so few Greek MSS. in the Vatican Library of Rome.” But it is presumed that the learned traveller was induced to think so, from his having experienced the same difficulties which have invariably prevented others before him, and after him, from pursuing their researches. The jealousy combined with the ignorance and bigotry of its masters, prevents the learned from having any access to its treasures of MSS. Out of all these treasures, only 34 copies have been collated.

In fine, not to mention numerous other public and private libraries; in the grand Ducal Library at Florence alone, *there are, at least, 1000 Greek MSS. of the New Testament!* And of these only 24 have been collated!§

But this is not all: few, very few, of the most ancient Greek MSS. now exist. Let the scholar only recollect the historical detail of the ravages made on them by the flames; and by the hands of tyranny. In the persecution of Diocletian, before the Nicene Council, the MSS. of the scriptures were sought with the ut-

\* See Kettnerus, p. 205.

† Kettnerus, p. 206 and 210.

‡ Horne's *Introd.* iv. p. 437.

§ Prolog. in Tom. i. ci.—cxxvi. and Horne iv. p. 437, note.

\* Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. ii. p. 649.

† Horne iv. 437.

‡ In his *Itinerarium* p. 141. and Kettnerus, p. 207.

§ Horne, vol. iv. p. 437.

most diligence by the bloodhounds of persecution. "And many thousands of the best volumes of the scriptures, were, throughout the Roman empire, in the east, and in the west, consumed in the flames."\* At Rome, Alaric, the king of the Vandals, destroyed the libraries and their precious MSS. In the great fire at Constantinople in the year 476, there perished in the flames 120,000 valuable manuscripts. Among these were all the collections of Constantine the Great, and of Theodosius; and the most valuable MS. copies of holy scriptures, some of which were written by Theodosius's own hand.†

From these historical statements laid down, it appears that the number of the MSS. collated, bears a very small proportion to those which have perished; and those which still remain to be searched. They are as a few precious remains saved from the ruins of a vast city: a few valuable specimens gathered from a vast cabinet of curiosities. And yet from these few remains our learned antagonists gravely draw their dogmatical conclusion, that this verse under discussion, is not found in a single Greek MS. written before the 16th century!!

What would any scholar—what would any schoolboy, think, of that chemist who, having made a few and profound dissertations on a small and extremely defective collection of metals, and having accompanied his dissertations with a few unsatisfactory experiments—would very gravely conclude, in the presence of his audience, that all the other metals would, without exception, give forth the same results? What should we say of the geologist, who after having examin-

ed the position and ingredients of a few imperfect and ill defined strata, would thence reason on the whole strata of the globe—and dogmatically pronounce on the position and strata which he had never seen—and concerning which he had not collected a single fact? What should we say of a judge who, after having examined a few of the witnesses at his bar—and these of a very suspicious character—would glance his eye over the host remaining, and gravely pronounce his judgment, that because these few have testified to a certain point, therefore neither those within doors, nor those known to be out of doors, can, or will, or do testify to any other point different from this?

Not a whit better is the form of our learned opponents' argument. It is absurd, by the rules of philosophy and reason: it would be admitted in no court of justice—if common sense presided on the bench. It is rotten to the core. The learned men do admit the existence of these MSS. They do admit that a small, a very small number of them has been examined and collated. And yet they have wantonly drawn the conclusion imposed on us. It is sincerely to be hoped, that in order that no more discredit may be brought on criticism and learning—that they may no more expose themselves to the ridicule of our tyros—that they will give up the whole argument as wholly and utterly irrelevant. Confusion and defeat must necessarily fall on every such attempt to *prove such a negative!* We can draw no conclusion from the data of Griesbach, Michaelis, and Marsh. Were it known satisfactorily that no other MSS. do exist—were it proved in such a manner as every premise ought to be proved—that they had *all* perished by the hands of Dioclesian and Alaric, and the flames of Constantinople—then there might be some plausibility in the present form of the argument. But when

\* Kettnerus, p. 176. However some ancient and valuable MSS. in Africa, escaped in A.D. 303, by the *pious fraud* of Bishop Mensurius, of Carthage. Kettnerus, p. 161.

† Spanhem. Hist. Eucles. p. 145. And Kettnerus, p. 107.

the learned do know that so many hundreds—nay thousands of MSS. of the Greek Testament do exist, and have not yet been under the eye of the critick, it is to be hoped that every scholar, who really would not be willing to expose the science of criticism to the laughter of the illiterate, will withdraw this whole form of argument, until every known Greek MS. shall be collated—and then after that is done, let them learn in modest silence, that there is a probability that thousands more may be discovered by the indefatigable industry of the learned!\*

Mr. Editor—I now bring to a close this my first number. It is hoped that the first part of their external evidence is entirely destroyed. We shall examine the remaining portion of their argument in our next.

I am, Mr. Editor,  
Yours with esteem and affection,  
W. C. BROWNLEE.

*Basking Ridge, July 21, 1824.*

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

Just as the preceding article was going to the press we received the Christian Observer for May last, in which we find some recent testimonies for the authenticity of the text for which our correspondent contends—we shall therefore copy it for our readers.

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

It seems to be very widely taken for granted, that almost every well-

\* The historian Gibbon, as well as many of our modern journalists, exhibit a ludicrous and self-important assumption of power to teach others before they themselves have learned. Gibbon, in his Rome, vol. iv. p. 407, tells us with a flourish, that this memorable text of John was condemned by the universal silence of the orthodox fathers, ancient versions, and authentick MSS. He then adds, from the depth of his theological researches, that all the MSS. now extant, are above four score in number!! And he had not examined the Greek fathers; nor all the Latin fathers!

read biblical scholar has at length discarded from his copy of the New Testament the celebrated verse, 1 John, v. 7. This, however, is by no means the fact. The testimony of the learned Bishop of St. David's has already been several times referred to in your pages. "I can say with truth," says his lordship, "that every renewed examination of the subject has added to my convictions of its authenticity." Mr. Nolan, in his profound and interesting "Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate," after stating the internal and external evidence of the verse, and his reasons for thinking that the verse was suppressed by Eusebius in the *edition* (if it may be so called) which Mr. Nolan supposes him to have *revised* under the sanction of Constantine the Great, adds, "I trust nothing further can be wanting, to convince any ingenuous mind that 1 John v. 7. really proceeded from St. John the Evangelist." Dr. Hales, in his learned work on "Faith in the Holy Trinity," speaks with equal confidence of the authenticity of the verse. "To the authority of Griesbach on this question," he says, "I shall not hesitate to oppose and prefer the authority of a celebrated German editor and critick, the learned Ernesti; with whose observations I shall close this minute and elaborate survey of the whole external and internal evidence; which, I humbly trust, will be found exhaustive of the subject, and set the controversy at rest in future." Mr. Grier, in his recent "Reply to Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy," after noticing "the invincible arguments" of Mr. Nolan, says, "I feel compelled to abandon my former prejudices against the verse, and to think that a person should almost as soon doubt the genuineness of the rest of St. John's Epistle, as that of the disputed passage."

A late edition of the Greek Testament, by the Rev. Edward Valpy,

THE  
**CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.**

OCTOBER, 1824.

**Religious Communications.**

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE I.

The subject of discussion at this time, is the seventh answer in our Shorter Catechism. It is expressed thus—

“The decrees of God are his eternal purpose, according to the counsel of his will, whereby, for his own glory, he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass.”

There are probably few present who need to be informed, that this answer presents one of the most difficult, and most controverted points, in theology. Yet, in my apprehension, the chief difficulty has always arisen from the reluctance which many feel to receive as truths or facts, things which they know not how to reconcile or explain. But it ought to be recollected that we do this in things of daily occurrence, and with which we are most familiar. For example—how *matter* should be moved by that which is *immaterial*—which takes place continually when the volitions of our minds produce the motions of our limbs and of our whole bodies—is quite as hard to explain or to see through, as how the free actions of moral agents should consist with, and carry into effect, the absolute decrees of God. We are, indeed, so familiar with the first of these inexplicable things, that we do not often think about explaining it;

VOL. II.—*Ch. Adv.*

but when we do, we find it attended with as much difficulty—it as completely baffles our investigations—as the abstruse inquiry with which we have compared it.

I have made the remarks you have just heard at the very entrance of this discussion, in hope they may have some influence in preventing a prejudice against the method in which I propose to conduct it; and in which alone, I am fully persuaded, it can ever be satisfactorily conducted. That all truth is really consistent with itself, or that every truth is perfectly reconcilable with every other truth, no one who knows what truth is, can for a moment doubt. But human intellect is not competent at present to investigate and reconcile all that is true, or all that may be perfectly easy of solution to beings of higher powers. Let me then request you to remember, that the *manner* in which one truth agrees or is consistent with another, is often unknown to us; and therefore that we ought never to resist the proper evidence by which truth is ascertained, because we see not *how* it is to be reconciled with something else which, on good grounds, we have been accustomed to receive as true. When truths or facts appear to militate with each other, it is indeed a reason why they should be repeatedly and most closely examined on all sides. But if, after such examination, the things which seem to militate appear to be accompanied by all the evidence ne-

vine counsel is frustrate, that God is disappointed, that Christ has failed, or endangered a failure, of his object or his reward, or that any "dead loss" will be sustained, by the presumed inefficacy of his blood towards them that perish.

God is over all, blessed forever. The blood of his Son will be charged to their account who reject it. "All thy works shall praise thee, O Lord; and all thy saints do bless thee." That God is in earnest and sincere when he offers salvation to men—that he is not tantalizing them or trifling with them—triflers as they are, and especially with him—is very plain from the *tremendous retribution* which awaits them; and which, therefore, himself executes upon them, who have "trodden under foot the Son of God, and have counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and have done despite unto the Spirit of grace." ZETA.

---

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. 2.

CLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF I JOHN V. 7.

"There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."

"We are unspeakably ashamed that any modern divines should have fought, *pedibus et unguibus*, for the retention of a passage so indisputably spurious."

*Eclectic Review.*

There are two classes of the learned to whom I have the misfortune of finding myself opposed in this discussion. The first are those frank and candid men, whose doubts have been so strongly excited by the arguments advanced against the authenticity of the verse, that they decline to quote it in their discourses and writings.

Yet they admit their lingering inclinations, and their "almost persuasions"—that the verse is authentic. They stand on neutral ground, they seem equally removed from our opponents, and from us. Time, and the unexampled investigations going on now in Europe, I am persuaded, will, ere long, unite them to us. The other class are fully convinced that this verse is spurious. And these able and learned men are not content with going all lengths "*in the rude shock of war*"—against this verse—but they employ irony and keen sarcasm against those who venture, in the sincerity of their hearts, to defend *this item of holy writ*. "They are unspeakably ashamed that any divine of the nineteenth century should, *pedibus et unguibus*, contend for it."

I do not quote this to blame them. I quote it to put them in mind that I feel myself privileged, from their example, to employ the same weapons against their weakness and folly. For who would bring out heavy artillery against a mud wall?

Our verse—as has been justly observed by an able writer in the Christian Observer of London—our verse "is very far from standing in that miserable state of destitution, to which its opponents seem to consider it reduced."—For one, I feel a confidence in believing that the time is fast going by, when the Christian publick will listen to the opponents of this verse. I am fully convinced from what I see and hear—and particularly from the able books lately published in defence of this text—and from the sentiments of the most learned divines of Britain, and the United States, expressed more and more fully, every day, from the pulpit; that the tide of belief is now beginning to set strongly, in favour of the authenticity of our verse.

I thank you, Mr. Editor, for that happy and seasonable selection

which you made from the Christian Observer of May; and which you added to my last communication. It helps to illustrate this fact; and to strengthen our belief in its reality.

We anticipate the period, when the advocates of this verse will come out in the language of the pious and learned Bishop of St. David's.—“I can say, in truth, that every renewed examination of the subject has added to my convictions of its authenticity.”\*—Nay, may I not venture to say, that we anticipate the period when more of the learned than a Grier, will be induced ingenuously to say, as he said, after reading Nolan—“I feel compelled to abandon my former prejudices against the verse; and to think that a person should almost as soon doubt the genuineness of the rest of St. John's epistle, as that of the disputed passage.”†

When the writings of Kettnerus, and Dr. Hales, and Wetstein, and Ernesti, and Nolan, and Burgess, and Travis, and Grier shall be in all hands, and carefully studied, I doubt not this will be the happy result.

In my last, I endeavoured to overthrow the first portion of the *external evidence* adduced against the authenticity of this verse, by our opponents. I now beg your attention, Mr. Editor, in the second place, to another portion of their *external evidence*. “No other ancient version besides the Latin contains this verse. And even in respect of the Latin version, it is wanting in the most ancient copies.”

This kind of argument, to prove a negative, must share the same fate with their other argument, which has been reviewed. We have no sufficient data given here. Certain *particular premises* are assumed. And from these *particular premises* they draw a *general*

conclusion. Need we say in this enlightened age, that from *particular premises* no general conclusion can be formed?—In reference to the versions of Syria, or of Ethiopia, or Armenia, or the Coptic of Lower Egypt, or the Sahidic of Upper Egypt, the researches of the learned have not been extensive enough to glean materials sufficient for any practical purpose. We admit that the verse is wanting in the copies that have come to light. But from a few solitary versions—the history of which, or the sources whence they were drawn, we cannot satisfactorily trace—it certainly would be altogether unbecoming the learned and candid, to conclude—as some have thoughtlessly concluded, to favour a theory—that this verse has never been found in these foreign versions; nor in any other version except the Latin.

We are led to the same conclusion respecting their *conjecture* which they offer for an *argument*, that even in respect to the Latin version, “the verse is not found in the most ancient MSS.” No negative, of this kind, can be established from such data, and such defective proof. No particular premise can lay a foundation for a general, or for an unlimited conclusion. Unless all the copies known to exist, be fully and carefully examined, no conclusion can be made in truth. And even the suspicion, that other copies may be found, would make the true crickick pause, and guard against conclusions which might expose him to deserved censure.

For in fact, if even there exists a reasonable suspicion that some MSS. still remain to be collated, what, I pray, becomes of the shrewdest theory? Griesbach, and Michaelis, and Marsh, may move on in the mightiness of their conjectures, and fill volumes with pompous accounts of MSS. We have only one brief reply. All this is no more than mere conjecture—brought forward in the imposing

\* Quoted by the Christian Advocate p. 358, for Aug. 1824.

† Grier's Reply to Milner's End of Religious Controversy, &c.

form of learned research. Your conclusions are at the mercy of the good natured reader. Besides all these copies which you have searched and collated, do you pretend to assert that there are not, that there cannot be, other copies which may bear testimony against you? Have you actually passed through all the private and public libraries of Europe? Have no collections escaped your eyes? Are you confident that the researches of the learned will bring no new materials to light? They are now in the full bustle of successful exertion to discover MSS. in this season of unusual opportunity, when peace reigns in Europe, and the learned of its different nations, amid the jarring elements of politics, grant to each other every facility to pursue their diversified objects of investigation? No, you have no ground of confidence here. In the list given by even Kettnerus,\* of the last age, I think I see some copies alluded to, which are not noticed by these learned men, or by any of our opponents, so far as I have examined.—And since their peremptory conclusions, Bishop Burgess has shown that there are, in the library of Verona, *three MSS.* more ancient by 200 years, than what they would admit to exist.† And thus as the learned shall continue their researches, fresh light will break in, to put to flight the most learned theories and ingenious conjectures! And I have a perfect confidence that fresh and additional proof of Bishop Burgess' observation, will be produced by the learned, at no remote period—"that though the 7th verse of 1 John v. be wanting in the *more ancient* (Latin) copies, it is also true that it is found in some of the *most ancient* copies."‡

\* See chap. 17, 18, of his learned work. This copy which I quote belongs to the library of Professor Dewitt, of New Brunswick.

† Vind. of 1 John v. 7. p. xxvi. 2d Edit. and pp. 53, 54. Horne's Introd. vol. iv. p. 441.

‡ Vind. pp. 53, 54, &c.

Another portion of their external evidence is this: "*The Greek Fathers have never quoted this verse—not even in those places where we should most expect it. And the Protestant reformers, with Luther at their head, rejected it from their versions, or have marked it as dubious.*"

Here, I admit, there is a greater plausibility afforded of proving a *negative*. Because generally speaking, the Greek Fathers are a definite and known body. I shall not avail myself of the supposition that there yet may be discoveries of *new fathers*: or at least, of *new works* of the fathers. Yet there would be nothing wild or extravagant in the supposition. Every scholar knows how long the epistle of Clemens Romanus, and of Barnabas, remained unknown to the learned world. The book of Lactantius "*De Persecutoribus*" was long concealed, and was, in a manner lost to the world.\*—Nor was this the fate exclusively of the fathers of the church. We are indebted to a distinguished scholar for some remarkable cases drawn out of profane history. The celebrated decree of the Spartan senate, passed to censure Timotheus, the musician, lay hid, or obscure, to say the least, for 1127 years; having been omitted by writers in history and policy; and was, after that lapse of time, quoted and restored to light by Boethius.†—Such, also was the fate of the copy of the league made by the cities of Smyrna and Magnesia, with the king of Syria. Having been omitted by some transcriber, or having escaped the notice of those who gleaned materials for history, it actually lay hid in the monuments of antiquity, and on the marble—unnoticed in any history now extant. But after a great lapse of time, it has been restored to light, and to

\* See Kettnerus, p. 104.

† Bp. Burgess's Vind. of the new Edit. of this Decree, p. 57, &c. and Horne, IV. p. 459.

the authentick page of history. The marble which contains it, is now in Oxford.\*

I shall not take any advantage offered from facts of this kind. Our cause needs no such aid.—I shall suppose for the sake of argument, that the assertion of our opponents is true; viz. that "*the Greek Fathers have not quoted this verse.*" Our cause will lose nothing by the admission.

If the Greek Fathers have never quoted this verse, no proof can thence be drawn that it was *not* in their copies. For in the first place, there are other reasons equally supposable, as that one of our opponents, viz. that the verse was not in their copies. It is well known to those acquainted with the history of the fathers, that they were, unhappily, not agreed on the precise meaning of the clause in our text, "*these three are one.*:" that many of them understood it to express the *unity* or *unanimity of sentiment* of the three heavenly witnesses. Hence, as men of perfect candour, who scorned to take any advantage which their consciences did not approve, many of them declined to quote it, while they had abundance of other proofs. But 2dly, if this argument of our opponents prove any thing, it proves *too much*—and consequently it is a fallacy. It has been justly observed by the learned,† that, in the controversy carried on by the orthodox fathers against the Sabellians and Arians, we cannot discover that they have quoted some of the most striking texts in the sacred volume, to prove the doctrine of the most Holy Trinity. And, to use the words of our opponents in reference to our text—"they have not quoted these texts in the very places where we should have expected them." For instance, they have not quoted in their

defences, that text so decisive in the proof of the Holy Trinity, 1 Cor. xii. 4-11.—Nay, they have not even quoted the words of the baptismal form in Matt. xxviii. 19, in the course of their controversy.

Now let our candid opponents say if it would be fair—if it would be justifiable, to infer from this fact—that, because these verses, so much to the point, are not quoted in the very places in which we should expect them—they were not in their copies of the holy scriptures.—Yet this is the very point and edge of the argument of our opponents. *The fathers did never quote it—hence this verse is not in their copies.* This argument proves too much. It is a fallacy.

The silence of the orthodox fathers in reference to these texts, and in reference to our text (on the supposition that they have not quoted it,) does indeed prove much against them. It does prove that they did not conduct their argument *fully*, or *properly*, by using all the materials which God had put into their hands. But it will never prove that the materials which erring men had not the wisdom to use, were not in their copies of the scriptures. On the principle of our learned opponents' argument, we should, in no case whatever, lay any blame on the mechanic—though he passes through his hands the rudest and most unsightly work. Though all men condemn it, it is not owing to any fault in the mechanic. The blame lies exclusively in his tools!

But, after all, the assertion of our antagonists, on which they build the whole of their argument, is *not true in fact*. Griesbach, and Michaelis, and Marsh are utterly in error, in respect to the Greek Fathers. "*The Greek Fathers,*" say they, "*never quoted this verse.*" *On the contrary, it is now fully proved that some of the most ancient of them—and, at least, eight of them have quoted this verse, and in other places evidently alluded to it.* Their words

\* See Horne, Vol. IV. p. 459.—Note.

† See the statements of Horne, IV. p. 459.

now lie before even the English reader. They are quoted, at some length, by that late able and successful writer, Bishop Burgess. If I can find room and opportunity, I shall exhibit these afterwards, when I enter on my *positive external proof* of the text. Meantime, I shall simply state what every careful student of this controversy knows; that the quotation of this text by Tertullian, and by Cyprian has been long before the church, in the authentick and correct editions of their works. The former wrote about 80 or 90 years after the death of St. John. The latter about 170 years.—And latterly we owe it to the very learned and distinguished Bishop Burgess, who has, in his book against Griesbach, carefully examined the pages of the Greek Fathers; and has demonstrated by large quotations from them, that our text has been quoted by at least eight of them.—And what is in no small degree pleasing to us—Cyril, whom our opponents have hitherto always claimed, is *shown to have quoted it*.\*

In reference to the venerable Reformers, we admit that they, in general, left it out of their versions. But this brings no argument against the authenticity of our text. It simply proves this fact, which we will not deny, that the verse was not in the copies to which they had access. And they had their doubts left unremoved; by reason of their not having the possession of ancient MSS., and satisfactory documents to remove these doubts. And some very natural and very satisfactory reasons can be given why this text has not been in many copies.†

Michaelis (vol. iv. p. 434, and Horne, iv. p. 458,) has treated with lightness the idea suggested by able

writers, respecting the corruption of some copies by hereticks. And he observes, "this could not have occasioned it in all the Greek MSS. and versions." The truth is, neither we nor the learned writer ever have seen, or will see, *all the Greek MSS.* But let this pass, it is the common error which glares on the pages of all our opponents.

Two things have struck us forcibly in this matter. 1st. We have the most satisfactory testimony of antiquity, that the Artemonistæ and other hereticks, who wrote against the Holy Trinity, did "*carefully expunge from their copies of the Scriptures those words which were pernicious to their doctrines.*"\*

2dly. The most ancient MSS. which want this verse, bear melancholy proofs of the hand of an enemy, carefully expunging many prominent texts, the authenticity of which cannot reasonably be questioned. They omit, for instance, Rev. i. 8.—"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord."—They leave the word *God*, out of Acts xx. 28.—"Feed the church of God, &c." making it read "Feed the church which, &c." They omit the first clause of 1 Tim. iii. 16. viz. "God was manifest in the flesh."—I humbly conceive that every one will see that all these bear upon a certain point of infinite importance—the true Deity of our Lord. And it really does seem to me as if there were traces of design in these omissions.

I trust, Mr. Editor, that the *external evidence*, which our antagonists have brought against our verse—in their attempt to prove a negative, is now fairly neutralized. From their data, and their materials, no negative can be proved. I appeal confidently to the learned. Their mode of arguing has, therefore, been lame and defective in

\* Burgess, Vind. p. p. xxxv. xliii. and pp. 29-43.—Horne, iv. p. 443.

† Kettnerus has four chaps. on this; to which I refer my reader, as I have no room for quotations here. I may touch on this afterwards.

\* Euseb. Lib. v. cap. 28. Socrat. Eccles. Hist. Lib. vii. cap. 32. Kettneri. p. 29. Millii Prolog. No. 640, 363, &c.

the last degree. "I feel unspeakably ashamed that men of learning in the nineteenth century," should so violate the first principles of logic—as invariably to draw general conclusions from particular premises.

In my next I shall notice, a little more fully, the defects of Griesbach—if I can find room: and then proceed in defence of my text. 1st. By circumstantial evidence. 2d. By positive internal evidence. 3d. By positive external evidence.

With great respect, I am,  
Mr. Editor, yours truly,  
W. C. BROWNLEE.

*Basking Ridge.*

*An Account of a Remarkable Revival of Religion in Freehold, New Jersey.*

(Concluded from page 404.)

The general effects produced on the minds and manners of these subjects of grace, were as follows: They were generally not only made to know, but heartily to approve of the great doctrines of the gospel, which before they were either ignorant of, or averse to, so that they all sweetly harmonized in exalting rich, free, special, and sovereign grace, through the atonement of Jesus Christ; being desirous of glorying only in him, who had loved them and given himself for them, an offering and a sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour. Mr. Ten-  
nent used to say, that he could not express the satisfaction with which he heard some, who had been wrought upon by divine grace, speak of the new covenant method of salvation through a Redeemer. They did it in such an affectionate manner, and with such clearness of language and evidence, as he thought sufficient to have convinced the most determined atheist, that the Lord alone was their teacher.

The alteration in some, from al-

most gross ignorance, to such clear gospel light, and in others from the most corrupt principles, to the acknowledgment of the truth as it is in Jesus, fully showed that none but he who made the understanding could effect the change. They approved of the law of God after the inward man, as holy, just, and good, and prized it above gold—yea much fine gold. They looked on it as their duty to wait on God in all the ordinances of his own institution, although they expected to merit nothing by it, for the love of God constrained them. They declared that in every thing they came sadly short of what they ought to do, and did bitterly mourn for it, but blessed be God they were not discouraged in their endeavours to reach forwards, if by any means they might apprehend that for which they were apprehended of God; and in all things they acknowledged they ought to look to Jesus, the author and finisher of their faith, who alone could work all good in them and for them,—to whom be glory for ever.

They were not unmolested in their way by enemies both from within and without, yet they professed that the comforts which they received, more than compensated for all their labour; that if there was no good to be expected hereafter, yet in keeping the commandments of God there was a great reward. They did not all make the same proficiency in the Christian life, neither were they all equal in their religious endeavours, nor were they at all times alike lively in a religious course. They had their spiritual disorders, which their ever merciful Physician healed by the balm of his own blood, and enabled them to run afresh in the ways of his commandments. They showed a particular love to the godly, whom they esteemed as the excellent of the earth, and did rejoice to hear of Zion's prosperity, glorying God on that account. They

THE  
CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

NOVEMBER, 1824.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE X.

(Concluded from page 437.)

I am now—

III. Not only to admit, but to assert and vindicate, other truths, with which the doctrine of the divine decrees may seem to be in conflict; to repel the false allegations which have been made, in relation to those who believe in the absolute sovereignty of God; and to show in what manner the apparently militating truths in regard to this subject ought to be received and held.

I cannot better introduce what I have in view in this part of our discussion, than by a quotation from our Confession of Faith, chap. iii. sec. 1—Let it be well observed, that this section was manifestly intended to contain both an exhibition and an explanation of the creed of our church, relative to the subject before us; that it may distinctly appear that what I have to offer is in perfect accordance with that creed. The section referred to, stands as follows—"God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin; nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures; nor is

Vol. II.—Ch. Adv.

the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established."

The first important guard or restriction of the truth here exhibited is, that we are never to consider the decrees of God in any such light as to make Him the author of sin. Judge, then, with what propriety the members of our communion have sometimes been charged with holding this horrible tenet. It cannot possibly be renounced in more unequivocal language than is here used in the standards of our church. And if any who call themselves Calvinists hold this tenet, we reject them, with as much promptitude as we reject the impious principle which they embrace. Calvin himself never held it—On the contrary, no man could more earnestly express his abhorrence of it, or more cautiously guard his followers against it. But, say our opposers, your doctrine of the decrees must draw this consequence after it—The consequence must necessarily follow from that doctrine. No—we reply—That is *your* consequence, not *ours*. We utterly deny the consequence. And you have no right to draw it for us, and to charge us with it; for that is to take for granted the whole matter in dispute.

And here, by the way, I would remark, that however frequently it may be done—and it is done very frequently—nothing can be more

time, die for their sins, and rise again for their justification: *nevertheless they are not justified*, until the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, *actually apply Christ unto them.*"

LARGER CATECHISM.

Answer to question 63, page 196. "The *visible church* hath the privilege of being under God's special care and government;—and of enjoying"—the "offers of grace by Christ to *ALL its members*, in the ministry of the gospel, testifying that *whosoever* believes in him shall be saved, and *excluding NONE* that will come unto him."

Answer to question 68, p. 199. "All the elect, and they only are effectually called; although others may be, and often are, outwardly called by the ministry of the word, and have some common operations of the Spirit; who, for *their wilful neglect and contempt of the grace offered to them*, being *JUSTLY left in their unbelief*, do *never truly come to Jesus Christ.*"

The Confession of Faith, and the accompanying catechisms, were composed by the Westminster Assembly of Divines in the years 1643-4, about 24 years after the Synod of Dort; and were, from the commencement of the Presbyterian church in this country, adopted as her standards of doctrine. Here then we have a publick exhibition of the views of the Old School; an exhibition that has been before the world for more than 200 years. They believe—

1. That Christ has made a full satisfaction for the sins of all who were given to him by the Father to be redeemed by him, and that they will certainly have the efficacy of his redemption applied to them, and be finally saved.

2. That the merit of Christ's death, in itself considered, is *infinite*.

3. That the gospel is to be preached, and its offers of salvation to be *freely made, indiscriminately to all*.

4. That all who truly come to

Christ shall be saved; and consequently if any not given to him by the Father were to come, they would be saved.

5. That the elect are by nature *under wrath*, as well as others, and are not in a justified state till they truly believe in Christ.

6. That all who hear the gospel are *bound* to believe it, and come to Christ; and of course all who do not, shall be punished for their *unbelief and wilful rejection of offered grace through Christ*.

Now, what more than this can ZETA want; who tells us he firmly believes in the doctrine of *election*, and that not one *non elect person* ever will believe in Christ? What does he intend to prove different from the doctrine of the Old School, which he professes to combat? Will he attempt to prove that Christ has made a *satisfaction* for the sins of those who have committed the *unpardonable sin*? for the sins of those for whom *Christ does not intercede*? for the sins of all those to whom the *gospel is never sent*, and who live and die *without ever hearing of the name of the Redeemer*? for the sins of all those wicked men, who had been, for hundreds, and some, for thousands of years, in *hell*, suffering under the *irreversible sentence of damnation*, before Christ came into the world, and made his satisfaction?

OMICRON.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. 3.

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF I JOHN V. 7.

"There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."

"Satis inde patet quod innumeros gravissimosque errores in iis commissos codicibus quos ceteroqui magni facio."

Griesbach.

Mr. Editor:—In the preceding numbers I have examined the argu-

ments of our opponents, that have been drawn from the silence of MSS. and versions, and fathers. And I leave your readers to judge whether *their mode* of argument is not at war with the first principles of logic: and something like an abuse of the materials which they possessed.—Their radical error, to which I have all along endeavoured to draw the publick attention, is this: They set themselves to prove a *negative*: and from a few *detached materials*, and *particular premises*, they draw *general conclusions* against us.

I now beg leave to proceed to show that their *materials*, out of which they have drawn those arguments, have proceeded from a source utterly corrupted. Those MSS. from the silence of which they have ventured to condemn our text, are, in general, primary or secondary copies from the corrupted and mutilated codes of Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea.

This, I presume, will appear from the following detail of facts.—To get rid of the various readings of the sacred volume, and to arrive at the genuine text, various schemes of classing MSS. have been proposed. Bently and Mills brought forward their plans. They proposed to make the Vulgate, as corrected by St. Jerom, their basis, and to class their MSS. by that.\*

But Griesbach, of the German school, proposed a different basis. He selected Origen, who wrote in the 3d century. His authority he preferred, because he had directed his attention, more than any other, to Bible criticism; and his unparalleled zeal and success had carried him before all the ancient fathers, on this field of science. Griesbach began by a most careful search of Origen's works, to ascertain, from his quotations, what copy of the

holy scriptures he had used. And having, as he supposed, ascertained this—he lays it down as his basis.—“Hoc exemplar nobis instar est fragmentorum ipsius codicis quem Origenes usurpavit.”\*

He then proceeds to show that there are three classes of MSS. texts of the sacred volume. And out of these three he undertakes to determine, by the above mentioned basis of Origen, in what MSS. is to found the genuine and correct text transmitted from the inspired penmen.—He finds that the fragments scattered over the pages of Origen, correspond in a remarkable degree, with the text of the Alexandrine MS. which had been brought from Alexandria in Egypt. He then determines the various MSS., which may be arranged under this first class. And he calls it the Alexandrine class. The second contains those MSS. which had been brought from Constantinople into the different European schools. These he calls the Byzantine class. The third embraces all those which differ from these two, in certain particulars: which have been found chiefly in Europe: and which harmonize with the Latin versions.†

The learned German critick gives a decided preference to the MSS. of the Alexandrine class. And he does not hesitate to pronounce the authority of these to be so great, that they “*outweigh a multitude* of the Byzantine class.” These readings of the Alexandrine class, he supports by some appeals to the fathers; but mainly by the authority of the “*fragments*” of Origen. The readings, thus sustained, he considers to be the true and genuine text. And venturously introducing them into the sacred page, he forms what, he has called, *his corrected text of the New Testament*. And this is that work which

\* Bent. Works, p. 237. Nolan's Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate: Lond. edit. p. 3.

\* Griesb. Symb. Crit. tom. i. p. lxxvii.  
† Griesb. Proleg. in Nov. Test. p. lxxiii. &c.

is the admiration of every scholar; and which is a stupendous monument of genius and learning: but which has a false foundation, and involves dangerous principles.\*

This theory, with all its mistakes, and want of proof to sustain it, is followed by Michaelis and Marsh; and, unless I be greatly in error, by all our opponents. The following is the sentiment of Marsh—in which he adopts this corrupted standard. “A reading, therefore, supported by the connected authority of the Syriac, the Coptic, and the Latin versions, by a *quotation from Origen*, and the ancient Greek MSS. of the Alexandrine and western editions, is not only of great importance, but may, in general, be regarded as genuine.”† Hence, while they hold up these MSS. as containing innate marks of a high original; they feel themselves justified in rejecting from their pages every text, or clause of a text, which is not found in their *standard MSS. and versions!*

But many reasons may be adduced to show why we ought to view these *standards* with jealousy and distrust. It is well known to every scholar, in what manner St. Jerom, in the days of the Pope Damasus; and after him, about the middle of the sixth century, Cassiodorus—*corrected* the old Italic MSS. according to the reading of the Vulgate, and some Greek copies. The latter gave instructions to the monks whom he employed in this service, *carefully to erase the former words, and to substitute his corrections in words, and in ink to resemble the old.* “*That they may be considered the execution of ancient writers.*” “*Ut potius ab antiquariis scriptæ fuisse judicentur.*”‡ Hence, as Nolan remarks, “those MSS. which

were considered as containing the marks of a high original, and ascending to the apostolical days, can really claim no higher authority than that of the illiterate monk of a barbarous age.”\*

But this was little, compared with the mischief done by Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea. For, to say the least, he seems to have originated all this venturous work of *correcting* MSS. and versions. He had certainly a *disposition* to do it. If he was not an Arian, or strongly inclined to that heresy, he did assuredly err by going into an extreme directly the reverse of Sabellianism. In the council of Nice, on the discussion of the doctrine of one substance in the Holy Trinity, Eusebius prevaricated in a scandalous manner. He first excepted against it in positive terms. Afterwards he actually subscribed to it. Then he wrote to his people at Cæsarea an epistle, in which he made a recantation of his former expressions.† As he had the *disposition* to make these changes, so he also had the *opportunity* and the *power*.

The emperor Constantine the Great addressed a letter to him, in which he instructed him to cause fifty copies of the scriptures to be prepared. In his epistle he uses this expression: “*Τὸν θεῖον κ. τ. εἶ.*” “Of the holy scriptures, whereof chiefly, you know the *preparation*, (*τῆν ἐπισκευήν*.) and the *use*, to be necessary to the doctrine of the church.”‡

\* See Simon's Hist. des Vers. chap. v. p. 92—95.

† See this stated in Socr. Eccles. Hist. lib. i. cap. viii.; and Theodor. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. vii. These are the words of Theodoret. “*πρῶτον μὲν συντρέχων τῆ ἀρεῖᾳ αἰετοῖ ὑπεροδὲ ὑπογράφας τῆ ἐν Νίκαια Συνόδῳ; κ. τ. εἶ.*” First, he went along with the Arian heresy; but, at last, having subscribed in the Nicene Synod, &c. &c. See Euseb. Epist. in Socr. Eccles. Hist. ut sup. p. 24. lib. i. cap. viii.

‡ See the Epist. of Const. in Euseb. Vit. Const. lib. iv. cap. 36. Also Nolan's Inq. p. 26.

\* See Nolan's Inquiry, p. 5, 6, 7, 13. 319.

† Introd. to the N. Test. by Dr. Marsh, vol. ii. p. 28.

‡ Cassiod. de Div. Lec. cap. 14, 15; and Nolan's Inq. p. 17, &c.

Now this clothed him with more power than any one man should have had in such matters. Besides these powers conveyed to him, he had, as a scholar, the most extensive influence. Add to this that, in consequence of the destruction of MSS. of the scriptures, throughout the churches, during the persecutions of the preceding emperors, copies of the sacred volume were very scarce. All these combined to give the codices of Eusebius an extensive influence and circulation.

Now these codices were, according to his will and his power, carefully suited to the views of the Arians. I do not say that he wished thereby to oblige that sect: It was most probably on account of his hatred to the term "ὁμοουσιον," "one substance" which the last clause of our text supports. But whatever may have been his reasons, he caused 1 John v. and 7 to be expunged from the fifty codices: and also the word "God" out of Acts xx. 28: and the first clause of 1 Tim. iii. 16.\* And the influence of the Arians having been carried to its height at the death of Constantine, they reigned and triumphed for forty years. And during this long period every facility was given to the fifty codices of Eusebius to extend their influence. "Mille corruptis codicibus," says Kettnerus, "ansam dare potuerunt."—And they did exert an extensive influence during these times. The history of it is traced by several writers: but by none perhaps, more carefully than by Nolan. He has shown that the influence of Eusebius is strongly marked on the versions of the east; and even in the Greek text itself, in many instances. The Coptick version, on which Dr. Marsh lays much stress, is evidently made to follow

\* See Kettneri Hist. Dicti. Joh. p. 85. And Nolan's Inquiry, p. 28 and 41. These writers give the fullest and most satisfactory evidence of this.

this. The evidence must strike every one. It wants those texts which he expunged out of the fifty codices; and it has the changes which he made on other verses. It has also "τους τιτλους και τα κεφαλαια"—the titles and chapters which Eusebius adopted. The same remarks extend to the Syriack versions: also to the Ethiopick (which Du Pin and others deduce from the Syriack); also to the Armenian, and the Arabick, and the Persick versions.\*—It is also to be observed that this influence found its way into the Vulgate. For the copies of the Vulgate used in France and England have the sacred text with the alterations, the titles, and divisions of Eusebius. And from the Vulgate this influence passed into those copies of the old Italic codices, which were under the control of the Roman see.† The Gothick, the Saxon, and some of the Slavonick versions, which the zeal of our opponents has somehow or other dragged into this controversy, are also to be set aside as equally irrelevant in this inquiry. The first was made under the influence of Arianism. For it is a fact well authenticated, that the Goths, out of compliment to the emperor Valens, accepted the form of Christianity, modelled for them, by that Arian prince.‡

That this work of mutilating, or correcting, if you will, was practised without secrecy, and without blushing, is well known to every scholar. "The facilities of correct-

\* See Nolan, p. 31.

† It will be an object of our future Inquiry to ascertain, if possible, whether there be not actually extant the genuine ancient version of the old Italic, in the translation of the Waldenses, the lineal descendants of the Italic church, who sustained their independence against the attacks of the Roman see, and who held the uninterrupted and free use of the scriptures. This text must be worth "a multitude" of Griesbach's MSS.

‡ Socr. Eccles. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 1. And Nolan's Inq. p. 323.

ing this text (the Palestine,) from Origen's works," says Nolan, "and the blind reverence in which that ancient father was held in the school of Cæsarea, seem to have rendered the corruption of the text unavoidable. Short annotations, or scholia, were inserted by Origen on the margin of his copies of the scriptures."—"A comparison between the text and the comment, constantly pointed out variations in the reading, and Origen's authority being definitive on subjects of sacred criticism, the inspired text was amended by the comment."—"This point is placed beyond conjecture by the most unquestionable documents. In some MSS. containing the Palestine text, it is recorded, that they were transcribed from copies, the originals of which had been corrected by Eusebius."—In proof of this, the following are the words quoted from a part of Eusebius's edition, and found in the Codex Marchalianus, "Παμφίλος και Ευσέβιος ἰδιωρθωσαντο."\* "In this Codex Marchalianus," continues Nolan, "the whole process observed in correcting the text, is openly avowed. The reviser there candidly states, that having procured the explanatory tomes of Origen, he accurately investigated the sense in which he explained every word—and corrected every thing ambiguous, according to his notion."† "And as the Palestine text has been thus corrupted from the same source with the Egyptian text, the joint testimony of such witnesses cannot be entitled to the smallest respect, when opposed in consent to the Byzantine edition."‡

The influence of Origen and Eusebius having thus corrupted the two grand classes of MSS. the Alexandrine and the Palestine—it is supposed, with reason, that it

found its injurious way into many of the original Greek copies. Transcripts from these exist in very great numbers. And on an examination of those, the learned find the texts above mentioned all wanting.\* And they discover the other minute changes existing in other texts, which he caused to be made in the fifty codices. They find also the "titles and divisions" of Eusebius. These proofs lying before the learned on the pages of our opponents' MSS. indicate, very clearly, the corrupted source whence they have descended.

But this is not all. I shall satisfy our opponents fully on this material point. Griesbach, the author of our opponents' theory of the German classification, has afforded us the most full and satisfactory evidence against these very MSS. out of which they profess to condemn our verse. And, first; in regard to Origen, whose text he has quoted as the authority and standard, in his classification: notwithstanding the unbounded confidence, which, at first, he placed in it—by his own confession, it turns out that that father is not worthy of the least confidence touching a single quotation:—that is, when strict verbal accuracy is looked for. It was the case with Origen, as with many more of the fathers, that when he quoted a passage out of holy writ, he generally quoted from memory; and often the meaning—and sometimes his impression, or idea of it—instead of a correct verbal quotation. Hence Origen may, *per accidens*, be correct. Oftener he is not. Even Griesbach declares this—that "no reliance can be placed on the edition of his works now in print: and his transcribers have used unwarrantable liberties with him 'Librarii—negligentiores fuerunt in describendis aut recensendis locis e sacris scripturis citatis:

\* Quoted from the Codex March. in Montfaucon, by Nolan, p. 508.

† Quoted from the Cod. March. by Nolan, p. 509.

‡ See Nolan's Inq. p. 509.

\* Such as the close of Mark's Gospel; John viii. 1—11; 1 Jo. v. 7, &c.

eosque e codicibus junioribus interpolantur.\* And again, 'exemplar Originis non ab omni labe immune fuisset.' And, 'Originis exemplar interpolatum jam esset.' †

And what is more to my point, such is the character of the MSS. on which Griesbach, (and with him the rest of those on the other side,) have founded their whole argument against our verse—that Griesbach himself—remarkable for his learning and candour—is constrained to speak of them in very severe terms. It appears to his reader, that he sometimes gets out of humour with his own materials. He seems to feel like one disappointed and betrayed by them. He is constrained to say that he did not discover one of that class of MSS. (to which his theory gives the preference,) which preserved his favourite *recension*, unless in a *very corrupted state*. "Manifestum est jam," says he, "nullum superesse codicem qui ubique unam ac eandem recensionem ita exprimat, ut lectiones ex aliis recensionibus admixtas habeant nullas!" †

Nay, to crown the climax—and what will our opponents after Griesbach say to this?—Griesbach himself, with one indignant sweep, *overturns the whole authority of that class of MSS.* He avows,—and openly proclaims to the discomfiture of his whole theory,—that the very best of them, even those in which he had the greatest confidence, he discovers to be so overrun with errors and interpolations, arising from the marginal scholia, and comments of the fathers, "that they are fouled in every page with gross corruptions." "Satis inde patet"—says the candid critick—"quod innumeros gravissimosque errores in iis commissos codicibus, quos cæteroqui magni facio."—

\* Griesb. Symb. Crit. tom. i. p. cix. And Nolan's Inq. p. 320.

† Griesb. ut supra, p. cxxxii.

‡ Griesb. Symb. ut sup. p. cix. cxi. and cxxviii.

"Nullum codicem quamvis vetustum, ab interpretamentis, et glossomatibus immunem esse largior."\*

This is a specimen of the candid avowal of their leading and most estimable critick. And the gentlemen on the other side, are bound to dispose of these serious charges against the very MSS. from which the whole of their leading argument has been taken—before they can offer another exception against the authenticity of our text. "Physician heal thyself."

Now—to use the words of Nolan—"Let the most prejudiced of the German method of classing the Greek MSS. according to the coincidences of their respective texts, take a retrospective view of their descent, as it has been traced from the edition of Eusebius. Let him compare the alterations which have been recently made, on their authority, in the text of scripture, with his peculiar opinions. Let him then answer how far their collective authority ought to decide against the truth of any doctrine; or the authenticity of any verse which is at variance with the peculiar opinions of him, by whom it was revised and published."

"In this impeachment of the original reviser of that edition of the scriptures, from which there is more than a presumption that all MSS. of character have, in some measure, descended; its last feeble support seems to be withdrawn from the German system of classification." †

Our opponents may ask, how then can you account for those affinities existing between these manuscripts? I answer, it is evident from the conclusions to which we have been led. They are all traced to the corrupted text of Eusebius; and, with the learned Nolan, ‡ we deny in the most explicit terms, "that the clas-

\* Griesb. Proleg. in Nov. Test. sect. iii. p. lxiv. edit. 2. mihi.

† Nolan's Inq. p. 41, 42.

‡ Do. p. 42.

sification by these affinities, acquires any support from the authority of Origen: that it receives any from the original testimony of the eastern and western versions: that it derives any from the best and most ancient manuscripts, or is countenanced in its important deviations from the received text, by any which have not been altered from the times of Eusebius.\*

It may again be objected: According to your conclusion then, no reliance is to be placed on MSS. And if so, what will be the consequence if we carry out this principle into its full operation? Will you impeach the integrity of the scriptures?

There might be some force in this objection, if *only one class of MSS. had existed*. But we have brought our objections thus far only against a *certain class of MSS.*; and the inference and objection of opponents are fair, if applied to the legitimate object. For indeed no reliance, in this question, is to be placed on those MSS. which are traced to the corrupted codices of Eusebius: and which derive their affinities to each other from their descent from his edition.

I beg leave to draw the attention of the learned to the third section of Nolan's Inquiry. By a mass of evidence the most satisfactory, I conceive, which can be wished for, he establishes his position, that the Byzantine text contains the genuine edition of the scriptures. He shows this from ecclesiastical tradition, the proper test of the integrity of the text. The Byzantine text is entitled to the preference from the place where it was found. It was found, he shows, in the region where the *holy writings were deposited*. It is the text retained by the Greek church. It has existed, with the evidence of an unbroken tradition for 1400 years. The eastern church gives its clearest testimony in favour of this text. It is supported by the number and prevalence of copies, and the antiquity

of MSS. The Alexandrine and Palestine texts (whom our opponents follow,) want this testimony. The tradition of these is broken in two places. *First*, by the text of St. Athanasius; and *second*, by Hesy-chius and Eusebius. Moreover, the western church gives her testimony to the Byzantine text as the genuine edition.

This is a point strongly established; and, I presume, the learned will admit it. Now give us MSS. from this source—give us versions from the genuine Byzantine source—and you will soon settle this question. From MSS. and versions of this class, we are willing to accept a decision which even our opponents will draw from them. But for the peace of the church, and for the honour of Bible criticism, let us hear no more of the classification of the German school; nor of the Alexandrine and Palestine MSS. or the versions drawn from this corrupted source. No Eusebius—no Arian—shall be permitted by us, to sit in judgment on the holy scriptures, and to expunge and alter texts according to "*their own notion*."\*

I shall, in my next, enter on the defensive part of my subject—according to the divisions mentioned in my last number.

I am, Mr. Editor,  
Yours, with affectionate respect,  
W. C. BROWNLEE,  
*Of Basking Ridge.*

---

STRICTURES ON GIBBON'S CHARACTER OF ATHANASIOUS.

Mr. Editor—On reading, several years ago, the character of Athanasius, as given by the historian Gibbon, the following remarks were penned. Perhaps they are of im-

\* This is their own phrase, used in the avowal quoted above. "*προς τῶν ἐπισημῶν ἐπισημῶσιν*." I corrected "them," (the inspired writings,) "according to his notion." See Nolan, p. 509.

# THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

DECEMBER, 1824.

## Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

### LECTURE XI.

Our last lecture related to a subject of importance, and of confessed difficulty.—It was not found practicable to bring within the time allotted to the discussion, all that properly belongs to it, or to the answer on which it was grounded. It is not my intention, however, to detain you with it much longer. But before we proceed to the next answer, I think it may be useful to notice very briefly a few frightful inferences, in addition to those mentioned in the last lecture, which have been made from the doctrine of the divine decrees—particularly the decree of election—and to enter at least a protest against the justice of these inferences, and of the charge that they are held or admitted, by those who hold the doctrine from which they are said to follow—I also propose to make a few remarks on that part of the answer, not yet noticed, which states that it was for “his own glory,” that God foreordained whatsoever comes to pass.

You will probably, my young friends, hear the church to which you belong reproached—for it has often been reproached—with holding generally “the horrible dogmas  
VOL. II.—Ch. *Adc.*

of Calvin.” On this I would observe to you, that it ought to be easy for us to forgive, and even to pity, the authors of this reproach; because I think it is scarcely ever made, except by those who are ignorant both of what *we* really believe and what *Calvin* really taught: and it is weak, as well as unchristian, to be much moved by the effusions of ignorance. If we soberly condemn the rashness manifested in such a reproach, and pray that those in whom it has appeared may come to possess a better spirit, we shall perform the duty which the occasion demands.

In *specifying* the false charges which have been brought against those who hold the doctrine of the divine decrees, especially as including particular election, the following may I think be mentioned as among the most common.—It is said, we believe that God formed a great part of the human race on purpose to damn them—having determined to deprive them of all power to help themselves; that we hold that there are infants in hell, of a span long; and that we represent the blessed God altogether, as an absolute, severe, and inexorable tyrant, disposing of his creatures in the most arbitrary and inequitable manner.—Need I assure you, that we reject every one of these revolting ideas, with as much *sincerity* as *any* of those who charge us with them—and with far more

cinian, that I believe God could as consistently realize salvation to us, as offer it on any other ground than that of atonement!—

But I intended only to state and expand *the fact*, that God offers salvation to all men—the *argument* shall appear more at length next month. The maxim, *semper festinat ad eventum* need not apply in theology. ZETA.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. 4.

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF I JOHN V. 7.

“There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.”

“Ecclesia codicem Novi Testamenti retinet, quem constans xvii. seculorum pietas diligenter servavit, et coluit; divinaque Providentia integrum, et ab interpolationibus liberum, usque ad nostra tempora propugnavit.”—*Schmidius, Hist. Antiq. et Vind. Canonis.*

Mr. Editor,—In the first two numbers I have endeavoured to draw the attention of the Christian public to the *mode of argument* pursued by the opponents of the authenticity of this verse: and to show that, in my view, there is a capital defect in it. In the last number, I endeavoured to trace the origin of that class of MSS. which are so decidedly preferred by the German school—according to the classification by Griesbach; and which want several passages of the holy scriptures besides this verse of John. We traced their descent from the corrupted codices of Eusebius of Cæsarea; and the influence and authority of Origen. These corruptions, or *alterations* in the sacred text, were shown to have, in process of time, diffused themselves over the Alexandrine and Palestine edition. And we called

the public attention to Nolan’s argument in favour of the Byzantine codices, as containing the purer edition of the scriptures. And we felt ourselves willing to abide a decision, by our opponents, on our verse, from ancient MSS.—provided that they were of the genuine Byzantine class.

In a discussion of this nature, Mr. Editor, it is not the smallest difficulty which one has to encounter, that there is an array of great names and of imposing authority against us. And I am sensible that, to some, it looks like arrogance for any one in this new world, where there is a barrenness of materials, to enter the lists against some of the great scholars of Europe.

With respect to materials, we make no pretences to new discoveries. Our best libraries boast of no very ancient Greek MSS. And the European disputants on each side of this question furnish us with all the materials that have been discovered. From these I *glean* and offer hints. I make no higher pretensions.

And I conceive that it is not with names, or persons, or mighty literary attainments, that we have to do in this discussion. I claim no merit in thinking myself a mere tyro, in the presence of such literary characters as Griesbach and Michaelis. But I do claim a right to say, that their *mode of conducting an argument*, their *dogmatical assertions*—unsustained by evidence; their sweeping *general conclusions*—not guarded by any explanation that they are made only from the present state of the discoveries of evidence—and their *general conclusions* from partial and defective premises, and corrupted materials, as those MSS. are shown to be—lay them open to the animadversions due to any common delinquent. And, surely, the scholar betrays neither vanity in opposing dogmatical assertions without re-

serve, nor arrogance in treating illogical conclusions with satire.\*

And, Mr. Editor, I beg leave to take the opportunity of saying here, that the name of the author is affixed to these "gleanings and hints," for the reason stated to you in private. It is simply this: He was willing to take off from the shoulders of the editor, and to lay on his own, *the whole responsibility of the quotations and references.* I shall now proceed in my defence.

And *First*—There are certain detached portions of *circumstantial evidence* which may be usefully exhibited in this stage of our argument.

1. There is in our verse not only nothing foreign to the doctrines of Christianity, but there is in it, as every body knows, a doctrine which pervades the holy pages of the gospel. And one of the learned men on the other side has laid this very thing down as a mark, or test of authenticity, "that a book, or passage of a book, to be genuine, must, in

\* Robert Stephens had inserted our verse in his edition, on the authority of seven MSS. The opponents of the verse, not being able to find these seven MSS., supposed that certain MSS., which they had seen, must, for some reasons, have been the MSS. of Stephens: and from these singular premises they conclude that Stephens was not justifiable in inserting the 7th verse; because these MSS., which they conjectured to have been *his seven*, did not contain the verse. They allude to certain MSS. in the French king's library. Mr. Travis visits Paris to examine them. He does it satisfactorily: and shows that such is the difference between these MSS. and Stephens's text, that he certainly had not followed them. Dr. Marsh attacks Mr. Travis. He admits that there is considerable difference between the French MSS. and the text of Stephens, but maintains that there is a *general resemblance* (a very safe assertion). And then he employs an *algebraic theorem* to prove the identity of these MSS. with those of Stephens. *He applies algebra to a moral or critical inquiry!* See Butler's Hor. Bibl. vol. i. p. 393. Perhaps the opponents of the good bishop may propose to extract the square root of his argument, or measure it by yards and feet!

the first place, contain nothing foreign to the doctrine of the author to whom it is ascribed." But the "three in unity," is no new, nor foreign doctrine. Our text is in fact an epitome of what is spread out on the pages of John's gospel—as we have already shown in the first number. The Father did bear testimony from heaven to the mission of his Son. The Word did bear testimony from heaven to Stephen, and to Paul at his conversion, and by shedding down on the church the Holy Ghost. Acts ii. 33. 36. And the Holy Ghost did bear testimony in "descending like a dove from heaven" at our Lord's baptism. And, as is proved out of the holy scriptures, by every system of theology laid before the public, each of these distinct persons is called by the name of the only true God. Each of them has the incommunicable attributes of Deity bestowed on them by the Spirit of unerring truth: each is exhibited to us as the object of divine worship. Each of them is God. But "the Lord our God is one Jehovah." Therefore, even had our text never existed, we should have been thus drawn to this necessary conclusion: "These three are one." Our text, then, is supported by that test of authenticity which even our opponents, and all the learned have laid down.

2. There is an allusion to our verse, if not a direct quotation of it, in a Greek dialogue of very great antiquity. It has been ascribed to Lucian, and is in the editions of Lucian's works. It is entitled *Philopatris*. It is in the Amsterdam edition of A. D. 1687, tom. ii. pp. 770. 568. I find it also in Dr. Thomas Franklin's edition of Lucian, vol. iv. The editors of the Amsterdam edition have shown that this dialogue is more ancient than any of Lucian's works. The author speaks as if he had been baptized, but had apostatized: he alludes thus to St. Paul, we think, in plain

terms: "I have fallen in with a Galilean with a bald head, and a long nose, who passed through the air; and got up into the third heavens, where he learned the most wonderful things: he hath saved us by water." (Kettnerus has rendered it thus: "*authorem per aquam renovavit.*" p. 16. See also Thomas Franklin's Lucian, vol. iv. p. 461.) Now Lucian lived to the year 171. If then the author of the Philopatris alludes here to St. Paul, he must have lived before the year 67, in which Paul departed this life. And he seems also to congratulate the emperor Trajan on his victory over the Persians (p. 779. tom. ii. Amstel. edit., and Franklin's edit. vol. iv. p. 476.), and Trajan died in the East in the year 117. This places the author before the times of Lucian.

Now in this very ancient dialogue a Christian is represented as catechising a heathen, and explaining to him the mystery of the Trinity. The heathen says, "By whom shall I swear?" The Christian is made to reply: "By God ruling on high, Great, Eternal; the Son of the Father; the Spirit proceeding from the Father: One of three; and three of one?" "*ἓν ἐκ τριῶν, καὶ ἐκ ἑνὸς τρία;*" "unum ex tribus et ex uno tria." "These do thou consider to be Jove (*Δία*, Jovem): This one reckon thou to be God." The heathen further says, "I do not understand what you say; one is three; and three are one," "*ἓν τρία, καὶ τρία ἓν.*"\* This he makes the subject of ridicule. Now it is not conceivable by me, that this ancient writer could frame this discourse—"ἓν τρία, καὶ τρία ἓν," "unum tria, et tria unum," unless he had read this verse of John, or had heard it quoted by Christians whom he ridiculed. And in order to either of these taking place, it does appear to me, that it must have been in ex-

istence in the scriptures at that very early date.

3. The sentiment, or the doctrine conveyed to us in our verse, and the expression "these three are one," was the constant subject of debate, on the rising up of every new sectary, during the first three centuries. The Jews, the Cerinthians, the Ebionites, directed their hostile attacks on not only the *thing*, or the *doctrine* of the unity of the persons, but also against the *words*, "*these three are one.*" In the second century the sectaries disputed against this position, "that the Father, and the Son, and Holy Spirit are one God." The Artemonistæ denied that they were *one*. Praxeas, against whom Tertullian wrote, affirmed that *they were one*. But, then, it was interpreted in a wrong sense. These persons were, in his view, *one person*. In the third century, the Sabellians entered the field of conflicting opinions. The main subject of debate between the church and these sectaries was this question, "Are the three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost *one*?" The Sabellians affirmed that "*these three are one.*" But, then, they made them *one*—literally *one and the same thing*.

And I confess that it is utterly impossible for me to persuade myself that these persons did not quote, and constantly use, and bend to their own purpose, and sense, *this very verse*, "*These three are one.*" One thing cannot be contested, that at a very early period, as shall be shown more fully in its place, the Christian fathers also quoted this verse, and by a critical discussion vindicated its meaning, and orthodox sense. The following will prove and also illustrate this point.

Tertullian wrote his book against Praxeas about eighty or ninety years after the death of the apostle John. In this book he gives quotations from Praxeas, in order to refute him. The following are

\* See Franklin's Lucian, vol. iv. p. 459. Lond. edit.

some of these. Praxeas, to show that the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit, are *literally one* and the same thing, quotes these texts: "I in the Father, and the Father in me." "He who hath seen me, hath seen the Father:" he adds, "Pater est solus unus Deus, et unus est persona: tres unum sunt, these three are one." Tertullian takes up each of these, and explains and refutes Praxeas. When he comes to the last quotation of Praxeas—which we affirm to be our text—he uses these words: "ita connexus Patris in Filio, et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes, alterum ex altero. *Qui tres unum sunt, non unus; quomodo dictum est, &c.*" (Basil. Edit. of Tertul. A. D. 1521. Kettneri, p. 9, 10.) And omitting others for the present, we find these words in Fulgentius, in his "Responsio Contra Arian:" "In like manner that text, there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one." "Hi tres unum sunt." "Let Sabellius," continues he, "hear *unus* and *tres*, and believe that there are three persons. Let Arius hear *unum*, and not say that the Son is of a different nature: since a different nature cannot be *unum*." (Quoted by Kettner. p. 170; and Horne, from Max. Bibl. Patrum Tom. ix. p. 41.) Fulgentius was born A. D. 468.

On the whole, we have arrived at this conclusion, that the *idea* or doctrine contained in our verse, was, on the appearance of each new sectary, made the subject of debate between the church and them: and during these discussions, in expressing their idea, the very words of the text seem, not obscurely, to have been used *on both sides*.

4. There is no trace of evidence that any of the different sectaries brought an accusation against the Christian fathers, of having interpolated this verse.—It is a fact on record that our verse was received

by the western churches in Europe, in general, at a very early period. Now on the supposition that this verse had not existed in the ancient genuine MSS. and that the Christian fathers had brought it forward, and quoted it publicly, without effective evidence of its authenticity, how is it to be accounted for, I pray you, that all the sectaries kept silence? The Sabellians, and the Arians, had both the disposition, and the power, and the means in their hands to expose the audacity, and to punish the sacrilegious deed of these fathers, *who had committed the interpolation*. If they could not discover the first who dared to add to God's word, they could easily discover the first who dared to make use of the fraud. How can it be accounted for that they never brought any charges of this kind? It cannot be affirmed that our verse never was quoted against them. This was done. It was done publicly by those brave Christian bishops, who, in Africa, "*bearded the lion in his den*." I allude to the famous assembly of bishops in Africa, who laid in their solemn testimony before the king of the Vandals, and the Arian bishops. In the year, 484, Hunneric, by an edict did summon all the orthodox bishops of Africa, and the isles dependent on his power, to appear before him in February of the following year, and to defend and establish *out of the Scriptures*, their doctrine of the unity of the three divine persons; their doctrine of the *ἁποθυσίου*. They had nine months allowed them and their antagonists to prepare themselves; to confer, and to collect MSS. and to draw up their confessions of faith respectively. At the time fixed by the royal edict, there appeared, says Gibbon in his Roman History, *four hundred and sixty bishops* from the orthodox African churches. They presented their confession of faith to the king. They had known their danger from that man of blood.

They stood on the brink of death. The bar of their God seemed as it were, almost immediately before them. They had made their preparations of proof for nine months. They knew that the eyes of *all the churches* of the east and west were on them. Would men ready to offer their lives on the altar of martyrdom—men who actually, after this, braved banishment and death—would these men interpolate, or bring forward a quotation, which by one word could be refuted and exposed by their learned and shrewd and powerful enemies? Would they do a deed which would expose their memory to infamy, before the eyes of all the churches? It is surely not supposable. They knew that their enemies had every facility to expose them by the possession of MSS. of the Scriptures. Hence they must have come conscious that what they were going to quote, they could sustain by ancient and authentic MSS. and by the testimony of the fathers. If they *did not all this*, then their act of quoting what was not scripture, and their offering what was interpolated, and not found in their enemies' copies, was little else than a wanton and a gratuitous act of throwing themselves into the fangs and the jaws of the lion—an act of self destruction—when they had abundance of other texts to sustain them in the dispute.

Now, the following is the clause of their confession, to which I have alluded. It is from Victor Vitensis. "And further that we may teach it to be clearer than the light, that the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost have one divinity; it is proved from the testimony of the evangelist John: for he says, there are *three that bear testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.*"—The Quarterly Review, Mr. Editor, to get rid of this testimony, tried to impeach the authority of Victor

Vitensis. But the able refutation by bishop Burgess has shown that Victor is sustained by the most unexceptionable authority—from that of the Emperor Justinian, even unto Gregory the Great. (Bp. Burgess's Vindication of 1 Jo. v. 7. p. 52. And Horne, vol. iv. p. 448.) Dr. Marsh supposes that the Arians did not stay to reply—or to reason the point. They resorted instantly to violence. But the Arians did reply—not at first by blows—not immediately by cutting out their tongues, but "*with the most tumultuous clamours.*" They insisted that these words did not prove the point in debate. They insisted that they could not find, in as many words, in the scriptures, the very word—the *ἁποστολικῶν*—which was the word used by both antagonists in the Arian controversy. (See Kettneri, p. 105.) Hence they did not deny our text—but they denied that the *ἁποστολικῶν* was contained in the verse.

Others of our opponents suppose that the Arians must have objected to this text brought against them: but that this has not been recorded by the orthodox, from whom we have the account. To this it has been justly replied, that if they had objected, we should most assuredly have found on the pages of the orthodox some reply to the objection. For it is evident that these fathers *could say* enough for it, when permitted—and did persuade the *whole western churches* to receive it as a genuine portion of the word of God! We feel ourselves fairly entitled to say, that the Arians were silent on this point. They brought no such accusations. And this silence seems to us a proof that they had it in their MS. copies of the Bible.

5. The opponents of the authenticity of this verse believe that it was first originated in the 4th century, by the process of spiritualizing the 8th verse: that it gained ground until the 8th century. That in the

twelfth it was *universally* received as genuine, by the eastern and western churches.

It is readily admitted that Augustine has given a "spiritualizing" of the 8th verse. But that, so far as I can perceive, bears no great resemblance to the 7th verse. That father has thus expressed himself: that *the three, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, may, without absurdity, be understood of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*. I cannot conceive how the remarkable expression of the 7th verse could grow out of this scholium, even had it been placed on the margin; and even had the transcriber of MSS. been accustomed to make very great changes *in words!*

Let this, however, be as it may, this theory will not account for the quotation of our verse by Tertullian and Cyprian, who lived before the *invention* of this scholium on the 8th verse. If I am not in error, all have admitted St. Augustine to have been the inventor of this spiritualizing of the 8th verse. Dr. Burgess has established the *historical* fact, that it was not known in the church in the days of Tertullian or of Cyprian.

But, allowing the theory of our opponents to be correct, and accepting from them their statements as facts, that our verse existed in the fourth century, that it slowly gained ground to the eighth century, that in the twelfth it was *universally* received as authentic:—I wish, with deference, to place before them one circumstance; or shall I call it historical fact? From the fourth century to the twelfth, and even to a period much later, there is not known—there is not discernible on the pages of the orthodox fathers, nor on the pages of any of the sectaries—one *single objection recorded against our verse*. This I have always considered an extraordinary circumstance, and a portion of strong circumstantial evidence.—I invite most respect-

fully, our scholars to institute the search for themselves, and to produce *one single objection, one vestige of opposition, one sentence containing even a suspicion against the genuineness of our verse, from any of the fathers, or any of the sectaries, from the earliest centuries, down until after the 12th century.*

After a long examination of this point, I was extremely gratified, Mr. Editor, in discovering *this evening* only, that that very distinguished scholar, Butler, in his *Horæ Biblicæ*,\* has expressed this sentiment in language very strong. And the vast extent of his reading, gives the greatest weight to his sentiments on this point.

Now, it would appear, that this circumstance cannot satisfactorily be accounted for in any other way, than by supposing that in these different ages, the most satisfactory testimony of the authenticity of the verse had been presented to the church, probably by the production of the very ancient and genuine MSS. (now fallen bye or perished)—all containing it, and exhibiting an unbroken chain of evidence, to the minds of the friends and the foes of orthodoxy—conveyed down from the times when the *Literæ Authenticæ*, from the hands of the apostles, were read in the churches.

6. The omission of a passage in ancient MSS. or versions, or authors, is not to be considered as a real or decisive evidence against its authenticity.—Let us take the case of the Spartan decree, mentioned by so many authors.—It was passed in the time of the first Philip of Macedon: or in the year before Christ's birth 602. It was noticed by Cicero, and by two other writers near his time. This decree fell into oblivion, by some cause or other. It was not quoted, nor alluded to, by any ancient writer for about 1127 years. At last, Boethius, in the year of Christ 525, pro-

\* Vol. i. p. 383. Lond. edit. of 1817.

duced a copy of it.—Or let us take the case of the league made by the king of Syria with the cities of Smyrna and Magnesia. That was made some time after the year before Christ 246. It was, from its very nature, publick;—yet this league is not noticed by any of the historians of that day: nor by any of their successors. It was, at last, produced and brought to light by a marble containing a copy of it—now at Oxford, (E.) from which it has been deciphered.

Now, suppose it to be thus objected against this copy. "There is no ancient MS. containing this decree or this league: none of the historians of that day notice them. They must be spurious. No scholar can consider them to be genuine." How should we meet these objections? The scholar knows how he should proceed. Place then this disputed text, (which, under the operation of several causes, disappeared from some MSS.) in the stead of this decree and this league: and pursue the same form of argument.

Its disappearance for a few centuries (from some copies,) is no more an argument against its authenticity, than the disappearing of the league and the decree can be any argument against their authenticity. Indeed, the disappearing of such a text under certain peculiar circumstances, is much less to be wondered at, than that of the decree and the league. Even supposing that no ancient writer quoted our text—that is no more than what happened to the decree and the league. But did Cicero and others actually mention the decree, and thereby lend their testimony to its authenticity? Is a copy of the league found on marble? We too have the direct quotation of our text by nine of the Greek fathers, (Dr. Burgess's late work contains the quotations,) and by the fathers of the west, Cyprian and Tertullian: (which shall be produced afterwards more fully.) And

we have some very ancient MSS. such as the Montfortian MS. the Complutensian Polyglot, collated from very ancient MSS. and the Ravian MS. of Berlin: not to say any thing of the *thousand and more* MSS. in the libraries of Europe—which remain yet to be collated.—These, to say the least, are equal to the evidence adduced by the learned, and received by every one of the learned, in behalf of the authenticity of the Spartan decree and the Syrian league.\* Why is it that all scholars do not render the same justice to this passage under discussion?

This I offer as a specimen of *circumstantial evidence* (I have used this word for want of a better). An outline of the *positive internal evidence* shall be presented in my next number—if God permit.

I am, Mr. Editor,  
Truly and faithfully yours,  
W. C. BROWNLEE,  
Of Basking Ridge.

Nov. 17, 1824.

---

#### SUBJECTS OF SELF-EXAMINATION AT THE CLOSE OF THE YEAR.

Not having received from our correspondents, as we hoped we should, an original communication on the subject of the closing year, we avail ourselves of an excellent paper on that subject, contained in the Christian Observer for 1805—the writer of which acknowledges his indebtedness, in drawing it up, to a previous publication.

---

#### SUBJECTS OF SELF-EXAMINATION.

Have I, during the year that is past, regarded the favour and everlasting enjoyment of God as the great end of all my schemes, and have I laboured to maintain a constant reference to him in all the actions of my life?

\* Horne, vol. iv. p. 459, and note 2d.

THE  
CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

FEBRUARY, 1825.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XII.

The subject of our present lecture is the tenth answer of our Catechism, expressed in these words: "God created man male and female, after his own image, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, with dominion over the creatures."

In discoursing on this answer, I know not that a better method can be taken than the one which we adopted in the last lecture, namely, to take the several clauses of the answer as they lie in the Catechism, and discuss them severally in that order.

1. Then God *created man*. I have already had occasion to treat of creation in *general*, and of the formation of the first parents of our race. But as the Catechism again resumes the subject in its *particular* relation to man, so this is exactly agreeable to what we find in the sacred records. The account of the other parts of creation is there cursory and general. The account of the creation of man is more full and particular. It was for man that the earth, and all which it contains, was formed. Of all terrestrial things, man alone can know and understand his origin, and adore the hand which gave him being. Of the origin of man, therefore, more was to be told than merely that he was made. Indeed, my young friends, there is no-

VOL. III.—Ch. Adv.

thing which shows the dignity of your nature in the scale of being more strikingly, than the account which is given of this transaction in your Bibles. When the world was formed and completely furnished for his residence, a council of the Godhead is held on the creation of man—"Let us make man. 'Man was to be God's viceroy in this lower world, the only image of his Creator in his moral perfections; and it was the purpose of God, though not then revealed, that the second person of the Godhead should become man; and hence the solemnity of the transaction, and of the account which is given of it—"Let us make man, in our image, after our likeness."—What can be the intention of this remarkable use of language in the plural number, on this occasion? We have already given some explanation of it. But let us examine it a little more closely.

There are only three ways of accounting for this manner of expression that deserve a serious attention; and indeed it is only the last of the three, that can have any thing, that is even plausible, said in its favour.

The first is, that the Deity is here represented as using the royal style, agreeably to what takes place in modern times, in which kings, or sovereigns, speak of themselves in the plural number. But Poole, in his Synopsis on the passage, quotes Aben Ezra, one of the most profound, learned, and candid, of all the Jewish Rabbies, as denying that

G

does not even think whether he is eloquent or not, but is entirely engrossed with his subject. In the pulpit, indeed, a preacher, in all cases, ought to think as little of his manner as possible. He ought to form himself to *right habits*, before he goes there; and when there, to lose sight, as far as he can, of every thing but the truth he is to deliver; and to let all other anxieties be swallowed up, in a concern for the edification and

salvation of his hearers. If he can pour his whole soul into all that he says, it will do more than any thing else, to make him speak well, and with a powerful effect.

With my earnest prayers that you may be useful, to the extent of the ability that God has given you, and that you may have many souls as the crown of your rejoicing in the day of the Lord Jesus, I bid you affectionately adieu. ———

## Miscellaneous.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. V.

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF I JOHN, v. 7.

—  
 “There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.”

—  
 “Insita sua bonitate commendatur lectio, quæ auctoris cogitandi, sentiendique modo, stylo, scopo; cæterisque—exegeticis, ut contextui, adjunctis, oppositis—sive historicis omnium convenientissima.”

Griesbach, *Proleg. Nov. Test.* p. lix.

In a former number of this subject, (No. III.) I endeavoured to establish the following positions; that the Greek manuscripts to which Griesbach and his followers give the preference, are liable to very serious objections; inasmuch as they may all be traced to the Alexandrine source: and, that those classes of MSS. having been avowedly *corrected*, that is, as we think, *mutilated* by the hands of Eusebius, are greatly inferior, in point of integrity to those of the Byzantine class. And we admitted that we were willing that a decision be made on our verse from MSS. of the *genuine* Byzantine source. We said *genuine*, emphatically. For I have not been able to persuade myself that the Greek Vulgate, with all its superiority, in point of integrity, (and Nolan demonstrates that it cannot

be impeached,) does *now* contain every item which existed in the ancient editions. It is admitted that *certain revisions* were made in the Greek Vulgate. The learned know that St. Epiphanius, (and he flourished at the time when the Greek Vulgate was restored,)—St. Epiphanius confesses that certain passages were omitted when that revision took place. If then, it is said, our verse is not found in this *revised* copy—I reply, that I am entitled to infer that our verse did not get justice done to it, for aught that I know: and most probably at the hands of even the orthodox. For it is a singular circumstance in the history of our verse, and almost without a parallel, that the expression in its close was, in very ancient times, viewed with about as much distrust and anxiety, by many of the orthodox, as it is viewed with doctrinal abhorrence by the modern sectaries. With a slight variation in the poet's intention, I may apply his famous line to its fate.

“Tros Rutulusque fuit—nullo discrimine habebunt.”

As we shall see when we come to give the quotations of the Fathers, the ancient foes of orthodoxy quoted this text to establish their ideas that the three persons of the Godhead were “one person,” or “*thing*,” as it is unguardedly rendered, even in two of the ancient French versions of the

Waldenses—"et ces trois sont une chose." Hence the ancient fathers seemed very willing, I mean some of the second, third, and fourth century, to let the verse, which seemed to give them this handle, drop into oblivion.\* And hence Eusebius actually dropt it from his fifty codices, which he published by the order of the Emperor Constantine.†

By the *genuine* MSS. of the Byzantine class, I beg leave to be understood, as meaning those which existed before the *revision*, above alluded to, took place. We shall show in its place, that we have good testimony, particularly that of the Western or Latin Church, that our verse was in their ancient MSS. and therefore, in justice, it ought to have been in *all* the editions of the Greek Vulgate. For, in my view of it, the case admits of proof, strong even to demonstration, that for two reasons, which I shall adduce in their place, the testimony of the Western Church is clearly to be preferred to that of the Greek Church, in this matter.

And here, Mr. Editor, let me pause a moment, to notice a thing which has often forced itself on my mind. Amid the doubts and difficulties with which the Biblical critick occasionally finds himself beset, the pious mind will distinctly perceive, and devoutly acknowledge, the hand of the Divine Preserver of the doctrinal purity and integrity of the sacred text. Copies of the Scriptures were multiplied to a great extent, over the face of the Churches, at the earliest periods. And when it happened that in one section, or nation, the carelessness of transcribers, or the malignant purposes of an enemy, or the cowardly jealousy of a friend, had committed an injury on the sacred text; an abundance of witnesses started up in other sections and na-

\* See Nolan's statements, (Inq. p. 93 and 545,) relative to St. Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Cyril on this point.

† See our statements in No. III., in the Christian Advocate, for November, 1824, in confirmation of this.

tions, to correct, to restore, and to preserve the integrity of the whole.

Over the whole history of this, the eye of the scholar cannot but recognise the supervision of an invisible hand, mysteriously bending every design, and overruling every event, to the establishment of the perfect doctrinal integrity of the holy scriptures. It has excited the amazement of the man of letters; and it has called forth the admiration and gratitude of every pious critick. In the midst of his speculations he pauses; and with the ancient documents and evidences in his hand, he feels himself constrained to exclaim—It is thy hand O God!—sovereign of the church—the guardian of truth throughout all generations; who hast thus most faithfully given effect, in the irresistible movements of thy providence, to thine own words: "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and out of the holy city; and from the things which are written in this book"—"till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled."—In the monuments reared over the fields of antiquity—in the documents collected by the scholars of all ages and countries, I perceive bright and convincing proofs exhibited to every mind, that He who hath said it shall make it good. And from his unchangeableness, illustrated amidst all the changes of men and things, we gather a divine assurance that he will keep his word pure and entire, until the last trump shall tell the last hour of time!

In my last number, I offered you, Mr. Editor, the outline of circumstantial evidence, in behalf of the authenticity of our verse. The following I shall venture to call positive internal evidence.

*First.* The connexion of our verse with the apostle's argument exhibits

an internal proof of its authenticity. —If we read the sixth verse in connexion with the eighth, as the copies of our opponents do, we shall perceive a repetition very unworthy of an inspired writer; and withal, such a want of energy, as strongly induces us to conclude that it never was so left by John. For instance; thus it stands in their copies: "The Spirit beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth: for there are three that bear record, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, &c." Does not this reading make the apostle repeat the expression, "the Spirit beareth witness;" "the Spirit beareth record;" and that too, without any conceivable reason?

It is to be regretted, that many on the other side, take no notice of this consideration. Whether it be owing to the conviction that they cannot better the thing, I shall not pretend to say. But of this I am certain that one learned man, whom I claim for our side, has, by way of trying the force of a concession—or rather by showing his most amiable disposition in being very obliging to the other side—admitted that the whole passage may be deemed complete without our verse; and has rendered the causal particle *ὅτι*, "thus."\*

It is deemed enough to reply, that this does not help the matter, as any one may perceive by repeating the passage with this rendering of the particle *ὅτι*.

The learned Porson, who was as superior to the most of men as a Greek scholar and a witty writer, as he is inferior to many as a theologian; has tried to enervate this argument, and to show that there is no useless repetition, and at the same time to attack our verse in this manner—"If the *Spirit* that witnesses in the sixth verse, be the Holy Spirit, which I think cannot be doubted, because the *Spirit is truth*, why is the epithet" (holy,) "after being twice omitted, added in the seventh verse, to mark a distinction without a difference?" (Porson, Letter XII.)

\* See C. Butler's *Horæ Biblicæ*, vol. i. p. 382. Lond. edit. of 1817.

To this I beg leave to reply; that it will seldom subserve a cause to build an argument on the peculiar phraseology of detached portions of an author. This may be strikingly illustrated in what is before us. In almost every page of the sacred volume the third person of the Most Blessed Trinity is made known by the names Spirit, and Holy Spirit, applied to him indiscriminately. In fact the inspired writers afford us no general rule, without exception by their own practice. The very opposite is the case. Compare Ephes. iv. 30, with 1 Thess. v. 19, and 1 Cor. vi. 19, with 1 Cor. iii. 16.—We can, indeed, perceive one particular distinction; and one that is carefully observed in general, if I mistake not, by the inspired writers of the New Testament: and it is in point to show the error of the learned man, in the above quotation. As the Father is a *spirit*, and as the Son is also a *spirit*, there is a necessity, and a beauty in applying to the third person some distinctive epithet, as for instance *holy*, (because he is the Sanctifier,) to distinguish him when he is mentioned in the order of the three persons. Hence we do find this so applied to him: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ; and the love of God; and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." Hence there is not only no foundation laid in the style of the holy scriptures, to support the learned man's remarks; but there is something positively hostile to it. And hence the phraseology of our text is precisely such as any other authentic verse would be.

Every exertion has been made by the writers on the other side, to account, in a plausible manner, for the actual existence of our verse. They seem generally to suppose that it was a gloss on the eighth verse, by some well meaning but weak interpreter, who was anxious to find the doctrine of the trinity in the earthly witnesses.

The seventh verse cannot be a gloss on the eighth verse; and it never was. In the first place; no man who is acquainted with the history of this mode of spiritualizing, will so far commit himself, as to affirm that this mode of interpreting was known in the Christian church, before the times of St. Augustine. It is a fact admitting the clearest historical proof, that that father *invented* that mode of interpreting. But we can produce genuine quotations of our text, some ages before that of Augustine.

Besides, our opponents conceive it to have been added originally on the margin, as a gloss on the eighth verse. And this supposition necessarily implies that, in their opinion, the orthodox must have made this gloss. Dr. Marsh, if I mistake not, and others, do not hesitate to assert this.

Now this appears to me to be a supposition made directly in the face of the numerous facts, spread out in that controversy which was carried on in those ages between the orthodox and the heretics. Our verse, as every scholar knows, was quoted by Cyprian and Tertullian.—But allowing, for a moment, that it was not quoted, it must be admitted that it was generally received, at any rate usually quoted, without contradiction, in the fourth and fifth centuries: for instance, by the bishops of the African church, in the presence of King Hunneric: by Phoebadius, and Eucherius. (See Nolan, p. 301.) Hence our verse, if a gloss on the eighth verse, must have been invented previous to this. That is, during the ages when the contest raged between the church, and her enemies, the Arians and Sabellians; relative to the person and supreme deity of Christ.

Now every scholar, I think, will admit, that if our verse had been thus expressed, "*The Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost,*" the utmost strength of argument would have lain against these heretics, and on the side of the doctrine of the church. But, on the other hand,

by making it run thus: "*The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost,*" the strength seemed to lie as decisively on the Arian and Sabellian side. Or to say the least, their interpretation of it, thus expressed, appeared to them unspeakably easier; and more plausible to their disciples. And many of the orthodox seemed also to think so; for they thought it helped their cause to quote the text thus, "*The Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*"—But let it be carefully observed that our verse in all copies runs thus, "*The Father, and the Word, and the Holy Ghost.*" On the supposition, then, that the orthodox did invent our verse; they must thus, even according to their own avowal, have invented a gloss, in terms much more favourable to the heretics, than to their own mode of explaining the verse.

In the second place: Our verse could not be a gloss originally on the eighth verse—for this reason, and I shall add no other.—The fathers since the days of Tertullian, and all scholars, so far as it can be discovered, determined that the word "*εις, unus,*" when opposed to "*εν, unum,*" always implied a person, as opposed to "substance:" or "thing," expressed by "*εν.*" This criticism, I believe, originated with Tertullian. And we are certain that that most eminent Greek scholar, Porson, has applauded it.\*

Now this canon being adopted, on the supposition that our verse, (seventh,) is a gloss or interpretation, originally formed on verse eighth, and placed on the margin; then this consequence must follow: The words in the seventh verse, or the gloss, "*και οι τρεις εν εις,*" "*hi tres unum sunt,*" when applied to the eighth verse as its explanation, will make *the spirit, and the water, and the blood, "εν" one thing, one substance with the spirit!* Thus, the orthodox, according to the gentlemen on the other side, must have written so absurdly, I should say, so impiously, that

\* See Porson's Letters, p. 240, and Nolan, p. 277.

they could have easily been convicted of blasphemy! There are no alternatives in this conclusion. Either the orthodox never wrote this verse as a gloss, or they wrote *blasphemy*. Either no scholar wrote this as a gloss—or he wrote *absurdity and nonsense!*

"I must question the seriousness of any man," says Nolan, (Inq. p. 301, note.) "who will persist in declaring, that he believes the latter verse, which is directly in favour of the hereticks' notions, and in opposition to the authority of Tertullian and Cyprian, could have been invented by any member of the African church: or that any authority could have gained it admission, in this form, into the received text of that church, but that which it derived from the implicit conviction of its members, that it was written by St. John the Evangelist."

We strengthen our argument taken from internal evidence, by taking into view the particular design of John in this Epistle.—In his days two dangerous sects were busily spreading the poison of their heresy—the Cerinthians, and the Nicolaitans. Their errors may be reduced to these two fundamental points. They denied that *Christ was the Son of God*; they denied that *he was come in the flesh*. Unbroken tradition declares that John wrote his gospel and his epistles, to counteract this heresy.\* And there is abundant internal proof in his gospel and first epistle, that such was his main design. He asserts his supreme Deity in the beginning of his gospel: and shows that Christ is *come in the flesh*. He exhibits very fully, the testimony of the *three heavenly witnesses* to these points: we have quoted these already (in number 1st.); and in his first epistle, I think it is plain that he is recapitulating what he had said more fully in his gospel.—The hereticks professed to believe in a *trinity*: but they held it in an

erroneous sense. To reform this abuse, and to give the church a correct idea, he declares the true doctrine of the Most Holy Trinity. He distinguishes the *persons* by masculine terms; "οι τρεις;" and the one Deity "το θειον," by a neuter term "το 'εν."—These hereticks had denied that Christ is the Son of God, in a sense which made him the Father's equal. John brings the testimony of the heavenly witnesses to this. *For where is the earthly testimony that could establish this? And it could not be established in the church without testimony from witnesses.*—The hereticks denied that Christ is come in the flesh. This was a point which came fairly within the range of earthly witnesses. He does bring the testimony of the earthly witnesses, and records it in the context. "*He came by water and by blood.*" "*There are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit,*" by his miraculous gifts, "*and the water*" of holy baptism, "*and the blood,*" symbolically set forth in the Holy Supper: and by which, as witnesses, a continuous testimony is set forth in the church to our Lord Jesus Christ as our mediator; and to his accomplished work of atonement.

"Now," as an able writer observes,\* "this appeal to the witnesses is as obvious, as the argument from it is decisive: those who abjured the *divinity* of our Lord, being as naturally confuted by the *heavenly witnesses*; as those who denied his *humanity* by the testimony of the *earthly*. Viewed with reference to these considerations, the apostle's argument is as full and obvious, as it is clear and decisive; while it is illustrated by the circumstances under which his epistle was written. But let us suppose the seventh verse suppressed, and he not only neglects the advantage, which was to be derived from the concession of his opponents, while he sums up "*the witness of men*;" but the very end of his epistle is frustrated; as the main propo-

\* Irenius, Advers. Hæres. b. lii. cap. xi. Nolan, p. 264, &c.

\* Nolan, Inq. p. 277.

sition is thus left unestablished, that "*Jesus is the Son of God!*"

Now let us add to this, what to me appears strong and decisive, the sentiment of the apostle expressed in the 9th verse. "*If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: For this is the witness of God which he has testified of his Son.*" In verse 8th, we have the witnesses on earth—the witness of men displaying the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit; and also dispensing in the church, the solemn ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper: and thereby giving solemn and effective testimony to our Lord's incarnation and mediation. But on the supposition that verse 7th were omitted, where, I pray you, is the witness of God, so emphatically alluded to in the context, "*For this is the witness of God?*" Where—I ask our opponents—where is the testimony of God, if our verse be an interpolation? Here something is evidently pointed to, as an immediate antecedent. It is not the testimony of man given by miraculous gifts, and by dispensing of the sacraments. No! He notices this, it is true. But it is something else that is so emphatically alluded to here; "This is the testimony of God." This sentence of the apostle is complete.—He does not proceed to give *some testimony of God*; as if that which he alluded to were not already here. On the contrary, the seventh verse being taken in, the whole paragraph becomes natural, consistent and complete. "*There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one. If we receive the testimony of men,*" (as exhibited in verse 8th,) "*the testimony of God,*" (as expressed in verse 7th,) "*is greater. For this is the testimony of God.*" But if "*this testimony*" be not that which our verse records, ("*the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, bear record in heaven,*") then the inspired

writer says, "this is the testimony of God"—when there is *no testimony of God here stated*: and he here calls our solemn attention, and here points us to something, which, on our opponents' supposition, *he has not set down before us!* Besides, as we have already remarked, and ought to repeat again, *one main end of the epistle would be frustrated, as the chief proposition is left unestablished; viz. "that Jesus Christ is the Son of God:"*—a mystery of pure revelation: and which, of course, could be certified only by heavenly witnesses: and which is certified by the heavenly witnesses, in John's Gospel—of which this epistle has been, by every body, considered as an abstract.

Hence we are led to one of two conclusions. 1st, either the reading of the MSS. and of Griesbach's "corrected text," which leave out our verse, is NOT THE CORRECT READING: or, 2d, "*there is a palpable oversight in the texture of the sense, in this passage of the inspired Apostle!*"

*Second.* An argument of importance is drawn from the grammatical construction of the whole sentence in which our text lies.—The rule laid down by all criticks, and acceded to by our opponents, may be usefully recited here. "Palpable oversights in the texture of the sense, and gross solecisms in the grammatical structure, cannot be ascribed to the inspired writers. If, of two readings, one be exposed to such objections, there is but the alternative, that the other must be authentick." We have, I trust, disposed of the first part of this rule. We have to try our verse by the second.

Now the preceding and following context to our verse is supported by all the readings: and it is admitted by the gentlemen on the other side, that the sixth and the eighth verses are authentick. There are two readings proposed with respect to the intervening part. We read "*Ὅτι τρεῖς*" *κ. τ. ε.* "For there are three," &c. Our opponents leave out this whole verse, and "*τῆ γῆ,*" "*in the earth*" from the 8th verse.

This reading, in our view of the subject, makes the apostle guilty not only of a palpable oversight in the texture of the sense, as I presume we have just seen; but of a gross solecism in the grammatical structure.

I shall not avail myself at present of Middleton's learned and ingenious remarks on the use of the article "το" as attached to "ἐν," in the 8th verse, and necessarily implying the existence of the corresponding expression in our 7th verse. I beg leave to offer simply one remark. His learned antagonists have shown successfully that he has advanced something fanciful; and something not uniformly supported by classical usage. But I do humbly presume, after close inspection, that there is something in the main argument of Dr. Middleton, which is by no means at all refuted. But our argument, I rather think, rises above the necessity of this *minute* criticism, as some deem it.

On the supposition that our text is left out, the whole sentence will read thus, as in the "*corrected text*" of Griesbach: "Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα: καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσὶν."

On what known grammatical principle can this construction be explained or defended? All the terms for "*the Spirit*," "*the water*," and "*the blood*," "τὸ πνεῦμα, τὸ ὕδωρ, τὸ αἷμα," are of the neuter gender. Yet the inspired writer makes them agree with five masculine adjuncts. He says—"τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες: καὶ οἱ τρεῖς."

The criticks of the German school, it is true, though they do not venture to contravene the text quoted above, do nevertheless permit themselves to use unjustifiable liberties with the sacred style; particularly with that of John. And I am not quite sure that Griesbach can wash his hands of this sin.

But we may fearlessly say that no scholar *can* impeach the grammar of an inspired writer: or *can* convict him of a gross solecism. *A priori*,

the thing is impossible. It is enough to say that the Holy Spirit was with him. He who gave the *gift of tongues*, would not give it in imperfection: far less with the drawback of palpable blemishes; still less would he bestow a gift involving false grammar, and absurdities which would expose to the ridicule of men his venerable apostles, employed in discoursing on the most grave subjects. Such an idea involves the purest absurdity—if not something even more than absurdity. The apostles did speak—they did write *as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*. Be our plain answer this.

But if our opponents choose to decide in this matter by a dictate *ex cathedra*—if they prefer the decision of a council of scholars—we are most willing. We too have our scholars. Without deducting the least item from the well earned and glorious laurels of the very learned Griesbach, and Michaelis, and Marsh, and Porson—we can name, on our side, men to whom we gravely say, they, on the opposite side, can select no equal from their ranks. We have—(to pass by a multitude)—we have Matthæi, Ernesti, and archbishop Eugenius—the first of Greek scholars. The fact is, we are indebted to the last mentioned Greek scholar, (Greek was as familiar as his mother tongue to him, who translated the Georgics into classick Greek.)—We are indebted to this Eugenius for the first detection of this anomaly of our opponents' *false Greek*. He thus expresses himself in a letter to Matthæi—Speaking of our opponents' proposed reading, by leaving out our verse, he says: "Haud planè consisteret:" &c. "It is by no means consistent; it involves an evident outrage to diction, and a most manifest solecism"—"solecismum patentissimum." He next notices the proof of this, the union of neuters with numerous masculines; and then gives what would be pure Greek and natural diction, had there been no verse pre-

ceding it, to cause this form of Greek, by the figure attraction.\*

But on the supposition that our verse is inserted into the sentence, it does appear to me, that the main difficulty vanishes; and that we have an easy way, and classical authority, to aid us in removing the obstacle from the apparent anomaly in the 8th.—I say *apparent*, on the supposition that our verse forms a member of the entire sentence.

For in the disputed verse, two of the terms, “ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ ὁ Υἱός,” “The Father and the Son,” are masculine. And the apostle is evidently speaking of persons: and even in respect to the third term, “τὸ πνεῦμα,” it is a curious fact, that John in his gospel, when speaking of the Spirit says—“ἔλθῃ ἑκεῖνος τὸ πνεῦμα.” (See ch. xv. 26. and xvi. 13.) Hence the apostle uses the proper adjectives. They are all masculine. And thence when he is about to express the earthly witnesses in the next verse, “it cannot be difficult to conceive,” as an eminent scholar has remarked, “that the sacred writer might carry on the same expression, or the same adjuncts, to the 8th verse. And the correspondence in number of witnesses, and the similarity of their design in bearing witness to the truth of Christ, may tend to confirm this sentiment.” (See Horne’s *Introd.* p. 456, vol. iv.) This form of style is caused by the figure attraction. It is familiar to the classick scholar. Even in the elementary books used to aid the pupil in constructing Greek, the rule of Nelson, and his numerous quotations from classick pages, make it familiar to the younger students. But let it be specially noted, that this figure attraction necessarily implies something preceding which does attract. Take away the preceding sentence or term, and you take away even the possibility of the figure attraction. To use the figure attraction, and to reject and cast out entirely what

goes before and does attract, is to violate the first principle of Greek syntax in this matter. It is to offer outrage to the genius of Greek. It is to construct such false Greek, as would have been spurned at contemptuously by every classick writer, sacred and profane.

Now apply this principle to our present purpose. Here, in the 8th verse, we have masculine adjuncts to neuter terms. Either this is falsely constructed Greek, and such as is utterly unknown on the classick pages; or it is the usual and well known example of the figure attraction. As it was written by John, and supported by all readings of the MSS. it must, of course, be classick Greek; and is also, of course, an example of the figure attraction. But the figure attraction, of necessity, implies that there is something going before which can, and does, attract. But on supposition that our verse is taken away, then all the masculine terms; all the attracting causes, are totally removed. Our verse being left out, there is nothing left—not even the vestige of a cause—not the slightest reason existing to authorize the figure attraction in the 8th verse. Had there been no witness mentioned before the 8th verse—had there been no particular phrase preceding—had there been no masculine adjuncts to cause the inspired writer to put, by attraction, the adjuncts of his neuter terms into the masculine gender; he could not have used this figure by any known grammatical principle: he would—as the most learned Greek scholar, Archbishop Eugenius, has observed—have written, in pure Greek, thus—“τρεῖς εἰσι μαρτυροῦντα—καὶ τὰ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσι.”\* Hence we are entitled to conclude, that the reading of Griesbach, and of those

\* See examples of the figure attraction, in John xiv. 26. xv. 26. and xvi. 13, contrasted with verse 7, &c. I beg leave to refer the reader, for the full explanation and examples of this figure, to the Port Royal Greek Gram. b. vii. ch. i., and Nolan’s *Inq.* p. 565, note; where he answers objections on this point.

\* Quoted from *Matthæi Greek Test.* vol. 9, *Introd.* and Nolan’s *Inq.* p. 257, note.

that follow him—inasmuch as it does thus *make the inspired writer guilty of a gross solecism in Greek—cannot be the correct reading. Hence our verse has been, and ever ought to be, a part of the genuine text.*

Griesbach has laid down a rule to determine between two readings. It is an admirable rule: I beg our learned opponents' attention to it. See Proleg. p. lix. vol. i. of his Greek Test. By this rule, which is the motto at the head of this paper, I have anxiously guided myself in the preceding argument. And it has conducted us to a conclusion perfectly the reverse of that of the German school. The reader must determine for himself which of the arguments, thus professed to be built on the same basis, leads to the legitimate conclusion.

The following remarks of the learned Nolan (pp. 259—261), I find so much to my purpose, that I gladly avail myself of his aid: and the reader will be pleased with the extract from such a masterly writer.—“In 1 John, v. 7. the manifest rent in the *corrected text*” of Griesbach, “which appears from the solecism in the language, is filled up in the received text: and ὁ Πατήρ και ὁ Λόγος, being inserted, the masculine adjectives τρεῖς οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, are ascribed to suitable substantives: and by the figure attraction, which is so prevalent in Greek, every objection is removed to the structure of the context. Nor is there, thus, a necessary emendation made in the apostle's language alone, but in his meaning. St. John is here expressly summing up the divine and human testimony; “the witness of God and of man”—verse 9. And he has elsewhere formally enumerated the heavenly witnesses, as they occur in the disputed passage. In his gospel he thus explicitly declares—*I am one that bear witness of myself. And—the Father that sent me beareth witness of me. And—when the Comforter is come, even the Spirit of truth, he shall testify of me.* And yet in his epistle, where he is expressly sum-

ming up the testimony in favour of Jesus, we are given to understand that he passes, at least, two of these heavenly witnesses by, to insist on three earthly: which have brought the suppressed witnesses to the remembrance of almost every other person who has read the passage, for the last sixteen centuries! Nay, more—he omits them in such a manner as to create a gross solecism in his language, which is ultimately removed by the accidental insertion, as we are taught, of those witnesses, from a note in his margin. Nor is this all; but this solecism is corrected, and the *oversight* of the apostle remedied, by the accidental insertion of the disputed passage from the margin of a *translation*: the sense of which, we are told, it embarrasses, while it contributes nothing to mend the grammatical structure!\* Of all the omissions which have been mentioned respecting this verse, I call upon the impugnors of its authenticity to specify *one*, half so extraordinary as the present! Of all the improbabilities which the controversy respecting it has assumed as true; I challenge the upholders of the corrected text, to name *one*, which is not admissible as truth, when set in competition with so flagrant an improbability as the last! Yet on the assumption of this extravagant improbability, as matter of fact, must every attack on the authenticity of this verse, be built as its foundation!”

I am, Mr. Editor,

With affectionate respect,

Yours truly,

W. C. BROWNLEE.

Basking Ridge, Jan. 19, 1825.

\* “Though the reading of the Greek Vulgate, τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, το Πνεῦμα και το ὕδωρ, και το αἷμα, is not to be tolerated: yet the reading of the Latin Vulgate (from whence it is asserted that 1 John v. 7, has crept into the Greek text), is grammatically correct—“*tres sunt qui testimonium dant spiritus, aqua, et sanguis.*” [Yet, our opponents say, the *false Greek* crept in out of this *grammatically correct Latin translation!*]

THE  
**CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.**

MARCH, 1825.

**Religious Communications.**

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XIII.

A very important and interesting subject, my young friends, now invites your serious attention, in the eleventh answer of our catechism—"God's works of providence are his most holy, wise and powerful, preserving and governing, all his creatures and all their actions."

In discussing this subject, we shall, as heretofore, pay a particular regard to the several clauses in the answer recited; yet we shall not take them in the exact order, in which they are there placed. Our method will be—

I. To show the nature, and prove the existence of the divine providence—It consists in preserving and governing the whole creation.

II. To consider the extent and operations of this providence—It reaches to all the creatures of God, and to all their actions.

III. To dwell a little on the character of this providence—It is most holy, wise and powerful.

IV. To make a few miscellaneous remarks, chiefly of a practical kind, on the whole subject.

I. Then, I am to show the nature, and prove the existence, of the divine providence—It consists in preserving and governing the creation.

It has been ably argued by some excellent writers, that the preserva-

tion of the universe is a continued exercise of creative power. Their supposition seems to be, that creature existence is a kind of *forced state*. That as matter rose out of existence at the command of the Deity, so it would fall back, or return to non-existence, if not constantly sustained in being, by the very same power or energy which first produced it:—In a word, that preservation is equivalent to a constant creation. They suppose that this theory is, at least, countenanced by scripture. Thus, in the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, the inspired writer connects together the creation of the worlds by the Son of God, and his "upholding all things by the word of his power,"—in such manner, it is supposed, as to represent the latter as a continuance of the former act.

But whether providence or preservation, imply a constant creation or not, it seems plain that there must be a continual exertion of divine power, in order to those movements and operations which constantly take place in the material world. Matter is of itself *inert*. This is always considered as one of its essential properties. Yet it moves incessantly, and is continually receiving innumerable new modifications, or changes of form. The established order in which this takes place, we call *the laws of nature*. But what do we understand by the laws of nature? If we do not mean by this ex-

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

*Supplement to No. IV.*GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN  
ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY  
OF 1 JOHN, v. 7.

—

“There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.”

—

“Quod sol est in mundo, quod in pyxide nautica acus, quod in corpore cor, id in hac Epistola Johannis est versus septimus capitis v.”—*Bengelii Gnomon*, p. 1184.

Mr. Editor,—Before I enter on the detail of the external evidence of the authenticity of our verse, I shall, with your leave, indulge myself in taking a discursive view of the past and present state of the controversy on this verse, in Europe: and in exhibiting a translation from Dr. Cave and Bishop Burgess, which will add some weight to a branch of my circumstantial evidence, in No. 4 of this discussion.

I. I am convinced that the strong language held by some of our opponents, approaching to a tone of defiance, and even to that of a victor, has not unfrequently created alarm in the minds of some, who have not had the means or the leisure, necessary to examine the evidence adduced on each side of this question. I think I may say with confidence, that a simple narrative of the state of the controversy will be acceptable to plain readers. And perhaps it may satisfy them, that our verse is not in the smallest degree of danger, even in those countries where hostilities are carried on by its most accomplished enemies.

For one, I may be permitted to say of my own convictions on this portion of holy writ, as a well read theological professor once observed to his friends, relative to Presbyterian church government.—“He never was a thorough Presbyterian, until he had studied Dr. Owen’s book against it.” When one discovers, *how little in reality*, even the most learned antagonists of our verse have brought

forward against it, he feels a high degree of satisfaction in the evidence which has been exhibited to support its authenticity.

The learned and witty Porson, has ventured to assert, in summing up a paragraph—“such is the state of the controversy: and all the learned had abandoned the defence of the verse.” It is true, he has given a very meagre view of the subject. He has numbered only *ten writers* in its favour. But in opposition to this representation of the Greek professor, I assert, that the learned know that at no period of the controversy, was *this statement ever true*. *The learned never had abandoned this verse*. But at *two different periods*, at least, our opponents had abandoned their attacks! The bishop of Peterborough has enlisted the fears of Christians on his side. He considers *the defence of our verse as jeopardizing the defence of the integrity of the New Testament*.\*

Dr. Marsh, in the vapouring style of Professor Porson—there can be no harm in calling things by their right names—tells us gravely, “that all hope of showing, *even with the least colour of probability*, that this verse, 7, *ever existed in ancient Greek MSS. appears to be entirely extinguished*.” Pref. to his letters to Travis.

But the advocates of this verse have a confidence in their minds that the day of triumph is coming round, when its authenticity shall be set on a solid basis. There is that going on in Europe which, it is believed, will put to rest the present opposition. The search which is being made for MSS. and for quotations in the pages of the Greek fathers, is earnest, and active, and extensive. The activity of one librarian, at Milan, has already done wonders. What will be the result, when this search shall be conducted with equal ability at Paris, at Moscow, at Florence, at Rome, and in England! The industry and skill that gave the learned world “Cicero de Republica,” and

\* Theol. Lect. 27th.

the Greek "Ode to Ceres," which, like our verse, had been lost for some centuries, will, under a kind Providence, we trust, soon shed increasing light on our text. And surely, Mr. Editor, this, on our part, is a reasonable anticipation. It is now known, that there is *already* one MS. of the New Testament (containing our verse) which is about *one hundred* years older than that Greek MS. which, by the consent of the learned, has restored to the light this famous Greek "Ode to Ceres." I mean the manuscript of the New Testament, formerly called the *Codex Britannicus*, now the *Codex Montfortianus*, in the library of Dublin College. The European critics, on the continent and in England, so late as the year 1823, seem now to have admitted that it belongs to the thirteenth century.\* And Porson's conjecture that it was forged about the year 1520, to impose our verse on Erasmus, is now laughed to scorn, I believe, even by his friends!

Erasmus was the first who raised this storm of disputation on the text of the heavenly witnesses. This he did by leaving the verse out of the first edition of his Greek Testament, printed in the year 1516. The verse had been quoted by Latin and by Greek fathers (as shall be shown in its place) from a remote antiquity. On the page of one Latin father, who lived near the apostolick age, we find it distinctly quoted. It was also quoted by Cyprian. It was in the pages of the Holy Scriptures, in current use in the Western Church for TEN CENTURIES! *Not one enemy had appeared against it*, even to question its authenticity, during those centuries. Not a writer of the orthodox side—not a writer from the lists of the hereticks, *had uttered a word or written a sentence against it*. We invite our opponents to contradict this. We invite our learned antagonists to show us one opposer before Erasmus, in the year 1516. We do

it with the most perfect respect. If they can produce a sentence or a writer against our verse, they will have effected more than our advocates during 300 years, from Stunica to Burgess, have been able to do.

The omission by Erasmus created a great sensation. Many antagonists "drew the battle blade." Stunica, and his learned coadjutors, in their "Annotations" defended the reading of the famous polyglot of Complutum. And Edward Lew (or Lee) an Englishman, though far inferior to Stunica, did ably defend the verse.\* Erasmus was candid. He demanded of Stunica to produce the MSS. used in composing the polyglot of Complutum. Stunica failed in this.† Erasmus professed himself willing to insert the text into the next edition, if a *single MS.* of any respectable antiquity could be shown to contain the verse.

The *codex Britannicus* (now the Dublin or *Montfortianus*) was produced. Erasmus yielded to the polyglot of Complutum, and the *codex Britannicus*: and the famous text appeared in his fourth edition of the Greek New Testament, in the year 1527.‡

From the days of Erasmus, the controversy continued, at intervals, to the year 1689. The advocates of the verse were men of illustrious attainments. The most conspicuous of them were Bellarmine, Gerhardus, Selden, Hammond, Calovius, Sebastian, Schmidt.§ They were giants compared to their opponents.

In the year 1689, father Simon

\* Kettneri Hist. &c. p. 190.—C. Butler's Hor. Bibl. vol. i. p. 104.

† It is now a settled point, I believe, that these parchment MSS. had, on the lamented death of Himenes, been disposed of, by a scandalous and unpardonable mismanagement, to a *rocket-maker*, of the name of Toryo. When Professor Moldenhawer went to Alcala to seek for these parchments, he discovered that this melancholy fact was true. The receipt given to Toryo for his purchase, was actually put into the Professor's hands. Butler's Hor. Bibl. p. 92, vol. 1.

‡ Kettner, p. 190.

§ See Burgess, p. i. Pref.

\* See Bp. Burgess's Vind. of 1 John, v. 7. p. 141, 142, Edit. 2d.

renewed the controversy, when it had nearly ceased by the discomfiture of the enemies of the verse. Simon gave a new turn to the dispute. He produced a quotation from Facundus, in which that ancient writer was found to give a forced and mystical interpretation of the 8th verse; and to refer it to the Holy Trinity. And thence, Simon argued that the *seventh verse* must have been utterly unknown to Facundus, and to every other man, *who could thus mystically interpret the 8th of the Trinity.\**

This idea, weak as it does appear to the advocates of the verse, has been actually seized upon, and played off with various success, from the year 1689, to this day. During the Porsonian controversy, we discover different specimens of the use of this hint from father Simon. "I reassert," says Porson, (Letters, p. 311.) "that no man, in his perfect mind, could possibly adopt this allegorical exposition of the eighth verse, if the seventh were extant in his copy."

This is a species of argument from our learned opponents, which is not bottomed on any solid basis. It has for its foundation a *supposition* of what is *proper* or *improper*, in their view of interpretation. But we reply to Porson and his able coadjutors, by simply adducing a fact—and a fact which the Greek professor ought to have known. The learned archbishop Eugenius of Cherson, has actually interpreted the 8th verse in this same mystical manner, and has referred it, we think indeed rather absurdly, to the Trinity; *and yet he quotes and defends the seventh verse.†* Hence, this new idea of father Simon, which Porson has borrowed, and has brandished over the head of Travis so unmercifully, is actually found to be an *erroneous conjecture*, and nothing more!

The attack of Simon called forth,

\* See Simon's *Histoire Critique du Text, du N. T.* par. i. cap. 18, and par. ii. cap. 9.

† See his letter to Matthæi, and Burgess. Pref. p. 5.

on our side, some writers of distinguished name. The most able, were Smith, Ittigius, Martiany, Maius, Mill, Pfaffius, Kettnerus. Their labours were attended with the happiest success, among scholars and Christians.

In 1715, Emlyn, a Presbyterian minister, renewed the contest. It continued with spirit till 1720. Mace was his able coadjutor. Calmy was one of their antagonists. But Martin and Twells were triumphant. Twells replied to Mace, who shortly after retired from the conflict. Martin's last tract silenced Emlyn. He survived its publication twenty-two years, and made no reply.\*

Mill, and Maffei, and Buddeus, (in his *Isagoge*,) were conspicuous advocates of our verse, a century ago. The first of these published his *Greek New Testament* and his *Prolegomena*, after spending thirty years of close study on it. The learned know how to appreciate the opinion of such a man, on a question of this kind. The opinion which this great man pronounced on this verse, was the following. "Nullo modo de suo loco movendus," &c. "By no means is it to be removed from its place. By whatever means it disappeared for a time, it certainly existed in the autograph of St. John; and in those exemplars copied after it," &c.

In 1734, Bengel distinguished himself in this controversy. He was conspicuous for his learning, his candour, and the force of his arguments. He wrote a great deal on many subjects. The following was the deliberate opinion of this scholar on our verse. "*Quod sol est in mundo,*" &c. "What the sun is in the world, what the needle is in the mariner's compass, what the heart is in the body, that this seventh verse of the fifth of 1 John is, in this epistle."†

We are indebted to Burgess for the character of several other eminent defenders. Bern. Maria de

\* See Bp. Burgess, p. 2.

† Bengelii *Gnomon*, p. 1184. Burgess's *Vind.* p. 2.

Rubeis, is mentioned with great respect. He appeared against Samuel Crellius, in 1756, in a dissertation on the three witnesses, published at Venice. Dorhout's "Animadversiones" appeared in 1768, with great applause.—C. F. Schmidt, in 1775. Knittel appeared in 1785. He wrote a work against Semler, with great effect. It made a considerable noise in Germany. That distinguished antagonist, Michaelis; remarked, after having read him: "learned and specious as his 'new criticisms' are, they *have not convinced me that Semler is mistaken.*" "This"—as bishop Burgess has shrewdly observed—"this is saying every thing but, *do tibi manus Plato!*"\*

In our slender enumeration, we must not be so ungrateful as to omit the following names, men whose memory is inscribed on the rolls of deathless fame. They successfully defended our verse, at different periods—Beza, Mosheim, Grabe, Ernesti, (a truly accomplished critick.) In England, we enumerate Bishop Pearson, ("qualis quantusque vir!") Stillingfleet, Wallis, Bull, Waterland, and Horsley; names to which the pious and learned look up with veneration; and in whose presence professor Porson ought to have carried himself with more modesty and diffidence. It ill became the Greek professor to talk as he has done, in the presence of such men, of "*fresh examples of forgery,*" "*of pious frauds and childish credulity,*" "*and of reviving stale and exploded reasons!*"† Was such language befitting the presence of Pearson, or Bull, or Horsley?

The last renovation of this controversy (and that which still is carried on) was provoked by a singular note on the pages of the historian Gibbon (see his Rome, chap. 37. Note 119). This note, remarkable for its sneer at good men, and its light and unsustained assertions on a very im-

portant subject, attracted first the attention of Archdeacon Travis. He animadverted on the sentiments of Gibbon, and defended the sacred text, in letters first published in the Gentleman's Magazine, in the year 1782. They were afterwards corrected and published in a volume, in 1786. Mr. Professor Porson was the antagonist of Travis. His letters appeared in the same Magazine for 1788. This controversy continued between these eminent men down to the year 1794. The professor's letters exhibit great learning, sagacity, and wit. The latter quality perhaps is frequently ill timed, and occasionally much misplaced. His review of the argument taken by our writers from the testimony of the African bishops, exhibits a proof of this.\* Bishop Burgess has shown that Professor Porson has *not advanced an original objection against the verse.* They are all borrowed from Sir Isaac Newton, Whiston, Emlyn, and Dr. Benson.†

We look back on the Porsonian controversy with regret and pain. We do not pretend to have made thereby any advance. "Considering Travis," says Butler, "was a mere novice in biblical criticism, when he first engaged in this controversy, he performed wonders. But it was his misfortune to combat giants." Bishop Burgess gives us, what our side conceives to be the correct idea of it. "Though Travis was laudable in his zeal, and successful in many points of the inquiry, and abundant in the collection of evidences, yet by his inexperience and his inaccuracy, he gave such an advantage to the wit and erudition of the Greek professor, *as threw the controversy back more than half a century!*"‡

Bishop Marsh distinguished himself also in this dispute. He published a translation of Michaelis, with copious notes. And in 1795,

\* Compare Porson's sentiments with C. Butler's reply to this part of his argument. Bibl. Horæ, vol. i. p. 403—405.

† See Burgess, p. 57.

‡ Burgess do. p. 4.

\* Burgess, do. p. 77. Edit. 2d.

† Porson's Letters, p. xxv. and 226.—And Burgess's Vindication, p. 10, Pref.

he commenced his letters to Travis. He and the writer in the *Eclectic Review* of 1810, and the present writer in the *Quarterly Review*, have been the last and ablest writers against the authenticity of the verse.

Nolan occupied the field of conflict in the year 1815. His profound and very interesting work on the "Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or received text of the New Testament," attracted great and merited attention in Europe and America. He has combated with success the theory of Griesbach, and has set aside his proposed plan of classing MSS. He has established the fact that that class of MSS. to which Griesbach and his followers give the preference, is derived from the corrupted texts of Egypt and Palestine. (Section VI. &c.) He has with equal success, we think, established the fact of "the verbal integrity of the received text, or the Greek vulgate, by the separate and distinct testimony of the oldest witnesses—the primitive Italick version, and the primitive Syriack version;" (Sect. V.) And he has, in an able manner, established the authenticity of the three famous texts, Acts xx. 28.—1 Tim. iii. 16.—1 John v. 7. (pp. 276—280; and pp. 511—572.) An idea of the character which this volume sustains in England, may be formed from the following remark of Grier (himself a distinguished writer) in his "Reply to Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy,"\*—after having noticed the "invincible arguments of Nolan," he proceeds to state their influence on his own mind in relation to our verse. "I feel compelled to abandon my former prejudices against the verse; and to think that a person should almost as soon doubt the genuineness of the rest of St. John's epistle, as that of the disputed passage."†

The distinguished advocate of our verse at present on the field, and oc-

cupying the attention of Britain, is Bishop Burgess, of St. David's. He published his "Vindication of 1 John v. 7," in 1821. In this first edition he has thoroughly answered, in my view of it, the different objections of Griesbach. He was reviewed in the *Quarterly Review* of March, 1822. The reviewer, if we may judge from his manner, was not in the best possible train of feelings. He gives the good bishop a great many uncalled-for cautions and exhortations, against hard names and reproachful language. There cannot possibly be a more polite writer than Dr. Burgess. But the reviewer, it would appear, mistook the hard knocks of the bishop's unanswered arguments, for hard names and reproaches. A second edition came out in April, 1822. He has retouched his argument against Griesbach: in his "*advertisement*" he replies to the Bishop of Peterborough: in a "*preface*" of 68 pages he answers fully every objection of the *Quarterly Review*; and Professor Porson has received in the preface and the body of the book, so close and well sustained an attack, that in our view of it, nothing of his hostility remains to gall any believer in our verse—except it be only *the flashes of his wit*.—"Vox et præterea nihil!"

An appeal is now made to the literary world in behalf of our cause. Griesbach was eternally the burden of the song; and next to him Porson "*adibat ad astra*." The Unitarians too, *who have not lent the least aid, and who have not produced themselves one single original objection against our verse*, have sung the praises of Griesbach and Porson—and they number Griesbach and Porson (though these great men were themselves orthodox) among the champions of their cause. "*It is not our business*"—says my old class-mate, Dr. Lant Carpenter, who has lately, in a melancholy manner, thrust himself forward into the first ranks of Unitarianism in England—"It is not our business to refute

\* Published in London, in 1821.

† See Burgess, p. 75.

them, but their business to refute Griesbach," &c.\* In his book, Bishop Burgess points out distinctly the two pillars on which Griesbach has erected the whole of his system. And we rest our cause with the candid of the literary world, to judge if the bishop has not completely torn down each of them. That profound scholar and theologian *has done it*. He speaks as one who knows that he has done it. And in his usual frankness he tells the Unitarians "that he has done it," and bids them go "and look out for other aids to maintain their anti-christian cause!"†

In the refutation of Porson, I perceive one severe rebuke, which, were the Greek professor alive, he would feel the sorest. Porson, in opposing the famous *Montfortian MS.* actually permits himself to say, that our verse, as it stands in that very ancient MS. is *bad Greek*, because "it wants the Greek articles before the terms for Father, Word," &c. The bishop shows that the classics and the New Testament writers very often omit the articles, and that the purest Greek very often wants them.‡ And, no doubt, the learned professor must have been in the habit of communicating to his pupils, this very doctrine about the articles, *ex cathedra*, every day.

The bishop shows, in a satisfactory manner, that even our opponents being witnesses, there is *no positive evidence against our verse*; that on the contrary, all the *positive evidence is in its favour*; that all the evidence collected by the industry of its enemies, is *entirely negative*; and by themselves called *negative*; and it is simply this—it is not in certain MSS.; it is not quoted by the Greek fathers (which we *now* positively deny). Hence the whole of the negative evidence may be considered as reduced to this item—it is not found in certain MSS.—We reply,

it is even so. And these MSS. on which you rely, are traced to the corrupt source of Eusebius's codices, through the Egyptian and Palestine editions, as you do actually, with the learned Griesbach, avow. In fine, Burgess shows that *the negative evidence in favour of our verse is much stronger than the negative evidence against it*.\* Of this we shall make our use afterwards.

We have frankly admitted, that, by the inexperience and inaccuracy of Travis, and by the *mode* in which Porson has *managed* the controversy, our cause was thrown *fifty years back*. But now, the advocates of the verse feel that they have not only regained all that was lost, but what is more, in England our cause is gaining a brilliant triumph. And from the nature of our opponents' argument, it would appear, that they have gained the summit of their objections; and perhaps the extent of their materials. But for us, such is the nature and kind of the evidence of our text (being positive) that we may still look forward to the disclosures of time, for fresh resources. Facts bear us out in this anticipation.

I may just add, that in 1823, Bishop Burgess advertised, "*as preparing for the press his 'Second Part,' in answer to the objections of Sir Isaac Newton and Michaelis.*" But I have not yet been able to procure it, though it certainly is before the publick.

II. The note from Dr. Cave (*Histor. Literaria*, vol. i. p. 17. and Burgess, p. 150) has a reference to the second observation in my Number IV., *Christian Advocate*, for Dec. 1824, p. 545.)—Dr. Cave fixes the date of that Greek dialogue, entitled *Philopatris*, in A. D. 116, or at the latest in A. D. 165. There is not much difference between us as to the date. And I shall leave it to the chronologer whether the reason adduced for my date (taken from internal evidence in the dialogue) be not, at least, much stronger than Dr.

\* See his "Unitarianism," &c., and his Reply to Dr. M'Gee, p. 416.

† Page 82.

‡ See Burgess, p. 59.

\* See Burgess, p. 15, &c.

Cave's. This great antiquity of the Greek dialogue being thus admitted by the most learned scholars in England, I shall exhibit from Dr. Burgess, the parallel between the sentence alluded to in this *dialogue*, and the famous *verse* of the three heavenly witnesses.

## PARALLEL.

1 John v. 7.

“Τρεις εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦν-  
τες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ—

ὁ Πατήρ

ὁ Λόγος

καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον

καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεις ἐν  
εἰσιν.”

Philopatris in Luciani Oper. p. 998, &amp;c.

“Υψιμεδων τε θεος, μεγας, αμβροτος, ουρανιων τε.

Ἵγιος πατρος—alibi, ὁ λογος dictus est: p. 1004.

“Πνευμα ἐκ πατρος ἐκπορευομενου, [et in p. 1004.  
Christianis dicitur παρα του πνευματος δυναμιν  
του λογου λαβειν.]

“Ἐν εκ τριων, και εκ ἑνος τρια, [et paulo infra addi-  
tur]—ἔν τρια, τρια ἔν.”

Dr. Cave adds—“You perceive here every thing consonant; the same sense brought forward on each side (or column) in almost the same words. By an argument to me more than probable, it appears to have been taken out of the testimony of St. John. And hence that verse

must have had a place in the most ancient codices. Quod erat demonstrandum.”

With affectionate respect,

I am, Mr. Editor,

Yours, truly,

W. C. BROWNLEE.

Basking Ridge, Feb. 1825.

---

 Review.
 

---

A SERMON, ON THE DUTY AND ADVANTAGES OF AFFORDING INSTRUCTION TO THE DEAF AND DUMB.—By Thomas H. Gallaudet.

This sermon is preceded by the following *Note*.

“The following SERMON was delivered at Burlington and Montpelier, Vermont; Portland, Maine; and Concord, New Hampshire; during an excursion of the author, the object of which was, not to solicit pecuniary contributions, but to excite in the public mind a deeper interest than has hitherto been felt for the DEAF and DUMB;—and is now published at the request of the Governor of Maine, and other gentlemen in Portland and Concord. —Whatever may be derived from the sale of the Sermon, after defraying the expense of publication, will be applied for the support of indigent pupils, at the Asylum, from the states in which copies of the Sermon may be sold.”

The text of the sermon is Romans xv. 21.

“But, as it is written, to whom he was not spoken of, they shall see; and they that have not heard, shall understand.”

The preacher shows, that the apostle was animated in his sacred work by witnessing, in the success of his labours, the fulfilment of the prophecy contained in this text. He then adds—

“While contemplating this generous ardour of the apostle, let us consider his example most worthy of the imitation of us all. And would to God, my brethren, that his spirit were transfused into the breasts of all the disciples of Jesus Christ; for never, perhaps, in any period of the history of the church, has she stretched forth her hands, with more eagerness of supplication, for the undaunted and vigorous exertions, in her behalf, of all who delight in her prosperity.

“Now her walls begin to rise, and her towers to lift their heads towards heaven; for many have come up to her help. Let not our hands refuse their labour in so glorious a work; for soon she shall shine

THE  
CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

APRIL, 1825.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XIII.

(Continued from p. 101.)

2. Another character of God's providence is, that it is *wise*. On this it will not be necessary to dwell long, since it is implied in what has already been said, and is, in general, exceedingly obvious. Wherever we turn our eyes—whether to the heavens, to the earth, or to ourselves—we see, at once, the wisdom of our Maker and Preserver. It is strikingly apparent, not only in the original structure of what we behold, but in the wonderful manner in which every process and operation is carried on and continued, and in which the wants of every living thing are consulted, provided for, and supplied—Or if we examine the moral world, the same wisdom is not less conspicuous. Good is brought out of evil, light out of darkness, and order out of confusion. The jarring passions, views, interests, and pursuits of men, are so overruled and directed, as to be made to issue invariably in the accomplishment of the designs of heaven.

3. The providence of God is *powerful*. "He doth according to his will, in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou?" How often

VOL. III.—Ch. Adv.

do we see the greatest events growing out of the most inconsiderable beginnings, or brought about, by what would have appeared to us, the most inadequate means and instruments? In the striking language of ancient prophecy—"Worm Jacob is made to thresh the mountains, and beat them small, and make the hills as chaff." From what small beginnings did the Christian religion proceed which is now filling the world? How few events have been productive of such great changes, of almost every description, as the Protestant reformation? Yet this reformation was chiefly effected by the instrumentality of an obscure Augustinian monk—for such was Martin Luther, when he commenced the great and glorious work which he was preserved and honoured to accomplish. On the other hand, the best concerted plans, and the most powerful preparations of earthly princes, have been often turned to confusion and destruction, by causes which were overlooked or despised. Whom God will protect, none can injure. Whom God will destroy, none can save. "If God be for us, who can be against us!"

IV. I am now to make a few miscellaneous remarks, chiefly of a practical kind, on the subject before us.

1. You will sometimes, it is probable, meet with a distinction made, between *ordinary* and *extraordinary providences*. By ordinary providences you are to understand those occurrences which take place agreeably to the established laws of na-

T

(the publick services of the chaplain of the garrison they hardly consider as worship;) they feel themselves very desolate. Never have I been so sensible of the value of Christianity as a bond of union and a spring of kindly feeling between strangers, so soon as they recognise in each other the relationship which their common Christianity has produced, as since my experience of the friendship of these interesting individuals. I had been advised before leaving home, in prospect of my travels, and as a passport to kindness among strangers in Europe, to become initiated in the Freemason society. What the value of this institution may be to travellers, I do not know; and my prejudices against it on several accounts, I am very sure will never allow me to know. But my lack of knowledge on this subject, I am very confident will never be matter of regret, should I be so happy, in the different places of my sojourn, as to meet with such Christians as I have found here: and I may add, the superiority of Christianity above masonry in the production of kindness towards strangers, is very conspicuous in this respect, that it reaches the female bosom. It excites, and directs, and sanctifies the kindly feelings of this more kindly part of man, which masonry excommunicates from its fellowship. If mankind were generally Christians, in practical compliance with the truly Christian injunction, "owe no man any thing, but to love one another;" Masonry, and every thing else which claims to be a bond of brotherhood in our world of selfishness and discord, would soon be superseded. In that case, the Christian traveller would find a home, and kindred, fathers and mothers, brethren and sisters, wherever he went; with the very large additional enjoyment of a grateful heart that it was so.

I am just on the eve of leaving this place. Whether I shall have time to write again, before the vessel in which I have taken my passage for Messina in the Island of Sicily

sails, I do not know. I have yet a few things, which I would wish to communicate. I may find time to put them on paper on shipboard, if not before.

I remain, most affectionately,  
Yours, &c.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. VI.

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF 1 JOHN, v. 7.

"There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one."

"Ex uno codice æque divina hauriri potest fides, atque ex mille: hoc præsertim loco, ubi adamantina versiculorum coherrentia omnem codicum penuriam compensat." *Bengelius, Apparatus Criticus*. p. 771.

Mr. Editor,—In No. V. I endeavoured to exhibit, as briefly as I could, the *internal* evidence by which our verse is sustained. On that species of evidence we lay great stress, and justly too. We say with Bengel, in the extract at the head of this paper—and we say it with strong emphasis: "From one codex, faith equally divine can be drawn, as from a thousand: in this place, especially, where the adamantine connexion of the verses compensates for all the penury of manuscripts."

The bishop of Peterborough in one of his lectures has, indeed, advocated this doctrine, "that no internal evidence can prove a passage to be genuine, when external evidence is *decidedly* against it."\* But his antagonist, bishop Burgess, in his review of that lecture, has justly observed, what must strike every scholar; that "the external evidence may be *decidedly* against a passage, and yet not *decisively* against it:—it may be so decided by the opponents of the passage, and even admitted to be so by

\* Theol. Lect. 27. on the Integrity of the N. Test.

its advocates; and yet not be *decisive* against it: because, *in itself the external evidence* is not sufficient for such a decision.\* And I would put it to the candour of every scholar to say, whether we have not the stronger evidence, of the two, on our side. Even admitting it to be a fact that the *external evidence* were *decidedly* against us—it is unquestionably true that the *internal evidence* is *decisively* for us.

It is worth while to observe how our opponents have treated the *internal evidence*. In theory they are strictly correct. They lay *decidedly* the greatest weight on it. They tell us so in plain terms. But when they come to apply their own theory—even their own sound rules to our verse—they err woefully against the very rules laid down by themselves. I solicit the special attention of the followers and admirers of Griesbach to this point. That very learned critick, in his own *rules*, lays it down as an important position not to be lost sight of, that the *greatest stress* is to be laid on the *internal evidence*; and *next to that*, on the *external*. “*In judicandis lectionibus, &c.*” “In judging of various readings,”—(I now quote Griesbach’s Rules)—“a respect is to be had in the *first place* to the *internal evidence*”—“*interna eorum bonitas*”—“and *secondly*, to the consent of codices, versions, and fathers.”† And moreover, in his latest work, in which of course we are to look for his maturest ideas, he makes the investigation of external evidence “a subordinate part of criticism;” and “a secondary means of determining the correct reading of a passage.” He makes it, in fact, even to consist in weighing and deciding on the *internal evidence*. “*In indagandis et expendendis internis veræ falsæ ve lectionis indiciis.*”‡ And that eminent critick shows that he can—in certain circumstances—be

perfectly consistent with his own rules. In deciding, for instance, on a manuscript, (the codex Paulin. 17,) he takes the *internal* proofs and evidence for his *chief* guide.\* There is also a comment on this point from the pen of one of our ablest opponents; to which I beg the attention of those who have rejected our verse, *exclusively* on the ground of *external* evidence; and that evidence too, taken mainly from manuscripts—I mean the comment of Wetstein. It is true he deemed the verse spurious on the testimony of manuscripts chiefly, even while he made the comment to which I allude. But it belongs to his friends to reconcile Wetstein to himself, in this matter. This critick has declared unhesitatingly, that the most ancient existing manuscripts are utterly insufficient to decide on a question of this kind. “*Tam multa codicibus, &c.*” “So many things,” says Wetstein, “can be objected to the”(existing)“manuscripts, both Greek and Latin, which weaken and enervate their testimony, *that scarcely any thing certain can be derived from them alone:*” “*ut ex illis solis vix quicquam certi confici possit.*”† And Wetstein has added the weight of his example to this rule. It is a fact well known to scholars, that Wetstein has defended—and successfully defended—the authenticity of the Syriac epistles of Clements Romanus, on the ground chiefly of *internal evidence*; and that too *against even the silence of the fathers, and the non-existence of Greek manuscripts!*”‡

Now when the leading criticks in the opposition, have been thus strictly orthodox in laying down the rule, and in applying it to every other thing *except our verse*; on what ground, I pray you, can they possibly be defended, in making our verse the solitary exception? I am sorry to be obliged to bring charges against any

\* Vindic. p. xxix.

† Symb. Crit. vol. ii. p. 90, note. And his Proleg. sect. 3, vol. i. of his N. Test.

‡ Comment. Critic. in Nov. Test. p. 4, &c.

\* See his Symb. Critic. vol. ii. p. 90, 91, note. See also Burgess’s Vind. p. 108.

† Wetst. Proleg. in N. Test. p. 296, edit. Semler. And Burgess, p. xxix.

‡ See Bp. Burgess, p. xxx.

man. But assuredly their own rules and conduct in other cases being evidence, these great men are guilty of inconsistency and *critical heresy!*

In the opinion then of the greatest men against us, (judging from the sound theory and sound part of the practice of Griesbach and Wetstein, above stated,) we ought, in strict justice, to reverse the maxim of the bishop of Peterborough; for the reverse is most certainly the truth—"No *external* evidence can prove a passage to be spurious, when the *internal* evidence is *decidedly*—or I should now say—*decisively* in its favour." Griesbach and Wetstein, and, so far as I know, all the criticks against us, confirm this by theory and by practice, with the single exception of their refusing an application of it to our verse.\*

Now I beg our readers to lay this *sentiment* and this *practice* of the foes and of the friends of our verse, by the side of the strong fact that there is no *internal evidence against our verse*. I speak this emphatically.—There is no *internal evidence against our verse*—even the whole of our generous opponents being judges. The whole of the internal marks, even all that goes to constitute the internal evidence—the *mode of thinking*, the *scope*, the *peculiar diction* of the beloved disciple—the *doctrine* in the verse—are all perfectly at one with John in his gospel, and in the rest of this epistle.—And moreover, the opponents of our verse have not only no interval evidence against our verse; but they have no other kind, even of *external* evidence, than that of the existing manuscripts; on which Wetstein has candidly pronounced a sentence—so fatal to our opponents' whole theory: For the fathers and versions will, as we shall see, give strong testimony in our favour.†

And surely it cannot have es-

\* See Burgess's Vind. Advert. to his 2d edit.

† I mean the versions used in the Western churches, which were less exposed to errors, than the Greek church.

aped the attention of the friends of Griesbach and his theory (it has excited the astonishment of his antagonists) that while he has, with his usual industry, collected every item of the *external* evidence (such as it is) against our verse; and has devoted twenty-four pages to it; he has made his escape, as if in fear of consequences, from the consideration of the *internal* evidence. He bestows only *one half page* on it—indeed only "*three words*."\* And in this single meagre paragraph—in his "three words"—he merely sums up in six observations, the whole of the *internal* evidence. He simply names them. He shows neither their merits nor their weakness. And the reader will on inspection perceive, that the only notice which he takes of the arguments, is an exclamation on the fourth head, "*speciosum argumentum!*" &c.—"*Specious argument*" this! were it not that the words "*in the earth*" are wanting in the MSS. as well as the words "*in the heaven*."†

\* This is his own introduction: "Tandem tribus verbis attingamus." See his Diatriba on 1 John, v. 7. vol. ii. of his Nov. Test. and end of the volume, p. 24, bottom.

† We have satisfactory evidence that even this is far from being true. Some versions, and some MSS., (such as those used by Facundus,) and many quotations (six out of Facundus) show "*ἐν τῇ γῆ*," "*in the earth*" remaining. But MSS. and versions, made long after the leaving out of our verse, have gradually, by the hand of transcribers, lost the phrase "*in the earth*," which most evidently referred to its correspondent one before, "*in the heaven*."—See Nolan's Inquiry, p. 555—557. In reference to Griesbach's judgment, in his Diatriba, &c. on 1 John, v. 7, I beg leave to refer the reader to Burgess's able exposure: 1st. That his judgment is *precipitate*; 2d. *Partial*; 3d. *Contrary to his own rules*; 4th. *Untenable*. Vind. pp. 87, &c. And in p. 89, the bishop gives us a specimen of Griesbach's "*extravagance, vanity, and untruth!*" See the paragraph alluded to, in Griesbach, in p. 25, of his Diatriba, last fifteen lines, beginning with "*Ego quidem*," &c. And Matthæi establishes against him the painful charge of *partiality*, in the process observed by him in the rejection of 1 John, v. 7: and in

And in a question of this kind, it is proper not to omit the opinion of the strength of the *internal* evidence in behalf of our verse—expressed by as able men and criticks as the world has yet seen; such as Mill, Bengel, Ernesti, Matthäi, Horsley, Eugenius. They did admit all the *kind of external* evidence which their opponents brought against the authenticity of the verse, and yet expressed, in strongest terms, their belief in its authenticity. “Tantum abesse”—(says Eugenius the archbishop of Cherson in his letter to Matthäi in A. D. 1781,) “tantum abesse per interpolationem illum versus surrepsisse, ut ne quidem versus octavus, qui sequitur, staret, nisi versus septimus præcederet, de quo agitur.”\* To these I ought in gratitude to add the following names, who expressed themselves quite as strongly: Pearson, Hammond, Owen, Wallis, Selden, Bull, Stillingfleet, and Grabe. And really, Mr. Editor, when one casts his eyes over the names of these great men—and can single out from them some of the very first of scholars and criticks—some who had spent fifteen years—some twenty—and some, like Mill, thirty years in their researches and commentaries on the New Testament;—and when we hear them teaching with solemnity and force of argument, the authenticity of our verse; we can scarcely refrain from smiling, when we hear these *new names*, (novi homines.) Dr. Carpenter, and Mr. Worsly, talking “of gross interpolations of the verse:” “palpable forgeries;”†—or

the adoption by him of *ὁς* instead of *θεός*, in 1 Tim. iii. 16. In rejecting 1 John, v. 7, observes Matthäi, he sets aside a mass of evidence from many witnesses, and the testimony of nearly the whole Western churches: while he eagerly adopts *ὁς* instead of *θεός*, “*who*,” instead of “*God*,” in 1 Tim. iii. 16, on much fewer, and even false witnesses, “*multo paucioribus, et mendacibus testibus.*” Matthäi nota in 1 Tim. iii. 16; and Burgess’s Vind. p. 88.

\* See Burgess, p. 56.

† See Dr. Carpenter’s Reply to the bishop of Raphœ, p. 415. and Bp. Burgess’s Vind. p. 107.

from feeling indignant at Griesbach’s telling us “of doubtful, and suspected, and trifling arguments:”\* or at Porson’s strangely forgetting himself, and descending to “the most arbitrary and unbecoming insult over his antagonist, archdeacon Travis:” and exhibiting “feelings” as Burgess justly observes—“which precluded the exercise of temperate and impartial criticism:”† and replying to an argument which he could not overthrow, nor shake off, in this style.—“If Jerome had told us that his Greek MSS. contained the three heavenly witnesses, he would have told us a notorious falsehood!”‡ “Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis!” &c.

In the singular discrepancy existing in the opinions of our opponents, relative to the origin of our verse, we can perceive no trifling proof of their incorrectness. We can hardly find two of the same opinion. Each new writer brings a new theory. Father Simon is confident that the verse originated in a Greek scholium. No, says Dr. Marsh, it certainly took its birth from a Latin scholium. Sandius is sure that it was not quoted before the *third* century. Socinus and Erasmus (I am sorry to put Erasmus into such company), are just as sure that it was not quoted before the *fourth* century. Griesbach has no doubt that it was not quoted before the close of the *fifth* century. The Quarterly Review (Review of Burgess, March, 1822,) is confident that every body is wrong, who thinks that it has been quoted before the sixth century.§ The fact is, they are all equally confident—and they are all equally right!

\* Griesb. Diatriba.

† See his Lett. to Travis, pp. 404—406, and Burgess, p. 63.

‡ See his Letters, p. 303, and Burgess, p. 43. Travis in the enlarged edition of his letters, has disdained to pay any particular attention to Prof. Porson. He pays attention only to his objections, which are almost entirely copied from Sir Isaac Newton.

§ See Burgess, p. 36. &c.

## EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

Before I proceed to quote from the pages of ecclesiastical writers, I wish here to set down a proof of the authenticity of our verse from the sacred page.—For it seems to me to belong rather to the *external*, than to the *internal* evidence. Our verse is found in a parallel passage of the Holy Bible. And this existence of a parallel passage does seem to me to have the force of a quotation by an inspired hand. For I view the Holy Bible as composed by the Holy Spirit. Men spake and wrote as He moved them. It is as a *whole* his divine composition. With *Him* there is no future time. With *Him* there is no past time. With *Him* there was no *priority*, nor *posteriority* in the composition of the different parts of the Bible. Every part of the New Testament was equally present before his mind, when he dictated all the parts of the Old Testament;—even as much so as they are now present before Him. Hence is there any absurdity in saying that *by the Holy Spirit* the quotation is made—and made by him in the Old Testament out of the New Testament? For to him it is the same thing—or it is as easy as to take a quotation from the Old into the New Testament. I can see no absurdity in saying then, that our text is quoted in Deuteronomy, vi. 4. in a manner as full and specific as quotations are usually made from the Old into the New Testament. In our common translation the verse is thus rendered. “Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.” In the Hebrew, the following is the arrangement of the words: “Hear O Israel, Jehovah, our Elohim, Jehovah . . . one.” It is certain that the term “one” is placed last. And critics know that there is a pause (the Hebrew *pesik*.) between the last word, *Jehovah*, in the Hebrew text, and the word for *one*. Thus, “Jehovah, our Elohim, Jehovah—one.” And this pause is expressed in some accurate copies of the Hebrew Bible by the usual marks for *pesik*. (see Frey’s Heb. Gram. p.

6.) or in other copies by the *literæ majusculæ*. In my copy it is expressed in the latter way.

The true reading, of the text, therefore, is this—“Jehovah, our Elohim, Jehovah—are one.” And here there is the distinct enumeration of the divine three. And they “are one.” This I call a quotation of our text by the Holy Spirit.\*

2. We have *negative external evidence* in favour of our verse. Our opponents cannot produce the authority of MSS. against our text, older than the beginning of the fourth, or the fifth, or even perhaps the sixth century. The Vatican and Alexandrine codices, I believe, are admitted by all to be among the oldest, if not the oldest. And I am not aware that it has been decided whether these codices are to be dated from the fourth, or fifth, or sixth centuries. They are certainly not older than the fourth century. Now, we have evidence of an unquestionable kind, that MSS. of this late date did suffer from the hands of men. Nolan has established this point beyond controversy, in reference to the codices of Eusebius, and those copied from them; namely, the Palestine and Alexandrine codices. Burgess is of opinion, that the MSS. were not mutilated; but that they suffered by the inattentions of transcribers. Now it is well known to the parties on both sides of our question, that, whilst there are no MSS. later than the fourth century, there are only two MSS. existing (namely, A. B. of Burgess, p. 145.) of a date later than the fourth. Woide places them in the fourth century, Wetstein and Mill in the fifth, and Michaelis in the sixth century. There are none of the seventh, none of the eighth, and two of the ninth century (namely,

\* The idea which I have here followed out, I took from the learned Pfeiffer and Leusden. See Joh. Laur. Pfeiffer, Dissert. De Æterna Divin. J. Christi, p. 6.—And Leusd. Philol. Hebr. pp. 110. 112. And his Clavis Heb. Vet. Test. p. 116, on the use and meaning of the *literæ majusculæ* in the words used in Deut. vi. 4.

G. g. Burgess, p. 145). All the rest are of a later date.

Now these four MSS. which want our text, can be traced to a corrupted source. Griesbach will not refuse that they are of the Alexandrine or Palestine source. He even advocates that class. And we refer our readers to what we have already established in relation to MSS. of this source.\* Hence we can distinctly perceive that the whole materials, whence the *external* evidence against our text is derived, are no older than the fourth century; or in the opinion of Michaelis, no older than the sixth century. Here the opponents of our verse must begin to draw all the matter of their arguments against us. The four, or the six centuries preceding this period, offer them no resources. But we can go back, under the clear light of unquestionable quotations out of Phoebadus, and Cyprian, Tertullian, and the testimony of almost the whole western churches, till we arrive near to the primitive and apostolical times, when the *literæ authenticæ*, or the autographs of the inspired penmen, were in existence in the church. And this distinct testimony existed in the western churches (fully equal in its testimony, nay superior, as we shall see in its place, to the Greek church, in a question of this kind,)—it existed in the western churches for centuries before the defective MSS. of our antagonists had an existence.

There is another branch of *negative external evidence*, which seems to me to merit some notice. *There is not an objection recorded on all the pages of the Greek and Latin fathers against our verse.* In the struggle with the Photinians, not an objection can be found on either side. In the severe and protracted controversy with the Arians, not an objection is recorded against it. It was distinctly quoted on a publick and interesting occasion, by the African bishops in the year 485, against the

\* See No. III. in the Christian Advocate for Nov. 1824. And also Nolan's Inquiry, p. 545, &c.

Arian bishop and his priests, supported by king Hunneric; but not a murmur, not an objection against its authenticity was heard, or is recorded. And we have authentic evidence, not only that it was quoted by these bishops, but that it was before their eyes, in the version in general use in the western churches.\* And what deserves our most particular attention, no Greek writer has recorded an objection or even a doubt against our verse. Let no man say, the members of the Greek church had never seen it—never heard of it. They *did see* it, they *did hear* it. If in no other way, and on no other page, they had heard of the African bishops quoting it publicly before king Hunneric, when called, at the peril of their lives, to defend the faith against Arianism. They *saw* it—they *heard* of it—they *knew* it on the pages of the version of the Latin church. No man in the sober use of his reason can say, that in this perfect publicity of our text in the western churches, it could be unknown to a minister, or a writer, in the Greek church. To suppose them ignorant of it under these circumstances, is to suppose an absurdity, an utter impossibility. Now, is it possible that any man can persuade himself that this verse could have been interpolated without the knowledge of the Greeks? Is it supposable that a Greek scholium, or a Latin scholium, could have crept in, and become the seventh verse, without resistance on the part of the faithful? It stood clearly before their eyes. It was quoted before them, at a time when the report of the proceedings of the African churches and bishops rang, not only over the plains of Africa, and over the hills and vales of Greece, but over all the east, and over all the west. The whole Christian world heard and knew that our text was quoted at that time. Now, no historian, no polemic, no practical expositor, Greek or Latin, has recorded one murmur, one doubt, one suspicion against this verse. We

\* See Burgess, p. x. 42. 46. 80. 81.

all know how the Greeks remonstrated, and fiercely contended with the Latin church, against her insertion of one word ("*filioque*") in the Latin copy of the Nicene creed. Long and severe was this war, about the insertion of "*filioque*" into their creed. Now, is it supposable that they would have kept silence, and not merely have allowed the insertion, but the interpolation of a whole sentence, and that not into a *creed*, but into the *page of God's holy book*? Or is it supposable that the fact of the Latin version containing our text, would be less known than the fact of the Latin Church having the Nicene creed with "*filioque*" in it? I earnestly profess, Mr. Editor, that I cannot conceive how all this silence, and consequent approbation on the part of the Greeks, as well as of Latins, and of hereticks; as well as of orthodox, can be accounted for, on any other supposition whatsoever than this—that our verse was before the fathers and writers of both churches, and that it was sustained by such unquestioned and unquestionable evidence, that every scruple was removed, and that its authenticity was acknowledged by all, with the most perfect confidence. To deny this, would be to bring up a greater difficulty than—I do not say *one*—but *all* the difficulties presented against our verse by our opponents.

Here, then, is a point which, I humbly presume, must be considered as clearly gained. And we hold it up, again and again, to the view of the church. From the days of St. John to Erasmus, no one single doubt, or objection, or even suspicion existed, or is recorded against our verse. It was, as we shall presently see in the progress of our discussion, well known; it was frequently quoted—it was often alluded to—it was in the Bible universally current in the western churches. Nothing can be opposed to this, from the fourth to the ninth century, but *four defective MSS.*—not to say with Nolan—*four mutilated MSS.* At length the verse gained a currency—not in

the western churches; it never ceased to have a currency there. We have two distinct testimonies of this; the Latin version, long current in Africa, before Jerome's version, and next to that Jerome's version; these—and they are two distinct witnesses—these declare decisively that our verse was always in currency in the western churches.\* But it gained a currency in other parts of the church, where the corruptions, or oversight, (to say the least) of transcribers, had for a season withdrawn it from the eyes of many. And, at last, in the circling ages of time, it took its own proper place silently, firmly, publicly, and immovably. As a noble and venerable prince, unhappily excluded, in some dark hour of trouble, from his own dwelling place, by some shameful jealousy, or by some foul conspiracy; he at last is brought back; he comes in; the whole of the guilty rise up before him; all recognise his rights—not a tongue utters discontent; he sits down in his place and power, and all do him homage—in silence—with a returning sense of duty and propriety. Even so our verse took its place, in those manuscripts and versions from which it had lost its place for a season. It took its place where the hand of John had placed it. And none stirred an objection till Erasmus, in the year 1516, ventured to leave it out of his printed edition of the New Testament. And let critics name any other subject of criticism, which brings in its defence such another strength of *negative external evidence*, as this verse does, feebly as we have here stated its outlines.

3d. We have *positive external evidence* in favour of our text. We shall collect in detail quotations of our text, by different authors and churches; beginning, not at the earliest periods (as Burgess does), but with the latest testimonies, and so trace it back towards the apostolical times.

It is admitted by all, as far as I

\* See Bengel, and Bentley, and Burgess's views on this. Burg. Vind. p. 7.

can discover, that our verse was generally received in the sixteenth century, by the most learned criticks, by evangelical churches and universities. The industrious Kettner, of the Lutheran church, gave a full and very interesting sketch of its gradual and general reception in the churches of all Europe.\*

In the early part of the sixteenth century appeared the celebrated Polyglott of Ximenes. It was printed off in the year 1517, but owing, I presume, to the lamented death of the Cardinal Ximenes, it was not published until 1522.† Upwards of eight very valuable criticks were employed by the Cardinal on it, for more than twelve years. The fourth and last volume contains the New Testament, in the Greek text and Latin version only. Our verse is found in its place in this Polyglott. The gentlemen on the other side, have raised an objection against the authority of this Polyglott. They deny that Ximenes possessed any MSS. of value or antiquity. And they have even ventured to say that he had no MSS. to sustain him in inserting the text of the heavenly witness; that he caused it to be translated into Greek from the Latin version. In reply, we have to say, that the very learned scholars, together with Ximenes, tell us, that no pains nor expense was spared, to procure from all parts, the most correct and most ancient MSS. in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; and that the Greek exemplars were from the Vatican Library of Rome; and moreover, they bear ample testimony to the value of the MSS. which they use. And although this must be taken with limitations, in those infantine days of biblical criticism, we may, at least, boldly set up their statements against the proofless conjectures of their opponents.‡

To the other portion of the above charge, we have to reply, that Xime-

nes and his coadjutors used the Latin vulgate version—the only version which Catholicks acknowledge to possess any authority. But the Greek text of the heavenly witnesses, as it stands in the Complutum Polyglott, differs, in some particulars, from the vulgate. In the latter, our verse runs thus, as in other copies: “*hi tres unum sunt.*” The Complutum Polyglott has it thus—“*οι τρεις εις το εν εισι.*”\* We cannot, therefore, suppose the latter to be a translation from the former. Besides, the most learned of the criticks against us, have vindicated the Polyglott from this charge of some of their associates; for instance, Michaelis, and Eichorn, and Goez, and Marsh.†

In the warm contest between Stunica and Erasmus, the former reproached the latter for his impiously omitting the text of the heavenly witnesses. Erasmus hurled back the reproach, and defied Stunica to produce a single MS. containing the verse; and he added, however, that if any MS. of respectability could be produced, containing the text, he would insert it in his next edition—(and, as we showed in our last letter—the supplement to the No. IV.—he kept his word). Stunica could not produce the MS. required; they had totally disappeared. An unfavourable opinion was formed against Stunica and his associates, who composed the Polyglott. But the fate of these parchment MSS. has at last been detailed. Ximenes died very soon after the printing of the Polyglott. The same cause which retarded the publication for several years, produced ultimately, no doubt, the destruction of the parchments.—I mean the confusion and desolation produced in a Catholick priest’s house by his death. For they possess none of the endearing, and affectionate, and attentive relations, which grow out of the married life. They have none

\* Kettneri Hist. Dicti Johannei, &c. pp. 190—193.

† Butler’s Hor. Bibl. vol. i. p. 90.

‡ See Butler’s Hor. Bibl. vol. i. p. 105.

\* As is evident from the *fac similes* in Burgess and in Horne, vol. iv.

† See Butler’s Hor. Bibl. vol. i. pp. 92, 93, 105.

to care for them—none disinterested enough to take care of, or to preserve, their valuable papers and collections—as for instance, in this case of the Cardinal Ximenes, the ancient and valuable MSS. which had been used in the formation of the Polyglott of Complutum.

I have already stated, that they had been sold to a *rocket maker*, and had been used up by him in his vocation. But this must have been long after the death of Ximenes. It was in the year 1784, that Professor Moldenharverd discovered, at Alcala in Spain, that these MSS. had been disposed of, *thirty-five years ago*, to the rocket maker.\* Now if our dates and information be correct, these valuable MSS. must have been swept away by the sons of the church, who, I believe, seize dutifully all that they can find in a deceased priest's house, for the benefit of the church. And they must have lain in the dark obscurity of their cells for upwards of 130 years, before they had been brought out into this unworthy market!

—In the year 1519, the annotations of Stunica appeared, containing his own labours and those of his profound associates, in defence of the polyglott; and particularly of our verse. In 1520, Edward Lew (or Lee) attacked Erasmus. In 1527, Erasmus states, that he had then for the first time seen the Complutum Polyglott. He had yielded to the force of the evidence of the Codex Britannicus (now the Dublin MS.), and had put the verse into his third edition of 1522. And though he may have done it "*causa ne cui sit calumniandi*;" yet after seeing the Polyglott, and weighing the evidence of the Codex Britannicus, he continued to support the verse, in his fourth edition of 1527, and in his fifth of 1535.†

In the fifteenth, and fourteenth, and thirteenth centuries, the verse had become familiar to all the Greek writers. This will appear from the currency given to it in the Greek

church, by the quotation of it in the acts of the council of the Lateran. The gentlemen on the other side do indeed gravely tell us, that the first Greek writers who quoted it, are Manuel Calecas, in the fourteenth century; and Bryennius in the fifteenth. This I presume is a gratuitous assertion. Or in the style of Professor Porson to Archdeacon Travis—"a mere invention of their own." They add, that when the 7th verse appeared, it presented itself in almost as many different shapes, as it did in its appearance among the Latins. To this we have one brief reply—that even admitting the statement of the thing as thus magnified—it is really *no evidence* against the authenticity of the verse. It exhibits a proof, indeed, of the carelessness of transcribers—but *no evidence* against the authenticity of the verse. A sufficient proof is drawn from the facts connected with the appearance of the 8th verse, in the existing copies. None of our opponents have questioned the authenticity of the 8th verse. And *they all know*, and Burgess has *clearly demonstrated* from quotations, that the 7th verse has actually *less uniformity* than the 8th verse!\* Let them draw the conclusion.

The great council of the Lateran was held in the year 1215.—In the acts of this council our verse is distinctly quoted, together with the 8th verse; and "it is quoted in the Greek."† Among the members of this council were the patriarchs of Jerusalem, and of Constantinople; and also the proxies of the patriarchs of Alexandria, and of Antioch; in short, the representatives of the Eastern churches. They all concurred in the acts of the council. These acts were rendered into Greek, and published in the churches of the east. This proves very clearly that this verse had been current in the Greek churches previous to this. For its quotation and existence in the acts of the Lateran excited, no question

\* Butler et Sup. p. 92.

† See Kettner. p. 190.

\* See the proof at some length, in Burgess, p. 53.

† See Butler Hor. Bibl. vol. i. p. 398.

about its novelty; no doubt about its authenticity. On the supposition of the contrary, namely, that it was *not known to the Greek patriarchs, bishops, and writers*, what a tumult and furious onset must its novelty and intrusion have created among the Greeks, who had long stoutly fought against the Latins on many points; and especially for their inserting "*filiogue*" in their Latin translation of the Nicene creed?\*

I anticipate an objection, by noticing what some of the gentlemen in opposition have brought forward, to excite a doubt and suspicion, as to the whole of this evidence. It is this: after the 8th verse is quoted in the acts of the Lateran, it is added, "*Καθως εν τισι κωδηξιν ευρισκεται:*" "*as it is found in some codes.*" But this is set down *at the close of the 8th verse—not of the 7th verse—but of the 8th.* And hence every reader must perceive (and both Griesbach and Marsh candidly admit it), that the reference is made to the last clause of the 8th verse; which is not found in some of the Latin versions.†

The Liturgy of the Latin church rendered our verse familiar to every intelligent worshipper in the *eighth* century, and down to this day. For it is recited in the office for the administration of baptism; and in the office for Trinity Sabbath; and Easter.‡

Our verse is found also in the ancient Liturgies, and Confession of Faith of the Greek church. The Liturgies contain it, as a portion of the lesson to be read in the churches, on the thirty-fifth week of the year. And the Greek Confession of Faith, after the mentioning of *God and three persons*, quote our verse, as in the received text—"There are three that bear record in heaven; the Father,

\* Kettneri Hist. Joh. Dict. p. 117. And Horne, vol. iv. p. 440.

† See Griesb. Nov. Test. edit. 2d. vol. ii. Append. p. 11. And also Marsh's Letters to Travis, p. 15.

‡ Kettneri, &c. p. 173. Horne, vol. iv. p. 445. See also Vossius de Bapt. Dissert. 16. And Selden de Synod. lib. ii. 138. And Cavei Hist. Liter. Append. p. 47.

the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one."\*

But this merits a fuller and more close investigation: I shall therefore resume it in my next paper—if the Lord permits.

I am, Mr. Editor, with affectionate regards, your's truly and faithfully,

W. C. BROWNLEE.

Basking Ridge, March, 1825.

From the London Christian Instructor.

#### LINES

ON READING THE STANZAS BY THE LATE LORD BYRON, ENTITLED, "ALL I ASK—ALL I WISH—IS, A TEAR."

Lately inserted in one of the Publick Papers.

(BY LORD BYRON.)

"All I ask—all I wish—is, a tear."

"When my soul wings her flight,  
To the regions of night,  
And my corse shall recline on its bier,  
As ye pass by the tomb  
Where my ashes consume,  
O! moisten their dust with a tear.

"May no marble bestow  
That splendour of wo,  
Which the children of vanity rear,  
No fiction of fame  
To blazon my name,  
All I ask—all I wish—is, a tear."

Thy corse will we lave  
As it sinks to its grave,  
With our tears we'll bedew the green sod,  
And weep that no more  
Thy spirit can soar,  
Or seek the forgiveness of God.

That a star once so bright  
Should sink into night,  
And in darkness should quench all its rays;  
Though it dazzled the world,  
Should from heav'n be hurl'd,  
In a moment extinguish'd its blaze;

This bids the tear flow,  
Opes the fountains of wo;  
It is set, and shall never arise!  
We hoped it would shine,  
Filled with lustre divine,  
And chase the foul mists from its skies.

But, ah! thou art gone!  
Like the dew of the morn,  
The muses have wept round thy bier;  
Now wrapp'd in thy shroud  
Thou art hid from that crowd,  
Whose sympathy *did* prompt a tear.

S. E.

\* Horne, vol. iv. p. 445; and Dr. Smith's Miscell. p. 155.

THE  
CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

MAY, 1825.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XIV.

The subject of the present lecture is thus expressed in our catechism—“When God had created man, he entered into a covenant of life with him, upon condition of perfect obedience; forbidding him to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, upon the pain of death.”

As it is my wish in this course of lectures, to touch, at least cursorily, on as many topicks as I properly can, a knowledge of which may be of use in the study of the scripture, I shall here say a few words on the garden of Eden.—It is proper to take notice of it here, if we notice it at all.

Few subjects have given rise to more fanciful speculations, than the question *where* the garden of Eden was situated. It appears, however—the general deluge notwithstanding—that it was the intention of Moses to mark out the place, in such manner that his cotemporaries might know distinctly its location. But the face of the earth has been so changed by a variety of causes, since the time of Moses, that it is not possible to find any place, at present, which fully answers to the Mosaick description. In the land of Chaldea, we find the names of two of the four rivers mentioned by Moses, as having their source in the garden of Eden—These are, the Euphrates and the Hidde-

VOL. III.—Ch. Adv.

kel or Tigris. At some distance below the conflux of these two rivers, and not far from the head of what is now called the Persian Gulf, we may, I think, with the most probability, fix the site of the garden of Eden. A little below this site, the stream formed by the junction of the Euphrates and Hiddekel, is again parted; and the eastern branch may have been the Gihon, and the western the Pison, of Moses.

The garden of Eden, in its primitive state, was a place of exquisite beauty, and calculated for affording every kind of pleasure and enjoyment to sinless man. It is sometimes called Paradise—the Greek term for a garden or enclosure; borrowed, it is supposed, from the Persian, and which, in the New Testament, is sometimes used to denote the heavenly state itself.

The terrestrial Paradise produced all manner of pleasant fruit; and the business of our first parents was, to dress and keep this garden. It is worthy of your notice and remembrance, that even in a state of innocence, man was formed for *industry*, and not for idleness. The garden, indeed, produced its fruit spontaneously—To till the ground, in order to obtain its increase, was a part of the curse inflicted for transgression. But to preserve and dress the garden, so as to keep it in its pristine order and beauty, and to gather its fruit, was the employment of man in innocence.

2 B

he is too much like myself, in having a larger store of doctrinal than practical religion. The captain is a good sailor, temperate, and to me entirely civil; but he distresses me with his blasphemy, from which he seems to make no attempts to restrain himself on any occasion.

But I beg leave here to close for the present, as I have wearied myself, and wish to be released a while from the drudgery of writing and thinking. On the subject of your satisfaction in the perusal, I make myself quite easy, knowing that curiosity and friendship will be gratified with details, which would be otherwise perfectly insipid.

I remain, &c.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. VII.

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF 1 JOHN, v. 7.

“There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.”

“Potuit igitur Hieronymus scribere Græcorum Codices fuisse integros; negarique non potest adeo, Patres Græcos locum citare.”

*Am. Dorhout, Animad.*

Mr. Editor,—I observed in the close of my last number, on the external evidence of the authenticity of this text, that it was contained in the primitive liturgy of the Latin church, which was composed in her purer times, and also in the ancient liturgy and confession of faith of the Greek church.

The existence of our verse in the publick standards of these very ancient churches is, unquestionably, a strong proof of its authenticity. A schism, as early as the Arian controversy, had separated these two churches from each other, and had removed the hearts of their respective pastors and doctors an immeasurable distance from brotherly love and Christian intercourse. It is scarcely

credible, therefore, that the one church would copy from the other; and especially so, when fresh occasions of animosity were often occurring to widen the breach, and perpetuate the separation.

Our opponents do indeed say, that “there is reason to *suppose* that this clause was interpolated into the Greek liturgy and confession, so late as the fourteenth or fifteenth century.” But whosoever takes the slightest survey of the state of things in the Greek church in these centuries—and particularly, if he considers the state of the feelings of the Greek church towards the overgrown tyranny and revolting mass of superstition and idolatry, presented in bold relief before the eyes of the Greek church—he will assuredly not yield to such an ill supported and rash *conjecture*. A few, I will even say many, of the Greek clergy may have been drawn over, and may have been made devoted partizans of the Latin See. But how is it possible that a body of the Greek clergy, (far less a few,) could add such a clause, in the face of the Christian people—in the face of her priests and bishops of different gradations? Was it done in some council? We demand the proof of this. If by a council, it could be no secret. It must be a subject of historical record. Was it effected by stealth—by the intrigue of some daring innovator, who imposed it on patriarch, bishop, priest and people? Is this supposable, even by the aids of the greatest credulity? The fraud would have been detected instantly, and a loud voice would have been raised against it; for the supposition of our opponents is—that a clause, containing our verse, had been added to the liturgy and confession of the Greek church, throughout her vast extent of churches—and so late as the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries, when copies of the liturgy and confession had been multiplied, in a ratio proportioned to the length of time from her establishment and to the number of her churches and priests! In *all these an entire clause had been*

*inserted*—and yet no authentick historical record of it exists—no voice was raised against it—no writer in all the Greek church has recorded one objection against our verse—against an entire clause interpolated into the liturgy! And, moreover, the interpolation is supposed to have been made—not in some obscure book—not in some individual's writings—but in the liturgy and confessions which were used in the churches every Lord's day—which were familiar to every worshipper—which were used at every baptism! An interpolation made in this so late as the fourteenth or fifteenth century, and no voice raised against it! If any man can seriously believe this, his faith can receive the miracles of the monks' cells, and can credit the incongruities of the prophet of Mecca! Assuredly the supposition is to be rejected as utterly without foundation, and really absurd. And the existence of our verse in each of these liturgies, composed in a remote antiquity, when these two churches saw purer and happier days, is to be admitted as affording us two distinct arguments, of no ordinary weight, for its authenticity and divinity.

Our opponents have been in the habit of making assertions unqualified, and often boastful, relative to the strength of their evidence against our verse, taken from versions. In fact, their statements would lead the inexperienced to suppose that *every ancient version* is decidedly against us. We shall yield them, as indeed we have already yielded them, the Oriental versions, so far as they have come to the light. We shall yield them the Syriack, the Arabick, the Ethiopick, the Coptick, the Sahidick. And we will yield to the learned Griesbach the Slavonick and the Gothick—made under Arian influence—to be taken for what they are worth. None of all these can be traced to an age remoter than the fourth century. And they, even the most respectable of them, bear with them the internal proofs of their origin. They can be traced to the influence

of Eusebius of Cæsarea, who, in his fifty codices, left out our verse, as we have shown in a former number; or, they were made by learned men who used copies taken from Eusebius's codes. But the text of the heavenly witnesses is found in *VERSIONS of the greatest antiquity and the highest authority!*

And, first, of the Latin version, usually called the OLD ITALICK.—It will not be questioned by any one, it is presumed, that the sacred oracles were entrusted, *as really*, and *as much* to the Latin church, as unto the Greek church, as the "witnesses of their authority, and the guardians of their purity."\* None, so far as I know, have questioned this. And while we thus put these two ancient churches on an equal footing, in general, certain circumstances have occurred to render the testimony of the Latin church even of much more weight than that of the Greek church, on a matter especially of this kind before us. Let us lay the doctrine taught in our verse by the side of the fact that the Arians, the avowed enemies of the doctrine taught in our verse, had, for a considerable period, gained the ascendancy in the Greek church, and had used that ascendancy in such a way as to give proof that they had not been idle in impressing the marks of their heresy and pollution on certain codices.† And while the Greek church was completely under this influence, the western church was retaining its strict purity in defiance of these enemies. Hence it is reasonable—it is just, to lay the greatest weight on the testimony rendered by the Latin church to the purity and integrity of the sacred text and its versions, and even to give it a decided preference to that of the Greek!‡

Now it is certain that the Latin church had a version, made at a very

\* A portion of the holy scriptures was addressed to the Latins, or Romans, by Paul; who laboured in the Latin church as well as in the Greek church, &c.

† See Kettneri Hist. pp. 91. 95. 106, &c.

‡ Consult Nolan on this topick, p. 294, &c.

early period of her existence. It was quoted generally by the Latin fathers before the council of Nice; and hence before the times of Constantine, when Eusebius made his alterations in the fifty codices. Father Augustine speaks in the highest terms of this version, and renders his testimony to its "strict literal fidelity," "In ipsis interpretationibus Itala cæteris præferatur; nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ."\* And we have sufficient evidence of this version's remaining unaltered and pure. *First*, It was not exposed to that influence which prevented the Oriental versions from being accurate, or rather, I should say, perfect. *Second*, The testimony of Hilary in the early part of the fourth century confirms it—"Latinos de veteribus Græcis translatos codicibus incorrupta simplicitas temporum servavit, et probat."† *Third*, In the early period, and before the time of Constantine, the Latins were not sufficiently acquainted with the original Greek to make alterations.‡

One *edition* of this version was called the Italick version; and, as the learned Nolan has shown us, it "took its name from that diocese or district of the church called the Italick, in contradistinction from the Roman diocese." The capital of that district was Milan. The Milan church was, of course, the metropolitan church.—This version is to be carefully distinguished from the Vulgate, now in use in the Romish church; and Nolan also distinguishes it from another version, which is contained in the Codex Vercellensis. The Vulgate, we all know, contains the copy which underwent the supervision of St. Jerome, who made his alterations or corrections in the old version, in the days of pope Damasus, about the year 384.§

\* S. Aug. Opera, Tom. iii. p. 27, and Nolan's Inq. p. 57.

† Hil. Com. in Rom. v.

‡ See more fully this idea in Nolan, p. 57, &c.

§ I am not to be supposed, by any means, as affirming that the Vulgate is now what it was when it came from the hands of St. Jerome.

The MSS. codex vercellensis, preserved at Verceli, contains the old version with corrections, or rather alterations, from the hand of Eusebius, bishop of Verceli, who died in the year 371. And the codex Brixianus, in the library of Brescia, written in silver letters, on beautiful purple vellum, is supposed, by the learned, to be that which preserves the greatest affinity to the most ancient Latin version, or the old Italick.\*

It is generally admitted, I believe, that the old Italick version is not found *entire* in any MSS. yet discovered. In the absence of such, we may look for the remains of it among those Christians who are descended from the Italick church. It is reasonable to suppose that in their ancient versions we may find the remains of the ancient Italick. Now, it is a matter of historical record, that the Waldenses are the lineal descendants of the ancient Italick church; and if we can find any trace of our verse in the version or confession of the ancient and apostolick church of the Waldenses, which sustained its independence against the cunning and violence of the Roman see; and which held "the uninterrupted and free use of the holy scriptures," from the days of the ancient Italick church—we must admit that it will present a testimony to the authenticity of our verse of the greatest weight and authority—and it gives me great pleasure in saying, that a learned man on our side has made the discovery. Of the old versions done into French, the Waldenses made two. In the extensive and valuable libraries to which our distinguished scholar Nolan had access in London, he discovered one of these versions. The following is the reading of our text in that version—"Trois choses sont qui donnent tesmoing au ciel, le Pere, le Filz, et le Saint Esperit, et ces Trois sont une chose." "There are three things (persons) who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the

\* See Nolan's discussions on this matter, p. 59, &c.

Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one thing" (substance).

For the proofs of the antiquity of this version, and for what relates to its authenticity, I must refer to Nolan;\* and I beg leave to notice that this version corresponds with the very ancient confession of faith of the Waldenses. In their confession each doctrinal article is proved by a testimony from the holy scriptures. The following is found in the article on the Trinity—"Lequel Dieu est un Trinitè, comme il est écrit en la Loy," &c. "That God is a Trinity, as it is written in the law: Hear O Israel the Lord," &c.† It immediately follows—"Et S. Jean: Il y en a Trois qui rendent temoignage au ciel, le Pere, le Filz, et le S. Esprit; et ces Trois sont un." "And St. John writes: There are three who render testimony in heaven, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one."‡

Here we have in the authentic remains of this old French version, and in the confession of this ancient and apostolick church, an explicit testimony to the fact that our verse of the heavenly witnesses was contained in the first Latin or old Italick version. And its existence in that primitive version is a testimony as explicit, that it was in the Greek copy from which the version was made; and we put it to the candour of the learned to decide how much a testimony of this kind is superior to that of "a multitude of MSS." of a suspicious origin. We bid them say how much a testimony from such a church, derived from the remotest antiquity, even far beyond the times of Arian and Sa-

\* See his Inquiry, Pref. pp. 18, 19.

† And here let it be observed that, that ancient and pure church took this passage of Deut. vii. 4. in the same *sense* and *form* as presented by us in our last number,—Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our Elohim, Jehovah, are one."

‡ See Le Long Bibl. Sacr. Tom. i. p. 313. Morland on the Churches of the Valleys, p. 14. Leger, Hist. Gen. Des Eglis. Vaudois, ch. viii. p. 1. Perrine, Hist. Des Vaudois et Albigeois. And Nolan, Pref. ut supra.

bellian corruptions, must be superior to the testimony of *two* manuscripts—not one more—*two* manuscripts—very evidently traced to the corruptions of Eusebius—*two* manuscripts, which cannot be traced further back than the fourth century, even by our opponents' own confession. On the one hand, we have the harmonious testimony of a very ancient and apostolick church to the authenticity of our verse. On the other, we have against us the negative testimony of *two* manuscripts, not older than the fourth century, and two others in the *ninth*.\* On the one hand, we have the distinct testimony of the primitive Italick church, conveyed to us by a strong chain of evidence, rendered by the church of the Waldenses, who had always "retained their independence, and the uninterrupted use of the holy scriptures!" On the other, we have against us the *negative* testimony—nothing *positive*—the *negative* testimony of *two* manuscripts only—not older than the fourth century—and not of the Byzantine class, but from the corrupt source of Eusebius—and, besides these, only *two MSS. more, written after our verse had been about a hundred years in daily use in liturgies of the churches!*

Again, we avail ourselves of the united testimony rendered to our verse by the Latin version current in Africa, and the version corrected by St. Jerom. Let this version current in Africa be the same as that of the old Italick, or let it not be the same, it will not affect my argument. It is evident from those who quoted it, that the version current in Africa was more ancient than the version of St. Jerom.‡ Hence they are two different versions. And thence we have from them *two distinct testimonies* to the authenticity of our verse. And the more closely we consider the authority and value of these versions, the more impressively we shall feel the testimony rendered by each of them. The learned world have ex-

\* See Burgess's Table of Greek MSS. in his Append. i.

† See Burgess, p. 7, and Nolan, p. 59.

pressed themselves strongly on this. Bengel thus speaks out their sentiments—"Enimvero interpres hic," &c. "Truly, indeed, this translation is more ancient than all the Greek manuscripts and fathers, of whom at this day any thing remains, and it was sufficiently near to the first,"—he means the autograph—"of this epistle of John:" "Et primo hujus epistolæ codici satis propinquus."\* And, with respect to the judgment which we ought to form of St. Jerom's improved version, Dr. Bently thus frankly speaks—and he was no friend to our verse—"It was plain to me, that when that copy came from that great father (Jerom's) hand, it must agree exactly with the most authentick *Greek exemplars*," &c.† And, in his letter to Wetstein, he says,— "The very ancient Latin versions like this, I would prefer even to the Greek copies."‡

And Semler himself, (as quoted by Burgess,) after making some cautious dispositions and arrangements, in case of the possibility of being constrained to retreat, says—"Sum fere in eadem hæresi—non quod sec intellegam, &c.—sed quod ad detegendam scripturam primam plus conferunt quam plerique Græci libri." "The Latin codes contribute more to the discovery of the *first scripture* than the most of the Greek books."§

We have seen the high opinion of Jerom's version, as expressed by Bently. Now, *it contained our verse when it came from the hands of Jerom*. Our leading opponents admit this. They do go indeed a little further than we could wish them to go, and further than they can support themselves by any argument. Sir Isaac Newton, for instance, insists that Jerom was the first who inserted the verse of the heavenly witnesses into the Latin translation. This is a gratuitous assertion. They have no ground

\* Bengel, in 1 John, v. 7.

† Dr. Bently's letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Burgess, p. 8.

‡ Letter inserted in Wetst. Proleg. p. 394.

§ See his note on Bently's letter, &c. and Burgess, pp. 8, 9.

to say so. But it is enough to our present point that they have admitted it to be in the version, "which," as Bently says, "*must, when it came from that great father's hands, agree exactly with the most authentick Greek exemplars.*" I may add here, that in the "Prologue to the Epistles," (which the most learned men, such as Erasmus, Sir Isaac Newton, Le Clerc, Mill, Dorhout, Burgess, and particularly Walafrid Strabo, who wrote a comment on our verse, and on the "Prologue," in the beginning of the ninth century, do unanimously ascribe to St. Jerom,) we have an assurance given that unfaithful translators had put in only the eighth verse, and had in some copies omitted the seventh verse," which (he testifies) did exist in Greek codices in his time.\*

That the Latin version current in Africa ought to be of equal, or rather even of superior weight with us, is evident from the following considerations. 1st, If not the same with the old Italick, it agreed in all points. 2d, The African church was of great antiquity, and it was distinguished for purity of faith,† and its most learned bishops and pastors. 3d, The persecutions which swept the other church long and terribly, like the sweeping pestilential blasts of the desert, were usually of short duration in Africa. 4th, And during its persecutions, its pious pastors anxiously preserved the sacred MSS. from the destroying hands of the persecutors.‡

\* See Burgess, p. 125, for this quotation. I shall resume this testimony of the Prologue in its place.

† Euseb. De Martyr. Palæst. cap. viii. p. 437, has spoken in terms of unqualified praise of its purity.

‡ Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, in the year 303, being aware that a search was about to be made by the persecutors for the sacred books of the Christians, removed the MSS. of the scriptures from the Basilica, and placed in their stead some "reproba scripta" of the hæretics. The persecutors came, seized the heretical writings, and hurled them into the flames, exulting in the destruction which they were making of the Christians' oracles. See Kettneri Hist. pp. 161, 144.

And, lastly, the boldness and publicity of the appeal to their copies of the Holy Bible on the subject under discussion, made by four hundred bishops collected from all parts of the African church. Standing before the Arian king Hunneric, they held up the version of the scriptures current in Africa from time immemorial, and with all the terrors of a cruel death before their eyes, and the eyes of all churches fastened on them, fearless of contradiction from the churches of the East and of the West, they appealed to our text in their copy, in the following words of their publick confession, laid before the king—“And, moreover, that we may teach it to be clearer than the light that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one Divinity, it is proved by the testimony of John the Evangelist; for, says he, there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.” They added in the same clause—“This is the opinion of the whole church of Africa, presented at the command of the king.”\*

Here, then, we have, in behalf of our text, the distinct testimony of two versions, and one of them in current use in Africa from time immemorial; and current also in the Italic region from time immemorial, (for the African and old Italic I have supposed to be originally the same.) These two distinct testimonies we hold up, as a decisive evidence that our verse was in the Greek codices, from which originally these versions had been made or corrected.

(To be continued).

---

THE REV. MR. STEWART'S PRIVATE JOURNAL.

In the Christian Advocate for the months of June and July last, we pub-

\* See the original out of Victor Vitensis, Lib. 3, in Kettner, p. 142; and Horne, vol. iv. &c.

lished extracts from the private Journal of the Rev. Mr. Stewart, from the time that he left this country in Nov. 1822, till his arrival with his family in the Sandwich Islands. The latest date of that Journal was May 14th, 1823. Within a few days past, the continuance of his Journal till October, 1824, has been put into our hands; and we have determined to publish the whole. This we shall do, not under the head of religious intelligence, but in a series of numbers, in the department of our work which we entitle *Miscellaneous*. The Journal, indeed, contains religious intelligence; and the great object of Mr. Stewart in his mission is to promote religion. To this his life is devoted; and nothing but religious principle, in a very powerful influence on his mind, could have induced him to relinquish all the endearments and elegancies of civilized life, which an independent fortune and a very liberal education enabled him to enjoy in his native land, and to spend his days among the rude inhabitants of some of the loneliest islands on the surface of the earth. But in a private Journal, intended for the gratification of a much loved sister and a number of dear and scientific friends, he has, with great propriety, inserted many things, which might not be so proper for a narrative simply missionary. This circumstance is the very one that, to a certain class of readers, not by any means unfriendly to religion or to missions, gives a peculiar interest to his Journal. They wish to be informed of the state of society in the Sandwich Islands; of the language, government, manners, customs, arts, and general aspect of the nation; and of the natural productions of these volcanic insular spots in the bosom of the ocean. In the first number of our work, published very shortly after Mr. Stewart left the United States, we announced our expectation of receiving information from him on all these subjects, and of enriching our work by inserting it in our pages. We are glad to be able now to do, what we then intimated

THE  
CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

JUNE, 1825.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XIV.

(Continued from p. 196.)

It only remains to consider the penalty of the covenant of works—it was *the pain of death*. There is every reason, both from observation and scripture, to believe that the penalty threatened to Adam for disobedience, was *death*, in all the various and fearful significations of that word—*death temporal, spiritual, and eternal*. There is indeed scarcely any thing, against which men of corrupt minds have more vehemently contended, than against this. But the mournful fact is ascertained and confirmed by the whole current of scripture, and by the actual state of the world. Do not men die? Who denies it? Are not men, without exception, depraved? Every day's experience proves it. Where is the human being so foolish and abandoned, as to say that he never sinned, in thought, word, or deed? Should you hear such a declaration, you would only consider it as proving the truth which it denied. And is not eternal punishment threatened to sinners? There is really nothing more clearly declared in holy scripture. Now, was any part of all this incident to man, before the fall? No, certainly. He was immortal; he was sinless;

VOL. III.—Ch. Adv.

he was to be eternally happy. How comes it, then, that man is so changed? Why does he die? Why is he depraved? Why is he an heir of wrath? Beyond all, peradventure, his apostacy from God is the cause of all. This it was that changed the primitive state of man, and changed it totally. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."

Some have supposed that there was some natural quality in the forbidden fruit, which changed the state of man's body, so that he became mortal. This is certainly a mere conjecture—There is not the least evidence from scripture, that the forbidden fruit possessed any inherent deleterious properties. On the contrary, as already intimated, it rather appears that the fruit was indifferent, till it was prohibited. The worst effect was, that man's *moral powers* were changed and prostrated; and this could not be effected, by the mere natural operation of any material substance.

On the whole, the threatened penalty was—

(1) Temporal death:—the body should die and return to dust. (2) Spiritual death:—the loss of his original righteousness and the favour of God. (3) Eternal death:—the exclusion of soul and body from God and happiness for ever. Such was the awful penalty threatened for sin:

cero, and our own Washington and Franklin.—“Nihil tam dispar sibi.”

The road which leads to and from this place lies on the opposite bank of the river: and it is a singular fact that until a short time previous to the present, no bridge existed either for man or horse; and to this day there is none but a swinging chain bridge across it for foot passengers. This is one of the neatest things of the kind I have ever seen, entirely suspended from posts on each bank of this expansive stream. Immediately after passing this bridge—which, though a little too modern and dandyish for the place where abbots prayed and Wallace fought, is yet very romantic—is a beautiful little quadrilateral temple, dedicated to the genius of Thomson. On each side is some emblematic device, with the name of the particular season to which the device alludes. This little temple, on the bank of the Tweed, and in such a lonely, beautifully, rural spot, and dedicated to the author of the Seasons, absorbed for a moment my every thought; and while lost in this pleasing reverie, the limpid placid stream, as it murmured past, seemed to me to be hymning its poet's requiem.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. VII.

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF 1 JOHN, V. 7.

“There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.”

“Potuit igitur Hieronymus scribere Græcorum Codices fuisse integros; negarique non potest adeo, Patres Græcos locum citare.”

*Am. Dorhout, Animad.*

(Continued from p. 216.)

Before we proceed to examine the quotations and allusions to our text, by the Greek fathers, we ought, per-

haps, to say something to the question put by the gentlemen on the other side. If this verse existed in their copies, why did not all the Greek fathers quote it in their Trinitarian controversy? We reply by saying, first of all, that had it been in *all* their copies it would probably have been quoted by them. But, say the learned men on our side, by some cause or other it certainly had been dropt from the copies used by the most of the Greek fathers whose writings have come down to us. But because it was wanting in some codices, and was, therefore, as it might be expected, not quoted by those who had it not, no argument of a satisfactory nature can thence be drawn, that the verse did not exist. It was in the copies of others. And it was quoted by others accordingly—or alluded to. “What then has become of the MSS. which contained it?” We return the question—and demand of our learned opposers, What have become of those hundreds of MSS. which contained the General Epistles of the New Testament? Only some few of them remain. Where are the rest? The same answer will serve for a reply by us, and by them. Go ask those whose ignorance or impious fraud sold the MSS. of Complutum to the *rocket maker*. Or go back into the remoter ages, and ask the blood-hounds of persecution in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, in the days of Dioclesian, and others, what have you done with the MSS. of the Holy Oracles?—Alas! these fiends of persecution and the ravages of time, have deprived us, hitherto, of the means which would have soon settled this dispute among brethren.

“But the fathers have quoted the 8th verse. On the supposition that the 7th verse did then exist, why did they omit it in the *Trinitarian Controversy*?” We reply in the words of the learned Nolan, that no such controversy as the *Trinitarian Controversy* existed in the times alluded to. The Trinitarian Controversy is a modern controversy.

The fathers combated the heretics, and the subject of the contest was the *divinity*, and the *humanity* of Jesus Christ. The heretics of those ages, in which our verse disappeared from many MSS. did not deny the "three and the one," the Trinity. They did plead for the "three in the one." But then, with Sabellius, they made "the three," to be one and the same thing; while some of them taught that the two distinct natures in Christ were blended into one. Hence, in the sense imposed by them on our text—a sense which puzzled the fathers—many of whom, perhaps, were not well versed in its true meaning, this verse was actually deemed by some of the orthodox, to lean toward the side of the heretics: Or, in other words, its literal form afforded the heretics an unusually strong plausibility. Hence these fathers did not quote it. This very thing is said to have induced Eusebius to leave it out of the fifty codices, published by order of Constantine. He wished to deprive the Sabellians of even the plausibility of a text that looked his way. And hence also, it was an opinion of many of the fathers—and our Nolan has actually laboured to prove the same thing—that the 8th verse was *absolutely more to the point than the 7th, and more effective* in proving, against the heresies of the time, that the three are distinct as persons; and one in essence. To refute the Sabellians, who made *one person*—they could not, in their mode of interpreting our verse, bring it forward. But then they had the 8th, which shewed that Christ must have been a distinct person from the Father—he having blood—and having shed it—which the Father had not done. And in refuting the Eutychians, who blended Christ's two natures into one, the 8th verse was more effective than the 7th verse. For it showed that Christ had blood—that therefore his human nature was not blended into the divine nature, and lost in it. If we should, with our opponents, con-

ceive of a "*Trinitarian Controversy*," in these primitive times, we might be induced to wonder why the fathers did not quote the 7th verse. But when we consider that there was really no such controversy then as the "*Trinitarian Controversy*" in our days; and especially when we do consider the real sentiments of the heretics, we must say with Nolan.—It is no wonder that the 8th verse should then be quoted in preference to the 7th verse. Our opponents do not realize the feelings and views of the fathers: nor have they formed, we think, a correct conception of the state of the controversies of those ages, when they reason, as they have done on this subject, that on supposition of the 7th verse being in existence, the fathers would certainly have quoted it.\*

From the Greek fathers and writers we offer the following specimen of *quotations*, and also *allusions*, which, as Burgess observes, are "tacit quotations," and indicate the existence of the original as really as a direct quotation. We shall begin with the latest that are known, and go back to primitive times.—In the fifteenth century, Bryennius, a Greek monk, whose works were edited by Eugenius, archbishop of Cherson, thus quotes our verse: "ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσι." *κ. τ. ε.* For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and "these three are one."† In the middle of the fourteenth century, Calecas thus quotes it. "τρεῖς εἰσιν ὅι." *κ. τ. ε.* "there are three that bear record, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost." He omits "in heaven:" and the last clause also. But it indicates the existence of the verse in his copy.—The Codex Montfortianus is a Greek manuscript in the library of Dublin college. Martin, of Utrecht, assigns it to the eleventh century: Porson to the sixteenth: but Dr.

\* See Nolan, p. 525—551.

† In Tom. i. p. 411. as quoted by Griesbach in his Diatr. p. 11. And by others.

Adam Clark and Dr. Burgess, place it in the thirteenth.\* And this, I am inclined to think, is admitted now by the most of our learned men. The learned men, in opposition, have attempted to bring *internal* proof against this MSS. They endeavour to show it to be a translation from a Latin code. Hence Porson attacks its form of Greek. "It is bad Greek," the professor says, because, verily, it omits the articles before the Greek for "Father," "Son," and "Holy Ghost." But every Greek scholar knows that the purest classicks often omit the article. And even professor Porson must have often read the Greek hymn beginning thus—with a most perfect illustration of my point. "Ἕμνοῦμεν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱόν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα." Moreover, he ridicules *ἐν τῇ γῆ*, and insists that if it had been written by a Greek scholar, or had been a genuine manuscript, it would have had *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. And yet, not to seek for refutations out of the pages of the New Testament, St. John (Rev. v. 13,) has *ἐν τῇ γῆ*.† Dr. Marsh too, unites with professor Porson in calling our text as it stands in this manuscript, "a bungling translation from the Latin," because it has "*ἐν οὐρανῷ*," being without the article. But an inspired writer has it "*ἐν οὐρανῷ*," more than once.‡ And with all humility, I would suppose that *inspired* writers, who spoke and wrote Greek fluently, must be allowed to know at least as much about Greek as an English professor, or bishop!§ In this MS. our verse is contained. "Ὅτι τρεῖς" κ. τ. ε. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and Holy Ghost; and these three are one."

In a preceding number I noticed the quotation of our verse in the acts of the Lateran council in the year 1215—and circulated in Greek,

\* See Clark's Succession of Literature, p. 88. And Burgess, p. 141.

† See also in Luke, xii. 51.

‡ Matt. vi. 10, and xxviii. 18, &c. &c.

§ See an ample defence of this MS. in Burgess, p. 60 and 142.

among the Greek churches. We find a quotation of the verse by Euthymius Zigabanus, in the year 1116. The quotation is thus, "ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ" κ. τ. ε. "Because there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." Here we have the verse quoted precisely as it is found in the received text. And there follows this quotation, an argument by the Greek writer, in which the doctrine of the verse is so interwoven, that every portion of it implies the existence of our verse before him as it stands in this quotation. And thus even the possibility of supposing an interpolation, is entirely taken away.

Professor Porson has exerted his ingenuity to overthrow the force of this quotation. He has, indeed, quoted the Greek writer correctly, so far as he goes. The Greek writer having set down, 1 John, v. 7, 8, 9, as they stand in our copies, goes on thus: "Θεὸς δὲ πάλιν." κ. τ. ε. "Behold now again, how the preacher of truth calls the Spirit by nature God; and of God: for having said that it is the Spirit of God that witnesses; a little onward, he adds, the witness of God is greater. How then is he a creature, &c." Here he stops. Thus it stands on Porson's page.\* On this quotation Porson argues thus. "The author who adopts this reasoning must have been ignorant of the 7th verse. How could he otherwise have missed the opportunity of insisting on the *connumeration* of the three persons: the assertion, of their joint testimony, and their *unity*." Now it is an extraordinary fact that the learned professor breaks off his quotation of the Greek writer merely at a comma; and actually omits the very sentence which contains the very thing which he had insisted on as an evidence of the 7th verse being before the writer. He omits the *connumeration* of the three persons, and the assertion of their *unity*. The sentence of the Greek writer runs thus, "Πῶς οὖν εἶσι

\* Letters to Travis, p. 224, &c.

ποίημα." κ. τ. ε. "How is he then a creature, [who is declared to be God with the Father of all, and complete of the Holy Trinity:]\*] or, "the one who fills up the number of the Holy Trinity." Mr. Porson leaves out this sentence between the brackets. He could not but see it. His motive we cannot comprehend. But it is perfectly obvious that the Greek author has precisely the things that Porson insisted on as necessary to prove the existence of the 7th verse.† Griesbach, in his Diatribe, takes a different process to enervate this quotation. He denies its authenticity—from the circumstance of its not being found in some other copies; and from its being wanting in the existing copy of Cyril's Thesaurus, whence Euthymius had taken the quotation. But later critics have proved, satisfactorily, that the quotation containing our verse is made from the Turgovist edition of Euthymius: that this was printed from eastern MSS. collated with a MS. in the imperial library of Vienna: and is allowed by the learned to be an accurate edition. And besides, there is in the passage itself an *internal* evidence, as clear as it is striking. The Greek is proving by an ingenious argument that the Holy Ghost is the true God—even "of the same nature with God, and one of the persons of the Holy Trinity." He appeals to John's Epistle. He quotes the 7th, 8th, and 9th verses. Then draws his conclusion that the "preacher of truth" declares the Spirit to be "God with the Father of all, and complete of the persons of trinity." Now let my reader suppose, with Porson and Griesbach, that the Greek writer leaves out the 7th verse, and he will instantly perceive that the conclusion here drawn is impertinent, and utterly without a foundation. For no such idea is taught in the 8th, or in the 9th verse

\* The original is "Πατρι συνθεολογούμενον; και της Τριάδος συμπληρωτικον."

† See more fully in Burgess, p. xxxvi. &c.

—which verses only these two learned men have supposed to be quoted by the Greek writer. This *external* and *internal* evidence produced in behalf of the quotation, give us, I conceive, the fullest and clearest testimony that can be desired to its authenticity in the Turgovist edition. And they also prove that the passage ought to stand exactly thus in Cyril's Thesaurus. And when we come to quote Cyril, I shall remind the reader that we consider this point as fairly established by our side.\*

Maximus Confessor was a writer of the seventh century. In the seventh section of a book which the learned have proved to have been written by him, entitled "The Dispute with Arius," we find a quotation of our verse immediately following his extract of Matthew, xxviii. 19—in proof of the Holy Trinity. "Προς δε τουτοις πασιν Ιωαννης φασκει. και οι τρεις [το]† εν ειση." "And in addition to all these, John says, And these three are one." It is beyond a doubt that these words were taken out of our verse. And hence it was known to Greek writers in the seventh century.‡

Our opponents have asked this question in their doubts and unbelief—"Whence did a writer of the seventh century derive a text, which is wanting in the generality of Greek copies?" Mill, in the depth of his critical researches, has answered this on our side. "Ex antiquioribus Græcis, puris atque integris." "From more ancient Greek copies, pure and entire."§

On the margin of some MSS. in Greek, there are found marginal comments, which have received the name of *scholia*. The existence of these standing opposite the 8th, and

\* See Burgess, ut sup.

† By what means this article το crept in, none of us can conjecture.

‡ See Griesbach Diatriba, p. 10. And Burgess fully, in p. 41, &c.

§ See Mill in 1 John, v. 7, and Bengel on the distinguished character of this Greek writer, in Appar. Critic. sect. xxiii.

sometimes the 9th verse, we adduce as Greek testimonies to the existence of our verse, in those copies into which these *scholia* had been *originally* entered. In the existing MSS. which retain these scholia, our verse, it is true, has, by some means or other, disappeared. But I think it will appear, on the inspection of these scholia, that our verse must have stood before the eyes of their writers. The following is a specimen. "In our codex, 62," says Griesbach, "opposite the word *πνευμα,* "spirit," in the 8th verse, the following scholium appears:" *το ἅγιον καὶ ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ.*" i. e. "The Holy Spirit, and the Father, and he who is his Son." Again, opposite the words *ἐν εἰσι,* "they are one," this scholium appears: *εἰς θεός, μία θεότης.*" That is, "one God, one Godhead." And in MSS. 2247, in the Royal Library of Paris, opposite the 8th verse, there is this scholium, *τούτῃσι, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ.*" "That is, the Holy Ghost, the Father, and the Son." And opposite to the close of the 8th verse it is added, *τούτῃσι, μία θεότης, εἰς θεός.\** Now, had there appeared only the first part of these scholia, it might have been set down as one of those forced and corrupt mystical interpretations of the 8th verse, to which Augustine gave, if not the origin, at least his support. But I will put it to the candour of every learned man, if any person can justly suppose these *scholia*, just quoted before us, to have been designed as mystical interpretations of the 8th verse. Many of the fathers wrote absurdly, it is true. But if you make these *scholia* their interpretation of the three earthly witnesses, then you represent them as *teaching blasphemy*. You make them teach that "the spirit, the water, and the blood, are *εἰς θεός, μία θεότης,*"—are "one God, one Godhead." Yes, either these are not glosses on the 8th verse, or the fathers who wrote them made "*the spirit, the water, and the blood,*" "one

God, one Godhead!!" Most assuredly the wildest mystic who ever raved in his cell, never could be capable of committing such an idea into language. The pen must have dropt from his hands in attempting it. To my mind it is perfectly obvious that these were comments set down opposite the 7th verse originally. Then our verse having been, by accident, or rather by impious fraud, left out, the 8th verse succeeded to the sixth, and thus stood opposite these *scholia*.

We have already mentioned the name of Cyril, of Alexandria. He flourished in the first half of the fifth century. In his Thesaurus,\* is found the passage quoted by Euthymius; and which we have just reviewed. It so happens that, in the copy of his works, now before the learned, the 7th verse has been omitted, by some accident or other. But we have seen that Euthymius, quoting him in the twelfth century, did quote out of Cyril the 7th verse: and we have also seen that the *internal* evidence of the passage did absolutely require the presence of that verse. Porson, (quoted by Burgess,) says, "I have seen this quotation with my own eyes in Cyril's Thesaurus. There is not a word more than the 8th verse." But the professor has forgotten himself. There is more in Cyril. *There is all that comment by Cyril on the passage quoted out of John*, which I have set down in a preceding paragraph. And I shall turn the learned professor's own words against him. He has said, "If Cyril had quoted the 7th verse, *he could not have failed to insist on the connumeration of the three persons and their unity.*" This Cyril *has actually done*. But then he has done it in *that clause of the sentence which Porson happened to omit*, as is shown above. By Porson's own argument, it appears that Cyril *must* have quoted the 7th verse. And I humbly presume that it will appear so to every scholar who inspects the quotation. When Cyril

\* Griesb. Diatr. p. 10. Burgess, p. 31.

\* In the Tom. v. Oper. Cyril.

says of the Holy Ghost, "How is he then a creature, who is declared to be *God with the Father of all, and complete of the Holy Trinity?*" There is only the one passage quoted by Cyril, on which he is thus commenting, and that is our text and context. He could not draw this inference from the 6th or the 8th verse. If he left out the 7th verse, there was no foundation in the passage before him, on which he could possibly build this weighty argument for the divinity of the Holy Ghost.\*—Thus we have a Greek father of the early part of the fifth century who quotes our verse; and one, moreover, whom our opponents had hitherto always claimed as belonging to their side.

In the year 1768, a work was published at Utrecht, by Ambrose Dorhout, entitled "Animadversiones in loca selecta, V. T." To this eminent scholar we are indebted for a new Greek authority, which had escaped the attention of all the writers in the *Porsonian* controversy: and which was first quoted in England by Dr. Burgess, very lately. It is that of Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, of the fourth century: and the instructor of Chrysostom. The following is the quotation from Dorhout's *Dissert. De 1 John, v. 7.* \*But let us pass to a document which is above all exception: We have asserted that the Greek writers did cite this text. We have a distinguished passage which will evince to the eyes of every man not blinded by prejudice, that the prologue of St. Jerom reports correctly, which affirms, that the Greeks read this text of the heavenly witnesses in their manuscripts. Suidas (in voce Diodorus, &c.) relates out of Theodorus, the Lector's church history, that Diodorus, the Greek monk, who lived in the days of the emperors Julian, &c., and who was afterwards bishop of Tarsus, wrote various pieces: among these the following: Works on the whole of the

\* See more fully in Burgess, p. xxxv. Note.

Old Testament, viz. Genesis, Exodus, &c. Also on the Evangelists; on the Acts of the Apostles, and "εις την επισολην Ιωαννου του Ευαγγελιστου περι του εις Θεος εν Τριαδι." And also on the Epistle of John concerning that passage which treats OF THE ONE GOD IN THE TRINITY, &c." "It appears to me clearer than the light," as Dorhout adds, "that this refers to the 7th verse." For there is no other passage in the Epistle to which it can be referred.\*

I have yet to notice several others of the Greek fathers, before I proceed to the Latins. But I shall close, at present, with another extract from Dorhout. "This testimony of Diodorus strengthens the authority of St. Jerom's Prologue to the General Epistles."—[The assertion of the prologue that "the Greeks following the pure faith, had the 7th verse in their codices," had called forth the furious attacks of the learned against it—as a fabrication—and not the work of Jerom.†] "Jerom could therefore write that the Greek codices were entire. And it can no longer be denied that the Greek fathers cite this verse under discussion. Mill, himself, being judge, this testimony from the prologue is such, that, "si modo sit sanus," it places this passage of St. John above all suspicion of interpolation. But when the passage which we have brought from Victor‡ is like a hundred MSS. of the best mark, of the fifth century, who, I pray you, will any longer question the authenticity of 1 John, v. 7." (Dorhout *Animad.* p. 282. Burgess, p. 158.)

I am, Mr. Editor,

With affectionate respect,

Yours truly,

W. C. BROWNLEE.

*Basking Ridge, April, 1825.*

\* See the whole passage also in Burgess, p. 157.

† I am sorry to say that Kettnerus is one of them, p. 134.

‡ We shall produce this writer's testimony when we arrive at the Latin fathers.

THE  
CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

JULY, 1825.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XV.

We are now to consider the following answer of our catechism.

“Our first parents, being left to the freedom of their own will, fell from the estate wherein they were created, by sinning against God.”

In discussing two or three of the previous answers, we have had occasion to say so much on the nature of that estate in which man was originally created, that it will not be necessary to add much to it here. It was an estate of perfect innocence, in which he had his standing under God, as his Lord and Creator; it was an estate in which he was perfectly conformed, in his measure, to the image of God; had intimate fellowship and communion with him; and an ample dominion over all the work of his hands in this lower world, the tree of knowledge of good and evil only excepted: It was an estate, too, in which he was bound to obedience by solemn covenant engagements, enforced, as was shown in the last lecture, by the awful sanctions of life and death, in all the various and extensive import of those terms; and in which he knew that his posterity, as well as himself, was to share. It was, in fine, an estate which he had full power given him to maintain;

VOL. III.—Ch. Adv:

since he could not lose it without the voluntary choice of evil; and since his will, though capable of choosing evil, was not only not inclined to it, but sweetly and perfectly disposed to the choice of good. Such being his estate, he was left to the freedom of his own will; and he fell by sinning against God.

How a being, formed and constituted as man was, should fall into sin,—how sin should ever come to be the choice of a perfectly free and holy soul,—is a problem on which the strongest minds have often tried their strength; and hitherto, so far as I know, they have tried it in vain. *The origin of moral evil* is, in every view that we can take of the subject, an inexplicable mystery. It is one of the *arcana* of the moral world. While no one can doubt or deny the fact, that it does exist,—for I do not believe that even professed atheists doubt it,—yet to account for its existence, or to explain the process, or manner, in which it came into existence, is not, I suspect, within the reach of the human faculties, in the present life.

Will any one undertake to affirm that the Deity could not have preserved all his moral offspring from sin? We have no right to say that he could not. We are by no means sure that man might not have been made and preserved in a state of as perfect freedom as he actually possessed, and yet have been kept from

*voces ab imo pectore*, which always excite the most feeling, and produce the greatest effect, especially on a mixed assembly. To excel greatly, however, in this kind of speaking, a man must be, in a good measure, gifted for it from nature; and those who are not so gifted, ought not to attempt it oftener than necessity requires. But almost every preacher of the gospel ought, I think, to make it an object of serious attention, from the time of his licensure, and even before that time, to acquire the ability of preaching occasionally without writing, or with no more than the putting down of a few short hints. To effect this, he should accustom himself to meditate closely on the topick on which he proposes to speak; to make in his own mind an arrangement or disposition of the matter which he intends to bring forward; to look, as well as he can, through every part of his subject; to think of the illustrations and arguments he ought to use; and, when time will permit, to go over the whole more than once, before he appears in publick. The habit of doing this, although he may make blunders and suffer mortification at first, will commonly enable him before long, to speak off hand, with an ease, propriety and effect, which he once had considered as entirely beyond his powers. Of this, there have been, and still are, many remarkable and very encouraging examples. The danger is, that a degree of success in this kind of address, may tempt to the neglect of habitual study and careful preparation. Guard, my son, against this temptation; for if it overcomes you,

be assured, it will ultimately diminish both your usefulness and your influence. And yet, endeavour earnestly to become qualified to speak with propriety to your fellow sinners, if you have not five minutes to make preparation.

As *preaching* is the most important *single* part of ministerial duty, I have said much more on this topick, than on any other which I have hitherto discussed, or shall hereafter have occasion to treat.

On reading over this letter, I perceive that it contains a good deal more of *egotism* than I could wish it did. But this I hope you will consider as at least excusable, in that unreserved freedom of communication which ought to subsist between an aged father and a beloved son, on a subject of the deepest interest to both, in discharging the duties of the most responsible vocation in which mortals can be employed. A quotation from the great apostle of the Gentiles, in addressing him whose name you bear, shall close this long letter, and all that I have to say on the subject of preaching.

“Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself, and unto thy doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.”

Most affectionately, adieu.

---

## Miscellaneous.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

### No. VIII.

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF 1 JOHN, v. 7.

There are three that bear record in

heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.”

“Negarique non potest adeo, Patres Græcos locum citare.”

*Am. Dorhout. Animad.*

Mr. Editor—In my last, I brought the evidence in behalf of the authen-

ticity of our verse, from the testimony of the Greek fathers, down to the time of the seventh century.

In the "Prologue to the Canonical Epistles," we find a testimony of no small importance. The "Prologue" is of great antiquity. It is ascribed to St. Jerom by the most learned men, who have bestowed pains in investigating the matter: such as Erasmus, Le Clerc, Sir Isaac Newton, and I may add Bishop Burgess.\* Mill, and Dorhout have, perhaps, made it out to be the work of St. Jerom, as clearly as a case of this kind can be made out. They have argued from the style and spirit of the work, and from the testimony of early writers.†

Walafrid Strabo, an illustrious scholar, from the school of Bede and Alcuin,‡ and a very eminent writer of the ninth century, wrote a comment on the "Prologue of St. Jerom," and speaks of it as a thing well known to the learned as the work of St. Jerom.—And Bengel (Apparat. Critic. sect. 23.) says, "Neque enim Lyranus, sed etiam Walafridus in Prologum commentatur." And Schmidius (Hist. Canon. Veter. et Nov. Test. p. 557.) writes thus of the Prologue: "In quam tanquam vetustam ineunte seculo nono Walafridus jam commentatur." "On which, as on an ancient work, Walafrid in the ninth century, writes a commentary."§

The author of this "Prologue," according to Mill, lived in the seventh century; or, according to Bengel, in the sixth century. But according to Walafrid, and Erasmus, Le Clerc and Sir Isaac Newton, the author of

\* See his Vind. p. 48, 49, &c.

† See Dorhout Dissert. in Animad. in Loca Selecta V. T., A. D. 1768. Burgess, Appendix, vii. and p. 48.

‡ Such men as Wetstein and Semler speak in the highest terms of Bede and Alcuin. See Wetstein's Proleg. edit. Semler, p. 229, and Semleri Nota ad Wetst. Proleg. p. 221. And Dr. Burgess, in the depth of his erudition, observes that Bede, and Alcuin, Rabanus, and Walafrid Strabo, would have been distinguished for their erudition in any period. Vind. p. 45.

§ Burgess, Vind. p. 49.

it was no other than St. Jerom: who lived in the fourth century. Now from this very ancient document (the authenticity of which has never been questioned by the learned,) I offer the following testimony. St. Jerom having lamented that the Latin translators and transcribers had not followed the Greek original copies, he singles out as an illustration, their presumptuous leaving out of the text of the heavenly witnesses. "Illo præcipuo loco ubi de unitate Trinitatis in prima epistola Johannis," &c. "Especially in that place where we read the passage concerning the unity of Trinity in the first epistle of John. In which we perceive that a great error from the verity of the faith has been committed, even by unfaithful translators; who have put in their edition only the three words, *the water, the blood, and the Spirit*; and have omitted *the Father, the Word, and the Spirit*." "Trium tantummodo vocabula, hoc est, *aquæ, sanguinis, et Spiritus*, in ipsa sua editione ponentibus, et *Patris, Verbi, et Spiritus* omittentibus."\* "By which text," St. Jerom adds, "the Catholic faith is in the greatest degree strengthened; and the *one substance* of the deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is established."

This testimony is decisive in proving the following points. 1. That it is a fact that at this early period, there were in existence Latin manuscripts, and Greek manuscripts; some of which did not contain the text of the heavenly witnesses, and some of which did contain it. 2. That the text of the heavenly witnesses was well known as a genuine passage of scripture, although it was omitted in some codices. 3. That those codices which did not contain this verse, were pronounced to be *not the most correct*; inasmuch as they had suffered, in the omission of this verse, from unfaithful transcribers and

\* St. Hieron. Prolog. in Canon. Epist. tom. i. col. 1667. edit. Benedict. Nolan, Inquiry, p. 564, has in his quotation "ponentes," "omittentes."

translators. 4. That the testimony of this very ancient writer is as decisive as to the fact that *Greek MSS. contained our verse*; as to the fact that some Latin MSS. had not our verse. I call it *equally decisive*, because he asserts the one as plainly and distinctly as he does the other. Hence there is a radical defect in the mode of argument pursued by the learned Professor Porson,\* and by the bishop of Peterborough;† who have adduced this very passage of the writer of the "Prologue," to show their readers that our text was not, at that early period, in the Latin MSS. They seem not to be aware that they take only the one half of an entire testimony; and that half only which suited their views. Burgess had noticed and exposed this incongruity: and his reviewers,‡ as our readers will be justly astonished to find, have actually taken the same ground. That is, when St. Jerom complains that unfaithful translators had not rendered this text into the Latin, but had omitted it; and that unfaithful transcribers had omitted it in copying, *he is not to be understood as intimating that the text must have been in the original codices which these unfaithful men were translating*: but he is only intimating that the text is wanting in the Latin copies, out of which they had omitted—that which stood before them in the Greek! That is, these men *omit* a verse in a translation from Greek to Latin. Yet the charge of *omission* is no proof that the verse is in the original codex out of which they make their omission! "If Jerom's authority be valid for the omission in the Latin, it must be equally so for the existence of it in the Greek," says Burgess. "No," say the Quarterly Reviewers, "*we do not think so.*" And pray why? "*We do not think so, because little could be known of Greek MSS. com-*

pared with what we know of Latin MSS." Most logical conclusion of the profound Quarterly Reviewers! "Because *we*"—they do not say Jerom or the ancients—but "because *we* know more of Latin MSS." therefore little could *then* be known of Greek MSS. by Jerom, or other learned men. "Because we know little of Greek MSS. in comparison with Latin MSS. in present times," therefore, little was known of Greek MSS. some twelve or fourteen hundred years ago! The reply of Burgess to this stupidity is very just. "The question of fact does not depend on the *comparative number of Greek and Latin MSS., but on the competency of the voucher.*"\* And that competency depends on his character and antiquity: and of these the learned have admitted that there is the most satisfactory evidence.

Before I leave this, I beg to be indulged in a single remark, on an expression used by Professor Porson—I cannot call it an argument—in his reply to the testimony of the "Prologue." "If," says the Greek professor, "if Jerom, to whom they ascribe the Prologue, had told us that his Greek MSS. contained the text of the heavenly witnesses, he would have told us a notorious falsehood." Such a gratuitous assertion, viewed simply as an *assertion*, is clearly beyond the reach of a reply. It is contrived to be put into a position so infinitely low, that we cannot get down to its depth so as to reach it! But we complain, not merely of the lowness of this thing. There is malignity in the manner of *giving the lie to old St. Jerom*. The following is a true parallel. "If Professor Porson had told us that he wrote a book against Archdeacon Travis, he would have told us a notorious falsehood!" Yet this is just as true, and just as polished, as is the expression of the Professor.

St. Epiphanius, in the fourth century, affords us a presumptive evidence of no small strength. He asserts, "that the epistles of John

\* Lett. to Travis, p. 303.

† Preface to his Lett. to Travis, p. xiii. note.

‡ The Quarterly Review for March, 1822.

\* Vind. p. 47.

agree with the gospel, and the Revelation, in the peculiarity of John's style, and the doctrine of the Logos, or Word. And this reason he gives why these heretics, the enemies of our Lord's divinity, called *Alogi*, did reject the epistles of John, as well as his other writings."\* And in the third century, Dionysius of Alexandria, asserts this still more strongly and fully. "Συναδουσι μεν αλληλοις;" κ. τ. ε. "The gospel and epistles of John entirely harmonize with each other in the characteristics of the Father and the Son. In all things they wholly agree on the perfections, and the names of the Father and the Son. There is the same form and representation of the attributes and the names, both in the gospel, and in the epistle," &c.

The peculiarity of John, and that which pervades all his writings, is this: he characterizes Christ as the *Logos*, or *Word*: and this *Word* is a divine person: and this divine person, is, in a certain sense, *one* with the Father. Now John calls Christ the *Word*, in the beginning of his gospel, and in the Revelation, and in verse 7, chapter v. of his epistle—and in no other passage in all the epistle. In the first chapter he calls him the "*Word of life*." This is, however, not the peculiar phrase. In no other place, than in our verse, does John call Christ the *Word*, and assert his unity with the Father. Hence, in my view of it, it is most obvious, that if our verse had been wanting in the codices of St. Epiphanius, and of Dionysius, there could have been no possible foundation for this assertion, so clearly expressed. Had the *seventh* verse been wanting in their copies, and had they been ignorant of it, their words would have exhibited the curious and monstrous logical phenomenon of a conclusion gravely drawn by wise and learned men, without any premises whatever.

Hence, we are entitled to conclude, that these statements made by St. Epiphanius, and by Dionysius, are clear and distinct testimonies to the existence of our verse, in the Greek codes, in the fourth and third centuries.

There is a circumstance discovered on the pages of St. Epiphanius, which does seem to me to add much strength to this.—It is well known, that there are precisely three striking passages of scripture in which *the distinction between the divine persons, and their unity, is brought before us in one view*. These are John x. 30: "I and my Father are one;" Matt. xxviii. 19: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the *name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:" and our text, 1 John, v. 7.

Now St. Epiphanius, in one of his works, when asserting the doctrine of the Trinity against the Sabellians, quotes John x. 30. He next sets down the form of baptism out of Matthew xxviii. 19. And then he "evidently makes an effort to quote the third of these texts." He does make a quotation, and professes to quote scripture; and he offers it to his readers as scripture. But it is singular, that as it stands in the existing copies of St. Epiphanius's works, that quotation is, in the *first* place, neither grammatical Greek, nor, in the *second* place, is it scripture—no such phrase being found in the Bible. It is this, "Και οι δυο εν εσμεν." And these two—we are one."\* Now, no scholar will refuse to admit that St. Epiphanius could not possibly write such Greek. To be grammatical, it must be, not εσμεν, but εστι.—And next the phrase "*they two are one*," is not found in any part of the Bible. But the sentence as St. Epiphanius wrote it, was declared by him to be a quotation of Scripture, as evidently as the other quotation of "I and my father are one." When

\* See Burgess's Vind. p. 126.

\* See Nolan, Inq. p. 542 and 543 note.

therefore, we consider the copious evidence already quoted, and moreover, the testimony of Tertullian and of St. Cyprian (which shall be produced in their place), that the phrase "tres unum sunt," and the Greek "οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσι," are a true scripture quotation, I think we ought decidedly to conclude that St. Epiphanius wrote the above quotation thus on his page, "καὶ οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσι," but by design or by mistake his words have been mutilated, or the word "δύο" had from the pen of a rapid or careless transcriber, passed into the quotation, instead of "τρεῖς." This, it must be admitted, is a natural and easy explanation; and at the same time, a defence of St. Epiphanius. Nay, it seems to be the only ground which we can take, in explaining and accounting for this passage in St. Epiphanius.

In the fourth century we have this additional testimony from Athanasius the younger. In his "*Synopsis Scripturæ*," he has the following words: "John, in his first epistle, shows the unity or oneness of the Son with the Father:" "τὴν ἐνοότητα Ὑίου πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα." But this ἐνοότητα, this oneness of the Son and the Father is taught in our seventh verse, and in no other part of the epistle. Hence in the days of Athanasius the younger, of the fourth century, our verse existed in the Greek codes.\*

Gregory Nazianzen uses the following expression—in which, writing of the blessed Trinity, without specifying the name of the Father, or the Son, he uses the adjective in the neuter gender, to express the unity in a peculiar sense:—"ἐν γὰρ ἐν τρισὶν ἢ Θεότης, καὶ τὰ τρία ἐν."† This is not produced as a direct quotation, but as an allusion, which

\* See Millii. Prolegom. § 994. And Burgess's Observations on the "*Synopsis Scripturæ*" of Athanasius, p. 42.

† See Griesbach. Nov. Test. Diatriba, in vol. ii. Append. p. 10. And Burgess, p. 40.

can be referred to no other passage in the Bible than our text. And an allusion of this kind, as every scholar admits, is a tacit quotation, and does as evidently imply the existence of our verse, as a direct quotation does.\*

Basil flourished about the middle of the fourth century. The following is a specimen of his striking allusions to our verse, if not rather a quotation of it:—"Πιστευομεν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ τὸν Λόγον" κ. τ. ε. "We believe in God, and in the *Word*, and in the Holy Ghost, being One Deity." And again: "οἱ ἀπεριεργως πισευοντες εἰς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ Λόγον:" κ. τ. ε. "They believing truly and faithfully in God, and in the *Word*, and in the Holy Ghost, the One Deity, the only object of divine worship."†

On this passage Porson has observed, "these words of Basil are indeed very like the verse of John:" he adds, "if these be quotations of 1 John v. 7, no verse has greater plenty of evidence."‡

The usual style in which the church expressed her belief in her formulæ, was, "we believe in God the Father, and the Son," &c.; but in the above passages out of Basil, the peculiar style of John is used, "the Father and the *Word*." This has induced some to class this among the distinct quotations. We contend not about words. These are evidently allusions by Basil of such a kind as to establish the fact that our verse was as certainly before his eyes, as any other portion of John's epistles.

In the nomocanon published by Cotelerius, we find another allusion equally direct and striking, or ra-

\* As a specimen in holy writ, compare the *allusion* in Heb. chap. i. ver. 5, to psalm 2, with the direct mode of quotation in Acts xiii. 33: and no man will deny that the existence of the passage in psalm 2, is as strongly indicated in the former by *allusion*, as in the latter by *quotation*.

† Basil advers Ennom, l. v.

‡ Porson's Letters, p. 254.

ther a quotation. "Αὐτὰ τὰ τρία Πατρὸς, καὶ Υἱὸς καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἐν ταῦτα τὰ τρία:" "These three persons, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—these three persons are one."\*

And the anecdote told of Meletius,† is worthy of our notice, as it exhibits in a new form, a strong allusion to the doctrine and expression of our verse. In the year 360, Meletius was invited to preach in the great church in Antioch, before the emperor, on that "controverted passage of Solomon, Dominus creavit me."‡ "The Lord created me (possessed me)." Meletius rose up amid the loud plaudits of the assembly. He pointed out the rule of right theology: he shows with his uplifted hand three fingers: then two of these were shut down, and one only was presented, while he uttered this memorable sentence, "τρεις εἰσι" κ. τ. ε. "There are three which are understood, but we address them as one." Here he has the *three*, and the *one*, in the blessed object of worship. It is impossible not to suppose that he had his eye fixed on our verse.

The following quotation of our verse has been by the learned ascribed to Origen, who lived in the beginning of the third century. It is found in a *catena* on psalm cxxii. 2. "Τὰδὲ τρία Κυρίου ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν εἰσι· οἱ νῦν (το) ἐν εἰσι." "These three are the Lord our God. For these three are one."§ This I venture to call a quotation, and one that does seem to me very obvious.—But even admitting it to be an allusion, it must be an allusion not to the eighth verse, but to

the seventh. For the author is speaking of the blessed Trinity, and of that only.—And the mystick explanation of the eighth verse, and its application to the Trinity, was unknown to the Greek fathers. Every scholar knows this. And I am confident that none of our opponents have ventured to ascribe the mystick explanation of Augustine's invention to any Greek father. No scholar can be guilty of doing them such an injury. Hence it is beyond dispute that this ancient Greek father, who wrote the above sentence, had his eye on the text of the heavenly witnesses.

In Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived in the year 191, we discover the following obvious allusion to our verse: "παν ῥημα" κ. τ. ε. "Every word is established by two, and by *three witnesses, by the Father, and by the Son, and by the Holy Ghost,*" &c.\* Contrast this with the following from Tertullian: "Si in tribus testibus," &c. "If by three (human) witnesses every word shall be established, how much more will the number of the divine names" (that is the three divine persons) "suffice to establish the confidence of our hope!" Then compare each of these with the ninth verse of 1 John v. "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater," and we shall perceive in all of these a most evident allusion to the three heavenly witnesses in our text. And, "such an allusion," we repeat it, "does as clearly indicate the existence of our text, as any direct quotation can."

In fine, in the "Apology" of Athenagoras, a Christian philosopher of Athens, who lived in the year 177, we find another quotation, or allusion, which establishes the fact of the existence of our text at that early period. "That we may understand what is the union

\* See Griesbach, Diatriba, p. 10. Burgess, p. 143.

† See Kettneri, Hist. &c. p. 165.

‡ So Kettner quotes it. I venture to propose an amendment. It ought to be "possedit."

§ Griesb. Diatriba, p. 10. And Burgess, p. 40. We do not know how the article το has crept into this passage.

of the Son to the Father, what the Father communicates with the Son, and what the Spirit is: what the unity of the three, and what the distinction of the united persons." "Because, as we believe in God, and the *Word*, his Son, and in the Holy Spirit, *three* indeed as to power, &c. the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, but *one* in act and substance."\* Thus he distinctly mentions "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost," and adds, "that these three are one." This exhibits the very doctrine and expressions of our text.

It is well known to the learned, that the Greek fathers have not yet been fully searched for their quotations of our verse. This is yet a *desideratum* in our controversy. Not an individual on either side of the controversy has found time to do it, or has been willing to undertake the drudgery. Those specimens which have been exhibited, have been gleaned from authors who had been searching these Greek fathers for other purposes, and who have simply, as if *per accidens*, mentioned the passages containing these quotations and allusions.— Yet meagre as this specimen is willingly allowed to be, we do feel a confidence in resting our appeal to the learned and the candid—whether it be not, as Dorhout has ventured to say, "clearer than mid-day that the Greek fathers have quoted our text," and alluded to it so often and so pointedly, that there can no longer remain a doubt that it was in their best and most approved copies of the scriptures. And an apology is due to the Christian publick from those learned men whose rashness and prejudice have led them to assert that the text of the heavenly witnesses is not quoted by any Greek father.

In my next, if the Lord permit,

\* "Athenag. Apol. for the Christians," quoted by Kettner in *Hist. &c.* p. 124.

I shall offer you specimens gleaned from the Latin fathers.

I am, Mr. Editor,

With great respect, yours, &c.

W. C. BROWNLEE.

Basking Ridge, June, 1825.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

[The following paper was put into our hands by a friend, who received it from a physician at Fayetteville, in North Carolina, by whom it was drawn up. It contains, we are assured, a faithful statement of facts; and we are persuaded its perusal will give pleasure to our Christian readers. It has brought to our recollection a remark we have heard—"that when God intends to communicate his grace to a heathen, he will either be brought to the gospel, or the gospel be carried to him." *Ed.*]

About the close of the importation of negroes into South Carolina, a rice planter of that state purchased a gang of slaves and sent them to his plantation; among whom was a man of a slender frame and delicate constitution, who was not able to labour in the field, or had not the disposition to do so. His health failing, he was considered of no value and disregarded. At length he strolled off, and wandering from plantation to plantation reached this place, was taken up as a runaway and put in jail, where he remained for some time. As no one claimed him, and he appeared of no value, the jail was thrown open,\* that he might run away; but he had no disposition to make his escape. The boys amused themselves with his good natured, playful behaviour, and fitted up a temporary desk, made of a flour barrel, on which he wrote in a masterly hand, writing from right to left, in what was to them an unknown language. He was also noticed by some

\* The cause of the jail being thrown open was, he was found to be "a bright mason."

THE  
**CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.**

AUGUST, 1825.

**Religious Communications.**

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XV.

(Continued from p. 292.)

But it is infinitely more important to consider the wiles of the adversary who lay concealed under the serpent, than to determine what was the original form of that animal. The account given of the temptation of our first mother, like every other part of the narrative, is very short and comprehensive. Yet comprehensive as it is, enough is said to show that the subtlety of the great deceiver was all exerted on the occasion. Nothing can be imagined more artful and insidious than his temptation. He begins with an inquiry addressed to the woman, in regard to the prohibition by the Creator of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. She answers it in a manner seemingly calculated to justify the divine prohibition of the interdicted tree, and to magnify the bounty of God in granting liberty to eat of all beside. The adversary then proceeds to question and deny the penalty of death, and in such manner as seems to intimate that possibly Eve had mistaken it; and yet carrying clearly the charge both of cruelty and falsehood, against the great Creator. Eve listens, deliberates, and is lost. She appears to have hesitated for some time; to

have viewed the tree attentively, to have strengthened her desire of eating by the view, and thus to have gained resolution to perpetrate the fatal act.

Ah! my young friends, remember while you live, this tampering with temptation by our first mother; and while, at this hour, you feel its consequences, follow not the fatal example. Remember it as a warning; and especially in youth, while the passions are ardent and the fancy is active. It was written for our learning. Remember that if you begin to parley with temptation, you are undone. Repel the tempter without listening to him. If he can gain your fancy and your passions, he will certainly succeed. *Obsta principiis.*—Dash from you, with abhorrence, the poisoned cup, the moment it is presented. Never listen to temptation—Never make it a question whether you will comply or not. Never suffer it to become the subject of meditation—There it first pollutes the soul. Look upon it, and think of it, and you will comply. Remember too that all seducers, and tempters to sin, are acting the part of Satan. If you listen to them you are lost. Hear them not; repel them with abhorrence, scorn and indignation. Avoid temptation, likewise, as far as possible. “Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of evil men. Avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it, and pass away.”

O! deny them not, I entreat you, the benefit of your daily fervent supplications, at a throne of grace. Assuredly when you cease to pray with and for them, you cease from all the fidelity of parental duty; and have no right to hope that you will be blessed in them, or they in you.

*My dear young friends.*—With the feelings of an affectionate Father towards you, let me beseech your attention for a moment. You have been much upon my mind since I left you. Often have I told you, what I now testify to you over again, that the things of religion, are the *great* things which claim your attention; and that the days of your youth, are the season above all to attend to them. Graceless, ill-spent youth, generally terminates in graceless old age—if life is so far prolonged; and in hopeless death.—Let me solemnly warn you, of the inevitable consequence of indulging in a course of idleness, carelessness, dissipation, and pleasure, to the neglect of your immortal interests; or of becoming companions of them that do so. Assuredly by such conduct, you will be making shipwreck of reputation, peace, comfort, health, and all that belongs to well being in this world; as well as in the world to come.—Seek instruction, seek it diligently.—Follow after sobriety, industry, humility, chastity; and above all, give yourselves to prayer, and to the Lord Jesus, in an humble reliance upon his merit and his mercy, as the Saviour of lost sinners: so will you rank among the excellent of the earth, and shine at last as the brightness of the firmament, among the angels of heaven.

Finally, my brethren of the congregation;—the peace of the Lord Jesus Christ, that passeth all understanding, be with you abundantly—Pray for me, that I may be preserved in the path of duty, while wandering a stranger in strange lands, and if it is the Lord's will, shortly restored to you, recovered

in health, (which from present circumstances I have some reason to hope,) and that the visitation which has produced a temporary, and threatened a final separation, may be blessed to us both; producing an increased diligence in duty—I to minister, and you to wait on and receive my ministrations; so that we may be much more profitable to one another, and blessed in one another as pastor and people, than we heretofore have been. But should it be the Lord's will to remove me, and I am to minister to you no more, my last charge, my dying charge to you, is, to obtain, as speedily as possible, the stated dispensation of Gospel ordinances, by a well qualified godly minister—Grudge not the expense. A people half your number, would belie themselves, to say they were not able to support the Gospel, and support it liberally. Since I have left you, I have seen people poorer than you, expending much more to support a superstition that destroys them, than it would cost you, to support a well gifted messenger of grace, to break the bread of life to you and your little ones, from sabbath to sabbath. Beware I beseech you of “a saving that tendeth to poverty.” May the God of wisdom and grace, counsel, direct, and bless you, abundantly, at all times, and in all things.

Your absent and affectionate Pastor. ———

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

*No. IX.*

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF 1 JOHN, v. 7.

“There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.”

“Numberless circumstances conspire to strengthen the authority of the *LATIN*

church in supporting the authenticity of this passage."—Nolan, p. 294.

Mr. Editor,—In closing, in my last number, the review of the quotations of our verse, and the allusions to it,—found on the pages of the Greek Fathers; I stated that the Greek Fathers have, in reality, not yet been examined, expressly for the purpose of ascertaining how far they have quoted our verse.—This is yet a *desideratum* in this controversy. And it is earnestly wished and hoped, that the task of supplying this want, may be undertaken by some of those British, or German, or Dutch scholars, to whom the Greek is as familiar as the dialects of their own language: and who recline in the sweet literary ease of their academick bowers: and whose official duties consume merely a unit of their time: and who have within their reach, in the libraries which have been accumulating for a thousand years, every book which they can ask for, from the MSS. on *papyrus* and rolls of *vellum*, to the Modern volume; and who have every facility for pursuing the deep research, which their souls can desire!

According to my plan, I am, in the *second* place, to examine the testimony given to the authenticity of our verse, by the Western churches in Europe and Africa: and the fathers usually called the Latins.

The oracles of God were committed to the Latin church, as well as to the Greek church. Thus far, in point of testimony to a matter of antiquity, they are on a footing of equality.—But when we recall to remembrance the well established fact that, in the Greek church, a heresy sprung up, of a fatal kind, and gained an entire ascendancy for forty years, at least: that the sect which propagated this heresy, and which denied the doctrine *truly* taught in our verse, had a dangerous controul over the most of the copies of the holy scriptures: the testimony of the Greek church begins to lose something of that which brought it up originally to a state of equality

with the Latin Church.—The testimony of the Latin church is, moreover, placed greatly in the advance of respectable superiority, by some important historical details by Eusebius. While persecutions, of the most desolating spirit, raged over all that extent of country, within the limits of the Eastern or Greek church; from Libya, through Egypt, and Palestine, round the Mediterranean even to Illyricum, for eight years: the provinces of Gaul under the milder sceptre of Const. Chlorus, and Africa (in which lay the churches whence we derive our best testimony of all the Western churches) did suffer *comparatively* little; and only for a short time; "not during two of the first whole years of the persecution."\* And there was a successful zeal exerted in concealing the sacred codices. And some bishops, taking advantage of the ignorance of the illiterate minions of persecution, gravely delivered up the parchments containing the writings of the Arians and other heretics, which were hurled by them into the flames: they reported to their masters that they had consumed the Bibles of the Christians! Hence the African churches lost few—very few copies of their sacred codices. And thence, as they did not require a supply of codices, at the time that the Eastern churches did, when Christianity was on the throne of the Cæsars, they did not, of course, receive the altered copies of Eusebius: and the copies of St. Jerom, prepared by him for *publick*† use.

Hence every scholar has felt the weight of the authority of the Western churches in Africa, and Europe, in sustaining the authenticity of our verse: and hence they have laid the greatest stress on their testimony.

\* "Ουδε ὅλοις ἔτεσι δυοσι τοῖς πρώτοις τοῦ διωγμοῦ;" κ. τ. ε. Euseb. De Mart. Palæst. cap. xiii. p. 437, &c. See also Mosh. Eccl. Hist. vol. 1. and Kettneri Hist. Johannei, p. 177.

† We shall explain this distinction in the course of the present argument.—See Nolan, p. 295.

The testimony rendered by Latin versions is decisively in our favour.—As we have already more than once alluded to the Italick version, we need say the less of it now. This version, it will be readily admitted, is the oldest version rendered in Latin. With the origin of the Vulgate, now used in the Catholick church; and with that of the Verceli manuscripts, we are made well acquainted by historical details. St. Jerome, at the command of pope Damasus, corrected, or framed the former of these: St. Eusebius of Verceli, at the desire of Pope Julius, corrected and formed the latter.—But of the author and origin of the Italick version, the records of history make no mention. Even tradition is ambiguous, or silent, on this point. We know nothing more of this very ancient version than simply this—That it had existed long before St. Jerome, or St. Eusebius had conceived their corrections: or had published their respective editions: and that it is remarkable for its faithful renderings from the original Greek.\*

Now the Waldenses are the lineal descendants of the Italick church. They are from the diocese called the Italick, as distinguished from the Roman diocese. Their testimony, therefore, relative to the primitive version must be valuable.

And we are indebted to Nolan, whose researches have produced before the publick this very thing. He has actually produced the complete and “unequivocal testimony given by the Waldenses, a truly apostolick branch of the primitive church, that the famous text of the heavenly witnesses, was adopted into the version which prevailed in the Latin church, *previously to the introduction of the modern vulgate:*”† and from time immemorial. Of four of the old versions made into French from the version used in the Italick church, or the Latin version, two were made by the Waldenses. Our verse is found

in that very ancient version, made from the Latin. The following are the words in ancient French. “Trois chose sont qui donnent tesmoing au ciel, le Pere, le Filz et le Saint Esperit, et ces trois sont une chose. Et trois sont qui donnent tesmoing en terre, esperit, eaue, et sang.” “There are three things (persons) who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: and these three are one thing. And there are three which give testimony on earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood.” And in the very ancient confession of faith of that primitive apostolick church, the text is thus quoted: “Et saint Jean; Il y en a trois qui rend temoignage au ciel, le Pere, le Fils, et le S. Esprit, et ces trois sont un.”\*

The Latin version of the scriptures, which had been current in Africa long before the version of St. Jerome had been published, did contain our verse; and in precisely the same terms as in the received copy. “There are three which bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.” Thus it was quoted by the four hundred bishops (according to Gibbon four hundred and sixty bishops,) before the king Hunneric, and out of the version held in their hands.

Of the Latin version, the accomplished critick Bengel thus speaks: “Truly this version is more ancient than all the Greek codices, and fathers, of whom any thing survives to this day: and it is sufficiently near to the first codex of this epistle.” “primo hujus epistolæ codici satis propinquus.”†

But St. Jerome’s version, made in the fourth century, also contains our verse, and in precisely the same terms, as those of the common version. And this testimony, rendered by such a scholar as St. Jerome, is of great importance. Dr. Bently judged

\* Nolan ut supra. And Perrin Hist. des Vaudois et Albigeois: ch. v. p. 201, &c.

† Bengel ad loc. in sect. 27; Burgess, p. 7, &c. &c.

\* See Nolan, p. 139.

† Nolan, pref. p. xviii.

so; and spoke in the strongest terms of it. And as this eminent critick, Dr. Bently, was our antagonist, in the controversy on the text of the heavenly witnesses, his sentiment will be duly appreciated by the scholars on his side. "It was plain to me," says Dr. B., "that when that copy came from that great father, Jerome's hands, it must agree exactly with the most authentick Greek exemplars. And if now it could be retrieved, it would be the best test and voucher for the true reading, out of several pretending ones."\*

Now it is a fact established by historical record, that our verse was in St. Jerome's version, "when it came from the hands of that great father." Our opponents know the evidence of this fact; and have admitted it. Sir Isaac Newton bears testimony to it. He does, indeed, throw out a strong charge—or insinuation at least. He does assert that "St. Jerome was the first man *who inserted the verse into the Latin version.*" Were this expression qualified, we would honour the prince of philosophers, by admitting it to contain a true statement. St. Jerome did insert it into *his* Latin version. But it is quite a different thing to say that he inserted it *first into the Latin version.* It was in that Latin version which had been current in Africa long before this; and which, as we have observed, was quoted by the 460 bishops in the year 484.—St. Jerome did insert our verse into his Latin version, made for the *private use of those who were initiated into the mysteries of Christ.* But the circumstances attending this insertion present us strong evidence from that able critick and eminent theologian, in behalf of the authenticity of our verse. St. Jerome in inserting, or rather restoring, our verse to its place, laments the inaccuracy of the Latin translators, who "did not follow the Greek ex-

emplars, but had omitted the text of the heavenly witnesses." This statement, which we shall presently quote more fully, establishes two things:—1. That our text was in St. Jerome's version "when it came from his hands." 2. It was inserted into a copy formerly defective; and inserted too on the authority of Greek manuscripts.

This testimony of St. Jerome's version of the 4th century, let it be particularly noticed, is a testimony distinct from that of the Latin version current in Africa long before Jerome's appeared. Hence the testimony given is *double.* These two important witnesses do mutually strengthen each other, and present a great force of evidence in behalf of the authenticity of our verse.—And when, in addition to all this, we consider these two versions as not merely exhibiting their individual testimony in a combined force, but as actually holding up, in the strongest possible light, the testimony of the whole Western Churches, pronouncing and declaring from time immemorial, and in language perfectly unequivocal, that the text of the heavenly witnesses was a true portion of holy scripture from the pen of St. John, and hence that it was not to be moved from its place—where he put it—I deem the testimony decisive on the point. And for one, I would as readily be induced to give up the whole epistles and the gospel of John, as to surrender the text of the heavenly witnesses! "Et cui fides non largiatur, nec sufficit demonstratio ulla!"\*

The evidence from Latin manuscripts now claims our attention.—"Of the Latin MSS." says Griesbach, "the number which reads the verse of the heavenly witnesses is much greater than the number of those which do not read it." And of nearly 240 manuscripts, of which he makes mention, about 45 want

\* Bentr. Lett. and Let. to the Archb. of Canterbury, p. 231, &c.

\* Huet. Evang. Demonstratio.

the verse. And if we give up—as I would for one cheerfully give up—those MSS. in which the verse is discovered to have been added by *another hand*, Griesbach may then claim about 55 or perhaps 60.—We may safely affirm that, bating some individual exceptions, the Latin MSS. in general, written after the eighth century, contain our verse.

We also readily admit that there is a considerable variety in the manuscript readings of our verse in the Latin MSS. We admit the fact in the face of all that our most distinguished opponent, Dr. Marsh, has made of it. Our cause needs no stratagems, nor ambuscades, nor concealments. And it asks quarter from none. We allow Dr. Marsh to go the full length to which his discoveries carry him. He states the variety of readings. He aggravates—and in nothing does he extenuate. He then turns the whole variety into materials for an argument, that the 7th verse was surely, nay indubitably, a Latin gloss of the Fathers on the 8th verse. And he is quite sure that this is a matter of historical fact.\* But one of his own side in this controversy—and one, moreover, from whom it could easily be shown that Dr. Marsh borrows his armour and his zeal—I mean Father Simon—denies this to be matter of historical record. He pronounces, as an oracle, that the verse originated not in a Latin, but in a Greek scholium, or gloss on the 8th verse.†

To this we oppose the authority and criticisms of Mill and of Burgess. They have demonstrated that the 7th verse *did not originate* from the *scholia*, but that the *scholia* or gloss originated from the 7th verse; and being found by transcribers, on the margin of MSS. after the 7th verse had, by inattention or fraud, been withdrawn, they

became attached to the 8th verse.\* And I would venture to repeat what has been set down in the close of my No. VII. the 7th verse *could not originate* in a gloss of the fathers on verse 8th. The very supposition involves in it a charge against the Father who is supposed to have produced the gloss, which if proved, would constrain us to place him by the side of blasphemers, or at least of maniacs! If the 7th verse be made a gloss on the 8th verse, then its author makes the Spirit, the water, and the blood, to be the persons of the most holy Trinity! And he makes the Spirit, the water, and the blood to be, according to the genius of the style employed, one and the same essence! Such is the consequence involved in the wild and extravagant supposition of Dr. Marsh.

Besides, were even all this laid aside, did even all this not lie against Dr. Marsh and his associates, and even admitting that the varieties in the readings of the 7th verse were to be turned into an argument for its being a scholium, what will Dr. Marsh reply, when we try the force of his principles on the 8th verse? Dr. M. and every scholar knows that there are, in the Latin MSS. even more varieties in the reading of the 8th verse, than of the 7th verse; for instance, in the transposition of certain words, in the change of others, in the leaving out of the last clause.† And yet neither Dr. Marsh, nor any other scholar, has ever questioned the authenticity of the 8th verse, nor supposed it a gloss! I leave it with the learned, to pronounce on this—whether it was an oversight, or the result of prejudice, on the part of this eminent critick. We pronounce nothing—being satisfied

\* See Burgess, Vind. p. xii. Horne, vol. IV. p. 442.

† See this fully illustrated in Horne, vol. iv. p. 442—or rather in Burgess's Vind. p. 53, 54.

\* Dr. Marsh's Lect. part vi. p. 22.

† Simon. Hist. Crit. De Nov. Test. p. 204.

if we can only neutralize their objections!

We claim not only the *greatest number* of MSS. as sustaining our verse—we claim the *most ancient* also. It is found in the Vauxcelles Bible of the eighth century; and in the three MSS. of the library of Verona of the same century. And hence, as Dr. Burgess has shown, “if our verse be absent from *more* ancient MSS. it is found in the *most ancient* copies.”\*

(To be continued.)

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. II.

TRANSATLANTICK RECOLLECTIONS.

Fasau et hæc olim meminisse juvabit.

It is known to all who are conversant with the ecclesiastical history of Scotland, that though Presbyterianism is the form of religion of that kingdom, yet it is divided into several sects, differing in a lesser or greater degree from the establishment. Perhaps the most respectable of these is the one known by the appellation, “Secession, or Burgher Synod.” This secession took place on the 10th day of November, 1733, when Messrs. Ebenezer Erskine, William Wilson, Alexander Moncrief and James Fisher, protested against the defection of the established church from its original purity, and the high-handed measures of a corrupt and intolerant party who then administered its ecclesiastical concerns; at the same time declaring that though they are “obliged to make a *secession* from them, and that they can have no ministerial communion with them, till they see their sins and mistakes, and amend them,” yet they declare their intention, “to exercise the keys of doctrine and discipline and government, according to the word of God

and confession of faith, and the principles and constitutions of the covenanted Church of Scotland.”

Perhaps the good which resulted from this secession, to the establishment and to the cause of religion in general; and the rapid growth of one of the purest and most apostolical churches of modern times—more than overbalances any pain which the breaking down of religious sects may occasion to the friends of union and brotherly love. Establishments “in natura rei,” are liable to become bloated with the nutriment which is intended only for their support, and proud from the contemplation of the civil power, which is arrayed only for their protection; so that their very stability generates an indecorous haughtiness, which ill comports with clerical responsibility, and which is, perhaps, never exhibited when a church depends solely upon the free-will offerings of its members for *support*, and on the strictness and purity of its doctrines for *protection*. The very independence on the laity, which an establishment gives to the clergy, relaxes their desires of being at all times pleasing and industrious. And as it lessens their human responsibility, so it tends to make them indifferent to the good opinion of the people. Indifference naturally begets or encourages laziness. Hence strictness of precept and example is relaxed, and the consequence is that, finally, neither in *faith nor practice* is the standard of orthodoxy very high. It was when the Church of Scotland, groaning beneath the enervating and polluting influence of worldly distinction, evinced a defection in spirit and in practice, that the aforementioned zealous and able ministers “of the faith once delivered to the saints,” made the bold and decided stand which hurled them from the bosom and emoluments of the establishment, made them liable to the scorn and contumely of the less faithful, and

\* Vind. p. 53 and 54.

THE  
CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

SEPTEMBER, 1825.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XVI.

The first subject of attention at this time, is the following very important answer in our catechism, to the question—What is sin? “Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God.”

That we may understand correctly the nature of sin as it is here defined, it will be of use to consider briefly, the nature of that law of which all sin is a violation. The law which sin violates is the law of God. “Whosoever committeth sin—says the apostle John—transgresseth also the law; for sin is a transgression of the law.” In defining a law generally, Hooker says—“That which doth assign unto each thing the kind, that which doth moderate the force and power, that which doth appoint the form and measure of working, the same we term a law.” More shortly and popularly, a law may be defined—a prescribed rule of action.

The laws of God, for the government of men, have some of them been temporary and local, and some of perpetual and universal obligation. The ceremonial and judicial laws of the Jews were, during the continuance of the Mosaick economy, perfectly obligatory on that people—as much so as the precepts

VOL. III.—Ch. Adv.

of the decalogue. But they were local and temporary. They never were binding on any other people beside the Jews; and not binding on them after the advent of the Messiah. They were given for a particular purpose—That purpose has been accomplished, and the Deity, the legislator who enacted, has repealed them, and they are no longer laws.

But there are other laws of God, which are of perpetual and universal obligation—These are called moral laws. But here, again, there is a distinction which deserves to be noticed. Some of these laws are technically denominated *moral natural*, and others *moral positive*. Laws *naturally moral*, are those which seem to derive their obligation from the very nature of things; insomuch that you cannot conceive that they should not be obligatory, while the relations exist to which they refer. Thus you cannot conceive that a rational and moral being should exist, and not be under obligation to reverence his Creator—You cannot conceive that it should be lawful, for such a creature to disregard and revile the infinitely great and good Author of his being.

On the other hand, laws *positively moral*, derive their obligation, not from the nature of things, but solely from the explicit command of God. Thus the intermarriage of brothers and sisters, must once

gard restoration, as an event that has almost ceased to be probable. It is not my business, however, to look into futurity, but to live from day to day by faith, and happily, the warrant for its exercise is always the same. The man who can say, "I know in whom I have believed," is a happy man, even though he had but another step to make, until he reached the grave's mouth, and that step lay in a foreign land, six thousand miles from his family and his home.—The information I have here communicated relative to my health, is calculated to make you feel uneasiness on my account. However, you will very probably not receive this, until it is accompanied with my next, which will very likely be dated from Genoa, and I am not without hope that enlargement, travelling, and exercise, will exceed expectation, in lifting me up from my present depression.

I remain, as ever,  
Yours, &c.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. IX.

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN  
ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY  
OF 1 JOHN, v. 7.

(Continued from p. 266.)

The absence of our verse from some Latin MSS. is readily admitted by us. And the following facts may lead to the discovery of the cause of that.

Something of the nature of the superstitious custom of the Jews, of avoiding the pronunciation of the Hebrew word for Jehovah, and of using a circumlocution—"the word of four letters—tetragramaton"—had, it seems, passed into the primitive Christian church, in relation to the mysteries of the Holy Trinity. The fathers avowed this custom. "We speak not openly of

the mysteries, but many things we speak in a concealed manner: that those who believe and know may understand; and that those who know not may not be hurt." "Ουδε τα περι των μυστηριων" κ. τ. ε.—And again: "The mysteries concerning the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, we explain not before the heathen." "Ου γαρ εθνικω" κ. τ. ε.\*

Now it does appear that St. Jerom had given out two editions of the Epistles of the New Testament. In the edition designed for *private* use among Christians, he *inserted the verse*. But in the copies designed for *publick* use, he had *omitted it*.—This unjustifiable mode of proceeding has been, in my view of it, established against him by the learned Nolan.†—And in some parts of his prologues to the epistles, St. Jerom does seem, in no obscure terms, to avow this. "Accedunt ad hoc invidorum studia," &c. "To this may be added the zeal of the envious, who blame whatever I write. And sometimes against the dictates of their own consciences, *publicé lacerant quod occulté legunt*, they *publickly* assail what they read *in secret*. Therefore, I beseech you, Domion and Rogatianus, that you be content with the *private* reading: nor do you bring these books into the *publick*, nor heap up food to those who are full. But if there be any of the brethren to whom our labours are not disagreeable, *to them show the exemplar.*"‡

To the evidence derived from the *most ancient* Latin MSS. which contained our verse, we may add the testimony still found on the face of a class of ancient MSS. which do not contain our verse. I allude to the singular fact that in the ancient class of MSS. to which our reference is made, there are found in

\* Chrysostom, Homil. in 1 Cor. xv. 19. tom. x. p. 379.

† Inquiry, p. 101, and 561—563.

‡ S. Hieron. tom. iii. p. 344. and Nolan, p. 101. Note: also p. 563.

the 8th verse the words "*in terra*," "*in the earth*," which had, in some unaccountable, but providential manner, escaped the erasing hands of the men who deprived these copies of our verse.—Our opponents, Porson and Marsh, were fully aware of the conclusion drawn from the existence of these words "*in terra*," in the 8th verse; that of consequence the corresponding words "*in cælo*," "*in heaven*," must somewhere precede—and of course that the 7th verse, of which these words are a part, must precede: and they have zealously denied that these words are to be found in any genuine copy.

But it is known to the learned, that these words "*in terra*," "*in the earth*," are found in genuine MSS. Griesbach does mention such manuscripts: and he states that such have also been mentioned by Stephens, by Lucas Brugensis, and by Hentenius.\* And the existence of them is put beyond a reasonable doubt by Facundus, the bishop of Hermianum, in the year 547.—In his "*Defensio Trium Caputum*," in the council of Chalcedon, he has, according to Burgess, quoted the 8th verse, or a part of it, with *in terra* six times.† On inspection, I count the quotation seven times. Porson does indeed deny the authenticity of these words *in terra*. But he offers only his conjectures. He produces neither quotations nor MSS. to sustain his conjectures. And on inspecting the pages of Facundus, it will be seen that the phrase is not only often repeated, but interwoven into the argument. For the nature of the heresy which Facundus was combating, made it essentially necessary that the phrase "*in the earth*," should be in the sacred passage opposed to that heresy. He is proving that one of the persons of

the Most Holy Trinity came into the world, and lived *in terra*, *in the earth*, in order to redeem us. If the words, therefore, *in terra*, *in the earth*, be left out, as Porson proposes, and zealously insists that they ought to be; then the very force and life of the argument of Facundus is utterly destroyed.

Let us next turn our attention to the Latin Fathers.—The number of these fathers who quote our verse is considerable. And their authority is of the greatest weight. It is found in the version by Wickliff, the Luther of England, made in the 14th century.\*—It is quoted by Thomas Aquinas, in the 13th century:‡ by Abbot Ruipart in the 12th century:‡ by Peter Lombard: and by Bernard in his sermons:§ by Ambrose Ambert in the eleventh century.|| It was in the copy of the holy scriptures in daily use in the Romish church from the 8th century. And it was as extensively known to men who made any pretensions to reading or writing, as the darkness of that gloomy period would permit.

Walafrid Strabo was an eminent scholar and theologian of the ninth century. He was of the school of the venerable Bede.—He was the immediate scholar of Rabanus Maurus: Maurus was a scholar of Alcuin, the preceptor of Charlemagne: and Alcuin was the scholar of Bede.¶ The testimony derived from such a quarter must be valuable. And Walafrid Strabo does bear ample testimony to the fact

\* See Selden de Synag. lib. 2. p. 139—Cavei. Hist. Eccles. append. p. 16.—Nolan shows that Wickliff obtained this verse, through the Lollards, from the respectable and primitive apostolick church of the Waldenses. Inq. p. xix. Note.

† In two different places besides his exposition of 1 John v. 7. See Kettner, p. 174. Nolan, p. 293. Note.

‡ In Lib. de Glorif. Trinit. cap. vi.

§ Kettner, p. 174.

|| Gerhardi, Disput. p. 1322.

¶ See Wetstein Proleg. Edit. Semler, p. 229, and Burgess, p. 45, &c.

\* Burgess, p. 143, &c.

† Burgess, p. 148. He quotes from the Paris edit. of the year 1629, which gives the phrase *in terra* seven times.

that our verse was well known and publickly used in the churches. *He wrote a comment on our text, and also on the "Prologue to the Epistles,"* which he tells us was written by St. Jerome. Now the author of the "Prologue," as already stated, has lamented the inaccuracy of some of the Latin copies, which did not follow the *Greek exemplars*: and he has specified, in particular, the omission of the text of the Heavenly Witnesses. On this "prologue" Walafrid Strabo comments, and he illustrates and proves these points. Hence we have the clear and decisive testimony of this distinguished scholar, in the ninth century, to these two points: 1. That some Latin copies were defective; and were declared to be defective in this part of John's epistle, by the best scholars of that time: 2. That the *Greek originals* had our text: and that if the *Latin codices* had contained our text, they would, on this point, have been as complete as the *Greek originals*. And thence all ground of complaint would have been removed.

Cassiodorus was a writer of the sixth century; and died in the year 577, aged ninety-six. He was eminent as a courtier and as a theologian. He was governor of Sicily, and a privy counsellor of King Theodoric. The following is a well known passage from his "*Complexiones*." "Testificant in terra, &c." "There are three mysteries bearing testimony on earth, the water, the blood, and the spirit, which are fulfilled in the sufferings of our Lord. But in heaven, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one God."\* That this contains the words of the 7th and 8th verses, but transposed, as is the case in the Vulgate, and in other copies, must be admitted by every one of our opponents.—It is certainly instructive,—I will not venture to say amusing, to view the zeal, and the

\* Cassiod. Comp. Epist. Paulin. See also Nolan, Inq. p. 292.

failure of Porson in his laboured effort to overthrow this testimony. "On a diligent examination of the *Complexiones*," says the Greek Professor, "I am persuaded that Cassiodorus found no more in his copy, than the words of the 8th verse: and that he gave his own, or rather Eucherius's interpretation of these words, and applied them to the Trinity."

Now what are the reasons which the learned man has alleged in behalf of this proposed correction of a well known passage in Cassiodorus? He quotes no *variæ lectiones*; he appeals to no MSS. He could produce no MSS: no different readings to support him. For there are none known to favour his idea. He simply alleges the word *mysteria* used by Cassiodorus: and then supposes that with Eucherius he applies this to the Trinity—for the word *mysteria*, of course, could not be referred to any one other thing than Trinity! Yes! This "*mysteria*" must determine it to be an allegorical application of the 8th verse, to the Trinity—and to that alone: Porson next proceeds gravely to say, "And I reassert that no man in his perfect mind could possibly adopt this allegorical exposition of the 8th verse, if the 7th was extant in his copy. Even a madman would have method in his madness. I appeal to any of the orthodox, whether he would force an indirect confession of his favourite doctrine, from one text by torture, when he might have a *clear, full, and voluntary evidence from its next neighbour*."\*—We reply, First: That all this declamation is misdirected. It is wholly built on false assumptions. It betrays an ignorance truly astonishing, of the nature of the early controversies in the church. He supposes that the state of the *Trinitarian controversy* since the Reformation has been precisely similar, or in fact, the same as in the primitive times. They are exceedingly different. I do not pro-

\* Porson, Lett. p. 311.

pose *here* to enter into the proof of this. Let me simply say, that no man acquainted with the true state of the controversies about the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, during the first five centuries, would have uttered such sheer absurdity and errors as those which glare in the above extract from the Greek Professor. He judged the state of the primitive controversy from our modern *Trinitarian* controversy. But I defy an opponent—I defy any follower of Porson to produce one sectary, or one antagonist of the orthodox cause in the first five or six centuries, that could have been successfully opposed by our verse. There was then really no *Trinitarian controversy* as it now is: all the sects of that time admitted a three in the divinity. The doctrine of the Gnostics and Ebionites, down through the Magians, Cerinthians, and Valentinians, and Marcionites, and Paulites, and Photinians, and Sabellians, did not clash with the *literal* expression in our text. They all admitted *the three in the Deity*. The controversy with the Sabellians approximated nearest to something like the modern controversy. Yet their heresy could quote and receive our text truly as it stands.\* They confound the three persons: and make the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, one—even one person. The controversy of the Arians did not reach the extent of a Trinitarian controversy. It respected the Son. Now with no kind of success could the ancients have quoted our text which, as it was then explained, did seem to favour these heretics. Had they quoted it—they would have been affording *apparently* something like weapons against themselves.† And to prove that

the persons were distinct—that, for instance, he who on the cross was pierced, and from whose side came blood and water, must be a distinct person from the Father and Spirit, could be successfully proved from the 8th verse—and not the 7th. Hence (and Nolan has followed out the argument at some length,) in the real state of the primitive controversy, “a stronger argument was deducible from the witnesses on earth, than from the heavenly witnesses.”\* For it is a curious circumstance, that while modern heretics admit the *humanity*—they deny the *divinity* of our Lord—whereas the ancient sectaries, in what Porson absurdly calls the *Trinitarian controversy*, laboured rather to deny and overthrow his humanity, while they admitted, in their own way, his divinity—even as Porson and his followers have actually done!†

We reply, *second*, to Porson, that he has misrepresented Cassiodorus and Eucherius, in a wanton and inexcusable manner in the above quoted declamation. It is, indeed, true, Porson does but copy. It has been the cant of every writer, if I mistake not, who has written against the authenticity of our verse; that the Latin Fathers, Cassiodorus and Eucherius, and others, have allegorized the 8th verse, and have tortured out of it an argument for the Holy Trinity. This every new writer learns from the report and tradition of his predecessor. And in his turn he repeats the vile cant; and hands it faithfully down. So has the great Porson stooped to do. It is a point which admits of proof strong as demonstration, *that Cassiodorus has not allegorized the 8th verse; and that Eucherius has not*

altered: then our text would, in its *letter*, be evidently against the heretical sects.

\* See this point carefully, but briefly examined by the very learned Nolan, in his *Inquiry*, pp. 525—550.

† See Penn's *Sandy Foundation Shaken* in vol. ii. of his works, folio.

\* We think that there is evidence that Praxeas, the antagonist of Tertullian, quoted our text against him; as Tertullian did quote it against Praxeas.

† Had the term *son* been in our text instead of *word*, the case would have been

*allegorized the 8th verse into an argument for the Trinity!* And the word *mysteria*, used by the former, does not insinuate that he finds the Holy Trinity in the 8th verse. The words of Cassiodorus, above quoted, are plain and clear and obvious. And it is to me a matter of the purest astonishment, that any man, who has the humble attainment of being able to read Latin, should not, at once, perceive his meaning. "The three mysteries," he expressly says, "are fulfilled in the sufferings of Christ: *in passione Domini impleta.*" He does refer the 8th verse to the *mysteries displayed in the death of our Lord, and to that alone!* And I challenge every scholar to inspect it for himself—and he will perceive the injury and the injustice done to this respectable Father by modern polemicks; who may have been flashy and witty enough, in all conscience, but who want the brains and the solidity of the Fathers!

As it respects Eucherius; in his "*Questiones*" he also refers the *mystery* to the sufferings and death of our Lord. And no Christian will require an apology from him for applying the term to this. "Great is the mystery of Godliness." Wonderful the *mystery* in the sufferings, and agonies, and death of the Son of God! What our opponents have ascribed so erroneously to Eucherius, is by him quoted, and given as the opinion of others. For after he had given the above sentiment as his own, he quotes the opinion of "*quidam*," and of "*plures*," who refer the 8th verse in an allegory to the Holy Trinity.\* Let our opponents review the passages on the pages of these Fathers, and their candour will, I doubt not, absolve them from the sin and scandal of such allegorical interpretation. In fine, from the zeal and total failure which have characterized the attempt of the Greek Professor, we may perceive, without an effort on our part,

\* See Burgess, Vind. pp. 27, 28.

the force and the value of this ancient testimony to the authenticity of our verse.

We have some more testimony, which is still more ancient, and if possible even still more decisive. But this we reserve for our next number, which I calculate to be my last.

I am, Mr. Editor,  
Yours truly and faithfully,  
W. C. BROWNLEE.

Basking Ridge, July, 1825.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. III.

TRANSATLANTICK RECOLLECTIONS.

"Forsan et hæc olim meminisse juvabit."

It was on the morning of a Saturday, about the middle of the summer of 1817, that I left a little village on the borders of the Ettrick forest, in company with a friend, to travel over about twenty miles of a country celebrated for the grandeur of its scenery, the patriarchal simplicity of its shepherd population, as well as for the bright colouring with which the legendary muse had invested it. Our journey lay through a country, which might indeed have been travelled on horseback; but at the same time the shepherd paths, by which it was intersected, were still better calculated for the pedestrian. We travelled during the whole day, as it were through a splendid vista or extensive archway. On each side arose those towering border mountains, so famed in Scottish story; and above they were arched by the lowering clouds, which poured upon us an incessant and unwelcome flood of rain. Through the valley we were accompanied by a little stream, which ever and anon approached and departed from us, as it gambolled and curvetted between its alpine boundaries, which were at sufficient distance to permit it to proceed in a most fantastic ser-