

INTRODUCTION ON THE PESHITO-SYRIAC TEXT AND THE REVISED GREEK TEXT OF 1881

by Norton

Norton's scholarly introduction to the Peshito Syriac text and the Revised Greek Text of 1881, examining the ancient Syriac translation of the New Testament and its significance for textual criticism and biblical scholarship.

12 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 01. The many countries in which Syriac was spoken.
2. 02. Proof that very few Israelites in the time of Christ understood Greek.
3. 03. The Difference between the Syriac of the Peshito-Syriac Text, and the popula...
4. 04. How we may know whether Books which are said to be the Word of God, are so o...
5. 05. The Belief of those Christian Bodies which have used the New Covenant Peshit...
6. 06. Internal Evidence that the Peshito-Syriac was made in Century I; and that it...
7. 07. Characteristic Differences between the Peshito-Syriac Text, and the Greek Te...
8. 08. The Result of trusting chiefly to certain faulty Greek copies, and slighting...
9. 09. Testimonies founded on Knowledge and Esteem of the Peshito-Syriac.
10. 10. Chief Peculiarities of the Text of the Peshito-Syriac.
11. 11. The Design of this work.
12. 12. Words in the Common Version not well understood by some, in words more famil...

01. The many countries in which Syriac was spoken.

01. The many countries in which Syriac was spoken.

Syriac is a very ancient language. It belongs to the same family of languages as the ancient Hebrew. In the time of the Redeemer it was spoken, in slightly different dialects, in many countries.

SYRIAC BECAME THE LANGUAGE OF PALESTINE.- Dr. Frederic Delitzsch, Professor of Assyriology, in the University of Leipzig, in a work on "The Hebrew Language Viewed in the Light of Assyrian Research, 1883," pg. 2, says, "The transportation of the ten tribes from Palestine to Mesopotamia and Media, and the close intercourse of those left behind with people of different nations, as the Elamites, Babylonians, and Arabs, who supplied the places of the exiled Israelites, struck a deadly blow at the ancient language of the kingdom of Israel. Nor was it destined to flourish much longer in the kingdom of Judah.....The termination of the Babylonian exile marks the beginning of the process," that is, as to Judah, "by which Hebrew gradually disappeared from among living languages. It is true that a small portion of the nation, those who availed themselves of the permission to return to the holy land, still wrote and spoke Hebrew; but the Aramaic [the Syriac] dialect, which had been favoured by the Persian kings, and was almost regarded as the official language of the western portion of the Persian empire, had already begun to bring its deteriorating influence to bear upon it; and, rapidly advancing, was conquering one portion of Palestine after another. This process continued under the dominion of the Greeks.....At the time of the Maccabees, Hebrew had already ceased to be a spoken language.....The learned among the Jews, during the last two centuries before Christ, even preferred to WRITE in Aramaic; and at the time of Christ, Aramaic reigned supreme as the adopted language of the country."

Those of the ten tribes who were "CARRIED AWAY INTO ASSYRIA," (2 Kings 17:6), adopted the Syriac language also, as well as those of them who remained in Palestine. We have proof in holy Scripture that Aramaic, now called Syriac, was spoken by some of the Assyrians, when the king of Assyria sent Rabshakeh against Jerusalem. For the elders of the Jews asked him to speak to them in Aramaic, that the rest of the Jews might not know what he said (2 Kings 18:26; Isaiah 36:11). The language then called Aramaic, and now called Syriac, was not the most ancient language of Assyria. The Rev. A. H. Sayce says, in his "Assyrian Grammar, 1872," pages 1 and 10, that the original Assyrian language was more like Hebrew and Phoenician than it was like Syriac. But by degrees the old Assyrian language gave place to Syriac. Mr. Sayce says at page 18, "Assyrian passed away before the encroaching influence of Aramaean."

Before the ten tribes were carried away into Assyria, they had been brought under the power of the Syrians of Damascus, and this may have tended to change their language. While they were in Assyria, they seem to have adopted Syriac wholly, and to have ceased to speak their ancient Hebrew tongue.

DR. ASAH EL GRANT, M. D., a modern missionary to that part of ancient Assyria, which is now called Kurdistan, published a book, the third edition of which is dated 1844, entitled, "The

Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes." At page 55, he says that among the Nestorian Christians whose ancestors dwelt there from before the time of Christ, the worship is still conducted and the Scriptures are read "in the ancient Syriac language," which is now "quite unintelligible to the common people;" so that when the Scriptures are read to them, they have to be translated by the reader into the modernized Syriac, which is now spoken both by these Nestorian Christians, and by the Israelites who are not Christians, who dwell near them in Coordistan. He says at page 149, that this modernized Syriac is "at this day a living language ONLY among the Nestorians and nominal Jews of Media and Assyria; unless an exception be found among the Syrian Christians dwelling west of the Tigris; who may, perhaps, also have a Hebrew origin." He says that both the Nestorian Christians, and the unchristianised Israelites, who use this "vernacular language, peculiar to themselves, must have acquired it at a remote period of antiquity; because an entire want of social intercourse forbids the idea that they have learned it from each other in modern times."

Dr. Grant says, that both the Nestorians and the Israelites say that they all speak this modern Syriac language because they have a "common ancestry"; and he thinks that their common and peculiar language "affords convincing proof that they are both alike the children of Israel."

Dr. Grant was fully convinced that the ancestors of these Nestorians "received the gospel from the apostles and immediate disciples of our Saviour," (pg. 56); "from Thomas, Bartholomew, Thaddeus, and others; not from Nestorius," from likeness to whom they are called Nestorians, (pg. 50). He says that their Scriptures, which are like other copies of the ancient Peshito-Syriac Bible, have been preserved by them "in manuscript, with great care and purity," (pg.60); that "these Nestorians throughout Assyria and Media have a generally and universally believed tradition that they are descendants of the ten tribes," (pg. 110); that the Israelites "admit that the Nestorians are as truly the descendants of the Israelites as themselves," (pg. 114); and that the Nestorians have a tradition that they "came from the land of Palestine," (pg. 113).

Dr. Grant remarks that both the Nestorian Christians and the Israelites, inhabit the very country where "the ten tribes were placed," (pg. 114); that they "are the only people in Assyria who can be identified with the ten tribes, and consequently that they must be their descendants," (pg. 140). He says that Dr. Perkins, another missionary, agreed with him that the body of the modern language now spoken by the Nestorians and Israelites, comes as directly from the venerable Syriac, and as clearly, as the modern Greek does from the ancient, (pg. 144).

Dr. Grant says also, "NAZAREANS is a term very commonly employed by themselves and others to designate the Nestorians. It is never applied to other Christian sects. The term Nazareans has been well defined to mean Christians converted from Judaism,.....who adhered to the practice of the Jewish ceremonies....."

Jerome speaks of them as Hebrews believing in Christ. We have good reason from Acts 15:5, to believe that the Gentiles never adopted the rites of the Jews, nor the name of Nazareans, to whom these rites were peculiar. It must then have been applied exclusively to the Jewish converts. Hence the conclusion that the Nestorians must have been Jews," (pp. 153-4). By Jews, he clearly means Israelites. Mosheim, in his "Christianity before Constantine," Cent. II., chap. xxxix., says, "A small band of Christians, who joined Moses with Christ, divided into two sects called Nazareans and Ebionites. The ancient Christians did not class the Nazareans with heretical sects." Dr. Grant

says, "It is the simple fact, that the Nestorians are what they profess to be-the children of Israel," (pg. 113).

Concurring proofs seem to make it certain that these Nestorian Christians received the gospel from some of the apostles; that there has been a succession of them from that time to this; that their copies of the Peshito-Syriac Scriptures are derived from copies received at a very early date; that they have been carefully made and preserved, and are of great value in determining the true text and meaning of God's word. A LIKE SETTLEMENT TO THAT IN COORDISTAN, of Christians and Hebrews dwelling near to each other, has also existed from the time of the apostles until now, IN TRAVANCORE AND THE MALABAR COAST OF INDIA. These Christians, as well as those of Coordistan, use the ancient Peshito-Syriac Scriptures in their worship at the present day. They believe they have had these Scriptures from before A.D. 325, in which year their bishop signed his name at the council of Nicaea. There is ancient testimony that the Gospel of Matthew in Syriac was left with them by the apostle Bartholomew, and that the apostle Thomas preached the gospel among them. The Hebrews, to whom these Apostles preached, must have been settled there at a still earlier period. Dr. Asahel Grant said of the Christians of Travancore, "They may be, in part at least, a branch of the present Nestorians of Media and Assyria. We have good evidence that they were formerly of the Nestorian faith, though they have more recently become connected with the Jacobite Syrians. It is worthy of inquiry whether they have not traditions, rites, customs, or other evidence of Jewish origin," (pg. 155). "That the apostle Thomas preached in India, we have the testimony of numerous Greek, Latin, and Syrian authors quoted by Asseman in his Bibliotheca Orientalis, vol. iv., pp. 5-25, 435." Grant, pg. 156, note.

DR. CLAUDIUS BUCHANAN, of the Church of England, in 1806-8, visited the Christians of St. Thomas in India, and also the Israelites who dwell near them. He found that the Israelites "are divided into two classes, called the Jerusalem or White Jews; and the ancient, or Black Jews." He saw and conversed with some of both classes. The White Jews delivered to him a narrative, in the Hebrew language, of their arrival in India. It stated that their "fathers, dreading the conqueror's wrath, departed from Jerusalem, a numerous body of men, women, priests, and Levites, and came into this land after the second temple was destroyed," which took place A.D. 70. This narrative states that other Hebrews afterwards joined them from Judea, Spain, and other places, (pp. 200-202).

He says of the Black Jews, "It is only necessary to look at their countenance to be satisfied that their ancestors must have arrived in India many ages before the White Jews.....The White Jews look upon the Black Jews as an inferior race, and as not of a pure caste, which plainly demonstrates that they do not come from a common stock in India. The Black Jews recounted the names of many other small colonies of the ancient Israelites resident in northern India, Tartary, and China; and gave me a written list of SIXTY-FIVE places. I conversed with those who had lately visited many of these stations." Dr. Buchanan seems to have regarded the Black Jews as part of the ten tribes. Those to whom the apostle Thomas preached must have been settled there before his arrival, which probably was many years before the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, and the arrival of the White Jews; so that there is a strong probability that those to whom he preached were a migratory part of the ten tribes. Dr. Buchanan says, "I inquired concerning their brethren the ten tribes. They said that it was commonly believed among them that the great body of the Israelites is to be found in the very places whither they were first carried into captivity; that some

few families had MIGRATED into regions more remote, as to Cochin and Rajapoor in India, and to other places yet further to the East, but that the bulk of the nation, though now much reduced in number, had not to this day, removed two thousand miles from SAMARIA." (pp. 206-207)

It seems to be certain that in the time of the apostles the language of the Israelites in Travancore must have been Syriac. For although the language now most in use, both among the Israelites and the Christians, is the Malabar, or Malayalim, which is the vernacular language of the country, (pg. 99); yet the ancient Peshito-Syriac Scriptures are still used by the Christians in worship, and they have to be "expounded to the people in the vernacular tongue," (pg. 100). The ancient Christians of Travancore and Malabar are still called 'The Syrian Christians of St. Thomas' and have received that name from their use of the Peshito-Syriac Scriptures, and from the fact that their ancestors received the gospel from the lips of the apostle Thomas. Dr. Buchanan says that the apostle Thomas is said by them to have landed at Cranganore, when he first arrived from Aden in Arabia; that not far from Cranganore there is an ancient church which bears his name still; and that the tradition among these Christians is, that he afterwards went to the Coromandel Coast, and was put to death at the place still called St. Thomas's Mount. (Researches, pg. 114) When the Portuguese invaded that part of India, and had established at Goa, what even the Roman Catholic Superintendent of sixty-four R. C. churches called in the presence of Dr. Buchanan, the "horrid tribunal" of the Inquisition; that tribunal used its utmost power to bring the Christians of St. Thomas under the dominion of the Pope. By bitter persecution and condemning some of these Christians to be burnt, it obtained the possession and use of many of their church buildings. The Peshito-Syriac Scriptures which they used, like all copies of the original Peshito, did not contain 2 Peter 2:1-22 and 3 John, Jude, Revelation, and some other passages contained in the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate. The copies of these Syriac Scriptures were ordered by the Inquisition, at the Synod of Diamper, to be all conformed to the R. C. Latin, and all books containing Nestorian teaching were ordered to be burnt. (Decrees of Synod of Diamper, by Dr. Michael Geddes, pp. 134, 147, 428) But even in the buildings which were thus obtained, the Roman Catholic Service was still conducted in Syriac instead of in Latin, as Dr. J. W. Etheridge states in his History of the Syrian Churches, 1846, pg. 158.

EUSEBIUS says that in the reign of Commodus (A.D. 180-192), Pantaenus, a Christian who had been a philosopher, went as an evangelist from Egypt as far as India; and was said to have found there "the Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew," that is, in Syriac, then called Hebrew, "among some who there knew Christ; to whom Bartholomew, one of the apostles, had proclaimed Him." Dr. Buchanan says that these Christians now possess the Peshito-Syriac Scriptures of both covenants in writing; that they believe they possessed them "before the year A.D. 325," (pg. 118); that "they have preserved the manuscripts of the Holy Scriptures incorrupt," (pg. 124); and with such care that in one written copy which he saw, "the words of every book are numbered." (pg. 118)

Syriac was the native tongue of SYRIA. Two territories were called Syria; one to the east, the other to the west of the Euphrates. The capital of Syria, west of the Euphrates, was Damascus. In 2 Samuel 8:6, "The Syrians of Damascus" are mentioned. Before the ten tribes were carried captive into Assyria, the kings of Syria had reduced them to long servitude. 2 Kings 8:12; 2 Kings 10:32; 2 Kings 13:4-7. Dr. Grant suggests that this tended to change the language of the ten tribes from Hebrew to Syriac. (pg. 147) Syria, to the east of the Euphrates, included the important city called

Edessa. Bar Hebraeus, a very learned Syrian of the thirteenth century, said, "Of the Syriac language there were three dialects. Of these the most elegant is the Aramaean spoken by the inhabitants of Edessa and Haran, and Syria the Exterior," that is, Syria in Mesopotamia. (Walton's Poly. Prol. xiii. 4; Asseman's Bibliotheca, Vol. I., pg. 476)

G. AMIRA, a Syrian of note, and the author of a Syriac Grammar, made a statement which tends to show how very widely the Syriac language was used. He said that "he was able to define the Syriac or Chaldaic tongue to be that which was born, and had chief rule in the East; which could alike be called Assyrian, Babylonian, Aramaean, Hebrew, or Christian; since it was known by nations of those names, and used by them." (Wichelhaus on New Covenant Peshito, pg. 21) Walton also, in his Polyglot (Prol. xiii. 2), says that the language in which the books of the Old and New Covenants exist in the east, and which to-day is called Syriac, "has been called Chaldaic, Babylonian, Aramaean, Syriac, Assyriac, and even Hebrew." The dialect in which the Chaldeans spoke to the king of Babylon, Daniel 2:4; and that in which Rabshakeh, the Assyrian, was asked by the elders of Israel to speak to them, Isaiah 36:11, are both called in those passages, Aramaean, a name which includes different Syriac dialects.

DR. J. S. ASSEMAN, the learned author of the great work-Bibliotheca Orientalis, published in four volumes folio; a Maronite Syrian; said in the Prologue to Vol. I, pg. 1, that the Syriac language formerly flourished in the immense empire of the Assyrians and that of the Chaldees, and was brought to the greatest degree of amplitude and elegance; that it was afterwards consecrated by the mouth of Deity incarnate and talking with men; that it was known familiarly by the apostles; that it was used in sacred worship every where in the East; and was made famous by being used by eminent writers of the greatest excellence. It was in this language that the gospel was diffused from Edessa and other places throughout the East, as from Antioch in Syria it was diffused by Paul in Asia Minor and in Europe. Dr. J. S. Asseman, also said in his Prologue, pg. 1, "To begin from those things which were first written in Syriac, it is a tradition certain and uniform, which the marvellous agreement of all the eastern nations confirms, and which both Eusebius of Caesarea, and Jerome, deemed to be established, that Thaddaeus, or as the Syrians prefer to call him, Adaeus, either an apostle or a disciple of Christ, immediately after His ascension into heaven, went to Abgar, the Toparch of Edessa, and instructed the people of Mesopotamia in the Christian faith; and that king Abgar himself received sacred baptism. The gospel was next openly proclaimed in those places, churches were built,.....and the sacred books translated out of Hebrew into Syriac.....Very many learned men began by their word, and by their writings, to deliver the divine teaching to the people, and to confute ancient, and more recent errors by their published volumes.....Frequent incursions of the Persians, Arabs, and Tartars into Mesopotamia, and the adjoining provinces of the Syrians, followed; by which, cities were overthrown to their foundations, monasteries levelled with the ground, churches consumed by fire, and volumes of the most surpassing worth taken away. If any escaped the hands of the barbarians (as it is certain that very many did) they either feed the book-worms of the desert, or are torn, cut up, and devoted to profane uses by their ignorant possessors." He afterwards refers to later times, to 1555, when the New Covenant Peshito was first printed, and to the efforts which have been made to discover, and to make use of, such ancient Syriac copies, both of the Scriptures and of other works, as may still exist.

JOSEPHUS is a very important witness in proof of the extent to which Syriac was known and used in the first century. He took part in the war against the Romans which led to the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70. He was taken captive by them, and was well acquainted with all the events connected with the war. He wrote a history of it in Syriac; and states how great a multitude of people, living in different nations, from near the Caspian Sea to the bounds of Arabia, could read and understand what he had written in Syriac. He afterwards wrote the same history in Greek, that those who spoke Greek, and those of the Romans, and of any other nations who knew Greek, but did not know Syriac, might read it also. He says, that in order to write the Greek history, he used at Rome the aid of persons who knew Greek; that Greek was to him a "foreign language;" (Jewish Antiquities, Book I); and that very few of his countrymen knew it well. (Jewish Antiq. Bk. I, chap. 8), "They see that some Greeks of the present time dare to write about these things, who neither were present at them, nor have taken care to get information from those who know about them." "But I have written a true history of the whole war, and of the particular events which occurred in it; for I was the general of those whom we call Galileans, so long as it was possible to resist; and I was taken and made captive by the Romans. Vespasian and Titus then kept me in custody, and compelled me to attend them." During the siege of Jerusalem, "Nothing was done which escaped my knowledge; for while I was observing whatever was done by the encamped army of the Romans, I carefully wrote it down; and I was the only person who understood what was told by those who delivered themselves up. Afterwards, having obtained leisure at Rome, the whole of my work being in a state of readiness, I made use of some to work with me in respect of the Greek tongue; and in this way I completed my account of those transactions. I had so strong a conviction of the truth of that account, that the first persons whom I selected to bear witness to it, were the chief commanders of the war, Vespasian and Titus. To them first, I gave my books; and I gave them afterwards to many of the Romans who had fought together in the war." It is evident from this account, that Vespasian and Titus knew Greek, and that if any of the Jews who delivered themselves up to the Romans during the siege, could have spoken Greek, Josephus would not have been the only person who understood them.

Josephus, in the Prologue to his Greek translation of the history of the war, says, "I have proposed to translate into the Greek tongue, and to relate for those who live under the rule of the Romans, what I before composed in the language of my own country, and sent to the upper barbarians." A. M. Ceriani, of Milan, speaks of a part of this history as still existing in the Ambrosian Library of Milan, in Syriac. There is other proof that Syriac must be the language which Josephus calls that of his own country. Josephus says, "I thought it would be unbecoming to overlook the perversion of the truth with respect to events so important, and that Parthians, and Babylonians, and the remotest Arabians, and those of our own race beyond the Euphrates, and those of Adiabene"-a part of Assyria-"should know correctly, by means of my diligence, whence the war began, and amid what great sufferings it proceeded, and how it ended; and that the Greeks, and those of the Romans who were not in the war, should be ignorant of these things, and should be deceived by flatteries or fictions." If we compare the countries mentioned in this passage of Josephus with those named in Acts 2:1-47, as countries from which devout Jews had come who were then "dwelling at Jerusalem," we find in both accounts Parthians, Arabians, and dwellers in Mesopotamia. The words of Josephus prove that Syriac was well understood in these countries as well as in Palestine; and that the tongues spoken by the apostles, which excited the surprise of those who came from these countries, must have been other tongues than Syriac, which was

spoken or read both in Palestine and in these countries. Peter, after the miraculous gift of tongues, addressed "all" these persons then dwelling at Jerusalem, (Acts 2:5; Acts 2:14), and must have spoken in a language which "all" could understand; for he intreated all to "hearken to his words." (Acts 2:14) This is proof that there must have been some language which all understood, and as Josephus states that Syriac was so generally known throughout the East, and there is no proof that any other language was so generally known there, it seems that the language to which Peter intreated all to hearken must have been Syriac. So that the events of that Pentecost concur with the testimony of Josephus to show how widely the Syriac language was understood.

02. Proof that very few Israelites in the time of Christ understood Greek.

02. Proof that very few Israelites in the time of Christ understood Greek.

Some have supposed that the language of Palestine in the time of Christ was either wholly, or in part, Greek. Professor A. Neubauer, Reader in Rabbinical Hebrew in Oxford University, published in "Studia Biblica, 1885," an essay "On the Dialects spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ." He says that Isaac Voss, who died in 1689, was the first who supposed that "Greek was the only language spoken in Palestine after Alexander," the Great; that Diodati in 1767, closely followed Voss, and sought to prove that "Greek was the mother language of the Jews in the time of Jesus;" that Professor Paulus, of Jena, in 1803, held that an Aramaic dialect was then the current language of the Jews in Palestine, but that Jesus and his disciples had no difficulty in using Greek in their public speeches when they found it convenient to do so; that Dr. Alexander Roberts, Professor of Humanity in St. Andrew's University, and a Member of the Company of Revisers of the New Covenant Scriptures, published in 1881, contends that "Christ spoke for the most part in Greek, and only now and then in Aramaic," (pp. 39-41). Dr. Roberts published in 1859 a work in which he discussed the question relating to "The language of Palestine in the time of Christ." At pg. 62, he said that he thought he had "proved that Greek, and not Hebrew, was the common language of religious address in Palestine in the days of Christ and his apostles." He said, at pg. 63, "Christ spoke in Greek, and his disciples did the same, when they reported what he said. Their inspiration consisted, not, as some have deemed, in being enabled to give perfect translations, either of discourses delivered, or of documents written in the Aramaic language, but in being led, under infallible guidance, to transfer to paper, for the benefit of all coming ages, those words of the Great Teacher which they had heard from his lips in the GREEK tongue." Few at present are of Dr. Roberts' opinion. The question does not affect the inspiration of the Greek text, but it has a very important bearing on the value of the Peshito-Syriac books of the New Covenant.

Professor Neubauer's familiarity with the Jewish writings of that time, enables him to discuss the subject with much fulness and force. He gives the following probabilities as the result of his own examination of the subject:- That in the time of Christ, the Galileans understood their own Syriac dialect only, together with a few current expressions in ancient Hebrew; that in Jerusalem a modernised Hebrew, and a purer Syriac dialect than that of Galilee, were in use among the majority of the Jews; and that the small Jewish-Greek colony there, and a few privileged persons, spoke a Judeo-Greek jargon, (pg. 50). He says that the Syriac dialect of Galilee was "the popular language;" and that it is the language which is called in the New Covenant, "Hebrew," (John 5:2); and is called by Josephus, and in the Apocrypha, the language of the country; that "it was in this dialect that Josephus at first wrote his historical work" on the war; that the Syriac words which are recorded in the Greek New Covenant Scriptures, prove that this was "a distinct dialect in some respects" from the Syriac of the Syrians, and yet was so like it, that "Josephus says the Jews could understand the Syrians," (pg. 53).

Prof. Neubauer has no doubt that the language used by Jesus was the popular Galilean Syriac dialect, and that in the Greek text we have only a Greek translation of the words which he uttered. He says, "Jesus, as is now generally admitted, addressed himself to his disciples and to his audience in the popular dialect. This appears, not only from the Aramaic words left in the gospels by the Greek translators, but more especially from his last words on the cross, which were spoken under circumstances of exhaustion and pain, when a person would naturally make use of his mother tongue; and from the fact that it is mentioned that he spoke to Paul in Hebrew, Acts 26:14," (pp. 53, 54). "The Jews so little knew Greek and so much less cared to know it, that Paul, in order to gain a hearing, was obliged to speak to them in their Aramaic dialects." "How would the Medes, Elamites, and Arabians have understood Peter at Pentecost, if he had spoken Greek to the 'men of Judea, and all who dwelt in Jerusalem,'" (pg. 54).

Prof. Neubauer gives many reasons for his "belief that few Jews in Palestine had a substantial knowledge of Greek." One of them is, that no events had occurred which could have made "Greek prominent in Palestine," (pg. 62); that no nation ever makes so great a change in its language as to adopt "a totally different" one, unless the conqueror transports the greater part of the inhabitants, and introduces foreign colonists who are far more numerous than the remaining inhabitants; and that the Greeks had never this superiority of numbers in Palestine, (pg. 64). He says that few Greek words occur in the Jewish writings such as the Mishnah, the Targums, and the Talmud of Jerusalem; that "no apocryphal book, as far as our knowledge goes, was composed in Greek by a Palestinian Jew," (pg. 65); that "so far as he can judge, all that the Jews in Palestine learned of Greek was at most a few sentences, sufficient to enable them to carry on trade, and to hold intercourse with the lower officials; and that even this minimum certainly ceased after the Maccabean victory over Antiochus Epiphanes; because it was the interest of the Asmonean Princes to keep the Jews aloof from the influence of the neighbouring dialects," (pg. 66).

Professor Neubauer thinks that those Hebrews who lived in cities occupied chiefly by Greeks, "may have acquired a fair knowledge of conversational Greek, but not to such an extent as to enable them to speak it in public," (pg. 67). He says that even those Jews of Egypt and Asia Minor who spoke Greek, maintained a connection with the mother-land by going to Jerusalem for feast-days; and that "we may infer that they all still spoke, more or less, their native Hebrew dialect, because no mention is made of interpreters being required for them either in the temple or outside of it," (pp. 62, 63). The Greek translation of the Old-Covenant Hebrew Scriptures, called the Septuagint, which was made in Egypt, existed in the time of Christ; but Prof. Neubauer says, "we may boldly state that this Greek translation of the Bible was unknown in Palestine, except to men of the schools, and perhaps a few of the Hellenistic Jews. It is said in the Talmud that when the Greek translation of the Seventy appeared, there came darkness upon the earth, and that the day was as unfortunate for Israel, as that on which the golden calf was made," (pg. 67). The fact that the Jews at Jerusalem who spoke Greek are called HELLENISTS, that is, GRECIANS, in Acts 6:1; Acts 9:29, shows that their Greek speech made them a peculiar class quite distinct from the rest of the people. In Antioch of Syria, though it was a celebrated Greek city, Syriac, as well as Greek, continued to be spoken. Professor Neubauer says, "Antioch and other Syrian towns would not give up Syriac," (pp. 63, 70).

He says also, "Had Greek been generally spoken and taught, why should the Talmud record a general exception, in favour of Gamaliel; and later, in the second century.....in favour of the family

of Judah the saint, the redactor of the Mishnah," a decision that they "should be allowed to learn Greek, because they had to conduct negotiations with the government," (pg. 67). The Greek Scriptures record some of THE EXACT WORDS USED BY JESUS. Many of these are words which were used only in Syriac dialects. This fact is often referred to as proof that Christ spoke in Syriac. Bishop Walton, in the 13th of his Prolegomena, section 19, says, "There are many purely Syriac words left in the Greek N.T., which cannot be explained without a knowledge of Syriac; as RACA, Matthew 5:22; MOMUNO, riches, 6:24; BAR-DE-YAUNO, son of a dove, 16:17; KURBONO, offering, Mark 7:11; SHEBAKTHONI, thou has forsaken me, Matthew 27:46; BENAI-REGESH, sons of thunder, Mark 3:17; TALITHO, KUMI, Damsel, arise, Mark 5:41; KHEKAL-DEMO, the field of blood, Acts 1:19. Many others occur in Acts 5:1; Acts 9:36; John 1:47; 1 Corinthians 16:22, -[MORAN ETHO, our Lord has come]; and elsewhere. Indeed JESUS, the name of our Lord, is Syriac for Saviour; the name MESSIAH is also Syriac, meaning Anointed.....The writers of the New Covenant first made known the heavenly words to the Jews, and to other surrounding populations in this their native tongue, and afterwards wrote in the Greek language, but in doing so retain everywhere a flavour of Syriac." Prof. Neubauer says, with reference to 1 Corinthians 16:22, written to Greeks, "Is not the watchword, MORAN ETHO, [our Lord has come], which passed to Greek-speaking populations, a sufficient proof that the speech of the first Christians was Aramaic," (pg. 54). A still more decisive proof that it was so, occurs in a remark made by Luke. He, guided by God's Spirit, said that the word AKELDAMA, (in the Peshito KHEKAL-DEMO), the field of blood, was part of the language commonly used in Jerusalem. There is no such word as KHEKAL, field, in Ancient Hebrew. The only languages in which Castle, in his Lexicon of the six related languages:- Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, Aethiopic, and Arabic, says it occurs, are Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. It does not occur in Gesenius's Lexicon of ancient Hebrew. When therefore Luke says-"And it became known to all the dwellers in Jerusalem, insomuch that in their language that field is called AKEL-DAMA, that is, the field of blood," (Acts 1:19), we have infallible proof that the Syriac language was the language of Jerusalem.

JOSEPHUS is a witness of very great importance on this subject also. He was so perfectly familiar with the state of things in Palestine, in the first century, and took such care to give correct information, that his testimony has great weight. At the end of his Antiquities, (written in Greek,) he said, "I am bold to say that no other person, whether a Jew, or of another race, would have been able, had he wished, to produce this work for Greeks, so accurately; for I am admitted by my own countrymen to excel them far in the learning of our country, and I have applied myself with diligence to obtain a knowledge of Greek literature.....For among us those are not esteemed who learn the languages of many nations;.....but testimony for wisdom is given to those only who understand well our laws, and are able to explain the meaning of the sacred writings. For this reason, out of the many who have toiled at this endeavour, scarcely some two or three have succeeded well." This testimony of the most learned and reliable of unconverted Jews, is proof how few Jews had much knowledge of the Greek language.

Another proof of this, is what he relates of the time when he was a captive in the Roman army on the outside of Jerusalem. In defending himself against Apion (Book I), he says that he presented his Greek history of the Jewish war "to the chief commanders Vespasian and Titus, and to many Romans who were in the war," and that these all bore testimony to his truthfulness. They all therefore knew Greek, and would have understood what those Jews who came out of the city, and

surrendered themselves, said, if these could have spoken only a few words of Greek. But Josephus says,- "The things told by those who surrendered themselves, only I understood." It is impossible therefore that the Jews of Palestine and Jerusalem could have understood either the Redeemer or his apostles, if they had spoken to them in Greek, or in any other language but that which Josephus calls the language of his own country at that time-a dialect of the widely spread Syriac language. THE CONCLUSION to which such a concurrence of evidence leads is that Syriac was unquestionably the language commonly spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ, and that very few Jews had a good knowledge of Greek. This conclusion leads almost of necessity to another; namely, that there must have been some provision in writing, made by the apostles for the use of that large body of Christians who knew no language well but Syriac. Whatever was revealed as the will of God, whether written at first in Syriac or in Greek, was to be taught, not to the Jews only, nor to the Gentiles only, but to ALL DISCIPLES EVERY WHERE; that all might know it, and all be guided by it. Peter, writing to Hebrews, said (2 Peter 1:15), "Moreover I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance." This could only be done by writing. The apostles knew well, and must have remembered as Peter did, that what they had taught by voice would soon be unknown to most, unless the disciples were well supplied with it in writing. They must all, of necessity, have had Peter's desire. They must have wished to make provision that what they taught by revelation to some one church might be known to all churches, not only while they lived, but after they were dead. Paul, who was willing to be made a curse, with view to the salvation of the Hebrews, must have desired that what was revealed to him for the guidance of Greeks, should be known also to Hebrews; and that it was known to Hebrews in his life time, appears from the remark of Peter, who laboured chiefly among Hebrews, and who, when writing to Hebrews, speaks of "all" Paul's letters as well-known writings. In 2 Peter 3:16, he says of Paul, "As also in all his letters, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which those who are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures to their own destruction." His words imply that all Paul's letters had been extensively read by Hebrew Christians, and that they were treated with the same supreme regard as "the other Scriptures." They cannot have been read by more than a few of the Hebrews in Greek; it seems almost certain that there must have been some Syriac translation. Such considerations as these prepare us to receive readily whatever proof may exist, that Greek was not the only language in which the apostles left written records of God's will.

TREMELLIUS, a Christian Jew, who was a Professor in the University of Heidelberg, and who published, in 1569, an edition of the New Covenant Peshito, contended that unless God loved FOREIGNERS more than Jews he must have provided these, as well as the Greeks, with the inspired writings in their own tongue. He said that it seemed to be "wholly in accord with truth, that at the very beginning of the Church of Christ, the Syriac version was made either by the Apostles themselves, or by their disciples; unless indeed we prefer to suspect that, in writing, they intended to have regard FOR FOREIGNERS ONLY; and to have either no regard, or certainly very little, for those of their own nation." (Gutbier's Peshito, pg. 29) We know that the apostles, instead of showing less regard for the Jews than for the Gentiles, always went to the Jews first, and showed a surpassing regard for their welfare. It seems to be extremely probable that Paul himself took care that most of his epistles should be written IN SYRIAC AS WELL AS IN GREEK, so as to inform his own countrymen everywhere of whatever was revealed to him for the guidance of all Christians throughout the world.

03. The Difference between the Syriac of the Peshito-Syriac Text, and the popular Syriac Dialect ...

03. The Difference between the Syriac of the Peshito-Syriac Text, and the popular Syriac Dialect of Palestine. The Syriac words which are retained in the Greek text have a slight difference, in form, from those of the Peshito-Syriac text; and show that the Syriac of Palestine, used by the Redeemer, differed slightly from that of Edessa, for which city the Peshito-Syriac was made. Professor Neubauer says, that the Syriac words which are recorded in the Greek text, show that the Jewish Syriac "was a distinct dialect, in some respects, from the Syriac of the Syrians," (pg. 53) No book of the New Covenant writings has come down to us, written in the popular dialect of Palestine. The Gospel of Matthew is said by all the early Christian writers to have been written for the Christians of Palestine in their own Syriac language. It has not come down to us in that dialect. But Jerome (who died A.D. 420) said that he had seen a copy of it. His words are these:- "Matthew, the first [writer], composed in Judaea, for those of the circumcision who had believed, a gospel of Christ in Hebrew letters and words. Who it was who afterwards translated it into Greek is not sufficiently certain. Moreover the Hebrew gospel itself is preserved even to this day in the Library at Caesarea, which Pamphilus the martyr collected with the greatest diligence," (Jer. Jones on the Canon, part ii., chap. xxv., sec. 13; also Prager on Old Covenant Peshito, pg. 36) The siege and destruction of Jerusalem are probably the cause of its having been so rare even at that time. It seems also to have been afterwards corrupted and made worthless. But it was much more important that copies of the inspired books should be preserved in the more widely used Syriac dialect in which the Peshito is written, than in the local dialect of Palestine. And God so ordered events that though whatever books of the New Covenant were written in the Syriac of Palestine, seem to have perished, those of the Peshito in the Edessa dialect were multiplied exceedingly, and were copied with the utmost care. The New Covenant Peshito Syriac, properly so called, NEVER CONTAINED THE WHOLE OF THE BOOKS WHICH WE HAVE IN THE GREEK TEXT. The books 2 Peter 2:1-22 nd and 3rd John, Jude, and Revelation, were never regarded as part of it, though these books, in a separate Syriac translation, were admitted to represent inspired books. The extraordinary esteem in which the books of the Peshito were held, shows that the Syriac copies of these were regarded as having had a far more exalted origin than the Syriac text of the other five. The fact seems to be, that at the later date at which the omitted five books were written, no inspired men corrected them in the dialect of Edessa; and that for this reason the Syriac translation of these five books was not permitted to be associated with that of the other books, to prevent it from being regarded as of the same authority.

Bishop Walton, in his Polyglot, Prol. xiii., sec. 16, says that "Syriac writers state that 2 Peter 2:1-22 nd and 3rd John, Jude, and Revelation, were not in the ancient edition" of the Peshito.

J. WICHELHAUS says, "It is very well known that the Syrians did not reject" the five books not contained in the Peshito. "We deem the sum of the matter to be that by the tradition of the Syrians, the Peshito version was made in the time of Abgar the King [of Edessa], at the time when the

gospel was preached there," (pg. 63) The Nestorian Christians deemed it "to have been written by APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY," (pg. 153) At pg. 85, Wichelhaus says of the five books which are not in the Peshito, that "by the consent of all, they ought to be assigned to the end of the lives of the Apostles;" and that some derive from their omission an argument for the antiquity of the Peshito, as having been "written before the four epistles and the Revelation were published" (pg. 85)

BISHOP HUET, in his learned work, "On the most illustrious Translators, 1683," remarks that the absence of those five books is "a great proof of the antiquity" of the New Covenant Peshito (pg. 126) The New Covenant Peshito-Syriac IS OF SPECIAL WORTH for two reasons; first, that there is credible testimony that it was made in the lifetime of the Apostles; and next, that the copies of it have been made with the greatest exactness and care. Wichelhaus says "There was no doubt about its truth and perfectness; and on that account the more effort and labour were bestowed on the text of the version, to keep it pure and free from every taint of error and variation" (pg. 153) "All persons testify, and the history of the Syrians itself clearly proves, that the greatest care was taken from the most ancient times, in order that the letter of the SACRED SCRIPTURE might be always perfectly preserved in agreement with itself. For of the Peshito version, there was the greatest veneration" (pg. 230)

04. How we may know whether Books which are said to be the Word of God, are so or not.

04. How we may know whether Books which are said to be the Word of God, are so or not.

Three things need to be proved to make it certain that any book which we have now, contains, "not the word of men, but the word of God," (1 Thessalonians 2:13) First, proof by miracles that God spoke by the alleged writer, (see John 3:2; John 10:38; Hebrews 2:3-4) Secondly, proof by the handwriting of the alleged author, or other means, that the original copy of the book was declared by him to be "the word of God." Paul gave this token by his handwriting, in every epistle (2 Thessalonians 3:17-18) Thirdly, proof that the book which we have now is the same book which he delivered, and has been copied and handed down to us without alteration. The first and second proofs could only be known to those of the first centuries. The handwriting of the apostles, which proved the divine authority of early copies, soon perished. What we need now is clear and credible testimony that copies, which were in public and private religious use in the early centuries, when their descent from the originals could be traced, and their likeness to them proved, were by most, or universally, believed to be true copies of the books which contained, not the words of men, but "the words" of God. We need also proof that these copies of the first ages were in the following centuries, so exactly copied, that we are assured that the copies which we have now, are exact copies of them. It is evident that if copies whose Apostolic descent was firmly believed and well attested in the first ages, have in the following ages, been copied in different places far apart; that, then, if the existing copies of these separate lines of descent agree, it is the most decisive proof possible that they must all have been most carefully made through the ages, or they could not possibly agree thus now. Proof of EXACT COPYING IS ESSENTIAL to our knowledge of what the Apostles wrote. For as, when a witness lies, no one can tell when he is speaking truth; so, when the copy of a book which contained at first the words of God, is proved to be untrue in many places, no one can rely on it as proof of what is true, or what is false, in doubtful readings. Copies proved to be of true descent, and to have been exactly copied from the first, are the only copies fit to be trusted as witnesses on disputed readings; especially because the question at issue is, 'What words are, or are not, the infallible words of God?' The exact copying of the Peshito-Syriac text is one of the things which gives it such great weight.

P. D. HUET, Bishop of Avranches, in France, a scholar of high repute, and chief editor of the Delphin classics, said, with respect to the means of deciding whether a work is really what it is said to be, "That every book is genuine which was esteemed genuine by those who lived nearest to the time when it was written, and by the ages succeeding in a continued series"; and that "this is an axiom which cannot be disputed by those who will allow any thing at all to be certain in history." (See Jeremiah Jones' work on the Canon, 1798, vol. I, pg. 43) Mr. Jones remarks on this axiom, that in the case of Christian books this kind of evidence may be stronger than in the case of other books; that the esteem in which the books from the first were held, the use made of them by religious assemblies, and the translations made from them very early into other languages, may

concur to make an imposture in their case "almost impossible;" (pp. 43, 44)

JUSTIN THE MARTYR, in his second defence of the Christians, written 150 years after the birth of Christ, said that they were an "innumerable multitude," and that every Sunday they met together, and read the "Gospels written by the Apostles" (see his Greek Apology). Justin describes himself as being "of Palestine," and as writing his address on behalf of those who dwelt there. (See the beginning). Mr. Jeremiah Jones remarks that as the language of Palestine was Syriac, the Gospels which were said by Justin to have been read every Sunday, must have been in Syriac. He says, "This argument I look upon as conclusive," in proof that the Gospels then existed in "the Syriac language" (Vol. I., pg. 97). No other Gospels but those of the Peshito, are proved by other evidence to have been in general use by those speaking Syriac. The one Gospel used by the Nazareans, cannot possibly be meant by Justin when he speaks of the records made by the Apostles, which are called "THE GOSPELS" (Paris edition, 1552, pg. 162).

Proof that the Peshito existed in the time of Justin the Martyr, and also that it had existed FROM BEFORE THE TIME WHEN THE LATEST APOSTOLIC BOOKS WERE WRITTEN, seems to be given by the fact that it does not contain these books. If they had been then WRITTEN, they could not have been then excluded from fellowship with the other divine writings without giving the false impression that they were not of the same divine authority. But there is proof that those five other books were not kept separate from the Peshito, because they were THEMSELVES denied to be of Apostolic authority, but only because the SYRIAC COPIES OF THEM were denied to be of the same authority as the other Syriac books in the dialect of Edessa. The difference made between those five Syriac books and the Peshito, was because the five had only some uninspired translator. It therefore implies belief that the Peshito had been made by persons who were MORE than mere human translators, such as he was who made the Edessene transcript of the other books; it implies that the Peshito was made either by persons who themselves wrote what God directed them to write, or by others whose work had their oversight and approval. For if all the New Covenant books had been written in the Edessene dialect by uninspired translators, there is no known reason why they should have been kept so separate; and why the Peshito alone should have been treated with such superior reverence, and with such faith in its VERY WORDS, as sacred, that it would have been deemed a sin to alter any of them. In this view Mr. Jeremiah Jones concurs. He says that "it seems most probable" that the reason why the five books are not in the [Peshito-]Syriac copies, is "because they were NOT WRITTEN when the Syriac Version was made; for had they been written then, those so useful Epistles would have been translated, for the same reason as the others. This was the argument which, among others, convinced Tremellius (see the preface to his Syriac N.T.) and the learned Bishop Walton (see the Prolegomena to his Polyglot), that this version was made in the Apostles' time (Jones, vol. iii., pg. 175).

CANON WESTCOTT, of Cambridge University, says in his work on the Canon of the N.T. (that is, on what books are really part of God's Word), 1875, that to justify the acceptance of any book as infallible, we need evidence similar to that which Bishop Huet says is a sure proof that a book is what it is said to be. Dr. Westcott says at pg. 12, "It is impossible to insist too often or too earnestly on this, that it is to the Church, as a witness, and keeper of holy writ, that we must look both for the formation and the proof of the Canon. The written rule of Christendom must rest finally on THE GENERAL CONFSSION OF THE CHURCH, and not on the independent opinions of its members.....The chief value of private testimony lies in the fact that it is a natural expression of the

current opinion of the time." He applies this rule to the Greek Testament, by showing that its several books were received at an early date, and prized in the following centuries, as divine, by the mass of those Greek Christians, who were not gross corrupters of the truth. He appeals to "common usage," pg. 12; to the mention of these books as "received by Churches," pg. 13, and to proofs of "a belief widely spread throughout the Christian body," as affording decisive evidence that these books are genuine and Apostolic (pg. 14).

Dr. Westcott admits that evidence very much like this exists also with respect to the Peshito-Syriac books. He says, "The Peshito Version is assigned almost universally to the most remote Christian antiquity. The Syriac Christians of Malabar even now claim for it the right to be considered as an EASTERN ORIGINAL of the New Testament, and.....their tradition is not, to a certain extent, destitute of all plausibility." "It was in the Aramaean vernacular language of the Jews of Palestine that the Gospel of Matthew was originally written, if we believe the unanimous testimony of the fathers; and it is not unnatural to look to the Peshito as likely to contain some traces of its first form." (pg. 233). "The dialect of the Peshito, even as it stands now, represents, IN PART at least, that form of Aramaic which was current in Palestine." (pg. 234). "Edessa is signalized in early church history by many remarkable facts. It was called the 'holy' and the 'blessed' city; its inhabitants were said to have been brought over by Thaddeus in a marvellous manner to the Christian faith; and 'from that time forth,' Eusebius adds, 'the whole people of Edessa have continued to be devoted to the name of Christ." Tradition fixes on Edessa as the place whence the Peshito took its rise. Gregory Bar Hebreus, one of the most learned and accurate of Syrian writers.....assumes THE APOSTOLIC ORIGIN of the New Testament Peshito AS CERTAIN.....He speaks of this AS A KNOWN AND ACKNOWLEDGED FACT." (pp. 235, 236). Dr. Westcott says also, "This version was universally received by the different sects into which the Syrian Church was divided [after] the fourth century, and so has continued current even to the present time. All the Syrian Christians whether belonging to the Nestorian, Jacobite, or Roman communion, conspire to hold the Peshito AUTHORITATIVE, and to use it in their public services.....The Peshito became in the East the fixed and unalterable RULE OF SCRIPTURE." (pg. 239). "The respect in which the Peshito was held, was further shown by the fact that it was taken as the basis of other versions in the East. An Arabic and a Persian version were made from it." (pg. 240).

Dr. Westcott has linked the Peshito with the Latin Vulgate in a passage which, if freed from reference to the Latin version, to avoid any discussion respecting it, says of the Peshito, "Its voice is one to which we cannot refuse to listen. It gives the testimony of Churches, and not of individuals. It is sanctioned by public use, and not only supported by private criticism. Combined with the original Greek [and the Old Latin], it represents the New Testament Scriptures as they were read throughout the whole of Christendom towards THE CLOSE OF THE SECOND CENTURY.....It furnishes a proof of THE AUTHORITY of the books which it contains, widespread, continuous, reaching to the utmost verge of our historic records. Its real weight is even greater than this; for when history first speaks of it, it speaks as of that which was recognised as a heritage from an earlier period, which cannot have been long after the days of the Apostles." (pg. 263).

Dr. Westcott gives at pg. 241, the following information from Dr. William Wright, Professor of Arabic in Cambridge University, one of the best informed persons on this subject. He says, "Of the Syriac manuscripts in the British Museum, the earliest of the N.T. which is DATED, is A.D. 768." It does not contain the five books last written. "An earlier copy of the 5th or 6th century gives the

same books in a different order.....The earliest manuscript in which the disputed Epistles occur is dated A.D. 823."

Dr. Westcott gives, under letter D, in his appendix, "The chief catalogues of the Books of the Bible during the first eight centuries." Sixteen out of thirty-two of them are those of the Eastern Churches. No. IV., by Chrysostom, cent. IV., has only "three catholic Epistles," James, 1st Peter, and 1st John. He omits the five books absent from the Peshito. No. VII. is a list by Hebedjesu, about 1318 A.D., from Asseman's Bibliotheca, Vol. iii. Hebedjesu omits the five books above mentioned. He says, "Matthew wrote in Hebrew in Palestine." He describes the three Epistles, that of James, 1st Peter, and 1st John, as "The three letters which have, written in them, writing by the Apostles in every copy and language, namely, those of James, Peter, and John; and which are called catholic." The statement that these three Epistles were issued by the Apostles in various languages, and authenticated in all of them by the handwriting of the Apostles, is of special importance. In No. XVIII., the list of Leontius, about A.D. 590, seven letters are called catholic, i. e., universal, namely, that of James 1:1-27 and 2nd of Peter, 1st, 2nd and 3rd of John, and that of Jude, and the reason given for this name is, "Because they were not written for one nation, as those of Paul were; but universally for all nations;" he means probably for the Hebrew Christians dispersed throughout all nations. The above lists all represent the Eastern Churches. The Churches which have used the Peshito-Syriac text have borne witness as uniformly to its "Apostolic origin" and authority, as the Churches which have used the Greek text have declared its Divine authority. Too little attention has been given to this admitted fact; and besides this, many modern critics who have treated the Greek text as the only text which has testimony to its Apostolic authority, have rejected the GENERAL TESTIMONY of those VERY CHURCHES which have used the Greek text. These critics have slighted the readings best approved by the mass and long line of those assemblies; and have adopted as chief guides two copies which have NO RECORD WHATSOEVER of having been generally approved by those Churches; they have also done this in spite of internal evidence in these two Greek copies, that they have been CARELESSLY WRITTEN. Special attention needs to be given to these facts. Even Canon Westcott, who insists so strongly, in his work on the Canon, pg. 12, that we must depend for proof of what "the written Rule of Christendom" is, on the "general confession" of Christian bodies, has adopted in connection with Dr. Hort, and with view to settle the Greek text upon a sure basis, "a system" which, as Dr. Scrivener says, (Introduction, pg. 537), is itself "entirely destitute of historical foundation."

CANON WESTCOTT AND DR. HORT have made and followed conjectures equally "destitute of historical foundation," with respect to THE PESHITO-SYRIAC TEXT. One of these conjectures relates to some fragments of an old Syriac translation of the Gospels, discovered by the late Dr. W. Cureton, and published by him in 1858. Nothing is known about it, except that it was brought from Egypt to Britain. I have not been able to get a copy, and know it chiefly by a review of it published in 1859, by Professor Christian Hermansen, of Copenhagen. This is not the place to discuss the peculiarities of that translation. It is sufficient to quote a few words from Mr. Hermansen. He says that the Peshito and this translation "greatly differ" and in "various ways," pg. 7; and that there is "a wonderful agreement between this translation and the Cambridge manuscript called D," (pg. 21), of which copy Dr. Scrivener, an able judge, says, "It may be said without extravagance, that no set of scriptural records affords a text less probable in itself, or less

sustained by any rational principles of external evidence, than that of codex D, of the Latin codices, and (so far as it accords with them) of Cureton's Syriac. (Introduction to N.T., 1883, pg. 510) Dr. Roberts, of Aberdeen, seems to be justified in saying of Dr. Cureton's fragments, "Never, probably, was there in the whole history of critical publications, such a notable example of self-delusion as that under which Dr. Cureton has laboured in this undertaking;" (Dr. Roberts, on the 'Original Language of Matthew', pg. 131; that is, the undertaking to prove that these fragments "more nearly represent the exact words of Matthew himself than any copy yet discovered," (pg. 122). And yet Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort ASSUME that this "Curetonian version of the Gospels" is the first form of the Peshito. Canon Westcott calls it the "Old Syriac," (on Canon, pg. 233, note 6). He says, "It appears to have been afterwards corrected," but "in the absence of an adequate supply of critical materials, it is impossible to construct the history of THESE RECENSIONS in the Syriac," (pg. 234). Notwithstanding these conjectured recensions, he speaks of "the present corrupt state of the text" (pg. 240). One is startled, pained, and almost appalled, by finding that a scholar so highly esteemed as Canon Westcott is, can so violate his own rules; by finding that he not only rejects the admitted testimony of "Churches" to the "Apostolic authority" of the Peshito as it now exists, but even invents and follows mere fictions, and these of a kind fitted and seemingly intended to destroy its reputation. Can it be that this amazing inconsistency and impropriety is in some degree due to a fact which Canon Westcott mentions in one of his notes, when speaking of the Peshito? The note is this (in his work on the Canon, pg. 238), "In reference to the phraseology of the Peshito, it is WORTHY OF REMARK that EPISCOPUS is preserved in one place only, Acts 20:28. Elsewhere it is KASHISHO (presbyter) except in 1 Peter 2:25." The Peshito has there "care-taker." Dr. Westcott's note directs special attention to the fact that the Peshito has omitted in most places the word, which, by being adopted as the name of the prelates who rule the Church of England, gives them some show, and but a deceptive show, of scriptural origin. It cannot be forgotten that Dr. Westcott has stated that the omission of the word BISHOP from passages in the Peshito, is a fact "worthy of remark."

DRS. WESTCOTT AND HORT published in 1881, six years after Dr. Westcott's fourth edition of his work on the Canon, dated 1875, a long and mysteriously made introduction to a new Greek text, full of strange changes. Both editors are responsible for the principles, arguments, and conclusions set forth in this introduction, but it was "written by Dr. Hort" (Intro. pg. 18). The following suggestions made by them are founded wholly on IMAGINATION, without one word of proof. "The popular Peshito version, till recently, has been known only in the form it finally received by an evidently authoritative revision.....An Old Syriac must have existed as well as an Old Latin. Within the last few years the surmise has been verified. An imperfect Old Syriac copy of the Gospels, assigned to the fifth century, was found by Cureton among MSS. brought to the British Museum from Egypt in 1842, and was published by him in 1858." This is ASSUMED by the writers to be the Peshito "in its original form," and is said to "render the comparatively late and REVISED character" of the Peshito, "a matter of CERTAINTY" (pg. 84). Upon this dream of the imagination, continued references are made to the Peshito as "not coming up to the requirements of criticism," etc. (pp. 84, 92, 136, 156, 158-159). Sadly often have "false witnesses risen up." But it must be deemed an alarming proof of the diseased state of biblical criticism, if we find even leading men indulging, not only in wild fancies, but even in false accusations against the most truthful of witnesses. The late Dean Burgon in his work, "The Revision Revised, 1883," pp. 273-278, said in reference to these conjectures, "Not a shadow of proof is forthcoming that ANY SUCH

RECENSION AS DR. HORT IMAGINES, EVER TOOK PLACE AT ALL." He has, "firstly, assumed a 'Syrian Recension;' secondly, invented the cause of it; and thirdly, dreamed the process by which it was carried into execution." After reminding Dr. Hort that Bishop Ellicott has said that, "It is no stretch of the imagination to suppose that portions of the Peshito might have been in the hands of the APOSTLE JOHN," the Dean said, "The ABOMINABLY CORRUPT document known as 'Cureton's Syriac,' is by another bold hypothesis, ASSUMED to be the only surviving specimen of the unrevised version, and is thenceforth INVARIABLY designated by these authors as the Old Syriac." "Not a shadow of reason is produced why we should SUPPOSE, first, that such a Revision took place, and secondly, that all our existing manuscripts represent it." "These editors even assure us that 'Cureton's Syriac' renders the comparatively late and 'revised' character of the Syriac Vulgate," i.e., the Peshito "A MATTER OF CERTAINTY. The very city in which it underwent revision, can, it seems, be fixed with 'TOLERABLE CERTAINTY.' Can Dr. Hort be serious?"

These painful details are given for the double purpose of guarding the reader, first, against wrong conclusions as to the Peshito itself; and secondly, against placing confidence, without due examination, in the conclusions of the most influential critics of the day. The habit of substituting mere conjecture for proof, is far too common with respect to the Peshito.

One illustration of the great importance of some of the questions which these editors try to decide by the aid of conjecture, is worthy of special notice. In John 1:18, they have placed words, meaning that Christ is "the only begotten God." They have placed these words in the main text. The Revisers of the English Version have not put these words in the chief place; but say in the margin, "Many very ancient authorities read, 'God only begotten.'" In two of the three creeds in the Prayer-book of the Church of England the semi-Arian belief is avowed that the Word, the second person of the GODHEAD, was BEGOTTEN by the first. In the Athanasian creed he is said to have been "begotten before the worlds." In the creed used in the communion service he is said to have been "begotten before all worlds, very God of very God, begotten not made." The Peshito has in John 1:18, "the only God," without the word "begotten." He who called himself "I am," declared that, like the Father, he, the Word, is self-existent (John 8:58). God tells us by Luke, that Jesus is called the Son of God, in respect of his manhood, not of his Deity (Luke 1:35). But these eminent scholars, by following corrupt copies, have introduced the false teaching of the creeds, as to the DERIVED and INFERIOR Godhead of the Word, into the Book of God itself. This false reading not only ascribes to the Redeemer a double Sonship, one, that of his humanity, another, that of his divinity, of which Scripture says nothing; but it provides a theme for the scoff of infidels; and builds a barrier which prevents the godly from asserting the absolute "oneness," and the underived equality of the Deity of the Father and the Word.

BISHOP HERBERT MARSH, Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, in his "Lectures on the Criticism of the Bible, 1828," maintained, as most persons do, that CONJECTURE must not be "applied to the sacred writings," (pg. 26). It is indeed self-evident that conjecture cannot possibly prove a book to be of Divine origin; nor can possibly be a fit reason for believing that any words in it have such authority. We have to insist that evidence, not fictions, shall guide those who profess to teach us what words are those of God, that readings approved by the mass of the faithful both of earlier and of later centuries, shall have a full hearing; that mere foundling copies, without a history, full of copyist errors, and tainted with semi-Arian untruth, shall have a low place and little regard; that copies exactly written, and well attested, as having descended from the very

time of the Apostles, shall be treated with all the honour which is their due.

05. The Belief of those Christian Bodies which have used the New Covenant Peshito-Syriac Books.

05. The Belief of those Christian Bodies which have used the New Covenant Peshito-Syriac Books. The fact that the New Covenant Peshito Books were never, for many centuries, combined with any Syriac translation of the five omitted books, though the omitted books were also believed to have had a divine origin in some other dialect, is, itself, a proof that the origin of the Peshito text was believed to be so much above any uninspired translation, that it would have been a sin to bind up any uninspired translation with the Peshito. Wichelhaus says, "In all copies of the Peshito version, those [five omitted] books are sought for in vain" (pg. 221). Yet "it is very well known that the Syrians did not reject those epistles" (pg. 63).

There is an account of the use of Syriac books called "The New Covenant" by the converts of Thaddeus, one of the seventy who were sent forth by Christ himself in his lifetime. Matthew says that the fame of Jesus "went throughout all Syria" (Matthew 4:24), and the following are not idle tales, but well authenticated historical facts. Abgar was the king of a small Syrian kingdom called Osroene, which, as Gibbon says, "occupied the northern and most fertile part of Mesopotamia, between the Euphrates and the Tigris. Its capital, Edessa, was situated about twenty miles beyond the Euphrates." (Decline, chap. viii.) Eusebius says that he himself, translated into Greek from Syriac, for his history, the account then existing in the public records of that kingdom, of the manner in which the king and many of the citizens became true Christians. Abgar was afflicted with an incurable disease. He heard of the cures effected by Jesus. He sent a messenger to him asking that he would come and heal him. Jesus is said to have replied, that after his ascension to heaven, he would send one of his disciples to heal him, and to teach both him, and those with him, the way of life. Eusebius says that after the ascension of Jesus, the Apostle Thomas, by divine direction, sent thither Thaddeus, one of the seventy. Thaddeus did great miracles. Abgar was healed by him, and many others.

Dr. Cureton found among the Syriac manuscripts in the British Museum a very old one, copied, he said, "certainly not later than the beginning of the fifth century." Its title is, "The Teaching of Thaddeus the Apostle." It relates what Thaddeus did and said, and what results followed his teaching, down to the time of his death. The Syriac original, and a translation by Dr. Cureton, are before me; also the Syriac, and an English translation of another copy published by Dr. George Phillips, President of Queen's College, Cambridge. Thaddeus, whose first address to the citizens is recorded in this document, spoke in a manner which remarkably corresponds with such a divine mission. In the course of it he said, "Though ye were not near at the time when the Anointed suffered, yet by the sun which was darkened, and ye saw [it], learn and understand how great a convulsion there was at the time of the crucifixion of him whose message has been spread abroad through all the earth, by the miracles which his disciples, my companions, are working in all the earth, and who, though Hebrews, who knew only the tongue of the Hebrews, in which they were born, behold! today are speaking in all tongues; that those who are far off, as well as those who

are near, may hear, and may believe, that this is he who confused the languages of the arrogant in this region of the ancients; that it is he who teaches by means of us today, trust in what is true and real, by [us] the lowly and uncultured, who are from Galilee of Palestine. For I also, whom ye see, am from Paneas, from the place where the river Jordan goes forth: and I was chosen, together with my companions, to be a bearer of tidings.....And the seed of his word I sow in the ears of every man; and those who are willing to receive it, theirs will be a good reward of [their] profession: but against those who obey not, I shake off the dust of my feet, as he [Jesus] commanded me. Turn, therefore, my beloved, from evil ways and hateful deeds; and turn to him with a good and honest will, as he has turned to you in the compassion of his rich mercies.....Flee, therefore, from things made and created, as I have said to you - from things which by name only are called gods, but are not gods in their nature; and draw near to him who, in his nature is God eternally and from everlasting.....Because though he clothed himself in this body, he is God with his Father." "Get that new mind which worships the Maker, and not the things made; [the mind] in which is to be formed an image of what is true and real - of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Spirit of holiness, when ye shall trust, and be immersed in the threefold glorious names." (See Cureton's Syriac copy, pp. 8, 9, 11).

Thaddeus was probably not one of the twelve, though he is called an apostle, but one of the seventy sent forth by Christ to preach, with power to work miracles, in his lifetime. The above extracts are given as a portrait of his ministry and teaching. He is the person to whose superintending care Syrian writers ascribe the formation of the Peshito; and as he worked miracles, whatever he sanctioned as part of God's teaching, had the same authority as that which the twelve said was from God. The above extracts tend to confirm belief in his fitness to make or obtain for his converts divinely attested copies of the sacred books so soon as they were written. It is vain to expect to trace all the means by which it was effected. It is enough for us to know that those who knew the result attest it to be, that the Peshito "was written by apostolic authority," (Wichelhaus, pg. 153). Thaddeus may have died before many of the books contained in the Peshito were first written. But the Apostle John lived for some time after they were completed, and, whoever may have written some of these books in the Syriac of Edessa, it was possible for them to have been submitted to him for rectification and divine authority. It is stated by an early writer that some books were really submitted to John for this purpose. Photius, who is called by Mr. Jeremiah Jones a "most accurate and judicious critic" (vol. i. 240), has given an extract from a very ancient book which states that the Apostle John, after he had been banished from Ephesus by Domitian, who died, A.D. 96, returned to Ephesus when Nerva succeeded him, "took the several books which contained the history of our Saviour's sufferings, miracles, and doctrines, and which were NOW TRANSLATED INTO SEVERAL DIFFERENT LANGUAGES, REVIEWED THEM, RECTIFIED THEM, and joined himself to the former three evangelists," i.e., by writing his Gospel in Greek. (Jones on Canon, Vol. iii. 2). A MANUSCRIPT OF THE FOUR GOSPELS IN SYRIAC, BEARING DATE A.D. 78, is mentioned by J.S. Asseman, in his Bibliotheca. The manuscript was preserved at Baghdad on the river Tigris; at the end it had these words under written; "This sacred book was finished on Wednesday, the 18th day of the month Conun, in the year 389," that is of the Greeks, which was A.D. 78, "by the hand of the Apostle Achaeus, a fellow labourer of Mar Maris, and a disciple of the Apostle Mar Thaddeus, whom we intreat to pray for us." This prayer implies that the statement was written after the time of Achaeus (who is probably the person called also Aggaeus), and Dr. Gloucester Ridley says that Achaeus died A.D. 48. For this and other reasons

J.D. Michaelis says that the statement "is of no authority." (Marsh's Michaelis, 1823, vol. ii., pg. 31). THE GREAT NUMBER OF CONVERTS made by Thaddeus, needed to be supplied immediately with WRITTEN DIVINE RECORDS IN SYRIAC, to teach them what to believe and what to do. Greek books would not have been suitable, for their language was Syriac. The ancient Syriac copy of "The Teaching of Thaddeus," from which the above extracts are taken, states that not only King Abgar, and many of the people of that city, were converted, but many also throughout "all Mesopotamia, and the regions round about it." It says that Thaddeus "received all those who trusted in the Anointed, and immersed them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Spirit of Holiness"; that the king gave money with which a house of worship was built; that in it they "offered praises all the days of their lives;" that in the worship conducted there, the teachers "read in the Old Covenant and in the New, and in the Prophets, and in the Acts of the Apostles every day." By the New Covenant seems to be meant the Gospels; for the New Covenant is distinguished from the Acts of the Apostles, and a little afterwards it is said that many people assembled from day to day, and came to the prayers of the service, and the [reading of the] Old Covenant and of the New in four parts. (See Syriac, pp. 13, 15). The Syriac of this narrative is like that of the Peshito itself; a fact which corroborates the statement that the Peshito was made by the care of Thaddeus.

SOME DOUBT, however, attaches to some of the above statements, because, "The Teaching of Thaddeus" has at the end, received forged additions. Dr. Gloucester Ridley says that Achaeus (sometimes called Aggaeus), a disciple of Thaddeus, died A.D. 48. Serapion was bishop of Antioch about A.D. 192-214; Zephyrinus was bishop of Rome 202-217. Yet in this record it is said that when Aggaeus died, "Palut received the hand of priesthood from Serapion, bishop of Antioch, which hand Serapion received from Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome, from the succession of the hand of priesthood of Simon Cephas." So that though the above extracts do not seem to be corrupted, some of them may be so.

BARDESANES was a Syrian writer of note in cent. II. Cave says that he flourished about A.D. 172. Dr. Nathaniel Lardner, in his *Credibility*, 1735, vol. ii., pg. 673, says, "Eusebius speaks favourably of him, though most later writers call him a heresiarch." Eusebius says that he was "a most eloquent writer in the Syriac language"; and that he wrote several dialogues in his own language "against Marcion and other authors of different opinions." (See Eusebius' *Hist.*, Cent., iv., ch. 30). Also that he was at first a follower of Valentinus, and that though he gave up some of his errors, he did not get rid of all the filth of his former heresy. Epiphanius says that he was a native of Edessa and very intimate with the king then reigning there, who was also called Abgar, and a professed Christian; that Bardesanes "went into several great errors but continued to use the Law and the Prophets, both the Old and THE NEW COVENANT, joining with them some apocryphal books." (Lardner ii. 677-678). This is evidence that at that time a Syriac "New Covenant" existed. Canon Westcott says also of the controversial writings of Bardesanes that they "NECESSARILY IMPLY the existence of a Syriac Version of the Bible." (On the Canon, pg. 237).

HEGESIPPUS lived in the latter part of the second century. Eusebius, bk. iv., ch. 22, says, "He sets forth some things from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and FROM THE SYRIAC, and from the Hebrew dialect as his own, showing that he was one of the Hebrews who had trusted. Dr. Westcott (on Canon, pg. 238) says, "This testimony is valuable, as coming from the only early Greek writer likely to have been familiar with Syriac literature." The bare reference of Hegesippus

to "the Syriac," leaves it uncertain to what part of the Scriptures in Syriac he referred; but it shows that he made use of some Syriac copy, and the Peshito is the only one which can be supposed to be intended.

APHRAATES, a Persian sage, wrote twenty-two Syriac homilies, A.D. 337-345. The citations from the gospels met with in these homilies, are said by Professor Wright to be very loose; to have some occasional resemblance to Cureton's Syriac, but to be on the whole, much nearer to the text of the Peshito. (Scrivener's Int. pg. 323, note.)

EPHRAEM, of Edessa, was a very eminent Syrian writer. He died A.D. 373. J.S. Asseman devotes 140 folio pages to extracts from his writings, and to comments on them. They are in the same Syriac dialect in which the Peshito is written. Dr. Westcott (on Canon, pg. 238) says, "Ephrem treats the version in such a manner as to prove that it was already old in the fourth century." One of Ephrem's similes will show the beauty of his style, and though it does not prove that he believed the New Covenant Peshito to have divine authority, yet his constant use of it seems to imply that he was referring to it when he spoke of the New Covenant as a harp, the notes of which have been played by the finger of God. He said, "Praise be to the Lord of all, who framed and fitted for himself two harps, those of the Prophets and of the Apostles; but it is the same finger which has played upon the two, the different notes of the two covenants." (Asseman's Bib. Or., vol. i., pg. 103). IN THE FIFTH CENTURY, those who used the Peshito began to be divided into different sects. But, as Dr. Westcott observes, the Peshito has continued to be "universally received" and used by these different sects down to the present time. He says, "All the Syrian Christians, whether belonging to the Nestorian, Jacobite, or Roman communion, conspire to hold the Peshito AUTHORITATIVE, and to use it in their public services.....The Peshito became in the East the fixed and unalterable RULE OF SCRIPTURE." (On the Canon, pg. 239). THE THREE CHIEF SECTS which, to this day, continue to use the New Covenant Peshito-Syriac books, are the Nestorians, Jacobites, and Maronites. Their names are derived from Nestorius, Jacob Baradaeus, and Maron.

NESTORIUS, or NESTORE, became Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 430. An absurd custom had arisen of calling Mary who was the mother of Jesus, "The Mother of God." Nestore objected to it, and said, as Mosheim relates, that she "was rather to be called the mother of Christ; since the Deity can neither be born nor die; and only the Son of Man could derive his birth from an earthly parent." (Cent. v.) The Emperor Theodosius called a council of bishops which met at Ephesus, A.D. 431. This council, one of "lawless violence," defended the false title given to Mary. Nestore was condemned. He resigned his bishopric, and was afterwards banished. Many agreed with him, and held that his sentiments had been taught by Scripture from the beginning. They were called Nestorians, not because they derived their sentiments from him, but because he was one of the chief defenders of those sentiments. Amrus, a Nestorian, about A.D. 1340, said, that "Nestore, whose name was imposed on them, was a Greek, but they were Syrians; they had never seen him, nor had he ever trod their lands" (Patriarchs, by Aloys Asseman, pg. 206). Another council of bishops (for prelates had then assumed to themselves the right to rule the churches, and pretended that their decisions were laws given by the will of God,) met at Chalcedon in Asia Minor, not far from Constantinople, about A.D. 451. This Council, by its decrees, said that some had dared to corrupt the mystery of the gospel, and were denying the application of the word "THEOTOKOS - mother of God, to the Virgin;" that this Council held that the Son, is "true God and

true man.....BEGOTTEN by the Father before the ages as to his DEITY.....but of Mary, virgin and DEIPARA - Mother of God, as to his HUMANITY; one and the same Jesus Christ, Son of God, Lord and only begotten, made manifest in two natures," which two natures "concur in ONE PERSON," who is "one and the same only begotten Son, the God-Word" (Magdeburg Centuriators, cent. v., Colossians 531.) It is self-evident that things that differ so much as Godhead does from manhood, are not "one and the same." The first evident error in the above statement is that the Divine Word is a BEGOTTEN Deity. The next is that the Deity of this begotten God, though declared to be quite distinct in nature from the humanity begotten of the Virgin, is nevertheless so "one" with it, that because Mary was mother of the manhood, she therefore was MOTHER OF THE GODHEAD ALSO. A greater absurdity is impossible. Yet this is still called, not only by Roman Catholics, but by a member of the Church of England, the orthodox faith of the true church. It was this absurdity which Nestore denied. For doing so, he is still called by many a heretic. Gibbon remarks, that the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon, namely, that in Christ there is but "one person in two natures," was received by Europe during ten centuries of servitude to the Vatican, and was then "admitted without dispute into the creed of the Reformers." (Decline, ch. xlvii.) Is it difficult to form a correct opinion on this point? The statement that the Deity and manhood of Christ formed but "one person" seems to mean that they had only one capability of personal action. In Christ "dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;" Colossians 2:9. Did this indwelling make the Godhead and the manhood to be so one, that when the manhood was crucified the Godhead was crucified? God dwells, in an inferior degree, in his saints; does this make them to be so one in person with God that when they pray and sing, God prays and sings? And yet for denying that God was born of Mary, Nestorians are counted heretics.

Nestorians were also charged with making the SONSHIP OF CHRIST DOUBLE. (See Magdeburg Centuriators, cent. v., Colossians 334, F.) Almost all the ancient creeds do this, by teaching that even the Deity of Christ was begotten, as well as his humanity. Nestore's opponents held this creed. But they seemed to have imagined that by calling the Godhead and the manhood "one person," they made the divine Sonship, in respect of which the Creed of Chalcedon says he was "begotten before the ages," to be one and the same with the sonship of his humanity. The charge against the Nestorians was that by denying Christ to be "one person," they left the double sonship unresolved into oneness. Nestore and his opponents both held that the Divine Word was a begotten Deity; but his opponents added absurdity to error when they imagined that the words "one person" converted two sonships into one. The word of God says nothing of a begotten God. "I am," which denotes underived existence, was used by Christ of his Godhead, as well as by God of himself when he spoke to Moses. (Exodus 3:14; John 8:58.) Oneness with the Father is the oneness of self-existence. God tells us that Christ is his Son because begotten by him of Mary, Luke 1:35.

ANOTHER CHARGE brought against Nestore was that he made FOUR PERSONS in the Godhead. (Magdeburg Centuriators, cent. v., Colossians 335 F., 338 F.) As if it were impossible to believe that the Deity of Christ differs from his manhood, without converting his manhood into a second Deity. Such absurdities seem to be intended to show that if men assume a lordship which God forbids, he makes their wisdom folly.

These facts are proof that the Nestorians, who suffered the loss of all things, and preferred to be under the ban of perpetual excommunication, rather than admit the untruth that Mary was the

mother of God, gave far better proof of being trustworthy witnesses as to the origin of their Scriptures, than those of the Greek and Roman bodies who asserted that untruth.

THESE CHARGES HAVE BEEN MENTIONED because they help to account for the unwillingness, so strong in some quarters, to receive THE TESTIMONY OF THE NESTORIANS respecting their Peshito Scriptures. For, strange as it may seem, even Dr. Liddon, a Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, in his Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of Christ, 9th ed., 1882, defends the false title "mother of God," (pg. 261.) He pleads that it has been used by those whom he calls "the whole church, since the Council of Ephesus," and justifies them in "attributing to God birth of a human mother," (pg. 261, note.) He calls the rejection of that false title by Nestore, a "vital heresy," (pg. 123.)

PENAL LAWS drove most of the Nestorians out of the Roman empire (Gibbon, chap. xlvii.) But ELSEWHERE THEY INCREASED EXCEEDINGLY. A large majority of the people of Persia became Nestorians. Cosmas, who is called the Indian navigator, and was a Nestorian, said of them, in the sixth century, that Christianity was successfully preached by them to the Bactrians, Huns, Persians, Indians, Medes, and Elamites; and that the number of churches from the Gulf of Persia to the Caspian sea, was almost infinite. Gibbon says that, in a subsequent age their missionaries pursued without fear the footsteps of the roving Tartar; that some of them entered China, and that under the Mohammedan Caliphs, "their numbers, with those of the Jacobites, were computed TO SURPASS THE GREEK AND ROMAN COMMUNIONS." (Gibbon, ch. xlvii. Nestorians.) All these churches used the Peshito. THE BEST CHARACTERISTICS of the Nestorians are their LOVE AND USE OF THE PESHITO, and THEIR GREAT CARE TO KEEP IT PURE. From the first they shared the corruptions of Christianity which prevailed in the fifth century; and Wichelhaus says, in reference to about the year 600, "They were often contentious, ambitious, covetous; doctrines were adulterated," a hierarchy had been founded and was promoted; they corrupted and depraved the doctrines and precepts which they had received pure from the Apostles, not less than the Roman Catholics did. "This thing only is to be praised in them, that they always used the Bible, and greatly valued learning," (pg. 130.) He says that from the eighth century, slaughter and desolation overwhelmed both the Nestorians and the Jacobites; that some of the Nestorians fled for refuge to the mountains of Coordistan, and some of the Jacobites, partly to the mountain regions of Mesopotamia, and partly to the solitudes of Lebanon; (pp. 205-206). J. Aloys Asseman (a nephew of J.S. Asseman, who wrote the Bibliotheca) wrote a history of the Nestorian Patriarchs, published A.D. 1775, and showed a constant succession of them down to that date. He gives an account also of some of their chief writers. One of these, Jesudadus, mentions the belief of the Syrians as to the origin of the Peshito.

JESUDADUS, who is sometimes called SOADEDUS, lived during the Patriarchate of Theodosius, A.D. 852-858. He said of the Syriac version, "The translation of the sacred books into the Syriac language was in this order; the Pentateuch, and Joshua the son of Nun, and Judges, and Ruth, and Samuel, and David, and Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs, and Job, were translated in the time of Solomon, at the request of Hiram, king of Tyre, his friend. But the rest of the books of the Old and those of the New Covenant, in the time of Abgar, king of Edessa, by the care and solicitude of Thaddaeus and other apostles." (J.A. Asseman's Patriarchs, pg. 102, note 1.)

Thaddaeus, who worked miracles, could give the same authority to what he approved, as the twelve apostles did. The belief of the Syrians, therefore, about 800 years from the time of the Apostles was that the New Covenant Peshito was made under such apostolic care that it had the same authority as the gospels of Luke and Mark had from being made under the care of Paul and Peter.

EBEDJESUS, who became Metropolitan of Soba, that is, of Nisibis, A.D. 1290, was a Nestorian of great eminence. His works were very numerous. The list which he gave of the sacred books of the New Testament was that of the Peshito, not of the Greek. He states that the Gospel of Matthew was "written in Palestine in Hebrew," that is, in Syriac, then called Hebrew; and that the reason why the epistles of James, 1st Peter, and 1st John, were called catholic, was because "they had in them words written by the apostles in every copy and IN EVERY LANGUAGE." The Syriac books of which he was speaking were those contained in the New Covenant Peshito. His statements imply the general belief of Syrians that those four books, at the least, were written in Syriac, and that the Peshito contained true copies of them. (See Westcott on Canon, pg. 540, and Dr. Badger's Nestorians, 1852, vol. ii., pp. 361-363.)

EBEDJESUS gives the following account of the origin of the Nestorians, the Jacobites, and the Melchites, in his work called "The Jewel," which is translated by Dr. Badger, vol. ii., pg. 380. Ebedjesus says that Cyril maintained that we ought to call the Virgin, "Mother of God," and wrote twelve sentences, excommunicating all who should draw any distinction between the Godhead and humanity of Christ after their union. Nestorius showed that these sentences were erroneous; that the appellation "Mother of God," is unscriptural. He called her "Mother of the Anointed," the Anointed being the word used by prophets and apostles. From this difference of creed came slaughter, exile, imprisonment, and great persecution. The Council of Chalcedon decided that there are TWO NATURES in Christ, and TWO WILLS, and anathematised all who should deny the two natures; but decided that there is but ONE PERSON. The party of Cyril objected to "two natures;" that of Nestorius to "one person." An imperial edict degraded from their dignity all who did not agree with the decision, that there are two natures and one person. Some submitted. Others did not. Hence arose three sects. Those who held ONE NATURE AND ONE PERSON IN CHRIST. This sect included the Copts, Egyptians, and Abyssinians. This is called the Jacobite sect, from a Syrian teacher called Jacob. The second sect held that there are TWO NATURES AND ONE PERSON in Christ. These are called Melchites - the king's party, because this creed was imposed forcibly by the king. It is received by the Romans called Franks, by those of Constantinople who are Greeks, and by all the people of the West, such as Russians, Circassians, Georgians and their neighbours. The Jacobites and Melchites accept the appellation "mother of God." The Jacobites have added the declaration that "God was crucified for us." The third creed is that of the Nestorians, that there are TWO NATURES AND TWO PERSONS in Christ. The Easterns have never changed their faith, but have kept it as they received it from the apostles, and therefore are unjustly called Nestorians, because he was not their patriarch, nor was his their language. Nestorius followed THEM, not they HIM, and more especially, as to the appellation "Mother of the Anointed." Such is the account given by Ebedjesus of the three sects. It shows how well informed he was, and how important his testimony is as to the books of Scripture. THE CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS, in India, whose profession of Christianity dates from the time of the apostles, maintain that Syriac was the original language of Scripture. Dr. Westcott says, "The

Syriac Christians of Malabar even now claim for the Peshito the right to be considered as an Eastern original of the New Testament." (On the Canon, pg. 233.) "How shall we know," said one of them, speaking to Dr. Claudius Buchanan about the Greek Testament, "that your standard copy of the Bible is a TRUE TRANSLATION? We cannot depart from our own Bible. It is THE TRUE BOOK OF GOD, without corruption; it is that book which was first used by the Christians of Antioch. What TRANSLATIONS you have got in the West, we know not; but the true Bible of Antioch we have had in the mountains of Malabar for fourteen hundred years, or longer." Another of these professed Christians said, "If the parables and discourses of our Lord were in Syriac, and the people in Jerusalem commonly used it, is it not marvellous that his disciples did not record his parables in the Syrian language, and that they should have recourse to the Greek? Surely there must have been A SYRIAC ORIGINAL. The poor people in Jerusalem could not read Greek. Had THEY no record in their hands of Christ's parables which they had heard, and of his sublime discourses recorded by John after his ascension? You admit that Matthew was written originally in Syriac; you may as well admit John. Or was one Gospel enough for the inhabitants of Jerusalem?" (Dr. Etheridge's Syriac Christians, pp. 166-167.) THE NESTORIANS NEVER TREATED THE GREEK TEXT AS OF HIGHER AUTHORITY than that of the New Covenant Peshito. Wichelhaus says (pg. 187,) that "the Nestorians had no social union with Western Christians; and that they held the text of the Greek New Testament in almost no esteem, and deemed the ancient Peshito to be in all things authentic." At pg. 153 he says, "In the history of the Nestorians, it was never found, so far as I know, that learned men took the trouble to compare the Syriac text of the New Testament with the Greek, and to conform it to that." (Also pg. 266.) THE TERMS APPLIED TO THE PESHITO prove the general belief of its divine origin. Wichelhaus says, (pg. 153), "It was extolled with the greatest praises; it was esteemed to be exactly what was written in the first times BY APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY; it was called, not only ancient, but SACRED AND BLESSED." THE EXTREME CARE taken to preserve its text in purity implies that every part of it was believed to be from God. The care taken was like that which the Jews took of their inspired Hebrew text. Wichelhaus says, "It is a proof of the extreme accuracy of the Syrians in treating the sacred text, that, like the Jews, they have their Masora," a collection of critical comments on correct readings; "not only do they divide the text into chapters and lections, but they also number the comma-divisions of each book." (pg. 156.) Monasteries abounded in the East from the fourth century. When the city of Edessa was taken by the Saracens, 300 monasteries were found in it, (pg. 126.) The monks of that period devoted their time chiefly to copying the scriptures, and making known the gospel. Wichelhaus attributes the great accuracy of the copies of the Peshito, and especially of the Nestorian copies, to the following causes. 1st. - Many copies were written in monasteries, by skilled men, from approved examples, and with the utmost care and attention. 2ndly. - Those copies were read and examined many times by ministers and monks. 3rdly. - In the time of Ephraem, cent. iv., deep interest was taken in the letter of Scripture, and many Syrians are mentioned who had committed almost the whole New Testament to memory. 4thly. - In schools, in church-assemblies, and in monasteries, there was such constant communication between the teachers and the taught, that if any differences crept into the text, they could scarcely escape notice, nor become fixed by custom. 5thly. - A large part of the Christians of that region had been Jews, they were compelled to discuss points with Jews, they had Jewish schools near them, and were thus accustomed to consider the words of sacred scripture, to be themselves sacred and inviolable, and almost to number the very letters." (pg. 151.) THE NESTORIANS WERE FAMOUS

FOR THEIR SCHOOLS. In these schools the copying of the scriptures was a first part of the education given. For instance, in the school or college at Nisibis, A.D. 490, the rules required that "the brethren admitted to it, should not, except from urgent necessity, cease from writing, reading, and expounding" Scripture. As to the writing of Scripture, they were "in the first year to write the Pentateuch, and a book of Paul; in the second, the Psalms and Prophets; in the third, the New Testament." (pg. 125.) There were secular studies, but the young had to begin with the study of Scripture. AS TO THE AGREEMENT OF DIFFERENT COPIES; most of those which have been brought to Europe, are not Nestorian, but Jacobite copies. But so far as the Nestorian and the Jacobite copies differ, the greater reverence which the Nestorians had for the Peshito, justifies a higher esteem for the exactness of their text. Wichelhaus says, "Testimonies prove that the text of the Nestorians is altogether the same as that of the ancient Peshito version." But the differences between their early texts, and other texts of early date, are so little, that Wichelhaus says, "The texts of copies written in cents. v. and vi., in Mesopotamia, and which bear the date when they were written recorded upon them, and the text of copies written at a later time, alike of Jacobites and of Maronites, of Nestorians, and of Melchites, is a text so entirely the same, and with such constancy of likeness, that, in the Syriac version, NO PLACE WAS GIVEN FOR RECENSIONS, such as are said to have been made in the GREEK TEXT, even in the first centuries." (pp. 150, 151.) This answer, by the voice of fact, denies almost the possibility of such a recension of the Syriac text, as Dr. Hort, in his Introduction to the Greek Testament of Drs. Westcott and Hort, 1881, first conjectures, and then treats as "certain." (pg. 84.)

2. THE JACOBITES BEAR LIKE TESTIMONY, as to the origin of the Peshito. They are called Monophysites, that is, persons who believe that in Christ there is but ONE NATURE, as well as one person. Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, had taught, before the time of Nestore, that Christ had NO HUMAN MIND, that he was only Deity and a human body. About A.D. 448, Eutyches, an abbot of Constantinople, spread this belief, while opposing the Nestorians. (Mosheim, cent. v.) At Ephesus, where the Council of 431 condemned Nestore, another Council in 449, condemned Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, and others, for excommunicating Eutyches. The Greeks called this Council "a band of robbers," because it "carried everything by fraud and violence." (Mosheim.) Gibbon says, "It is certain that Flavian, before he could reach the place of his exile, expired on the third day, of the wounds and bruises he had received at Ephesus. The synod has been justly branded as a gang of robbers and assassins." (Decline, ch. xlvii.) Wichelhaus (pg. 134) says that the Emperors Zeno and Anastasius were favourable to the Monophysites, (A.D. 474-518); but that when the Emperor Justin (518-527), began to remove the Monophysite bishops from their sees, the Monophysites, chiefly by the influence of Jacob Baradaeus, separated themselves from the Greek church, and became a distinct body, thenceforth called Jacobites, from their connection, it is said, with Jacob Baradaeus. The Nestorians more abounded in the East of Asia; the Jacobites in the West, and in Egypt. A body with such an origin, and such a creed, cannot be said to have much claim to general confidence; but Gregory Bar Hebraeus, one of their learned men, is much relied on. Dr. Westcott calls him "one of the most learned and accurate of Syrian writers." (On the Canon, pg. 236.)

"GREGORY BAR HEBRAEUS," Dr. Westcott says, "relates that the New Testament Peshito was made in the time of Thaddaeus and Abgarus, king of Edessa, when, according to the universal opinion of ancient writers, the Apostle went to proclaim Christianity in Mesopotamia. This

statement HE REPEATS SEVERAL TIMES, and once, on the authority of Jacob, a deacon of Edessa, in THE FIFTH CENTURY.....It is worthy of notice that Gregory assumes THE APOSTOLIC ORIGIN of the New Testament Peshito AS CERTAIN; for while he gives three hypotheses as to the date of the Old Testament Version, he speaks of this as A KNOWN AND AN ACKNOWLEDGED FACT." (On the Canon, pg. 236.) Bishop Walton said that if the Peshito was "made by some one of the Apostles, it would have divine and equal authority with the other sacred books." It is therefore worthy of special notice that, according to Bar Hebraeus, the Peshito was "known" to be of "Apostolic origin," and therefore was known to be of the same authority as the Greek Text. Even Canon Westcott calls attention to the unwavering and unqualified nature of this testimony to a "known fact."

BAR HEBRAEUS was born 1226, and died 1286. He said, speaking first of the Old Covenant Peshito-Syriac, -"Respecting this Syriac translation, there were three opinions; the first, that it was translated in the time of kings Solomon and Hiram; the second, that Asa the priest translated it, when the Assyrian sent him to Samaria; the third, that it was translated in the days of Thaddaeus the apostle, and of Abgar, the king of Edessa, when also they translated the New Covenant in the same Peshito form;" that is, in the same simple or faithful manner. (See the Syriac words in Prager, on Old Covenant Peshito, pg. 7; and a Latin translation in Wichelhaus, pg. 61.)

BAR HEBRAEUS records also, in another place, the fact that JACOB OF EDESSA says, "that translators were sent by Thaddaeus the apostle, and Abgar, the king of Edessa, into Palestine, and translated the Scripture from Hebrew into Syriac." (See the Syriac words in Walton's Prolegomena, xiii. 16.) The words of Jacob of Edessa refer to the Old Covenant Peshito; but Bar Hebraeus in the above extract says that the New Covenant Peshito was made at the time when Jacob of Edessa said, in this passage, that persons were sent into Palestine to translate the Old Covenant Scriptures. THE JACOBITES SEEM TO HAVE ALTERED TWO PASSAGES in some of their copies of the Peshito, to justify such expressions as that "God was crucified for us," a statement which Gibbon says was "imagined by a monophysite bishop." (Decline, ch. xlvii. The Trisagion.) In Acts 20:28, most of their copies have "the church of THE ANOINTED, which he purchased with his blood;" which is in agreement with other copies of the Peshito. But Wichelhaus says that Sabarjesus, a Nestorian Presbyter, mentions Jacobite copies which had "the church OF GOD;" and that Asseman found in the Vatican library a monophysite copy which has "of God." (pg. 150.) Our common English Version has "of God;" but Griesbach and Tischendorf adopted "of the Lord," as the true Greek text. The general testimony of the Syriac copies is that "of the Anointed" is the true text of the Peshito. In Hebrews 2:9, most of the Jacobite copies say of Jesus, "He, God, in his merciful favour, tasted death on behalf of every man." This reading could be used to defend the statement that God was crucified. The Nestorian copies have, "For he [Jesus], apart from God, (or the Godhead)," etc. Origen, nearly 200 years before Nestore lived, mentioned Greek copies which had a like reading. He died about A.D. 254. Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, a celebrated Greek writer, who died about A.D. 429, said that some persons had removed the reading, "without God," and had substituted, "by the merciful favour of God." He said also that the context shows that the apostle was not speaking of God's mercy, but of the relation between the Deity and manhood of Christ. (See Tischendorf's 8th edition under Hebrews 2:9.) Tischendorf says, "From these testimonies, it is CERTAIN that the reading, without God, did not originate with the Nestorians; for Origen found it in his copies." There is no reason, therefore, to suppose that the Nestorian text of

the Peshito in Hebrews 2:9, is the result of any change made by them; but there is reason, on the contrary, to regard it as part of the original text of the Peshito; and a proof that the Greek copies which had the same reading in the time of Origen were correct. THE JACOBITES DID NOT CONTINUE, as the Nestorians did, to treat the Syriac as BETTER THAN THE GREEK TEXT. About A.D. 616, a new Syriac version of the New Covenant, was made by them. It was from the Greek text, and followed it closely. It is called the Philoxenian Syriac, from Philoxenus, its patron. Wichelhaus says that the Jacobites seem to have thought that it would be wicked to supplant the Peshito, and yet to have preferred the new version. He thinks that the name Peshito came into use at this time, and among them, because the Nestorians had no need of a distinct name for the Peshito. They had not, as the Jacobites had, a second Syriac version.

Wichelhaus says also, that all the Jacobite teachers took delight in making changes, called corrections and emendations, (pg. 205); and that after the Philoxenian version was made, they began to conform, even their copies of the Peshito, to the Greek text, so that, in estimating the worth of copies written after that date, inquiry needs to be made whether they are Jacobite or Nestorian. (pg. 231.)

3. THE MARONITES GIVE LIKE TESTIMONY RESPECTING THE ORIGIN OF THE PESHITO. Bishop Walton says, "The Maronites were so called from Maro, an abbot. They were reconciled to the Pope, and to the church of Rome, A.D. 1182. They have a college of Maronites at Rome, founded by Gregory 13th," (who died in 1585), "from which priests and bishops are sent into their country." (Walton, Polyglot, Prolegomena xiii. 2.) They are an offshoot from the Jacobites. About the close of the seventh century many of the Jacobites fled, to save their lives, partly to mountains in the north of Mesopotamia, and partly to Mount Lebanon. Those who fled to Lebanon divided into two parties; one party submitted to the emperors of Constantinople, and were called Melchites, that is, Imperialists; the other party maintained a more independent existence, and were called Mardaites, that is, Rebels. Of this party John Maro became a leader, and a Patriarch. J.S. Asseman, in his Bibliotheca Orientalis, vol. i., pg. 517, shows that Maro opposed both the Monophysites and the Nestorians. Maro seems to have been a Monothelite, that is, one who held that in Christ there was only ONE WILL. J.S. Asseman contends that he held the creed of Rome, - that of two natures and one person; but Gibbon says that the Maronites, before they joined Rome, were Monothelites. He says of them, "The unfortunate question of ONE WILL, or operation in the two natures of Christ, was generated by their curious leisure.....Their country extends from the ridge of Mount Libanus to the shores of Tripoli.....In the twelfth century the Maronites, abjuring the Monothelite [- the ONE WILL] error, were reconciled to the Latin Churches of Antioch and Rome.....The learned Maronites of the college of Rome have vainly laboured to absolve their ancestors from the guilt of heresy," that is, of Monothelism. (Ch.xlvii.)

GABRIEL SIONITA, is one of the many learned Maronites who have become eminent since the erection of the Maronite college at Rome. Ancient Syriac writing was a kind of short-hand, in which there was little more than the consonants written. While it was a living language, the vowels could be supplied by the reader, though not without liability to error. By degrees, signs were used, placed at the top and bottom of the consonants, to indicate the true vowel sounds. Bishop Walton, speaking of the Peshito, says, "That most illustrious man, Gabriel Sionita, first put vowel-points to the Syriac; for before that time all manuscripts were destitute of vowel-points," or nearly so. This was done by him for Michael de Jay, in his splendid work, the Paris Heptaglot, A.D. 1628-1645.

Bishop Walton gives the following testimony of Sionita to the Peshito.

SIONITA, says Walton, "testifies that the Peshito has always been held in the greatest veneration, and held to be of THE GREATEST AUTHORITY by all the populations which use the Chaldaic or Syriac language, and has been publicly accepted and read in all their most ancient churches, formed in Syria, Mesopotamia, Chaldaea, Egypt, and finally, in those which are dispersed and spread throughout all parts of the East. In this language they read, not only the Scriptures, but liturgies also, and celebrate divine worship, even in those places where Syriac is not today the mother-tongue; although from those liturgies, and the longer responses of the people, it is sufficiently evident that those liturgies were commonly known and understood WHEN THEY FIRST BEGAN TO BE USED." (Prol. xiii. Sec. 18.) In reference to Scripture, "the greatest authority" is DIVINE AUTHORITY.

FAUST NAIRON, a Maronite, is often referred to by J.S. Asseman as a writer of eminence. He was one of the two editors of the edition of the Peshito Syriac Version, printed by the side of an Arabic Version of the New Testament, in 1703, by command of the Roman Congregation DE PROPAGANDA FIDE, for the use of the Maronites. He also wrote the preface. In this he said, (pg. 2) "The Syriac text EXCELS IN ANTIQUITY ALL OTHER TEXTS. By it very many places which in these are obscure, may be made plain." He proceeds to endeavour to prove that the Syriac text is more ancient than the Greek text of the Gospels. He mentions the common opinion that the Syriac Gospels were translated from the Greek, and says that there are better reasons for concluding that the Greek Gospels were translated from the Syriac. The weak part of his argument is, that he considers it certain that the sacred writers could not have given details of words and events so numerous and so varied as to time and place, unless they had made a WRITTEN RECORD of them, when they heard, saw, or were first informed of them. He says, that if they did make such a record, it must have been in their own language, Syriac. To this it may be replied, that we have very little evidence that any of them did make such records in the Saviour's life-time; and that they had no need of them, because the Holy Spirit brought all things to their remembrance. (John 14:26.) But the events which occurred were so extraordinary, and Christ so often called attention to his teaching, by saying, "He that has ears to hear, let him hear," that those who could write, would of necessity think it worth while to keep a written record of what they heard and saw, as Josephus did of the events of the Jewish war. Evidence that this was done by some persons appears from what Luke says of the many who had "set forth in order" the events of the gospel history (Luke 1:1); and when he says of himself, that he had "closely followed up with exactness FROM THE FIRST what had been DELIVERED by those who, from the beginning, were eye-witnesses;" he seems clearly to intimate that what he wrote was from written records made by himself FROM THE FIRST of what these eye-witnesses had told him; so that Faust Nairon has, in these words of Luke, some support for his remark, that the sacred writers in order to construct with accuracy, as witnesses, what they knew of the "parables, miracles, and sayings of Christ," may have done so, unless the Holy Spirit's aid dispensed with ordinary means, from records made in the life-time of Christ; and that as they then knew no language but their own native Syriac tongue, these records must have been made in Syriac. (Introduction, pp. 2, 3, 4.) Of MATTHEW, Faust Nairon says, and correctly, that "all the ancients bear witness that he wrote his Gospel in Syriac." (pp. 3, 4.) He states also that Theophilact says the apostle John translated it into Greek. He notices the singular fact that Matthew does not record the ascension of Christ to heaven, and he

draws from this the conclusion that the gospel was completed before that event took place. (pg. 6.) Of JOHN'S GOSPEL, Faust Nairon says that Alexander, (who was bishop of Rome about A.D. 109 to 119), stated that John opposed and confuted the error of Cerinthus, who in Jerusalem, Caesarea, and Antioch, denied the Deity of Christ. Faust Nairon says, that for this purpose John's Gospel must have been first written in Syriac. He says that Cerinthus afterwards went into Asia Minor. Irenaeus, who died about A.D. 200, says that John "published a Gospel while he dwelt at Ephesus, in Asia." (Lardner's Credibility, bk. i. ch. xvii.) Faust Nairon suggests that this may mean that John, to meet the error of Cerinthus there, re-issued his Gospel, and in Greek. He says that John, like Matthew, does not mention the ascension, and that this implies that his Gospel was written before it took place. He says also, that the Syriac modes of speech in John's Greek Gospel, imply that it was first written in Syriac. (pg. 4.) Of MARK, Faust Nairon says that he preached the gospel in many regions, and that some writers say that he wrote his Gospel in THREE LANGUAGES; Greek, Latin, and Syriac. (pg. 5.) Of THE GOSPEL OF LUKE, Faust Nairon says, that from the writings of Origen, Ambrose, Theophilact, and Epiphanius, it appears that Luke was a Syrian from Antioch, and sent his Gospel first to his own countrymen in Antioch, to oppose some false teachers there; that for this purpose it needed to be written in Syriac, as well as in Greek; because, though Greek had been introduced by the Greek rulers of Antioch, it was not the common language of the citizens. He says also, that Greek was not the native language of Luke himself, but acquired by him afterwards; that this appears from the statement of Jerome, that he was "a physician of Antioch, and not ignorant of Greek." Faust Nairon says, that the many Syriac idioms in Luke's Gospel shows that he was a Syrian. OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, Faust Nairon says that Jerome states the book was written in Greek, but that Metaphrastes says, Luke also wrote it in the language of his own country, which was Syriac. OF 1 JOHN, he says, that it was sent to Hebrew Christians who lived beyond the Euphrates under the rule of the Parthians, that it was anciently called, The Epistle to the Parthians, and must have been written in Syriac, the native tongue of the Hebrews there. (pg. 8.) OF HEBREWS, JAMES, and 1 PETER, Faust Nairon makes no special mention; but his remark, that all the epistles must "of necessity have been written in the language of those to whom they were sent, or they could not have been understood by them," applies specially to these epistles; for their contents prove that they were written to Hebrew Christians, and their native language, as Faust Nairon says, was Syriac. (pg. 9.) OF THE EPISTLES OF PAUL, he says, that to them, as well as to all the epistles, the rule must be applied, that they must have been written in the language of those to whom they were sent. We have Paul's letters in Greek, and we have them also in Syriac, with abundant evidence that they were written in Syriac in the time of the apostles. From what Peter says of Paul's Epistles, it seems probable that they were circulated among Hebrew Christians in Syriac, very soon after they were written. Syriac was the only language, as we have found, which was GENERALLY, and well understood by all the Hebrews. Yet Peter, writing to the dispersed Hebrew Christians of Asia Minor, speaks of "ALL" Paul's Epistles, as if well known among them, and not only those which Paul had written "to them." (2 Peter 3:15-16.) This reference to "ALL his Epistles," seems to imply that those which he had written in Greek were well known to Hebrews who knew little of any language but Syriac; and tends, by its agreement with the Syrian testimony, to show that ALL THE LETTERS OF PAUL IN THE PESHITO, were written in Syriac in the time of the Apostles.

Faust Nairon says in proof that THE PESHITO, AS A WHOLE, IS NOT A MERE TRANSLATION OF THE GREEK COPIES, that the NUMBER of books in it is different from that of the Greek text,

which has 2 Peter 2:1-22 and 3rd John, Jude and Revelation. That the ORDER of books is also different from their order in most Greek copies; for James, 1st Peter, and 1st John, follow the Acts; and that the Greek text has passages which the Peshito has not.

He says that Luke 22:17-18, is not in most copies of the Peshito. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." Bishop Walton says, "These verses are not found in the Vienna manuscript, nor in the one which we have mostly used." They are placed in brackets by Dr. Lee, 1816, and in the Ooroomiah edition, to show, apparently, that they were not in the copies followed. The account of the adulteress, John 8:1-11, which is in many Greek copies, is absent from most of those of the Peshito. Bishop Walton printed it in Syriac from a copy in the library of Archbishop Usher, but said that it was absent from all preceding printed editions. In Dr. Lee's edition, and that of Ooroomiah, lines are placed across the page at the beginning and end of the passage, with evident intention to show its absence from the copies followed.

Acts 28:29 : "And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves," is not in the Peshito. Nor is 1 John 5:7 : "There are three who bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one." Faust Nairon remarks that this verse is quoted by Cyprian, (bishop of Carthage, 247-258), when writing on the unity of the Church, and that this was before Arius was born. (See the edition of Cyprian's work by Le Preuse, 1593, pg. 297.) Cyprian says, "Respecting the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, it is written, 'And these three are one.'" Faust Nairon suggests that this verse was probably added to the epistle when published in Greek, with view to meet more fully the denial of the Deity of Christ by Cerinthus; and that its appearance in the Greek text, though absent from the Syriac, tends to show that the epistle "was first written by John in Syriac." (Nairon, pg. 8.)

FAUST NAIRON'S belief that A RECORD WAS MADE IN SYRIAC by Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John, of events in the Saviour's history, DURING HIS LIFE-TIME, receives some support from the contents of the first three Gospels. It has been observed, that there are passages in some of the Greek copies of these three Gospels, which are in EXACTLY THE SAME WORDS as passages in others. Bishop Herbert Marsh, in his translation of the Introduction of J.D. Michaelis, vol. iii. pp. 160-409, prints an elaborate treatise on the origin of the first three Gospels, and gives in Greek many instances of these identical Greek passages. He says that it is "wholly impossible" that these three historians, if they had no connexion with each other, should have written IN GREEK, passages so identical, (pg. 168); and that "we are reduced to this dilemma, 'Either the succeeding Evangelists copied from the preceding, or that all the three drew from a common source.'" (pg. 170.) After examining various attempts made by others to account for this identity of Greek words, he comes to the conclusion that internal proofs show that these three writers did not copy words one from another. (pp. 320-330.) At pg. 361, he says that the verbal agreements and disagreements of these three Gospels, can be solved in a manner which is perfectly consistent with the inspiration of the Greek Gospels, by admitting that "all three writers used copies of A COMMON HEBREW," that is, A SYRIAC "DOCUMENT."

STEPHEN EVOD ASSEMAN, Archbishop of Apamea, a third Syrian of the name of Asseman, in answer to an inquiry made by Dr. Gloucester Ridley, who published a work on the Peshito in 1761, said, - "The first [Syriac] version of the New Testament is called the Peshito; the Syrians believe

that its translation of the Gospels was made either by the Apostles themselves, or at least by the Apostle Thaddaeus; that the Acts and Epistles were made by Apostolic men, and that Ephraem, and other fathers, who flourished in the third and fourth centuries, used that version." (Wichelhaus, pg. 68.) Dr. N. Lardner defines the meaning of "apostolical men," to be "disciples of the Apostles, intimately acquainted with them," (Credibility, book i., chap. xxii., pg. 536); men like "Mark and Luke, companions of the Apostles." (chap. xxvii. pg. 576.) Such men could obtain from the apostles their correction of and authority for what they wrote.

TRANSLATIONS MADE FROM THE PESHITO FOR CHRISTIAN BODIES are themselves testimonies that its authority was deemed as great as, or greater than that of the Greek text. Faust Nairon, in the Introduction already named, refers, as Bishop Walton has done also, to a Syrian Commentator on Psalm xix., who asserts, in reference to the "New Covenant," that "though the Armenians translated from the Greek, they afterwards compared their copy with the Syriac, and made it agree with the Syriac in particular places." (pg. 9.) An Arabic version in part, and a Persian version, were made from the Peshito. (Wichelhaus, pg. 241, also pg. 152.) In the above testimonies, NO ELEMENT IS WANTING OF PROOF HELD TO BE DECISIVE, that a book is what it is said to be. They give, by their universal and continuous harmony, from very early to the present time, proof that the Peshito had its origin in the time of the Apostles, and was made under their care. They fully satisfy the rule of Bishop Huet. They equally satisfy the rule laid down by Dr. Westcott in his book on the Canon. They are testimonies respecting the belief of large Christian bodies; a belief attested by the treatment of the book as "sacred," and as a Divine Rule of faith and practice. The Peshito is a witness, such as the utmost efforts have failed to find in Greek copies of early date. Vain, as yet, has been every attempt, by means of Greek copies, to give a text which is proved to be "brought back to the condition in which it stood in the sacred autographs." (Scrivener, Int. pp. 6, 520.) But the Peshito, in the opinion of Wichelhaus, who has studied it and its history with the greatest care, possesses a Syriac text so ancient and so well preserved, that even if it were due only to a human translator, it would be proved to represent, with a few exceptions, a Greek text "most like to the autographs of the apostles." (Wichelhaus, pg. 264.) Canon Cook also, the Editor of the Speaker's Commentary, says that "the Syriac Peshito, is the version which probably COMES NEAREST TO THE AUTOGRAPHS of the Evangelists, especially in Matthew;" and that to it, and some other authorities, "a higher value is to be assigned in some cases," than to any Greek copies, because this version is "MORE ANCIENT, and BETTER ATTESTED than any manuscripts." (First Three Gospels, pg. 143.)

06. Internal Evidence that the Peshito-Syriac was made in Century I; and that it is not a mere tr...

06. Internal Evidence that the Peshito-Syriac was made in Century I; and that it is not a mere translation of the Greek.

JESUDAD said that the New Covenant Peshito is "a translation made by the care and solicitude of Thaddaeus and other Apostles." Books written, as the Gospel of Matthew was, in the Syriac of Palestine, needed very little change when translated into the Syriac of Edessa. Paul's letter to the Hebrews, the letter of James, the first of Peter, and the first of John, were all addressed to Hebrews, and probably, therefore, were first written in Syriac, the language of the Hebrews; and needed but few changes when translated into the dialect of Edessa. These few changes were probably what Jesudad called a "translation," so far as the word had reference to these books. The Apostles, when taking the care and oversight of the translation of all the books in the Peshito, were not bound as an uninspired translator would have been, to follow always the exact words of what was translated. They had divine authority to use whatever difference of expression the Holy Spirit might guide them to adopt, as better fitted for use in the translation.

If, therefore, in comparing the Syriac with the Greek text, we find that they both express nearly the same MEANING, but that in places a supposed Greek original so differs IN WORDS from the Syriac, that if the Syriac had been made by an uninspired translator, he would be justly condemned for licentious departure from his Greek copy, the reason may be, that the inspired translator has been divinely guided to make that difference; and if, in some of these cases of different wording, the Syriac meaning be more clear, or exact, or better adapted for Syrian readers than the Greek wording is, those very differences become evidence of the correctness of the Syrian belief that the Peshito was made "by the care and solicitude of Apostles." For it is evident that an uninspired translator could not, as a rule, bring light out of darkness, clearness out of obscurity, exactness and correctness out of ambiguity and uncertainty. Persons familiar with the Peshito admit the truth of Faust Nairon's remark, that the Peshito does really sometimes "make clear, things difficult or doubtful in the Greek." (Introduction, pg. 9.)

Bishop Walton quotes with approval the remark of De Dieu, that "the true meaning of phrases which often occur in the New Testament, can scarcely be sought from any other source than the Syriac. (Polyglot, Prolegomena, xiii. 19.)

J.D. Michaelis says, "the Syriac Version leads us sometimes to just and beautiful explanations, where other help is insufficient." (Marsh's Michaelis, vol. ii. pg. 44.)

WICHELHAUS REJECTS THE SYRIAN TESTIMONY that the Peshito was made by "the care of Apostles," and gives this reason for doing so, - that it "does not in all things express and religiously follow the Greek text;" (pg. 259.) But these differences, according to Syrian testimony, are differences made BY SOME OF THE APOSTLES THEMSELVES, in writing or revising the same things in two different languages. If, in some places, the expressions in the Syriac are more exact,

and make the meaning more clear, than the Greek does, the fact that they differ from the Greek more than a faithful translator from the Greek would have dared to differ, favours the Syrian belief that they are due to that apostolic authority which had a right to vary the mode of verbal expression, where this was thought to be desirable, in a different language. The following are specimens of those differences which Wichelhaus mentions, and which, as he contends, COMPEL the conclusion that the Syrian belief which has existed from the first ages till now, is a complete delusion. The reader will probably think that, instead of proving this, there is nothing in them which is inconsistent with that belief. The passages which ARE NOT IN THE SYRIAC, are not on that account to be deemed of doubtful authority; for if they are well sustained by Greek copies, that is evidence that they were afterwards added by Apostolic authority. Dr. Scrivener says that some various readings are probably due to additions made by the sacred writers themselves to some copies of their writings after these were first issued. He says, "It may be reasonably thought that a portion of the variations [in ancient copies], and those among the most considerable, had their origin in a cause which must have operated at least as much in ancient as in modern times, the changes gradually introduced after publication, BY THE AUTHORS THEMSELVES, into the various copies yet within their reach. Such revised copies would circulate independently of those issued previously, and now beyond the writer's control, and thus, becoming the parents of a new family of copies, would originate and keep up diversities from the first edition, without any fault on the part of transcribers." (Intro., pg. 18.) In MATTHEW, six differences named by Wichelhaus as proof of bad translation, are certainly not so. They are cases in which the common Greek text is admitted to be corrupt, and the Revisers of the English Version have followed the Peshito readings. They are Matthew 5:27; Matthew 9:13; Matthew 22:44; Matthew 26:9; Matthew 26:60; Matthew 28:9. In 14:24 also, some Greek copies have, as the Peshito has, "many furlongs distant from the land," instead of, "now in the midst of the sea;" so that it is doubtful whether the true Greek text differs from the Syriac there. In 7:14, the Syriac has, "how narrow"; the Greek has, "for narrow." In 10:10, Syr., 'staff'; Grk., some copies, 'staves'; some 'staff.' 13:18, Syr., 'seed'; Grk., 'sower.' 14:13, Syr., 'on dry land'; Grk., 'on foot.' 16:27, Syr., 'holy angels'; Grk., 'angels.' 21:34, Syr., 'that they should send'; Grk., 'to receive.' 22:23, Syr., 'the Saducees were saying'; Grk., 'the Saducees who say.' 22:37, Syr., 'and with all thy might'; Grk. has it not. 27:9, Syr., 'by means of the prophet'; Grk., 'by means of the prophet Jeremiah.' AN ERROR, for the words are in Zechariah 11:12-13. In Matthew 17:60, Syr., 'was hewn'; 'they rolled, placed, departed'; Grk., 'he had hewn'; 'he rolled, and departed.' 28:18, Syr., 'And as my Father sent me, so I send you'; Grk. has it not. IN Luke 9:34, Syr., 'And they feared when they saw that Moses and Elijah entered the cloud'; Grk., 'and they feared when those, (some copies have, 'when they') entered the cloud.' In John 7:39, the Syriac has, 'The Spirit was not yet given'; the Greek, 'The Spirit was not yet.' In 8:1-11, the Syriac has not the account of the adulteress. In the Greek some copies are without it; but others have it. It probably is due to an addition made by John himself after his Greek Gospel was first issued. (See the remark of Dr. Scrivener, quoted pg. xlvi, from his Introduction, pg. 18.) It has in itself strong evidence of Apostolic origin. In Acts 3:21, Syr., 'until the completion of the times of all those things of which God has spoken'; Grk., 'until the times of the restoration of all things, of which God has spoken.' 5:37, Syr., 'in the days in which men were enrolled for the head-tax'; Grk., 'in the days of the enrollment.' 10:22, Syr., 'in a vision by a holy angel'; Grk., 'by a holy angel.' 12:1, Syr., 'Herod the king, who is surnamed Agrippa'; Grk., 'Herod the king.' 12:10, Syr., 'the iron gate'; Grk., 'the iron gate which leads into the city.' 13:13, Syr., 'Paul and Barnabas'; Grk., 'those around Paul.'

17:19, Syr., 'to the house of judgment which is called Areopagus'; Grk., 'to the Areopagus.' 18:5, Syr., 'was restricted in speech'; some Grk. copies have, 'was pressed in spirit'; others, 'was hindered in word'; rendered in Revised English Version, 'was constrained by the word.' 18:7, Syr., 'Titus'; Grk., 'Justus.' 20:4, Syr., 'Timothy, who was of Lystra'; Grk., 'Timothy.' 28:13, Syr., 'Peteoli, a city of Italy'; Grk., 'Peteoli.' 28:29, Syr., nothing; Grk., some copies, 'And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.' Other Grk. copies, and Revised English Version, have nothing. In Romans 1:1, Syr., 'Paul, called, and a Chief Messenger.' The Grk. has not the word 'and.' The Greek meaning is uncertain. The Common and Revised Eng. Vers. have, 'called [to be] an Apostle'; but the Grk. may be rendered, 'One called, an Apostle.' 5:9, Syr., 'how much more shall we now be declared just'; Grk., 'how much more, having now been declared just.' 15:6, Syr., 'God the Father'; Grk., 'the God and Father.' So also in 2 Corinthians 1:3; Ephesians 1:3; 1 Peter 1:3. In 1 Corinthians 7:35, Syr., 'but that ye may be faithful to your Lord in a comely manner, not setting thought on the world'; Grk., 'but for what is comely and serviceable to the Lord, without interruption.' 10:2, Syr., 'were immersed by means of Moses'; Grk., 'were immersed into Moses.' In Php 2:13, Syr., 'to will and to do that which ye wish'; Grk., 'to will and to do on behalf of [his] good pleasure.' 2:15, Syr., 'pure sons of God, who dwell among...'; Grk., 'children of God without blemish, in the midst of...'. 2 Thessalonians 1:7, Syr., 'with the power of his angels'; Grk., 'with the angels of his power.' 1 Timothy 2:15, Syr., 'but she is to have life [bliss] by means of her children, if they, [the women]', etc. Grk., 'but she will be saved by means of the bearing of children, if they, [the women]', etc. In Hebrews 2:6, Syr., 'the Scripture'; Grk., 'one somewhere.' 6:2, Syr., 'the teaching of immersion'; Grk., 'the teaching of immersions.' 6:4, Syr., 'have gone down into immersion'; Grk., 'have been once enlightened.' 7:3, Syr., 'neither his father, nor his mother, was written in family records, nor the beginning of his days, nor the end of his life'; Grk., 'without father, without mother, without family record, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life.' 10:32, Syr., 'in which ye received immersion'; Grk., 'in which, having been enlightened.'

IN THE WORDS USED TO DESCRIBE CHURCH ELDERS, there is evidence that the Peshito is not a mere word-for-word translation, as some imagine, of the Greek Text. The Syrians sometimes used the Greek word EPISCOPOS, in the form of EPISCOPE. It is used in Acts 20:28, "The church - the assembly, over which the Holy Spirit has made you OVERSEERS;" for 'overseer' is the meaning of EPISCOPOS, anglicised in the word 'bishop.' But in 1 Timothy 3:1, where the Greek has "the office of overseer," the Peshito has, "the office of elder." In verse 2, the Greek has overseer; the Peshito, elder. In Php 1:1, the Greek has, overseers, the Peshito, elders. In Titus 1:7, the Greek has overseer, the Peshito, elder. In 1 Peter 2:25, the Greek has overseer, the Peshito, care-taker. So that the difference of the words used for the same office in all these cases but one, shows that the Greek was not a mere translation of the Syriac.

[[This was misstated by William Norton - he meant to say "...shows that the Syriac was not a mere translation of the Greek" which coincides with the title of the section, namely, VI.-INTERNAL EVIDENCE THAT THE PESHITO WAS MADE IN CENT. 1, AND IS NOT A MERE TRANSLATION OF THE GREEK.]] IN THE NAMES OF PLACES, the Peshito shows the same independence of the Greek. In Matthew 4:13, the Grk. has Capernaum; the Syr. has, The village of Nahum. In John 3:23, the Grk. has, Aenon; the Syr. has, The Fountain of the Dove. In John 19:38, the Grk. has Arimathea; the Syr. has, Romtho; in Acts 21:7, the Grk. has Ptolemais; the Syriac has, Acu.

Mr. Jeremiah Jones, in his work on the Canon, 1798, contends that the use of the name ACU, for Ptolemais, is a decisive proof that the Peshito must have been made not far in time from A.D. 70, when Jerusalem was destroyed. (vol. i. pg. 103.) He says that the most ancient name of this place among the Israelites was Aco, or Acco, Judges 1:31; that this name was afterwards changed to Ptolemais; that some say it had its new name from Ptolemy Philadelphus, about 250 B. C. He says it is certain that the old name Aco, was antiquated and out of use in the time of the Romans, and that the use of the old name Acu, in the Peshito, can be accounted for in no other way, but by supposing that the persons for whom the version was made were more acquainted with it, than with the new name Ptolemais; that upon any other supposition it would have been absurd for him to have used Acu. He says, that until the destruction of Jerusalem, one may suppose that the Jews may have retained the old name Aco still, out of fondness for its antiquity; but, he says, "how they, or any other part of Syria, could, after the Roman conquest, call it by a name different from the Romans, seems to me impossible to conceive..... To suppose, therefore, that this translation, in which we meet with this old name, instead of the new one, was made at any great distance of time after the destruction of Jerusalem, is to suppose the translator to have substituted an antiquated name known to but few, for a name well known to all." (pp. 104, 105.)

Mr. Jeremiah Jones says that a similar proof that the Peshito cannot have been made much after A.D. 70, is found in the fact that the Peshito often calls the Gentiles, as the Jews were accustomed to do, PROFANE PERSONS, where the Greek calls them THE NATIONS, that is, the Gentiles. The Peshito calls them profane, in Matthew 6:7; Matthew 10:5; Matthew 18:17; Mark 7:26; John 7:35; Acts 18:4; Acts 18:17; 1 Corinthians 5:1; 1 Corinthians 10:20; 1 Corinthians 10:27; 1 Corinthians 12:2; 1 Peter 4:3. The expression is used, therefore, throughout the Peshito. Mr. Jones says, that it shows that the writer was a Jew, for no other person would have called all the world profane; and that after the destruction of the temple, all Hebrew Christians must have seen that other nations were not to be reckoned unclean and profane in the Jewish sense, and that therefore this version must have been made either before, or soon after, A.D. 70. (On Canon, Vol. i., pp. 106-110.)

It must be admitted, I think, that the above differences are not inconsistent with the proof given by Syrian testimony that "the Peshito was written by Apostolic authority." (Wichelhaus, pg. 153.) Those differences seem to indicate that the Apostles, who had authority to deviate from their own words in one language, when writing or revising copies in another, did so deviate with respect to the Peshito text, and the Greek text. And it is evident that Wichelhaus and others, not only reject the evidence on which we must rely in order to know the true origin of the Peshito, but also create for themselves a difficulty which they do not solve; namely, that an uninspired translator, whom they praise for his great general exactness, has to be accused by them of practising, in some places, a "licentious" freedom of which no mere translator, if faithful, can be supposed to have been guilty.

07. Characteristic Differences between the Peshito-Syriac Text, and the Greek Text.

07. Characteristic Differences between the Peshito-Syriac Text, and the Greek Text. The following passages, as well as the preceding, tend to illustrate differences between the Syriac and the Greek. In some of them, it will probably be thought that the Syriac has the truer meaning, or expresses the true meaning more clearly than the Greek does. The translation of the Greek is that of the Revised English Version, the marginal readings of which imply some obscurity or ambiguity in the Greek text.

Hebrews 5:7. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC) , Also when he was clothed with flesh, he offered up prayer....to him who was able to bring him to life from death.

Hebrews 5:7. (THE GREEK), Who, in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers....unto him that was able to save him from death. Margin, or out of death.

Hebrews 6:2. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), The teaching of immersion.

Hebrews 6:2. (THE GREEK), The teaching of baptisms. Margin, or, washings.

Hebrews 9:28. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), The Anointed was offered up once, and in himself he slew the sins of many; and the second time he is to appear without the sins, etc.

Hebrews 9:28. (THE GREEK), Christ, having been once offered, to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, etc.

Hebrews 10:5. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), But with a body thou hast clothed me.

Hebrews 10:5. (THE GREEK), But a body didst thou prepare for me.

Hebrews 10:12. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), This [Priest] offered up one slain offering on behalf of sins, and sat down at the right hand of God forever.

Hebrews 10:12. (THE GREEK), He, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God. Margin, or, for ever sat down.

Hebrews 10:38. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), He who is righteous will have life[-bliss] through trust in me.

Hebrews 10:38. (THE GREEK), My righteous one shall live by faith. Margin - Some ancient authorities read, The righteous one.

Hebrews 11:1. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), Trust is persuasion about things hoped for, as if they were things done; and it is a revealing of those things which are not seen.

Hebrews 11:1. (THE GREEK), Faith is the assurance of [things] hoped for, the proving of things not seen. Margin, assurance of, or, the giving substance to. Proving, or test.

Hebrews 11:12. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), Abraham, who was incapable from age.

Hebrews 11:12. (THE GREEK), As good as dead.

James 1:18. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), The Father of lights willed, and begat us by the word of truth.

James 1:18. (THE GREEK), The Father of lights, of his own will, brought us forth by the word of truth.

James 2:10. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), He who sins in one thing is condemned by the whole law.

James 2:10. (THE GREEK), Whosoever shall stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all.

James 2:13. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), Ye are to be exalted by mercy above condemning judgment.

James 2:13. (THE GREEK), Mercy glorieth against judgment.

James 3:6. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), The tongue is a fire, and the world of sin is like a wood; and the tongue being itself in the midst of our members, blackens our whole body.

James 3:6. (THE GREEK), The tongue is a fire; the world of iniquity among our members is the tongue, which defileth the whole body. Margin, Or, a fire, that world of iniquity: the tongue is among our members that which, etc. Or, that world of iniquity, the tongue, is among our members that which, etc.

James 4:5. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), Or think you that the Scripture has said without reason, that the spirit which dwells in us, covets eagerly through envy?

James 4:5. (THE GREEK), Or, think ye that the Scripture speaketh in vain? Doth the spirit, which he made to dwell in us, long unto envying? Margin. Or, The Scripture saith in vain, the spirit which he made to dwell in us, he yearneth for, even unto jealous envy?

Or, That spirit which he made to dwell in us, yearneth [for us], even unto jealous envy?

Or, instead of, he made to dwell, some ancient authorities read, dwelleth in us.

James 5:11. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), Ye have seen the ending which the Lord worked out for Job.

James 5:11. (THE GREEK), Ye have seen the end of the Lord.

1 Peter 2:24. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), And he bore our sins, all of them, and carried them up in his body to the cross, that we might be dead to sin, and have life [-bliss] by his righteousness.

1 Peter 2:24. (THE GREEK), Who his own self, bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness.

Margin. Or, carried up our sins to the tree.

1 Peter 3:20-21. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), Into which [ark] only eight persons entered, and were kept alive by the waters. In likeness to which example, ye also have life [-bliss] through immersion,

(not when ye wash the body from filth, but when ye profess God with a pure conscience,) etc.

1 Peter 3:20-21. (THE GREEK), Wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved through water; which also, after a true likeness, doth now save you, [even] baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, etc.

Margin. Were saved, or, were brought safely through water. Interrogation, or inquiry, or appeal.

1 Peter 5:2. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), Take care [of the flock] spiritually.

1 Peter 5:2. (THE GREEK), Exercising the oversight.

1 John 3:1. (THE PESHITO-SYRIAC), Who has called us sons, and has also made us sons.

1 John 3:1. (THE GREEK), That we should be called children of God. The different translations given by the Revisers, show how unable they were to decide what is the right meaning of the Greek in some of the above passages. The different meanings given, leave the reader in utter uncertainty as to what the right meaning is. The meanings given by the Peshito are not only clear, but most of them have the appearance of being also correct.

08. The Result of trusting chiefly to certain faulty Greek copies, and slighting the Peshito-Syriac.

08. The Result of trusting chiefly to certain faulty Greek copies, and slighting the Peshito-Syriac. The Greek copies, from having been less carefully written than those of the Peshito, abound with various readings, some of which make the meaning of important passages uncertain. The result is, that the infallible teaching of those parts of Scripture is said to be destroyed.

Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF, who was President of the American committee which took part in preparing the Revised English Version of 1881, says in his Companion to it, 1883, that, as "most of the variations" of the Greek text "date from early transcription in the first two centuries, AN INFALLIBLE TEXT IS IMPOSSIBLE." (pg. 420.) He says this, as one who believes that the Scriptures were given to be an "Infallible Guide in all matters of Christian faith and duty." (pg. 494.)

Dr. SCRIVENER suggests, that in the 2,094 Greek manuscripts now known, the variations may amount to more than 100,000. Comparatively few of them affect the meaning of Scripture on points of great importance. But a sufficient number of them do so, to afford those who undermine the authority of Scripture, some seeming reason for saying that if Divine guidance made it infallible at first, it has ceased to be so now. The aim of Biblical critics has been, as Dr. Scrivener says, "to bring back the Greek text to the condition in which it stood in the sacred autographs, by separating the pure gold of God's word, from the dross which has mingled with it through the accretions of so many centuries." (Introduction, 1883, pg. 5.)

Dr. SCRIVENER admits, that notwithstanding the greatness of past efforts, difficulties still "defy all our skill and industry to detect and estimate aright." (pg. 520.) All these difficulties arise, either from wilful alterations, or from THE WANT OF EXACT COPYING, especially in the second century. Hence the extreme value of copies of the Peshito, which are proved to have been made with the greatest care and exactness from the first. This proof exists in the marvellous agreement of all early copies, wheresoever and by whomsoever made. As DR. SCHAFF says, to restore infallibility to the Greek text, in doubtful places, BY MEANS OF GREEK COPIES, SEEMS TO BE "IMPOSSIBLE." The only hope of knowing, in such places, what is true, and what is false, seems to arise from the exactness of the Peshito copies. Even the penmanship of some specimens of these, as given by Professor Adler, is of great exactness and beauty; and the Rev. D. T. Stoddard, an American missionary at Ooroomiah, in Persia, says of the Nestorian copies, "They are sometimes very beautifully written, and the best type can never exceed, and perhaps not even rival them in elegance." (Grammar of Modern Syriac, pg. 21.) This is no slight proof of the care with which they have been written.

Dr. SCRIVENER says, "The Peshito-Syriac has not yet received that critical care on the part of EDITORS which its antiquity and importance so urgently demand," and "with such full means of information within our reach, it will not be to our credit if a good critical edition of the Peshito be much longer unattempted." (pp. 317-318.) But though a good critical edition is much to be desired,

there is far greater need of readiness on the part of Biblical critics, to give to the Peshito the attention due to it, and the influence which it ought to exercise. No great changes are to be expected from a new critical edition, though such an edition is so much to be desired. The Rev. G. H. GWILLIAM, M. A., of Oxford University, will, it is to be hoped, be enabled to complete his new critical edition of the Gospels of the Peshito, "based on a number of copies of very great antiquity, and high critical value." (Studia Biblica, 1885, pp. 153-154.) He has kindly told us in advance, that in this new edition, "A certain number of corrections will be made, but that these, for the most part, will be in comparatively unimportant points of grammar and orthography." (Same, pg. 161.)

Most critics of the Greek text have been TOO INDIFFERENT TO THE TESTIMONY OF RELIGIOUS BODIES, in reference to Greek manuscripts. They have trusted too much to copies which have no known support from the approval of any such societies. The result is, that instead of establishing a Greek text upon a sound historical basis, they have given us the result of THEORIES, of SPECULATIONS FOUNDED ON PROBABILITIES, and on a comparison of copies which, as Dr. Scrivener says, "are PERPETUALLY AT VARIANCE WITH EACH OTHER," and "SCARCELY EVER IN UNISON." (Introduction, pg. 523.) These copies have been unreasonably supposed to be of supreme authority, because THE SUBSTANCE ON WHICH THEY ARE WRITTEN has survived that of other copies more in use, and has brought them down from times when Greek manuscripts, instead of being pure, were full of the errors, both of those, and of preceding centuries. The lamentable result is, that by the latest Greek Text, Drs. Westcott and Hort seem to have done more harm than any earlier Greek editors, by the selection of wrong readings, and by corrupting still more a text which they profess to improve. The statement of Dean Burgon may, with apparent reason, be regarded as lamentably true, that this text is "the most depraved which has ever appeared in print." (Revision Revised, 1883, pg. xxx.) THE GREEK COPIES CALLED ALEPH AND B, are those on which Drs. Westcott and Hort chiefly rely. They say that the readings of these "should be accepted as the TRUE READINGS, until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary." Yet, as Dean Burgon has said, these copies "have come to us without a character, without a history, without antecedents of ANY kind," (pg. 14); except, indeed, such antecedents as Canon Cook, in his "First Three Gospels, (1882)," has shown to be almost ascertained facts. He has shown it to be in the highest degree probable, that these Greek copies were made when Arianism was in high favour, and under the superintendence of Eusebius of Caesarea, whom Jerome calls "The standard-bearer of the Arian faction." (Cook, pp. 151, 164, 183.) Canon Cook says that the omissions and corruptions of these two Greek copies are "logically incompatible with an entire faith in the Saviour's proper and true Divinity." (pg. 177.) He says also, that these two oldest manuscripts, Aleph and B, "are responsible for nearly every change which weakens or perverts the record of sayings and incidents in our Lord's life." (pg. 142.) Among these changes Canon Cook mentions the following. Drs. Westcott and Hort omit the leading point in the title of Mark's Gospel, "'Son of God,' an act of singular temerity." (pg. 35.) They reject, as a forged addition, the account of our Lord's bloody sweat in Gethsemane; Luke 22:44. They omit the doxology in the Lord's prayer, Matthew 6:13, "For thine is the kingdom," etc. They reject the first words uttered by the Redeemer on the cross, Luke 23:34, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." (Cook, pg. 106.) They omit the last 12 verses of Mark, which Canon Cook calls a mutilation without parallel in the critical history of the New Testament," (pg. 120); and one which removes Mark's account of the ascension, removes the only statement in the Gospels that Christ is seated at God's right hand; removes an emphatic statement of the necessity of faith,

"and the most emphatic statement in the New Testament as to the importance of baptism." (pp. 121-122.) The following eminent critics have endeavoured to CORRECT THE TEXT OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT, and have published editions of it. John Mill, 1707; John Jacob Wettstein, 1751-52; Griesbach, 1771-75; Lachmann, 1842-50; Tregelles, 1857-1879; Tischendorf, 8th ed., 1869-1872; Westcott and Hort, 1881. Most of these have treated the Peshito-Syriac as of little importance.

Dr. JOHN MILL, 1707, is spoken of by Dr. Scrivener as having rendered "services to Biblical criticism, which surpass in extent and value those rendered by any other, except, perhaps, one or two men of our time." (Intro. pg. 448.) He did not know Syriac, but he collected the readings of the Peshito, relying on translations of it, and was sometimes misled. (Wichelhaus, pg. 246.) He speaks of the Syrians as glorifying their version too much in saying that it was made "BY THADDAEUS AND OTHER APOSTLES;" but he seems to concur with Bishop Walton and many of the learned, IN CONJECTURING that it was "made by APOSTOLIC MEN in the age next to that of the Apostles." He says that "beyond all doubt it was used by the Syrians not long after the beginning of their church," which must have been begun about A.D. 35. (Prol., sec. 1237.) He trusts to CONJECTURE, and rejects SYRIAN TESTIMONY.

WETTSTEIN says, that "if you listen to some men, this version is the most ancient of all, and made by an Apostle, or Apostolic man.....This is untrue, as will appear from what I subjoin." His proofs consist of differences between it and the Greek text. He regards it as the work of an uninspired translator, who, instead of always following "the Greek text closely, used licentious liberty in substituting some things for others, and in too frequently giving a paraphrase." (Prol., pg. 109.) The insufficiency of such reasons has been shown in the preceding section, with reference to like objections by Wichelhaus.

GRIESBACH supposed that there had been three recensions, or rectifications of the Greek text, one of which he calls Alexandrian, another Western, and the third Constantinopolitan. He says of the Syriac Version, "As printed, it is like none of these recensions, and yet it is not wholly unlike any of them. In many things it agrees with the Alexandrian, in more with the Western, in some also with the Constantinopolitan.....It therefore seems to have been AGAIN AND AGAIN REVISED at different times, according to very different GREEK COPIES. (Prol., sec. iii. 15 pp. lxxi.-ii.) These revisions of the Syriac are all PURE CONJECTURES; and he admits that his whole Greek text "is only his OWN JUDGMENT of various readings." Wichelhaus says, "Ought not Griesbach to have distrusted his recensions, when he found that the text of the Syriac version combined the readings of those three recensions? a version which is held to be OLDER THAN THE TIME WHEN THOSE RECENSIONS HAD THEIR ORIGIN. But men are accustomed to distrust all things rather than their own opinion of them." (pg. 240.)

LACHMANN did not know Syriac, and he asks, "Of what use would it have been to me to have learned the language of the Syrians, while the most ancient copies of the Peshito, and those worthy of trust, have not yet been classed and presented to view, in the way in which I have divided the Latin ones?" (Pref. pg. 24.) This question has for suitable answer, that those who know Syriac, have not only printed editions, but access also to ancient manuscript copies. Wichelhaus says of those who act thus, "Even those who appear to have laid up all store of learning, and to have searched all library-shelves, that nothing may adhere which is false or foreign to the text of

the Bible, care not to study that version of it, which all those who are most skilled in it say is most ancient; the numerous copies of which are of wonderful age, and easily viewed, and which has been found to be EQUALLY ONE AND THE SAME, not only in printed editions, but in manuscript copies, and throughout the churches of the whole East." (pg. 240.) Lachmann says of the Received Greek Text, that no learned man deems it genuine. How is it then, asks Wichelhaus, that the Ancient Syriac Version does not represent those readings which our critics call ancient, genuine, best and true, but represents the Received Greek text? (pg. 268.) "Lachmann praises what is ancient; he wishes that nothing be received which is not proved to be ancient. I wonder, therefore, why he does not think it worth while even to refer to our [Syriac] Version. If his will is to form a [Greek] text by readings from Origen, and the most ancient Greek copies; he will not deny that if we produce as a witness the Eastern Syriac Version, we have in it documents more ancient still." (pg. 268.) Wichelhaus gives cases from Luke, in which he contends that the Peshito is right, and Griesbach and Lachmann are evidently wrong. (pp. 268-269.)

Dr. TREGELLES is more daring still. He makes a statement which Syriac copies prove to be utterly groundless, namely, that "The Peshito-Syriac was frequently modernized from time to time." (Grk. Test. Introductory Notice, pg. v.)

TISCHENDORF said in an edition of the Greek Testament dated 1858, that "The Peshito was made in the second century." Of this he gives no proof, nor have I seen any clear evidence of it given by others.

Drs. WESTCOTT and HORT assert in their Greek Testament, that a foundling Syriac fragment which has no known, nor seeming connection with the Peshito, "renders its revised character A MATTER OF CERTAINTY." Dean Burgon's rebuke of this untruth has already been given at pg. xxv. Dr. Scrivener says, "Of this formal transmutation of the Curetonian Syriac into the Peshito, (for this is what Dr. Hort means, though his language is a little obscure)...not one trace remains in the history of Christian antiquity; no one writer seems conscious that ANY MODIFICATION OF THIS TRANSLATION WAS MADE IN OR BEFORE THEIR TIMES." (Introduction, pg. 533.) On Dr. Scrivener's testimony we may fully rely.

This, then, is the state of the conflict: - These critics have ALL REJECTED the uniform Syrian testimony on a question of fact, - the very testimony on which the rules of evidence teach us to rely, as the only sure means of knowing the truth on points which we cannot ourselves investigate. Dr. JOHN MILL "was a friend of truth," and he received the Peshito as a witness of what the Greek copy was, from which, as he supposed, it was made, and said, that except in some passages, "there could be seen in it, as a mirror, the natural face of the Greek text, from which it was formed." (Prol. sec. 1243.) But most of the other Greek editors speak evil of the Peshito, though they give no proof of the evil; this evil-speaking is disproved by known facts. These charges being all both unproved and disproved, the Peshito ought to be free from suspicion of being marred and mis-shapen, as it has been said to be. Meanwhile the Syrian testimony in its favour, remains uniform and universal. "No clear evidence is adduced against that testimony," as Bishop Walton says. (Prol. xiii. 16.) The credit of the Peshito stands in reality all the higher, for its having passed through the ordeal of having had to meet many charges, and being untouched by any of them. The conduct of the accusers is viewed with surprise and indignation. The harm they thought to do it, falls on their own heads. They are distrusted. They are felt to be unsafe, if not even dangerous

guides. On the other hand, THE MOST ELABORATE ATTEMPTS TO RESTORE THE GREEK TEXT TO PURITY by the comparison chiefly of Greek copies, is admitted to have been hitherto a failure. Dr. Scrivener asks, as if almost in despair, "Is it true that we are thus [by past failures] cast upon the wide ocean, without a compass or a guide? Can no clue be found that may conduct us through the tangled maze? Is there no other method of settling the text of the New Testament than by collecting, and marshalling, and scrutinizing the testimony of thousands of separate documents, now agreeing, now at issue with each other." "Elaborate systems have failed, as might have been looked for from the first. It was premature to frame them in the present stage of things." "The delicate and important process, whereby we seek to determine the COMPARATIVE value, and trace the mutual relation, of authorities of every kind, upon which" the attempt to restore "the original text of the New Testament is based.....will (as we trust) gradually develop facts which will eventually put us on the right road, although, for the present, we meet with much that is uncertain, perplexing, ambiguous." (Introduction, 1883, pp. 520-21.)

09. Testimonies founded on Knowledge and Esteem of the Peshito-Syriac.

09. Testimonies founded on Knowledge and Esteem of the Peshito-Syriac.

Bishop Walton, 1657, had some degree, but only some degree, of reliance on Syrian testimony respecting the Peshito. He said that "much is to be yielded to the general tradition of the Eastern Churches, because no clear evidence is adduced in opposition to it, and it is sustained by internal evidence in the Peshito, which proves its great antiquity; for 2 Peter 2:1-22 and 3rd John, Jude, and Revelation are not extant in the old issue." The real Syrian tradition is, that it was made not only in the time of the Apostles, but by THE CARE of Apostles; as that tradition is related by Jesudad. But as related by Bishop Walton, "The constant and uninterrupted tradition is, that the Peshito was made in the time of the Apostles, either by some of their DISCIPLES, or by APOSTOLIC MEN." Even this version of it, implies that the DISCIPLES, or the COMPANIONS, of the Apostles, would, in the time of the Apostles, submit to them what they wrote, for their correction, that it might have, as the writings of Luke and Mark have, Apostolic authority. Bishop Walton admits, that if "it were made by any of the Apostles, it would have an authority which is Divine, and equal to that of the other sacred books," and he says that therefore "he would not readily admit that it was made by any one of the Apostles." He says also, that "no one up to that time had affirmed its Divine authority;" and yet this is the very authority which the Syrians seem to say it has. (See Chap. v., especially the words of Jesudad, and of the Indian Christians.) The Syrians have a tradition that the Peshito was made chiefly by MARK. Bishop Walton thinks this incorrect, because "many parts of the New Testament were written after his death, which Jerome and others say took place in the eighth year of Nero," that is, in 62. (Prol. xiii. 16.) The great utility of the Peshito, in the view of Bishop Walton, is, that Syriac was the language spoken by Christ and his Apostles, and that the meaning of many expressions which occur in the Greek New Testament, can scarcely be discovered, except from the Syriac. (Prol. xiii. 19.)

JACOB MARTINI was Professor of Theology in the University of Wittenberg, and wrote a preface to the New Testament Peshito-Syriac, in which he said, "It is a version, but of all, it is the first and most ancient..... It is a version, but made either by one of the Evangelists, or at least, of those who.....had the Apostles themselves present, whom they could consult and hear, respecting many of the more obscure places. To this ONLY, therefore, when some obscurity or difficulty occurs in Greek copies, can we safely go. This ONLY, when doubt arises respecting the meaning or translation of any passage, can be consulted with safety and freedom from error. By this ONLY, the Greek Text is truly illustrated, and rightly understood." (See Gutbier's Preface to his Syriac N.T., 1663, pg. 26.)

J.D. MICHAELIS, in his Introduction to the New Testament, 1787, chap. vii., sec. 4, says, "The Syriac Testament has been my constant study." In section 8, he says, "The Peshito is the very best translation of the Greek Testament that I have ever read....Of all the Syriac authors with which I am acquainted, not excepting Ephraem and Bar Hebraeus, its language is the most

elegant and pure.....It has no marks of the stiffness of a translation, but is written with the ease and fluency of an original." "What is not to be regarded as a blemish, it differs frequently from the modern modes of explanation; but I know of no version that is so free from error, and none that I consult with so much confidence in cases of difficulty and doubt. I have never met with a single instance where the Greek is so interpreted, as to betray a weakness and ignorance in the translator; and though in many other translations the original is rendered in so extraordinary a manner as almost to excite a smile, the Syriac version must be ever read with profound veneration." "The affinity of the Syriac to the dialect of Palestine is so great, as to justify, in some respects, the assertion that the Syriac translator has recorded the actions and speeches of Christ in the very language in which he spoke." "The Syriac New Testament is written in the same language [as that of Christ], but in a different dialect, in the purest Mesopotamian." The question is, whether the contents of the Peshito are inconsistent with what the Syrians state to be a known fact; namely, that it was made in the time of the Apostles, and by the care of the Apostles. J.D. Michaelis did not give the above testimony with view to answer that question; yet, what he says, shows that he found the Peshito to be as accurate as it would be, if made under Apostolic care. He had found "no version so free from error." He found that "this must ever be read with profound veneration." And owing to some unexplained cause, when he had "difficulty and doubt" as to the Greek, he could with "much confidence consult" the Peshito. The Rev. JEREMIAH JONES said, "The Primitive Christians are proper judges, to determine what book is Canonical, and what is not." (On the Canon, vol. i. pg. 43.) "The Greek copies, and the Syriac ones, were both esteemed the Word of God, though in different languages." (pg. 103.)

Professor WICHELHAUS, 1850, dwells much on the worth of the Peshito. He calls it, "The most ancient witness, a version most accurate, untouched and untarnished, ever transcribed and preserved by the Syrians with the greatest care." (pg. 236.) He did not see why, with some few exceptions, it should not be "most like to the autographs of the Apostles." (pg. 264.) He said, as Dr. Gloucester Ridley had done, "The Peshito is older and better than all the ancient Latin versions." (pg. 77.) The Common English Version is from a Greek text much like the Peshito. Wichelhaus remarks, that "the ancient Syriac version represents the Received Greek Text." (pg. 268.) This is a point of deep interest to all to whom the Common English Version is dear.

He asserts that, with certain exceptions, the Peshito "is to be esteemed to be amongst the best and firmest aids for the right construction of the [Greek] text." (pg. 270.) The Rev. EZRA STILES, D. D., President of Yale College, in the United States of America, said, in an Inaugural Oration, "In Syriac, THE GREATER PART of the New Testament (I believe) was ORIGINALLY WRITTEN, and not merely translated, IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE..... The Syriac Testament, therefore, is of high authority; nay, with me, of THE SAME AUTHORITY AS THE GREEK." (Appendix to Dr. Murdock's English Translation of the Peshito, New York, 1851, pg. 499.)

Dr. JAMES MURDOCK, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, at New Haven, Connecticut, USA, and Author of an English Translation of the Peshito, 1851, says that Dr. Ezra Stiles was not the only person who believed that "the books of the greater part of the New Testament WERE ORIGINALLY WRITTEN in Syriac." He thinks that the Peshito "MAY BE something more than a mere translation; that it may have nearly, or quite equal authority with the Greek." (pg. 500.)

DEAN JOHN W. BURGON, B. D., was the author of three articles in the Quarterly Review, which, he says, were "wrung out of me by the publication on May 17th, 1881, of the Revision of our Authorised Version of the New Testament." In compliance with much solicitation, he published them separately in 1883, under the title of "The Revision Revised." (Pref. pg. ix.) He felt conscious, after the publication of his first article in October, 1881, that enough was even then on record, "to secure the ultimate rejection of the Revision of 1881," and that "in the end, it must be universally regarded as - what it most certainly is - the most astonishing, as well as THE MOST CALAMITOUS literary blunder of the age." (Pref. pp. x. - xi.) He knew that "by demonstrating the worthlessness of THE NEW GREEK TEXT of the Revisionists," he had proved that "the English translation of it must be incorrect." He soon found that "the Revised ENGLISH, would have been in itself intolerable, even had the Greek been let alone." (pg. xii.)

Dean Burgon says, "I am able to prove that this Revision of the Sacred Text is untrustworthy from beginning to end." (pg. v.) "The systematic depravation of the underlying Greek, is nothing but A POISONING OF THE RIVER OF LIFE AT ITS SACRED SOURCE. Our Revisers, (with the best and purest intentions, no doubt), stand convicted of having DELIBERATELY REJECTED THE WORDS OF INSPIRATION in every page, and of having substituted for them fabricated readings, which the church has long since refused to acknowledge, or else has rejected with abhorrence, and which only survive at this time in A LITTLE HANDFUL OF DOCUMENTS OF THE MOST DEPRAVED TYPE..... The Revisers have, in fact, been the dupes of an ingenious Theorist..... If any complain that I have sometimes hit my opponents rather hard, I take leave to point out, that..... when THE WORDS OF INSPIRATION ARE SERIOUSLY IMPERILLED, AS NOW THEY ARE, it is scarcely possible for one who is determined effectually to preserve the Deposit in its integrity, to hit either oo straight, or too hard." (pp. vi. - viii.) "I traced the mischief" (done by the New Greek Text of the Revisers) "home to its true authors, - Drs. Westcott and Hort, a copy of whose unpublished text of the [Greek] N.T., THE MOST VICIOUS IN EXISTENCE, had been confidentially, and under pledges of the strictest secrecy, placed in the hands of every member of the revising Body." (pg. xi.) In answer to Dean Burgon, it was insinuated that he could not disprove THE THEORY of Drs. Westcott and Hort. This, he says, compelled him to demonstrate that "in their solemn pages," there is only "a series of UNSUPPORTED ASSUMPTIONS;..... a tissue as flimsy and as worthless as any spider's web." (pg. xiv.)

Dean Burgon says that the Greek Text, which is commonly called "THE RECEIVED GREEK TEXT," is confessedly, at least 1,530 years old." (pg. xx.) Dr. Hort admits (see his Intro. to Grk. Test., pg. 92), that "The fundamental text of late extant Greek manuscripts generally," that is, of copies which have had THE APPROVAL OF CHRISTIAN BODIES, on which bodies we have to rely, as on well-informed and credible witnesses to the truth; he says that the text of their "manuscripts generally, is, beyond all question, identical with the dominant Greco-Syrian text of the second half of the fourth century;" that is, with the text approved by both Greeks and Syrians, from A.D. 350-400. Of this text the Peshito is one member. This is the text which Dean Burgon says Isaiah 1,530 years old. But the THEORY or CONJECTURE which it has pleased Drs. Westcott and Hort to adopt, is, that the original Greek text was VERY DIFFERENT FROM THIS, and is contained in A FEW COPIES of the fourth, or next following centuries, which are not known to have been APPROVED BY ANY LARGE BODIES free from any serious error. To account for the fact that the text of these few copies was "generally" rejected by Greeks and Syrians, Drs.

Westcott and Hort gamble with conjecture. They cannot find history to quote, and therefore invent fictions. Their chief fiction is, that "a NEW text" was formed, "different from all" preceding texts, of which there had grown up three; and that this new text was "a work of attempted criticism, performed deliberately by editors," (Intro. to Grk. Test., pg. 133); that there was "an authoritative revision of GREEK texts at Antioch, which revision was then taken as a standard for a similar authoritative revision of THE [PESHITO] SYRIAC text; that the Greek text was itself at a later time subjected to a second authoritative revision; but that the Vulgate [Peshito] Syriac did not undergo any corresponding second revision." (Intro. to Grk. Test., pg. 137.) The invention of what is unsaid in history, under pretence of PROVING the facts of history, and with respect to infallible truth, is as rash as it is wrong. But the use made of this invention of revisions which never took place, is more rash still, for it is assumed that the best text of Greek and Syriac copies was rejected by the Revisers in both cases; that the purer texts were abandoned, and the more corrupt adopted throughout both Greek and Syrian bodies in all following ages. Drs. Westcott and Hort conjecture that the leading Christians in those bodies were so weak, or so wicked, that they preferred "acceptability" to "purity of text," and were so "capricious," that their "new interpolations," their forged additions, "were abundant." (pp. 134-35.) On the ground of this slanderous assumption, they please to decide, that any reading which is "distinctly Syrian, is to be rejected at once," (pg. 163); and that the whole line of Greek and Syriac manuscripts in which this alleged "new" text is found, is to be rejected also. What evil influence can possibly have so possessed and blinded minds trained to reason rightly, that they can say what is so unreasonable? On this subject Dean Burgon says: - "We are invited to make our election between FACT and FICTION." (pg. 293.) If there had been such a revision, "we should insist that no important deviation from such a TEXTUS RECEPTUS as THAT, would deserve to be listened to. In other words, if Dr. Hort's theory about the origin of the TEXTUS RECEPTUS have any foundation at all in fact, it is 'all up' with Dr. Hort. He is absolutely nowhere." (pg. 293.) But no such authoritative revision is recorded as having ever occurred. "As a mere effort of the imagination," says Dean Burgon, "it is entitled to no manner of consideration or respect at our hands." (pg. 277.) But if it had occurred, then, according to Dr. Hort's theory, we should behold ON ONE SIDE the "choice representatives of the wisdom, the piety, the learning of the Eastern Church, from A.D. 250 to A.D. 350. ON THIS SIDE sits Dr. Hort. An interval of 1,532 years separates these two parties." (pg. 288.) "According to Dr. Hort, by a strange fatality, - a most unaccountable and truly disastrous proclivity to error, - these illustrious fathers of the church have been at every instant SUBSTITUTING THE SPURIOUS FOR THE GENUINE, - a fabricated text in place of the Evangelical verity. Miserable men!" (pg. 289.) "The self-same iniquity [was] perpetrated," Dr. Hort supposes, in the case of the Peshito, as in the case of the Greek text. "One solitary witness" to the true text, "Cureton's fragmentary Syriac, is suffered to escape, and alone remains to exhibit to mankind the outlines of primitive truth;" a fragment which is in reality "utterly depraved." (Revision Revised, pp. 279, 289.) "Who is it who gravely puts forth all this egregious nonsense? It is Dr. Hort, at pp. 134, 135, of his Introduction. According to him, those primitive fathers have been the great falsifiers of Scripture, have proved the worst enemies of the Word of God. And (by the hypothesis), "Dr. Hort, at the end of 1,532 years, aided by codex B, and his own self-evolved powers of divination, has found them out, and now holds them up to the contempt and scorn of the British public." (Revision Revised, pg. 290.)

Dean Burgon says that the admission by Drs. Westcott and Hort of "the practical identity of 99 out of 100 of our extant Greek manuscripts," with what they call "the Greco-Syrian text of the second

half of the fourth century," makes the following the only question to be answered, "How is this resemblance to be accounted for?" and he replies, "Certainly not by putting forward so violent and improbable - so irrational a conjecture as that.....an authoritative standard text was FABRICATED at Antioch;" but by owning that in the similar text of those Greek copies of 350-400 A.D., and of the Peshito-Syriac version, and the mass of Greek manuscripts, there is probably a "GENERAL FIDELITY TO THE INSPIRED EXEMPLARS THEMSELVES, from which remotely they are confessedly descended." (Revision Revised, 295.)

"THE VERY LITTLE HANDFUL" of Greek copies to which Dean Burgon refers as those on which Drs. Westcott and Hort chiefly rely in opposition to all other sources of information, are those four which are called B, Aleph, C, and D. He says, it matters nothing to these editors "that all four are discovered, on careful scrutiny, to differ essentially, not only from 99 out of 100 of the whole body of other extant manuscripts, but even FROM ONE ANOTHER; the last circumstance being obviously fatal to their corporate pretensions," because it proves that "in different degrees they all exhibit a fabricated text." He says, "that when compared with THE COMMONLY RECEIVED GREEK TEXT, B and Aleph have 8,972 omissions, additions, substitutions, transpositions, and modifications; that these are by no means the same in both;" and that "these four codices, be it remembered, come to us without a character." (Revision Revised, pp. 11, 12, 14.) The Rev. F. C. COOK, M. A., Canon of Exeter, and Editor of the Speaker's Commentary, published in 1882, a valuable work on "The Revised Version of the First Three Gospels." He mentions the Peshito thus: - "The Peshito, an independent version, and of THE HIGHEST VALUE." (pg. 37.) "Occupying the highest place among ancient versions." (pg. 81.) He names it as being one of the "authorities to which, in some cases, A HIGHER VALUE IS TO BE ASSIGNED, THAN TO ANY MANUSCRIPTS," because it is "more ancient, and better attested" than these. He says that it is "the version which probably comes NEAREST TO THE AUTOGRAPHS of the Evangelists, especially of Matthew;" and that "It supports the old Received [Grk.] Text in the passages which he dwells upon, as of special importance." "For my own part," he says, "I do not doubt that this version is more trustworthy than manuscript B, especially as evidence against omissions. In fact, in the great majority of disputed readings, that which has its decided support, has a PRIMA FACIE claim to PREFERENCE, IF NOT TO ABSOLUTE ACCEPTANCE." (pp. 143-44.) His remarks on the two Greek copies, B and Aleph, which are relied on as the chief foes of the Peshito-Syriac text, are VERY IMPORTANT. He says that they "were certainly written at a time when Arianism was in full ascendancy; when Eusebius of Caesarea was the most prominent and the most influential leader of that party," (pg. 244); and that a "combination of facts, external and internal, appears to be incompatible with any other hypothesis, than that these two manuscripts which have furnished the Revisers of the English Version with their new Greek text, were among those which Eusebius prepared by the order of Constantine." (pg. 243.) He says that the Peshito-Syriac Version "must surely be regarded as THE MOST TRUSTWORTHY WITNESS to the state of the text, as received from the beginning in Palestine, and all the adjoining districts; that it gives us distinct intimation of the existence of words, clauses, entire sentences, which are obliterated or mutilated in those two manuscripts;" and he asks whether "we can hesitate as to which testimony has THE BEST, THE ONLY RIGHTFUL CLAIM TO ACCEPTANCE?" (pg. 245.) Of B, Aleph, C and D, Canon Cook speaks as Dean Burgon does. He confirms "the charges of corruption and depravation made against B, Aleph, C and D," (pg. 229); and says that D is, "of all manuscripts, the least trustworthy." (pg. 214.) Of B and Aleph he says, "I hold it as ALL BUT CERTAIN that they were

written at Caesarea, between 330 and 340 A.D., under the direction of Eusebius," (pg. 245); whom Jerome called "the standard-bearer of the Arian faction." (pg. 166, note.) He says that the Greek Text followed by the Revisers, as well as by Drs. Westcott and Hort, is "virtually identical with B." (pp. 133, 149.)

Manuscript A differs in character from the rest of "the oldest five Greek manuscripts; Aleph, A, B, C and D." (Dr. Scrivener's Intro., 523.) "Manuscript A is the representative," says Canon Cook, "according to Westcott and Hort, of their [imaginary] Syriac recension. It actually represents the text which was adopted and used, without the slightest indication of doubt, by the great divines, the masters of early Christian thought in the fourth century," (pg. 217); it is the text "generally followed" in the later manuscripts, "especially in those which appear to have been the chief authorities for what is called the TEXTUS RECEPTUS, which, as Dr. Scrivener and others have shown, is the foundation of our Authorised Version." (pg. 133.)

Canon Cook says of the general mass of Greek manuscripts, which many critics despise, that "they ought not to be disregarded on the mere score of inferior antiquity. Because they record THE TRADITION OF THE CHURCHES for some ten or twelve centuries, and, as Dr. Hort admits, represent the fathers of the fourth century, including Chrysostom, and those who lived after him." (pg. 228.) The testimony of Canon Cook, therefore, to the value of the Peshito-Syriac, is VERY STRONG; and he represents that testimony, as others do, to be in harmony with the Greek copy called A, with the text approved by early Greek writers, with the text of the mass of Greek copies, and with that followed in the Common English Version; and also as being opposed to that of Drs. Westcott and Hort, and of the Revised English Version.

DR. SCRIVENER, Prebendary of Exeter, is said by Dean Burgon to be "FACILE PRINCEPS, without question first, in Textual Criticism." (Revision Revised, vii.) He is also named by Canon Cook as "that most cautious and judicious critic, the very foremost among those who in England combine reverence for God's Word with the most thorough appreciation of every point bearing upon the criticism of the New Testament." (On Revised Version, pg. 120.)

Dr. Scrivener says in his Plain Introduction, pp. 312, 313, "The grievous divisions of the Syrian Christians have now subsisted for fourteen hundred years, and though the bitterness of controversy has abated, the estrangement of the rival churches is as complete and hopeless as ever. Yet the same translation of Holy Scripture is read alike in the public assemblies of the Nestorians among the fastnesses of Coordistan, of the Monophysites who are scattered over the plains of Syria, of the Christians of St. Thomas, along the coast of Malabar, and of the Maronites on the mountain-terraces of Lebanon. Even though the Maronites acknowledged the supremacy of Rome in the twelfth century, and certain Nestorians of Chaldaeia [did so] in the eighteenth, both societies claimed at the time, and enjoy to this day, the free use of their Syriac translation of Holy Scripture. Manuscripts too, obtained from each of these rival communions,..... ALL EXHIBIT A TEXT IN EVERY IMPORTANT RESPECT THE SAME."

Dr. Scrivener says that "The mere fact that the Syriac manuscripts of the rival sects, whether modern, or as old as the seventh century, agree with each other, and with the citations from [the Syriac Gospels by] Aphraates, A.D. 337-45, in most important points, seems to bring the Peshito text, SUBSTANTIALLY IN THE SAME STATE AS WE HAVE IT AT PRESENT, UP TO THE FOURTH CENTURY OF OUR ERA..... Of this version there are many codices, of different ages,

and widely diffused. Of the Curetonian but one." "Adler (pg. 3) describes a copy of the Peshito in the Vatican, dated, A.D. 548. From the Peshito, as the authorized version of the Oriental church, there are many quotations in Syriac books, from THE FOURTH CENTURY downwards." (pg. 322.) "We are sure that Christianity flourished in these regions [that is, the regions of Antioch and Edessa] at a very early period..... The universal belief of later ages, and the very nature of the case, seem to render it UNQUESTIONABLE that the Syrian Church was possessed of a translation, both of the Old and New Testament, which it used habitually, and for public worship exclusively [of any other], from THE SECOND CENTURY of our era downwards. As early as A.D. 170, THE SYRIAC is cited by Melito on Genesis 22:13. See Mill, Prol. 1239." (pg. 312.) In strong contrast with this proved agreement of all Syriac copies from all quarters, from the fourth and sixth centuries till now, is Dr. Scrivener's reliable account of THE CORRUPT STATE OF THE GREEK COPIES. He says at pg. 532, "During THE FIRST HALF OF THE SECOND CENTURY," that is, between A.D. 100 and 150, "must have originated the WIDE VARIATIONS from the prevailing text, which exist in primary authorities, both manuscripts and versions; variations which survive in D, of the Greek, and in some of the old Latin codices. The text they exhibit is distinguished as Western." Its readings are "the EARLIEST which can be fixed chronologically..... The chief and most constant characteristic of the Western readings is a love of PARAPHRASE. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences, were CHANGED, OMITTED, and INSERTED, with astonishing freedom..... There was a disposition to enrich the text, at the cost of its purity, by alterations or additions taken from TRADITIONAL, and perhaps from apocryphal, and other non-biblical sources." (Dr. Hort, pp. 120, 122-123, quoted by Dr. Scrivener, pp. 532-533.) Dr. Scrivener gives passages from B and Aleph, the oldest copies now existing, in proof of their corrupt state, (pp. 543-552); and says that the text which Drs. Westcott and Hort have built chiefly on them, "is destitute, not only of HISTORICAL FOUNDATION, but of ALL PROBABILITY," (pg. 542); that it is even VISIONARY." (pg. 531.)

Dr. Scrivener says that "During THE WHOLE OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH CENTURIES, CHANGES appear to have been going on without notice;" those of them which are called Western, in Africa, France, and North Italy; those of another kind, in Egypt and its neighbourhood; and of a third kind, in Syria, Antioch, and Constantinople, (pg. 554); and that "ALL that can be inferred from searching into the history" of the Greek text, "amounts to NO MORE THAN THIS: - that EXTENSIVE VARIATIONS..... subsisted in it FROM the earliest period to which our records extend," (pg. 519); and that "beyond this point our investigations CANNOT BE CARRIED, without indulging in PLEASANT SPECULATIONS, which may amuse the fancy, but cannot inform the judgment." He says that he is "brought reluctantly to this conclusion after examining the principles laid down by Bengel, Griesbach, Hug, Scholz, Lachmann, by his disciple Tregelles, and by Professor Hort and Canon Westcott." (pp. 519-20.) He says, "Elaborate systems have failed," (pg. 520); "for the present, much is uncertain, perplexing, ambiguous." (pg. 521.) He knows of no means of GIVING SURE PROOF, by means of Greek copies, of what readings are true, and what false. The result of comparing Greek copies, is, in many cases, nothing but an OPINION ABOUT PROBABILITY; and Dr. Hort admits that these fallible opinions show "great diversity of judgment" (Scrivener, pg. 541.) It is self-evident that decisions of this kind fail utterly to establish A SURE TEXT, such as God's book must have, to be infallible. The attainment of such a text in many places, from the mere study of Greek readings, seems to be a forlorn hope.

HOW IMMENSELY IMPORTANT, therefore, is the certainty given by the agreement of Syriac copies! They retain almost throughout, their FIRST FORM, and are, as Dr. Scrivener says, "IN EVERY IMPORTANT RESPECT THE SAME." (pg. 313.) He states that, "Literary history can hardly afford a more powerful case than has been established for THE IDENTITY of the Syriac Version NOW CALLED the Peshito, with that used by the Eastern church long before the great schism had its beginning;" that is, long before A.D. 431. (pg. 313.) He says, "The Peshito has well been called the Queen of versions of Holy Writ, for it is at once the oldest, and one of the most excellent." "It is composed in the purest dialect of a perspicuous and elegant language..... No version can well be more exempt..... from stiffness of expression; yet, while remarkable for its ease and freedom, it very seldom becomes loose or paraphrastic." (pg. 319.) "It is assigned by eminent scholars to THE FIRST CENTURY, undoubtedly it is not later than the second." (Contributions, 1859, pg. 14.) As to THE RESEMBLANCE of the Peshito to other texts, Dr. Scrivener says that "It habitually upholds the readings of A, one of the oldest uncial copies, those of the later uncials, and of the vast majority in cursive characters." "I claim for codex A and its numerous companions, peculiar attention by reason of their striking conformity with the Peshito Syriac." (Contributions, 1859, pg. 14.) "Beza was the true author of what is called the Received Text." (Intro. pg. 441, note.) "Beza's text of 1598 is found on comparison to agree more closely with the Authorized Version than any other Greek text." (See Greek Text with variations of Revised Version, 1881; preface, pg. 8.) THE UNTRUTH OF STATEMENTS AND CONJECTURES made by Dr. Tregelles, Dr. Westcott, and Dr. Hort, against the Peshito, in order to sustain their own Greek texts, is fully shown by Dr. Scrivener. Dr. Tregelles collated a Nestorian manuscript of the Peshito called Rich, 7157, and has said in Horne's Introduction, pg. 264, that the greater part of the materials afforded by a comparison of manuscripts with the printed text, for a critical revision of it, "relate to grammatical forms and particulars of that kind." (Scrivener's Int. pg. 318.) Yet Dr. Scrivener, writing in 1859, said, that though "this precious document [Rich, 7157] had been collated throughout by Dr. Tregelles, together with several other manuscripts of high antiquity in the Museum," and though Dr. Cureton, Mr. Ellis, and two German scholars, had found that these "venerable manuscripts exhibit a text singularly resembling that of the printed editions," Dr. Tregelles had spoken of the Peshito, in his "Printed Text of the Greek N.T., 1854," pg. 170, as "the version COMMONLY PRINTED AS THE PESHITO." "He would persuade us," says Dr. Scrivener, that the sects of "the whole Eastern church, distracted as it has been..... have laid aside their bitter jealousies in order to substitute..... a spurious version, in the room of the Peshito, - that sole surviving manuscript of the first ages of the gospel in Syria! Nay more, that this WRETCHED FORGERY has deceived Orientalists profound as Michaelis and Lowth." (Contributions, pp. 14, 15.)

Drs. Westcott and Hort have represented the Peshito, in the Introduction to their Greek Testament, as made in the third or fourth century out of a corrupt text called the Curetonian Syriac, and have implied that all the Syrians have been deceived as to its origin. (Intro. pg. 84.) Dr. Scrivener says, "Of this two-fold authoritative revision of the Greek text, and of this formal TRANSMUTATION OF THE CURETONIAN SYRIAC INTO THE PESHITO..... NOT ONE TRACE REMAINS IN THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY; no one writer seems conscious that any modification, either of the Greek Scriptures, or of the vernacular translation, [the Peshito], was made in, or before their times..... Yet Dr. Hort regards his SPECULATIVE CONJECTURE AS "UNDOUBTEDLY TRUE;" and, though he believes that this recension was "made deliberately by

the authoritative voice of the Eastern Church," he declares that all readings so made "must be AT ONCE REJECTED, (pg. 119); thus making a clean sweep of all critical materials, - Fathers, versions, manuscripts uncial and cursive, comprising about NINETEEN-TWENTIETHS OF THE WHOLE MASS, which do not correspond with his PRECONCEIVED OPINION of what a correct text ought to be," pg. 163. (Scrivener's Intro., pp. 533-34.)

These last remarks apply equally to the untruthful statement of Dr. Tregelles, in the Introduction to his Greek Testament, that "The Peshito-Syriac was frequently modernized from time to time." (pg. v.) When the word of God is in question, it is necessary to know and show who are trustworthy, and who are not. THE ABOVE STATEMENTS, made by persons well informed and of faithful mind, will aid some, it is hoped, to arrive at the truth, by as short a path as the breadth of the field permits. Most of these witnesses reject the Syrian testimony that the Peshito was made in the time, and by the care of the Apostles. But they give no good reason for doing so, nor is it easy to see why, if Greek testimony is accepted as proof of the Apostolic origin of the Greek text, Syrian testimony should not be received as proof of the Apostolic origin of the Syriac text. But it is evident that even on the supposition that the Syriac is but a man-made translation, the three facts, that it was made at so early a date, that there is no proof that it was greatly altered in the first centuries, as the Greek copies were, and that the agreement of existing copies, and of quotations from it, show that it has remained without material change from the fourth century till now; these facts prove that its text has a purity and a stability which are not only peculiar to it, but are providential gifts exactly suited to our present need. They prove that it is able to restore to God's word much of that certainty which some have impaired, and to affirm parts of it to be genuine which they would take away.

10. Chief Peculiarities of the Text of the Peshito-Syriac.

10. Chief Peculiarities of the Text of the Peshito-Syriac.

1. Books, passages, and words, NOT CONTAINED IN IT.

2 Peter 2:1-22 nd and 3rd John, Jude, Revelation.

Matthew 10:8. Raise the dead.

Matthew 27:9 Jeremiah, not named.

Matthew 27:35. That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.

Luke 22:17-18. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.

John 7:53; John 8:1-11. The account of the adulteress.

Acts 8:37. And Philip said, If thou dost trust with all the heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus the Anointed is the Son of God.

Acts 15:34. But it pleased Silas to remain there.

Acts 18:6. Your blood is on your own heads.

Acts 28:29. And when he had said these things, the Jews departed, and had much reasoning among themselves.

1 Timothy 3:16. The word "God" is not expressed, though evidently understood in the words, "He was revealed in flesh."

1 John 5:7-8. In heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness on earth. The absence of a passage from the Peshito, is not, of itself, evidence that it is not a part of God's word; for the passage may have been added by the inspired writer to a Greek copy issued afterwards. If Greek authorities give strong evidence that such a passage is of divine origin, its absence from the Peshito implies that the Peshito was made in the life-time of that sacred writer, and before he wrote those words. But if the evidence from Greek authorities is not decisive, then the absence of the passage from the Peshito strongly implies that it is an unauthorized addition.

2. Readings which DIFFER from the Common Greek text. In Acts 20:28, some Jacobite copies have, "The assembly of GOD, which he purchased with his own blood." But most Syriac copies have "The assembly of THE ANOINTED," etc. Wichelhaus says, "If I mistake not, all the Nestorian copies have, 'of the Anointed;,' some Jacobite copies have, 'of the Anointed;,' some of them have,

'of God.'" (pg. 150.) Some Greek authorities have "of the Lord," others, "of God." Those Greek authorities which have "of the Lord," are, on the whole, the more trustworthy. In 1 Corinthians 5:8, some Syriac copies have, "with the LEAVEN," instead of, "with the UNLEAVENED [bread]," etc. In Hebrews 2:9, the Nestorian copies have, "For he, APART from Godhead, tasted death," etc. The Jacobite copies have, "For he, God, in his merciful favour tasted death," etc. Dr. Lee, 1816, without giving any authority, has placed the word "God" after "favour," and has made the passage read thus, "He, by the merciful favour of God, tasted," etc. But unless manuscript authority can be produced in proof that such a reading existed, it has no title to be considered part of the Peshito. Greek copies had "without God," as early as the time of Origen, and as the Nestorian copies are, as a rule, so correct, there seems to be no reason for doubting their correctness in this instance.

11. The Design of this work.

11. The Design of this work. THE CHIEF DESIGN has been to aid in defending THE TRUE TEXT OF GOD'S WORD, by means of the Peshito-Syriac. God has preserved the Peshito from being corrupted as Greek copies have been. The use recently made of some of these corrupt copies has undermined belief in some parts of God's Book. The testimony of the Peshito-Syriac tends to re-establish confidence in most of these parts, whether they have been set forth as doubtful or rejected. By comparing the translation here given of the Syriac text, with that of the Received Greek text, printed by the side of it, the reader can see how very much the two agree, and how they tend to fix the true meaning of both. The Received Greek text agrees in most places with the Peshito, in opposition to the new Greek text constructed by the Revisers of the English Version. The Common English Version is also proved to be, as a rule, more in accord with the Peshito, than the Revised English Version is. A hope has also been entertained of making THE WAY OF SALVATION MORE CLEAR. In the common version the verb TO BELIEVE is used where a verb is needed which agrees with the noun FAITH. The Greek noun PISTIS is sometimes translated BELIEF, sometimes FAITH, and correctly so. But the Greek verb PISTEUO is translated BELIEVE, even when it means TO HAVE FAITH; and this leaves the impression that belief of THE TRUTH OF WORDS is meant, when the real meaning is that of trust on God himself, or on Christ Jesus. The word BELIEVE means, indeed, to trust; but only to trust in the truth of words. The Hebrew, Syriac, and Greek words, which sometimes mean to trust in the truth of words, are used also to express trust in persons; and the word BELIEVE cannot express this trust with clearness and full effect. In the Common English Version, those passages in which the idea of trusting ought to be clearly expressed, often fail to convey that meaning, from the unfitness of the word BELIEVE to do so. We do not, in the language of daily life say we BELIEVE IN, or BELIEVE ON a person, when we wish to express full trust in him, with view to some benefit. We say then that we trust in him. Who is there who has not felt the difficulty of defining how a person must BELIEVE, so as to be saved? Some have said that no one really believes a thing to be TRUE who does not act accordingly. But this is plainly contrary to fact; for we may believe a thing to be good and right, and yet resolve to have nothing to do with it. Others, when asked what it is to believe so as to be saved, say that the word believe must be understood in Scripture to have the unusual meaning of rely on. But this is a poor remedy for a faulty translation. The mass of readers and hearers have to trust to the impression given by the word BELIEVE itself, which impression, in most cases, is likely to be, that to believe in the truth of facts and doctrines, and in the reality of the Saviour's history, if this belief be connected with morality, makes salvation sure.

Some may perhaps ask for PROOF that the Greek word PISTEUO does ever mean to trust.

One proof is, that other passages require repentance, devoted love, and unreserved obedience, as necessary to salvation; and that these would not be necessary if salvation were promised to those who only BELIEVE.

ABRAHAM is often referred to in the New Covenant, in order to show how we may be declared just, and saved. The words in Genesis 15:6, which describe how Abraham came to be declared just, are quoted in three places in the New Covenant Scriptures; in Romans 4:3; Galatians 3:6; and James 2:23. In each of these three quotations the Common Version says, "Abraham BELIEVED God." It may be asked, perhaps, how these passages can possibly mean more than that Abraham BELIEVED THE TRUTH OF GOD'S WORDS. It is true that the English version of these passages DOES convey this meaning; and yet this meaning implies that salvation is sure to all who believe the truth of what God says, even though they should live in sin, and care nothing about him. But these three passages must, in reality, have the same meaning as Genesis 15:6, of which they are a quotation. What do those Hebrew words really mean? The word AMAN is there used in its Hiphil form, of which Gesenius says in his Hebrew Lexicon, "It often means to have faith in, as in Job 4:18; Job 15:15; Job 34:12; Psalms 78:22; Psalms 78:32; Psalms 119:66. In Genesis 15:6, [it means] he had faith in God," that is, he trusted in God. In Genesis 15:6, the word meaning to trust is followed by the preposition IN; and the trust is said to be, not in the words of God, but "in Jehovah" himself. In the following passages the same word with the same preposition IN, can have no other meaning than TRUST IN. Job 4:18, "Behold, he put no trust in his servants. Job 15:15, "Behold, he putteth no trust in his saints." Job 15:31, "Let not him who is deceived trust in vanity." Micah 7:5, "Trust ye not in a friend." In these passages the evident meaning of AMAN with IN could not be expressed by BELIEVE. They prove that the meaning of Genesis 15:6, MAY be, and SEEMS to be, "Abraham trusted in Jehovah." If we substitute "believed in Jehovah," the meaning is, that Abraham believed Jehovah to be what he really is. But is it not evident that "trusted in Jehovah," must be the REAL meaning? Therefore, as Genesis 15:6, not only may mean, but so far as evidence goes, does mean, "Abraham trusted in God;" each of the passages, Romans 4:3; Galatians 3:6; and James 2:23, must have the same meaning; and this meaning is one which agrees with what all other passages say of the way of salvation. It does not convey the false impression which BELIEVE does, namely, that to believe the truth of what is true, saves. The word trust implies the existence of love and obedience, which other passages make necessary to salvation.

ANOTHER PROOF that PISTEUO means to TRUST, when it refers to the way of salvation, is the description given by Paul of what it meant in his own case; (see 2 Timothy 1:12,) the committing or intrusting of himself to God. He says, "I know in whom PEPISTEUKA -- I have TRUSTED, -- and am persuaded that he is able to guard my deposit, -- what I have intrusted to him, against that day." In many passages PISTEUO means to INTRUST SOMETHING to the care of another. This shows that the idea of trust is really in the word. It is used in this sense in Luke 16:11, "Who will commit or intrust to you the true riches?" Romans 3:2, "Because they were intrusted with the words of God." (See also 1 Corinthians 9:17; Galatians 2:7; Titus 1:3.) THE PESHITO-SYRIAC uses a word which means to trust where the Greek has PISTEUO. For instance, in John 3:36, "He who trusts in the Son has eternal life." John 6:29, "This is the work of God, that ye trust in him whom he has sent." Acts 16:31, "Trust in our Lord Jesus the Anointed, and thou shalt have life-bliss." The Syriac word is the same as the Hebrew word used in Genesis 15:6. It has in Syriac the same meaning which it has in Hebrew. It means in Syriac to trust. Wichelhaus says of the noun HAIMONUTHO, which is derived from the verb AMAN, to trust, "It expresses much more fully than the PISTIS of the Greeks, the true idea of faith; for it denotes that state in which..... the reliance of the heart is placed on that which is most firm and certain." (On Peshito, pg. 329.) A

FEW PASSAGES WITH THE WORD TO TRUST SUBSTITUTED FOR TO BELIEVE, will show how correctly and how clearly the way of salvation is thus described; and how fully the wrong or imperfect idea which the word BELIEVE conveys, is thus removed. No one can say that this result is one of slight importance; for nothing can possibly be more harmful than that an English word should be used to describe the way of salvation, which may lead some to believe that A SOUND CREED is meant, instead of a change of heart, and which is the cause to others of ceaseless difficulty, when trying to find out the true meaning of Scripture, or when trying to prove to others that the belief which has salvation, is not what is commonly called belief, but something quite different from it. The following passages are selected from those in which the Greek word PISTEUO is used with IN, with ON, with A DATIVE CASE, and without IN, ON, or A DATIVE CASE.

PISTEUO followed by IN. Matthew 18:6, "Whoso shall make stumble one of these little ones who trust in me." John 3:15, "So must the Son of man be lifted up, that everyone who trusts in him may not perish, but have eternal life." John 6:40, "And this is the will of him who sent me, that everyone who sees the Son, and trusts in him, shall have eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

PISTEUO followed by ON. Acts 11:17, "Since, therefore, God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us, who have trusted on the Lord Jesus, the Anointed," etc. Romans 4:24, "It was written also because of us, (that trust was reckoned to Abraham), of us who trust on him who raised up Jesus our Lord from among the dead."

PISTEUO followed by A DATIVE CASE. John 5:24, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that he who hears my word, and trusts on him who sent me, has eternal life." John 8:31, "Jesus said to those Jews who had trusted on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed."

PISTEUO WITHOUT IN, ON, OR A DATIVE CASE. Mark 16:16, "He who shall trust, and be immersed, shall be saved; he who shall be trustless, shall be condemned." Acts 18:8, "And many of the Corinthians heard, trusted, and were immersed."

Another wish has been, TO CONNECT BY LIKENESS OF WORDS, what is said of ATONEMENT in the New Covenant, with what is said of it in the Old Covenant. The importance of this is evident from the fact that what was written in the Older Scriptures, was written in part for our benefit. (1 Corinthians 10:11); and that what was said to be effected by the old sacrifices, which could not take away sins, is of special use to teach us what was really accomplished by the sacrifice of Christ, which could take away sins. This use of the older Scriptures is partly destroyed by the carelessness of translators, when they destroy that likeness of words by which God has linked the Older Scriptures with the New. The English word used about fifty times in the Old Covenant writings, to describe the efficacy of slain offerings, is the word ATONEMENT. But in our New Covenant version that word is used but once, and then wrongly; for it represents in Romans 5:11, a Greek word which means RECONCILIATION; and reconciliation is THE RESULT of atonement, not atonement itself. Atonement is the cause of forgiveness or reconciliation. In the Revised Version, the word atonement is not, I think, used at all. There are four passages in which the Syriac and Greek words used to describe the efficacy of the sacrifice offered by Jesus, are of the same meaning as the Hebrew word which is represented by the English word atonement, in the Old Covenant Scriptures. They are Romans 3:25; Hebrews 2:17; 1 John 2:2; 1 John 4:10. In Romans 3:25, the word PROPITIATION is used both in the common and in the revised version. If

the word ATONEMENT be used, the English word has the same relation to the English word used in the Old Covenant, which the Syriac and Greek words have to the Hebrew word. The passage then reads thus: "Whom God appointed beforehand [to be] an atonement, by means of faith in his blood." In Hebrews 2:17, the common version has, "to make reconciliation." The revised version has, "to make propitiation." If the word atonement be used, the passage reads thus: "That he might become a merciful and faithful High Priest in things relating to God, to make atonement for the sins of the people." In 1 John 2:2, both English versions have "propitiation." If atonement be substituted, the meaning is, "And he is the atonement for our sins." In 1 John 4:10, both English versions have propitiation. If atonement be used instead, the words mean, "God loved us, and sent his Son to be an atonement for our sins." The English reader, on meeting with the word atonement in these four passages, is reminded of the word atonement in the older Scriptures, and there he finds that when it is said that an atonement was made for any sin, the words often follow, "and it shall be forgiven him." (See Leviticus 4:1-35; Leviticus 5:1-19.)

Another passage in which the word atonement should occur, is Hebrews 9:5, "The cherubim of glory overshadowing the place of atonement."

Another wish has been to use words, the meaning of which is known to the unlearned by their own DAILY USE OF THEM, instead of words which are less known, or which are but partly understood by those who do not know Latin and Greek. There are many Latin-English words in the Common version. Those who have never learned Latin, have scarcely any CLEAR idea of what some of these mean. These words are little better to them than words translated out of one foreign language into another.

Words which do not express their meaning clearly, may also be made strongholds of error. They permit a false meaning to be given them, and become a storehouse of untruth. Thus the word CHURCH, which ought always to mean, as the Greek word does, an assembly, is constantly applied to bodies which never assemble. In the next section a list of words is given which, though well understood by very many, are wanting in clearness to a large number of people. Their meaning is given in words more familiar to most. The desire has been to use the English language ACCORDING TO ITS USE IN DAILY LIFE. In the Greek and Syriac texts, the words used are those which were used about the things of this life. And to use in any translation of them forms of speech, which differ from those in common use, is to distort and disfigure God's word, instead of giving its true likeness. How absurd and unseemly it is to prefer to call a person WHICH, instead of WHO, as the revised version does; and to suppose that "she RUNNETH," is a more holy expression than "SHE RUNS."

12. Words in the Common Version not well understood by some, in words more familiar.

12. Words in the Common Version not well understood by some, in words more familiar.

Acceptance of persons, wrong regard for persons. To adjure, to command to answer an oath. Ado, outcry. Adversary, foe. Adversity, affliction, distress. Advocate, pleader. Allegory, description of one thing by another. Alms, gifts. Anathema, a setting aside under condemnation. Angel, [heavenly] messenger. Apostle, chief messenger. Apparel, clothes, clothing. Appease, quiet. Appertains, belongs or relates to. Array, dress. Archangel, chief [heavenly] messenger. At hand, has come near. Audience, to give; to listen to. Austere, harsh. Avenge, punish for injury.

Babble, prate, talk foolishly. Backbite, slander. Baptism, immersion. Baptize, immerse. (1.) Barbarians, people of foreign race and language. Beguile, deceive. Behoved him, it was due that he; or he was bound. Believe, the Greek and Syrian words often mean to trust. (2.) Believer, he who trusts, one trusting. Betroth, engage to be married. Bewray, betray. Bishop, overseer. (3.) Blaspheme, speak evil of, revile. Born of water and of the Spirit. John 3:5. Christians are not BORN of the Spirit, but BEGOTTEN by him; nor are they begotten by means of water, but by means of God's word. 1 Peter 1:23. The Greek word used in John 3:5, is GENNAOMAI, which sometimes is applied to birth of a mother, and then means to be born, as in Matthew 2:1, "when Jesus was born in Bethlehem;" and sometimes to origin from a father, when it means begotten, as in Matthew 1:2, "Abraham begat Isaac." In John 3:5, this word must of necessity be used in both of these senses. It must mean BORN, as to water, which does not beget; and BEGOTTEN, as to the Holy Spirit, of whom no one is BORN. So that the correct English translation must be, "Be born of water, and begotten by the Spirit." By and by, immediately.

Note 1. The Syriac word used where the Greek word means "was baptized," is AMAD. Wichelhaus says, "It means, was immersed, and admirably expresses what baptism properly is; it explains what the Apostles teach, that we are immersed, and buried with Christ," (pg. 308.) He says also of Hebrews 6:4, where the Greek has, "were once enlightened," "The Syriac has 'they descended to immersion,' from which it appears, first, that the recently baptized were said to be enlightened; and next, that those who were baptized descended into a bath." (pg. 332.) He says also, "It appears from the Syriac words of 1 Peter 3:21, meaning, 'when ye profess God with a pure conscience,' that a profession of God was made in baptism." (pg. 332.)

Note 2. Wichelhaus remarks, that the Syriac word HAIMONUTHO, which is used where the Greek has PISTIS, expresses "much more fully than" this Greek word does, "the true idea of faith; it denotes that state of mind, in which..... the heart places TRUST in what is most firm and certain." (pg. 329.) John 14:1, is an illustration of the manner in which the Syriac sometimes gives a meaning which is without ambiguity, when the meaning of the Greek is uncertain. A Greek word is twice used, which in each case may either be a statement or a command. In the common version it is once translated as a statement, once as a command: - "Ye BELIEVE in God, BELIEVE also in

me." The Syriac has, "Trust in God, trust also in me," which commends itself as being probably the true meaning.

Note 3. Wichelhaus says, "To all men who love truth, it is sufficiently evident that in the letters of Paul, the office of bishop does not differ from the office of elder. This is proved most clearly by the Syriac, in which [the Greek words for] both bishop and elder are translated by the Syriac word KOSHISHO, elder. By this testimony of the Syriac, those are refuted who say, persuading themselves I know not how, that [modern] episcopacy was instituted by John. It is most certain that in the time of the Syriac translator there was no episcopal authority in the church." (pg. 331.)

Candlestick, Hebrews 9:2, lamp-stand. Carnak, fleshly. Carriages, Acts 21:15, baggage. Centurion, captain of a hundred foot-men. Chambering, Romans 13:13, deeds of bed-lust. Charger, Matthew 14:8, dish. Charity, love. Chasten, punish. Christ, the Anointed. Church, (both in Syriac and Greek), assembly. (4.) Circumcise, to cut the foreskin around. Cloven tongues, Acts 2:3, tongues divided into parts. Commend, Luke 23:46, yield up; Romans 16:1, recommend. Commit, 1 Peter 4:19, intrust. Commune, to share in common, but in Luke 6:11; Luke 22:4; Luke 24:15, talk, converse. Communicate, Galatians 6:6, Hebrews 13:16, give gifts; Galatians 2:2, to state something to (others.) Communication, 1 Corinthians 15:33, companionship; Ephesians 4:29, talking with. Communion, 1 Corinthians 10:16, [sign of] common interest in; 2 Corinthians 6:14, in common; 13:14, gift of, or fellowship of (the Spirit.) Compassed with, Hebrews 5:2, clothed with. Compassed about, Hebrews 11:30, gone round. Comprehend, John 1:5, Ephesians 3:18, perceive; Romans 13:9, sum up. Conceive, James 1:15, become pregnant. Concision, Php 3:2, those who cut and kill. Conclude, Romans 11:32, Galatians 3:22, inclose, shut up. Concupiscence, Romans 7:8, covetousness, lawless desire. Conditions, Luke 14:32, terms. Confer, take counsel with. Confess, sometimes, profess. Confirm, Acts 14:22, make steadfast. Consecrated, Hebrews 7:28, perfected; 10:20, newly made. Consorted, Acts 17:4, joined their lot with. Constrain, 1 Corinthians 7:9, have self-control. Conversation, 1 Peter 1:15, conduct, course of conduct. Conversion, Acts 15:3, turning to God. Convert, James 5:19, to turn a person to God. Covered, Romans 4:7, (sins) forgiven.

Note 4. The Syriac word, as well as the Greek word, for what is commonly called A CHURCH, means an assembly. Wichelhaus says that the Peshito describes it to be "a congregation, an assembly, a meeting, in which some fill the office of elders, others of servants."

Deacon, servant. Dearth, famine. Dedicate (a covenant), Hebrews 9:18, to make binding, by killing and dividing some living creature. (5.) Defer, Acts 24:22, to delay, to adjourn. Deliver to Satan, exclude from the Christian assembly. (6.) Descent, Hebrews 7:3, family-record. Desolate, of a person, Revelation 17:16, in want. Desolation of a country, Matthew 12:25, likeness to a desert. Despiteful, Romans 1:30, full of spite or scorn. Determinate counsel, Acts 2:23, fixed design. Devotions, Acts 17:23, objects of worship. Discern, judge of, or between. Disciple, a submissive learner. Dispensation, stewardship. Disputation, debate. Dissemble, feign. Dissimulation, pretence. Divination, pretence to foretell events. Doctors, Luke 2:46, teachers. Doctrine, teachment, what is taught. Dominions, Colossians 1:16, Lords. Draught, seat of relief. Dureth, continues.

Note 5. See the custom in Genesis 15:9-18. Wichelhaus says, "The ancients threatened men, that if they broke a covenant, they would be cut in pieces, as the animals were cut in pieces over which

it was customary to take the oath." He suggests that the words "shall cut him asunder," Matthew 24:51, probably refer to this custom.

Note 6. The Greek, of 1 Corinthians 5:3-5, implies that the WHOLE ASSEMBLY was to deliver the person to Satan. Wichelhaus remarks that the Syriac uses the words, "that YE deliver;" showing more fully that the act was to be that of the whole assembly.

Earnest, a gift given to prove fulfilment sure, sure pledge. Easter, Passover. Edify and edification, build up, building up. Effeminate, 1 Corinthians 6:9, men-harlots. Elect and election, choose, choice. Emulation, Romans 11:14, zeal; Galatians 5:20, rivalry. Ensample, example. Ensue, 1 Peter 3:11, pursue. Epistle, letter. Eschew, 1 Peter 3:11, depart from. Espouse, 2 Corinthians 11:2, engage to be married. Establish, Hebrews 13:9, make firm. Estate, low, Luke 1:48, lowly state. Estates, chief, Mark 6:21, first men. Eunuch, a stoneless man. Evangelist, one who tells good tidings. Exorcists, Acts 19:13, those who pretended to cast out devils. Expedient, 2 Corinthians 8:10, useful, of advantage. Extortion, unjust exaction.

Fables, 2 Timothy 4:4, fictions. Faithless, be not, but believing; John 20:27, be not trustless but trustful. Fashion, Luke 9:29, and James 1:11, appearance; Acts 7:44, pattern; 1 Corinthians 7:31, plan; Php 2:8, form. Fellowship, Php 3:10, sharing in; Acts 2:42, probably, the giving of gifts; 1 Corinthians 1:9; 1 John 1:3, association with. Flux, bloody; a flow of blood from the bowels. Froward, 1 Peter 2:18, perverse.

Gainsay, Luke 21:15, reply to. Gainsayers, Titus 1:9, those who speak in opposition. Gainsaying, Acts 10:29, objecting; Jude 1:11, opposing speeches. Gangrene, in margin of 2 Timothy 2:17, a deadly sore. Garner, granary. Garnish, put in order, adorn. Gatherings, 1 Corinthians 16:2, collections. Gender, beget. Genealogies, 1 Timothy 1:4, family-records. Generation, Matthew 1:1, parentage; Matthew 1:17, men of like age, or of the same period; Matthew 3:7, offspring; Matthew 12:39, men of like character. Gentiles, the nations, other than the Hebrews. Gift, Matthew 5:23-24, gift-offering. Glistening, Luke 9:29, flashing like lightning. God forbid, by no means. Gorgeous, splendid. Gospel, good tidings, good message. Grace, Romans 5:20, merciful favour; 1 Peter 4:10, gifts of merciful favour. Grounded, having a foundation on. Guile, deceit.

Hallowed be, Matthew 6:9, be held holy. Halt, Matthew 15:31; Matthew 18:8, lame; those named with the lame seem to be the crippled in hand, from 18:8, "hand or foot." Handmaid, Luke 1:38; Luke 1:48, bond-servant. Heathen, those of the nations not Hebrews. Heirs, sometimes, as in 1 Peter 3:7, inheritors, in possession. Hell, sometimes not the place of torment, but, as in Acts 2:31, of spirits absent from the body. Heresy, a self-willed plan. Heretic, one who follows a self-willed plan. Heritage, 1 Peter 5:3, inheritance, possession. Holy Ghost, Holy Spirit. Honour, sometimes, as in 1 Timothy 5:3, honour with a gift. Hospitality, love shown to strangers. Husbandman, one who tills the ground, farmer. Husbandry, God's, 1 Corinthians 3:9, God's tilled field. Hypocrisy, false show. Hypocrite, one who makes a false show.

Idol, image. Idolatry, the worship of images. Illuminated, Hebrews 10:32, enlightened. Immortality; in 1 Corinthians 15:53, this dying [body] must put on life which cannot die. Immutability, Hebrews 6:17, changelessness. Impenitent, Romans 2:5, unrepenting, without change of mind. Implacable, Romans 1:31, never at peace. Implead one another, Acts 19:38, prosecute one another. Importunity, shameless begging. Impotent, John 5:3, sick people; Acts 14:8, strengthless. Impute,

reckon. Incontinence, want of self-restraint. Incorruptible, which cannot perish. Incorruption, 1 Corinthians 15:53, life which cannot perish. This perishing [body] must put on [life] which cannot perish. Infidel, 2 Corinthians 6:15, 1 Timothy 5:8, one who does not trust. Infirmity, weakness. Iniquity, Matthew 13:41, what is unlawful; 23:28, law-breaking, lawlessness; Acts 1:18, unrighteousness. Inordinate affection, Colossians 3:5, passionate desire. Instant, Romans 12:12, persevering. Instantly, Luke 7:4, Acts 26:7, earnestly. Insurrection, uprising, rebellion. Intercession, intreaty on behalf of others. Interpret, Acts 4:36, translate. Interpretation, 2 Peter 1:20, prophetic meaning. Issue, Matthew 22:25, offspring.

Jeopardy, danger. Judgment, sometimes as in James 2:13, condemning judgment. Justify, declare righteous. Justification, the declaring a person to be righteous.

Kindred, relations of the same family, tribe, or race. Kinsfolk, Luke 2:44; Luke 21:16, relations. Kinsman, John 18:26; Romans 16:11, a relation.

Lasciviousness, lustfulness, gratified lust. Laud, extol. Lawyer, a teacher of the Law of Moses. Lewdness, reckless wrong-doing. Life, often a life of blessedness; as in the words, eternal life. In Syriac, LIFE is used where the Greek has SALVATION, and means a life of blessedness. Lineage, line of descent. Low estate, Luke 1:48, lowly state. To lust, to long for eagerly. Lust, strong and wrong desire.

Magnificence, Acts 19:27, great glory. Magnify, Luke 1:46, praise greatly. Majesty, Hebrews 1:3, greatness. Malefactor, wrong-doer. Malignity, Romans 1:29, crafty malice. Manifestation, Romans 8:19, revealing to sight. Manifold, Luke 18:30, many times; Ephesians 3:10, very much varied (wisdom); 1 Peter 1:6; 1 Peter 4:10, various. Martyr, a witness-bearer. Master, often, teacher. Meat, food. Mediator, one who stands between God and man; to stay, as Aaron did, in Numbers 16:48, God's anger. For a memorial, to bring to memory. Messiah, a Hebrew word, like Christ in Greek, the Anointed. Minister, servant. Ministration, serving. Ministry, service. Mortal, dying. Mortality, that which dies. Mortify, put to death. Multiply, to increase in number, or, Acts 12:24, in effect. Mystery, a secret.

Nations, the; Luke 12:30, those not Hebrews. Nay, no. Noisome, Revelation 16:2, hurtful. Nurture, Ephesians 6:4, instruction.

Observation, Luke 17:20, outward watching for. Occasion, opportunity. Offence, sometimes sin, as in 2 Corinthians 11:7; transgression, as in Romans 5:15; sometimes a cause of stumbling, as in Romans 16:17, and 1 Peter 2:8. Offend, often, to make stumble, as in Matthew 5:29; sometimes, to stumble, to be faulty, as in James 2:10; James 3:2. Omnipotent, almighty. Oracles, words. Ordain, 1 Corinthians 7:17, Titus 1:5, arrange, appoint. Ordinances, commands. Overcharged, Luke 21:34, be weighed down.

Palsy, now called paralysis. A parable, a comparison. Passion, after his; Acts 1:3, after he suffered death. Pastor, shepherd. Patience, sometimes as in Romans 2:7, patient continuance; sometimes, as in 2 Corinthians 1:6, bearing patiently. Pentecost, fiftieth day after the Passover; the feast of harvest-thanksgiving. Perdition, destruction. Phylacteries, words of Scripture worn on the dress. Potentate, mighty. Preach, Luke 8:1, to tell good tidings; Luke 9:2, to proclaim, to make proclamation; Luke 9:60, and Acts 4:2, to make known; or announce; Acts 8:25, to speak. Predestinate, Romans 8:29, to destine beforehand. Prevent, Matthew 17:25, to speak or act in

advance of another. Prophecy, 1 Corinthians 14:3, to build up, admonish, or comfort by means of a miraculous gift. Propitiation; Romans 3:25, Hebrews 2:17, 1 John 2:2; 1 John 4:10, atonement. Proselytes, converts to the law of Moses. Provoke, to make angry; but in Hebrews 10:24, to urge onward; in Romans 10:19; Romans 11:14, to excite to jealous zeal. Publican, a tax-collector. Purloin, Titus 2:10, pilfer.

Quicken, to make alive, give life to.

Receive, Romans 14:1; Php 2:29, embrace. Recompence of reward for transgression, Hebrews 2:2, just repayment of punishment. Recompense to no one evil for evil, Romans 12:17, repay, etc., also repay in 2 Thessalonians 1:6; Hebrews 10:30. Redeem, set free by ransom; Titus 2:14; 1 Peter 1:18; Revelation 5:9, to buy; and in Galatians 3:13; Galatians 4:5, to buy out (of curse.) Redemption, Hebrews 9:12, freedom by ransom. Regeneration, begetting again. This English word is used only twice in the New Covenant Scriptures, and both times **WRONGLY**, instead of **NEW BIRTH**. The Greek word in Matthew 19:28, means the new birth (of the new creation.) In Titus 3:5, it also means new birth: - "By means of the bath of new birth." The words probably refer to baptism, as the birth or manifestation of that new life which the Holy Spirit begets beforehand, by means of God's **WORD**. See 1 Peter 1:23, James 1:18. The divine act called begetting by Peter and James in these passages, is called in Titus 3:5, the renewing of the Holy Spirit. The false rendering, "**REGENERATION**," claims **SPECIAL ATTENTION**. Because, by means of it many teach that new life is **BEGOTTEN BY BAPTISM**, and deceive many fatally. Remission, forgiveness (of sins.) Remnant, Romans 11:5, those who are spared, a spared number; in Matthew 22:6; Revelation 11:13; Revelation 12:17; Revelation 19:21, the rest. Repent, follow a new mind. Reprobate, false, counterfeit. Respect of persons, wrong regard for persons. Restitution, Acts 3:21, restoration. Resurrection, rising up (from death.) Revenge, 2 Corinthians 10:6, punish. Rudiments, Colossians 2:8, low-grade lessons.

Lord of sabbaoth, Lord of armies. Sabbath, (day of) rest. Sacrifice, a slain-offering. Sacrilege, robbing a temple. Saints, holy ones. Salvation, the Syriac uses the word **LIFE**, where the Greek has **SALVATION**. This shows how great is the error of those who say that the promise of eternal life is merely the promise of eternal existence, instead of the promise of a life of bliss. Sanctify, make holy; the death of Christ is said to make holy by the efficacy of his sacrifice, Hebrews 9:13; Hebrews 10:10; the Spirit is said to make holy, 2 Thessalonians 2:13; and by means of God's truth, John 17:17. Sanctification, the being made holy. Sanctuary, a holy place. Savour, sweet smell. Ephesians 5:2, an odour of sweet smell. Savourest not, Matthew 16:23, dost not approve of. Schism, 1 Corinthians 12:25, division, split. Scribes, learned writers. Scrip, bag for food. Scripture, the writing; some word like "holy," as expressed in Romans 1:2, and in 2 Timothy 3:15, is understood when the words "the writing" refer to God's book. Secure you, Matthew 28:14, free you from anxiety. Sedition, Acts 24:5, rebellion. Senate, the body of elders. Servant, sometimes a bond-servant. Paul calls himself a bond-servant of Christ, Romans 1:1. He calls every Christian so, 1 Corinthians 7:22. Sinners are called bond-servants of sin, Romans 6:16. Christians are forbidden to be bond-servants of men, because they have been bought by Christ, 1 Corinthians 7:23. Settled, Colossians 1:23, firmly seated. Shambles, meat-market. Shew-bread, Matthew 12:4, bread set before God. Shrines, temples. Sleight, subtle arts. Sojourn, to dwell without fixed abode. Soothsaying, pretence to foretell events. Sorcerer, one who uses arts of magic to deceive. Spirits, 1 John 4:1, men who said that the Holy Spirit spoke by them. Stature, size of body. Strait, narrow.

Straitened, to suffer from narrowness. Straitest sect, Acts 26:5, strictest sect. Straitly, strictly (charge). Matthew 9:30; Acts 5:28. Subvert, Titus 1:11, upset. Subverted, Titus 3:11, quite turned away. Succour, help. Succourer, helper. Superscription, words written above. Superstitious, Acts 17:22, devoted to the worship of demon gods. Sustenance, Acts 7:11, food. Synagogue, a place of meeting, Matthew 12:9, for Jews; James 2:2, for Christians.

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
 - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net