

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1850.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*The Works of Algernon Sidney, 1722.*

MILTON has well said; "A commonwealth ought to be as one huge Christian personage, one mighty growth and stature of an honest man, as big and as compact in virtue as in body." But what ought to be seldom is, and what is really good on earth is seldom in perfection. The trail of the serpent is seen everywhere. Yet this is no reason, why the best things in the highest degrees should not be earnestly sought. The school-boy may be but a blotter of paper for a long time, nevertheless he should have good copies before him all the time, lest in imitating he should incurably learn a bad hand. No man can do a better civil service to his country than to hold up before the young the best models of states and statesmen. When political virtue lives in the poor-house, political liberty goes to jail. This is ever true. Therefore he who wishes well to men, should study and adduce the bright examples of former days, for the admiration and benefit of his own and future ages, and so much the more as living instances are rare.

Very few names in the history of the past are more entitled

other worthy objects, and then parents can enjoy the satisfaction of making themselves the necessary arrangements for their oldest children, while if Providence spared their lives, another visit would keep up the acquaintance of parents and children, and afford the privilege of counsel and help in all needful plans for their future and common welfare.

With these views, we commend this important subject to the consideration of our readers.

ART. III.—*An Apology for the Septuagint, in which its Claims to Biblical and Canonical Authority are briefly stated and vindicated.* By E. W. Grinfield, M. A., Editor of the Hellenistic Greek Testament. London: Pickering. 1850. 8vo. pp. xii and 192.

We are more and more struck with the characteristic difference between the theological and biblical writers of Germany and England. We do not now refer to the great minds of either country but to the literary multitude in both. The difference of which we speak is that between the rigorous and formal method of the German and the desultory or colloquial freedom of the English school. Accustomed as we are to hear and speak of German speculation as the wildest that the world has known, we must not forget that even the abstrusest transcendentalism is propounded under formulas of systematic nomenclature and arrangement, which with us are only known in works of the severest scientific character. This fashion, in the hands of original and able writers, never loses its respectability. But when we get down to the third and fourth-rate men it often becomes quite bewildering, so that we gladly turn away from the formal treatise on some trivial subject, with its axioms, definitions, and endless subdivisions, to the desultory and colloquial style, in which the same theme is apt to be treated by a contemporary English writer of precisely the same calibre.

Any attempt to account for this diversity by tracing it to a

constitutional difference in the national mind, is forbidden by the fact that it has not always been so, and that even the most ordinary English theologians and interpreters of scripture in the seventeenth century were as formal and methodical as those of Germany are now. The true solution, we believe, is furnished by the different modes of education and of authorship which now prevail in the two countries. While the English candidate for orders, until very lately, might be said to have no systematic training for his work, nor any training at all beyond the course of his own desultory reading, the German student of theology is marched, with military rigour and precision, through a whole encyclopedia of "sciences" and "disciplines," primary, subordinate, and auxiliary. With the merits of the two modes of professional study we have nothing here to do, but only with their several effects on the externals of professional authorship; and these effects are obvious enough. They are rendered still more marked, however, by the concurrent action of another cause, closely connected with the one just mentioned, but still less remote. This is the difference in what a German would call the *genesis* of books in the two cases. As a general rule, all German works, on learned or professional subjects, are the work of teachers, and grow directly out of their instructions. The university professor prints his lectures, the gymnasial rector or conrector his synopses and collections, originally made for the use of his own pupils. So fixed and settled is this practice, that a work of any learning, or of much pretension to it, by a parish minister is always viewed with some disfavour, and the cases of such men as Bretschneider, Bähr, and Kliefoth, who have risen to high places in the church by literary no less than by clerical accomplishments, are perhaps mere exceptions to a general rule. This academic or scholastic origin of most learned German works affords a further explanation of the elementary preciseness and formality by which they are externally distinguished. Even where the name and outer garment of the lecture or the text-book is discarded, the simplicity with which the learned man begins at the beginning of his subject, and assumes the mind of his reader to be a *tabula rasa* with respect to it, and proceeds with measured step from

small to great, from known to unknown, often betrays the work-shop or the factory to which the *magnum opus* owes its existence. Take up a contemporary English book of corresponding character and equal merit, as to all substantial qualities, and the chances are that you will find it, even though composed in academical retirement, savouring less of the school or auditorium than of the parlour or the combination room, and exhibiting, instead of the elaborate and complicated methods which can scarcely be acquired without experience in teaching, the easy and meandering flow as well of thought as of expression which belongs to the spontaneous meditations of the scholar in his hours of leisure.

Of both these peculiarities there are numberless gradations, arising from personal or local causes, and it is only in extreme cases that either of them is absolutely ludicrous, a condemnation into which the German often falls when the Englishman escapes by his greater freedom from pretension. As to the comparative advantages and evils of the two modes, a reader's estimate is apt to differ at first view and after more mature consideration, and also according to the standard of comparison. At first sight, and ever after as a matter of mere taste, the German extreme strikes the cultivated reader as the error of a pedant or a pedagogue, the English one as that of an amateur or gentleman-scholar. After longer acquaintance, and when measured by a utilitarian rather than an aesthetical standard, the relative demerit of the two may assume a very different aspect. When the object is to while away an hour without wasting it, in a kind of scholarlike or learned indolence, an English book of the most desultory kind above described may be a truly welcome and agreeable companion. But when the object is to find out what the book contains, or what the author means, and why he thinks and teaches as he does, commend us to the most precise and priggish *Lehrbuch* with its infinitesimal divisibility of matter, but with every atom of the system in its right place and a place where you can find it, rather than to the most genteel and flowing allocution on the same theme, in which the whole appears to have no parts, or the parts, if any such there be, are, at the same time, everywhere and nowhere.

All this is by no means an ideal speculation, suggested by the name of transcendental Germany, but an experimental truth which, in the highest degree, savours of the realty. In other words, it is associated, in the closest manner, with the beautiful octavo now before us, which, in point of paper, ink, and press-work, is among the choicest products of the Chiswick press and of Pickering's Aldine book-manufactory. If the merits of publishers and printers could expiate the sins of authors, Mr. Grinfield might well claim to be acquitted without trial. But according to the common law of criticism, he must answer for himself, and of himself we know nothing beyond what we have gathered from this volume and the advertisements appended to it. From these we learn that he is a member of the Church of England; a Master of Arts, no doubt of Oxford or Cambridge; a classical scholar of no mean attainments; a devout believer in the inspiration and divine authority of Holy Scripture; a moderate and soberminded thinker upon all subjects which he touches except one; unusually free from all appearance of vanity or ambition; which is the more remarkable in one who has spent thirty years in a laborious and (to most men) uninviting study, the fruits of which he has given to the world in two works hitherto unknown to us, but of which we may hereafter give a more particular account. The first is a Hellenistic edition of the New Testament, in which it is explained by illustrations from the Septuagint; the other Hellenistic Scholia on the New Testament, derived from Philo and Josephus, the Apocrypha and Fathers. The almost exclusive study of Hellenistic Greek, for so long a period, while it must have placed him at the head of this his favourite department, has not failed to contract and distort his views of other subjects, and if not to originate at least to strengthen habits of weak and inconclusive reasoning, the more surprising because found connected both with learning and with moral qualities, which entitle their possessor to the most unfeigned respect. Of this logical deficiency, or intellectual disproportion, we have been painfully sensible in trying to obtain a clear view of the author's doctrine as propounded in the book before us, and of the grounds on which it rests, the result of which attempt, such as it is, we shall now proceed to lay

before our readers, with a few necessary comments of our own.

The title may be thought a misnomer by a superficial reader of the volume, because instead of being an *apology*, it really asserts a claim or pretension of the highest kind. But this is in strict accordance with the ancient and patristic usage of the Greek word, as applied to those intrepid arguments, in which the early champions of the Christian faith demanded for it, at the hands of heathen emperors and wise men, not toleration or indulgence, but submissive recognition, as of an infallible authoritative revelation. As the word *apology*, however, in its popular and modern acceptation, does not convey to the English reader the true character of Mr. Grinfield's doctrine, it is the more important that it be intelligibly stated, a service which it can hardly be said to have received at the hands of its respected author, but which even the humblest of his critics, who has ascertained his meaning, may, without the least presumption, undertake to do instead of him. That the reader may be in a situation to do justice to this statement and the comments which shall follow it, we beg leave to refresh his memory by a very brief preliminary statement, with respect to the history of opinion on the subject of the Septuagint Version.

The traditional history of its origin is well known. According to its most embellished form, the seventy-two translators, sent from Jerusalem to Egypt at the request of Ptolemy Philadelphus, were shut up singly or two and two in cells, and produced as many independent versions, which were found on comparison to tally, word for word. The miraculous part of this account is wanting in the oldest narratives upon the subject. Whether either form of the tradition has respect to the Law in the wide sense as meaning the Old Testament, or in the strict sense as meaning the Pentateuch, is still a matter of dispute. That the whole was certainly not the work of the same hands, and probably not of the same age, is clear from the glaring inequality of the execution, and the difference of Greek style, idiom, and diction, in the several parts. Common to all accounts, and now universally admitted, are the facts, that this translation was completed long before the birth of Christ, and was in common use among the Jews at the time of his appearance.

The contemporary Jewish writers, Philo and Josephus, habitually quote it in their writings. The best historical critics are agreed that it was used even in the synagogues, wherever the Greek language was vernacular or generally known. In the New Testament itself it is continually quoted or referred to. Mr. Grinfield, whose protracted Hellenistic studies entitle him to speak with some authority, maintains that this is true to a far greater extent than is commonly alleged on one side or admitted on the other. Be this as it may, there can be no doubt, that the Hellenistic Jews, for many generations, received the Septuagint as an authentic version of their Scriptures. It is equally certain that they afterwards rejected it, and that between the advent of our Lord and the completion of the Babylonish Talmud in or before the sixth century of the Christian era, a feeling of hostility to this translation had begun to prevail among the learned Jews, and sometimes found vent in expressions still on record that are absolutely ludicrous. Such are the sayings often quoted, that darkness overspread the earth when the Septuagint version was completed, and that the sin of making it, if not of using it, was equal in atrocity to that of making or worshipping the golden calf.

This total change in the estimation of the Septuagint version by the Jews themselves is commonly ascribed to the virulence of anti-christian controversy. The advocates of Christianity after the first generation were familiar only with this form of the Old Testament, and their Jewish adversaries would naturally fall back on the inspired original, as well when the version really failed to give the true sense, as when worsted in argument and anxious for a pretext of retreat. At the same time, this effect would be promoted by the gradual disuse of the Greek language in extensive regions, where the Jews would naturally and most justly prefer the inspired original to a version never perfect and continually growing less intelligible. But whatever may have caused this revolution of opinion and of feeling in the Jews, there can be no doubt that it led, by a violent reaction, to the opposite extreme among the Christians. In proportion as one party learned to depreciate the Septuagint, and to insist upon the permanent and exclusive claims of the

inspired text, the adverse party, to whom that text was for the most part inaccessible, clung to the famous and time-honoured version which to them had so long held the place of an original. The honour which had practically thus been put upon it, now began to be even theoretically claimed for it. A version originally made in the noblest and most cultivated of all human tongues, and subsequently honoured by the composition of inspired books in the same dialect, and by the adoption of its religious terminology, as well as by direct quotations from it, might very plausibly be represented as itself invested with divine authority, and as having thereby superseded the original. This doctrine was not only soothing to the pride but indulgent to the ignorance and indolence of those who were familiar with Greek, either as their mother tongue or as the language of polite and learned intercourse, but who could only make themselves acquainted with Hebrew by laborious exertion, and who shared in the Greek and Roman prejudice against it as a language of Barbarians. From these and possibly from other causes, which we cannot now stop to investigate, the Septuagint became established in the Greek Church, either in theory or practice, as the very word of God, to the virtual if not the nominal exclusion of the Hebrew text.

The next stage in the progress of opinion on this subject is one by no means difficult to trace. In proportion as Greek gave way to Latin in the western provinces, and Jerome's direct translation from the Hebrew supplanted the Greek version, there arose a party whose interest it was to deny the authority which had so long been conceded to the Septuagint. Many of these insisted on transferring the usurped pre-eminence to their own oracle, the Vulgate, while the more enlightened were content to claim it for the Hebrew text, as the inspired original. This claim was urged with new zeal at the time of the Reformation and the Revival of Letters which preceded it. Its advocates, however, still cherished a profound respect for the Septuagint, as a version venerable from its antiquity and signally honoured by our Lord and his apostles. The remarkable agreement, in a multitude of cases, between the New Testament quotations and this version, led some learned men to the conclusion, that although not inspired, it

presented the true sense of the original in a purer form than the existing Hebrew text, which they supposed to have been corrupted, either fraudulently by the Jews or inadvertently by others.

In opposition to this new view of the matter it was afterwards unanswerably argued, that in order to entitle any version to the preference above even a corrupted original, it must be proved to have been made before the alleged corruption, with strict correctness and fidelity, and to have been itself preserved from all corruption; requisitions which can never be complied with by this or any other ancient version. Whatever reasons, therefore, may exist for considering the Hebrew text corrupt, the very same reasons must forbid the substitution of a version for it. At the same time it was argued, that since the Hebrew text could not have been corrupted before Christ, or he would not have sanctioned it, both negatively, by his silence as to any such corruption, and positively, by appealing to the scriptures as they then existed; since the possibility of subsequent corruption was precluded by the mutual vigilance of Jews and Christians; and since the only motive of the Jews must have been the desire to expunge the proofs of Christ's Messiahship, which still exist, and are even said to be stronger in the Hebrew than in any ancient version; we have every reason to believe, that the Hebrew text has undergone less change than that of any ancient version, preserved in the ordinary way, without that extreme and almost superstitious scrupulosity, with which the Jews are known for ages past to have watched over their original scriptures.

The tendency of these considerations was to turn the tables, or invert the mutual relation of the Hebrew and Greek text of the Old Testament. Instead of alleging the corruption of the latter and the consequent necessity of appealing to the former, those who admitted the validity and force of the reasons just recited, but still cherished a traditional respect for the most ancient and most highly honoured of all versions, were obliged to harmonize their views on both points by maintaining that the Septuagint, although at first a perfect or at least a masterly translation, had itself been corrupted by the lapse of time, and was only entitled to

consideration so far as it could be shown to have escaped this alterative process.

From this ground the transition was an easy one to that extreme depreciation of the Septuagint, by which some modern schools of criticism have been distinguished and even characterized. Let it once be conceded that the advantage, not merely as to inspiration, but even as to purity of text, is on the side of the original, and the centrifugal force of these critics is so great as to forbid their stopping short of the opposite extreme. Their fundamental principle is All or Nothing. The Septuagint, if not an authoritative standard, must be absolutely worthless. If not a judge in the last resort, it cannot even be a witness. Such, when stripped of their sophistical disguises, are the shallow and precipitate reasonings, which have led some to the total and contemptuous neglect of this most ancient and important version.

But this ground is too hollow and factitious to be long occupied by candid and enlightened critics; and accordingly we find that in exact proportion as the strongest and the soundest minds of all schools and parties have been sensibly receding from other extreme doctrines in relation to the criticism of the scriptures, there has been a similar and simultaneous recession from this false position with respect to the Septuagint version. It may be regarded as one of the points on which the learned, after many oscillations of opinion, have at length subsided into an agreement, equally removed from the error of the Fathers who regarded the Septuagint version as a second revelation, by which the first had been legitimately superseded, and that of the contemporary Jews, who not content with rejecting its unauthorized pretensions to take precedence of the Hebrew text, repudiated and denounced it as an impious abomination. Individual exceptions there will always be; but the great majority of learned critics at the present day are just as unanimous in condemning both of these extremes, as in condemning those of Buxtorf and Parkhurst with respect to the vowel points, or those of the Hebraists and Purists with respect to the Greek of the New Testament.

Such is the wise and learned compromise, if such it may be called without awakening unfortunate associations, in which

the violent disputes and extreme doctrines of preceding ages have been forgotten but which the author of the work before us now seeks to disturb by the new and startling doctrine here propounded, which is neither simply an advance nor simply a recession, but a monstrous mixture of the two, combining one of the most antiquated forms of opinion on the subject with an inconsistent and incongruous extravagance never before heard of. The doctrine of the work before us is, that the Septuagint version is inspired, and precisely equal in canonical authority to the Hebrew text, or rather paramount to it, on account of its close affinity to the New Testament, arising from community of language, dialect, and diction, and from its being directly quoted in the New Testament itself.

We have called this a new and startling doctrine. Of its novelty, we think, there can be no doubt. Without pretending to assert, of our own knowledge, that it never has been broached before, we rely upon the absence of any such intimation by the author, who is not the man to seek a poor distinction by suppressing such a fact, if known to him. Without directly claiming it, so far as we remember, as his own, he does so indirectly by propounding it, not as a mere curious speculation, but as a practical remedy for evils which he thinks inseparable from all former views, or at least such as none of them has ever yet availed to cure. We call the doctrine startling on account of the effect which it must have, if true, or if received as true; on the whole work of translating and interpreting the scriptures, and the obvious necessity of some contrivance by which interpreters may steer between a version and original alike and equally inspired, but in a multitude of cases quite irreconcilable.

For these reasons we propose to state, as briefly and clearly as we can, the grounds of Mr. Grinfield's theory, so far as we can ascertain them, scattered as they are throughout his volume, with an incoherence so extreme, that, to use a most expressive German figure, they might almost seem to have been snowed into it. From the first page of the text to the last page of the notes, there is a constant iteration of his theme, without ever seeming to satisfy himself by clear and full expression of his own ideas. The effect of this is aggravated by

a very helpless and inartificial style, rendered still more obscure by a peculiar mode of punctuation, which the author has invented for himself, with the usual result of rendering his sentences almost unreadable by others. These facts we are obliged to state in justification of our not attempting to give the author's arguments and reasons in his own words, which would either be impossible or useless, but with all fidelity, as if we were speaking for ourselves.

1. In the first place, Mr. Grinfield seems to think it a priori probable, that before the change from a local and temporary dispensation to an ecumenical and final one, the revelation which had been originally given in the language of the chosen people, and thereby sealed up from the world at large, would be transfused, under Divine direction, into a language more extensively known and common to all civilized and cultivated nations. Such a transfusion would at least make the analogy between the Word and Church of God more perfect. As the latter was to undergo a total change of form before the change of dispensations and in order to it, why should not the former undergo a like change for precisely the same purpose? Now there was such a version of the Hebrew scriptures made, in the interval between the Old and New Testament, into what was then becoming the *κοινή διάλεκτος* of the civilized world, and under circumstances certainly remarkable, even when stripped of all mythical embellishment. Can this coincidence be purely accidental or without significance? Such seems to be the a priori argument for Mr. Grinfield's doctrine, ever present to his mind, though nowhere very clearly stated.

2. This antecedent probability, arising from the mutual relation of the old and new economy, our author seems to think confirmed by the fact, that when the New Testament was written, it was written in the very language of this ancient version; not merely in Greek, but in that very kind of Greek, that strange local or provincial Greek, the earliest specimens of which are furnished by the Septuagint version. Why was not the New Testament, as well as the Old, written in Hebrew? Because it was no longer meant to be a local but a universal revelation? Why then not in Attic Greek, or in the Macedonian dialect, to which the conquests of Alexander had

imparted such extensive currency? Our author's answer to this question, if we rightly apprehend him, is, because the Old Testament had already been translated into Greek, and thus provided an appropriate idiom and vocabulary for the new revelation.

3. In accordance with this view of the matter, it is urged, that the whole religious terminology or theological nomenclature of the New Testament, instead of being borrowed from the classics or invented *de novo*, is derived in mass from the Septuagint version. This is one of the most interesting points of Mr. Grinfield's argument, and one which his peculiar studies must have specially prepared him to illustrate. But we look in vain for any detailed statement of the facts in this book, and can only hope to find it in one or the other of his Hellenistic works already mentioned. His argument derived from it appears to be, that this use of the version by inspired writers puts it on a footing of equality with the New Testament itself.

4. The grand argument, however, upon which our author seems to rest, is the use made of the Septuagint in quotation. Why should inspired writers quote it, even where it differs from the Hebrew, if it was not a part of scripture, and as such entitled to be so used, as a matter not of mere convenience but of right and duty? Mr. Grinfield strives to fortify this argument, which is in fact his main defence, by urging that this use of the Greek version is far more extensive than has usually been imagined even by its advocates. For the detailed proof of this general statement he seems to refer to his Hellenistic edition of the New Testament. But whether it be true or false, is a question which can only affect the force and not the validity of the argument. For this reason we shall not dispute it, but allow it all the weight which Mr. G. considers it as adding to this part of his ratiocination.

5. We hardly know whether we should mention, as an independent argument, a reason upon which the author lays great stress, and of which he speaks repeatedly with great excitement, as a new and wonderful discovery, imparted to himself, he almost seems to think, by special revelation. This is the supposed fact, that our Saviour, in his childhood, was taught

to read the Septuagint version. However interesting such a fact may be historically, we are wholly at a loss to understand the weight attached to it by Mr. Grinfield in this argument. It seems to have occurred to him after he began to write the work before us, and to have so affected his religious sensibilities, that without attempting any proof of the alleged fact, or showing how it is to be applied, he merely dwells upon it in a kind of rapture, which is much more edifying than convincing.

6. Subsidiary to these arguments is one derived from certain practical effects which have resulted and, according to our author, must result from a refusal to regard the Septuagint version as canonical and equally inspired with the Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament. We were struck, in our perusal of the volume, with the number and variety of evils, which the author, sometimes quite ingeniously, derives from this unsuspected source. The greater number we have quite forgotten, having taken no pains to record them, and are not disposed to go back now in search of them. Two of the most important, which we still retain, may serve as samples of the rest. The first is what the author more than once describes as German and American neology, for which "bad eminence" our country is indebted to the learned skepticism of Mr. Norton. This neology is traced, we scarcely know by what means, to the neglect of Hellenistic learning and exclusive study of the Hebrew scriptures. A more plausible deduction of the same sort is the one that traces to this origin the Judaizing spirit of the Puritans and Millennarians. These however are mere adjuncts to the main arguments before recited, with which they must either stand or fall, and to which the comments which we have to offer will be consequently limited.

Our first remark is, that the arguments adduced by Mr. Grinfield either prove too little or too much. If, as he quietly assumes, "things must be as they may," if possibility, necessity, and certainty, are all identical or mutually presuppose each other, then he has certainly demonstrated, that an inspired translation of the Hebrew Scriptures not only might but must be made before the change of dispensations, and that only such a version could have possibly supplied the terms required to express the peculiar truths of Christianity, and that

from such a version only could our Lord and his apostles possibly have quoted. But if all this, though admitted to be possible, and therefore credible when proved, cannot be proved at all; if an uninspired and imperfect version, providentially provided, would have answered all the purposes in question; if from such a version the inspired writers of a later date might be led to draw their terms and their quotations, under a divine direction shielding them from error; then the fact that all this really took place is no proof that the Septuagint version was really inspired, but only that it was employed in the promotion of a great and glorious providential purpose, which we heartily believe and are as ready to maintain as Mr. Grinfield can be.

If, on the other hand, it be assumed, that an inspired Greek version was essential to the end proposed, the argument proves too much for our author's purpose, since it proves that the Hebrew text was thenceforth useless, being superseded by a version equally inspired, and therefore really a new revelation, adapted and intended to succeed and do away the old; which is precisely the old doctrine held by some of the Fathers, and the practical belief of the Greek Church at this day, against which Mr. Grinfield here protests with more solemnity than logic.

But the fatal objection to this doctrine is, that the inspired text and the inspired version do not agree. It is in vain that Mr. Grinfield tries to overcome this difficulty, by maintaining that the Hebrew must be interpreted according to the Septuagint. There are cases in which this would be as hopeless as to make one verse in the translation determine the sense of an entirely different verse in the original. Our author strives indeed to do the impossible, by pretending that our knowledge of the meaning of Hebrew words is derived from the Septuagint version. He might almost as well say that our knowledge of Homer is derived from Virgil. The meaning of most words in the Hebrew Bible is as well ascertained by tradition, usage, and analogy, as those of any other ancient writings. This notion belongs to a system or a school which we had fondly believed to be long since exploded, but which seems to linger still in England. Its resuscitation here is only one of many proofs, that Mr. Grinfield has no very profound knowledge of the Hebrew

language. If he had, this book must have contained at least some incidental proof of it. If he had, he could scarcely have confounded the Samaritan Pentateuch with the Samaritan Version, as he seems to do on p. 169. If he had, he could not possibly have entertained such superstitious notions as to the terrible obscurity and difficulty of the language, upon which his doctrine with respect to the necessity of an inspired version seems to rest. All these erroneous prepossessions would be instantly dispelled by the most elementary knowledge of the language itself. If our suspicions as to this point are well founded, we cannot regard it as a proof of Mr. Grinfield's wisdom, that he should have spent thirty years in studying the version without ever seeking to compare it with the original, which he admits to be equally inspired. We can only explain this by supposing, what is probable for other reasons, that his recognition of the Hebrew text is merely nominal, and that to all practical intents and purposes he looks upon the Septuagint version as complete in itself and all-sufficient.

If, on the other hand, he really believes, that the Hebrew and Greek texts are co-ordinate parts of the inspired canon, how can he account for the irreconcilable discrepancies between them? That such discrepancies exist is as notorious to all who have compared them, as that Greek and Hebrew are written in opposite directions. If their existence is accounted for by assuming a corruption of the text, on which side are we to assume it? Why should the inspired original be suffered to become corrupt any more than the inspired version? Or why should a version be inspired and then abandoned to corruption, so as to defeat its very purpose? And if either is essentially corrupted, what assurance have we that the other is not? If it be said that the truth sometimes lies on one side and sometimes on the other, then as wide a door is opened to the discretion or caprice of the interpreter, as by any of those systems of neology which fill the mind of Mr. Grinfield with horror.

Little as we have said, it is enough, we think, to show, that of all conceivable hypotheses, in reference to the mutual relation of the Greek and Hebrew text of the Old Testament, this is the most improbable a priori, as well as the most destitute

of proof a posteriori; the most irrational in theory, as well as the most inconvenient, useless, and unsafe in practice. We are far from denying that our author's arguments, though loosely and confusedly expressed, have some plausibility and force; but in the same degree that this is true, they tend not to establish his belief but to refute it. They all prove either nothing or too much. The shafts of his logic either fall short of the mark, or shoot beyond it towards the very point which he was anxious to avoid. So far as they have any force, they all go to demonstrate that the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is either sufficient or superfluous.

A more inventive or less candid writer might have framed, out of the very same materials, a theory which, although false, would not have been so easily refuted. By alleging that the Septuagint text was not a version but a new and improved form of the Old Testament revelation, designed to supersede the Hebrew text forever, every one of the absurdities and contradictions which embarrass Mr. Grinfield's mongrel system might have been avoided, and every one of the important ends at which he aims accomplished. It is to this conclusion, though he does not seem to know it, that his a priori argument legitimately tends. For this he might have urged the analogy of the Hebrew and Greek Matthew, as now explained and held by many eminent authorities. In this way too he would have freed himself from the necessity of reconciling two co-ordinate but inconsistent revelations, a necessity which now hangs like a millstone round the neck of this beloved but predestined whimsey.

But while such a doctrine would have been exempt from most of the objections which are urged against the one before us, it would still have been exposed to one, extremely simple but extremely fatal. The captivating theory which we have sketched has every thing to recommend, embellish, and confirm it, if it can only be proved to be true. But alas, this is precisely what cannot be done. The common-sense view of the matter to which all judicious critics, and indeed all plain men who investigate the subject, will still come back at last, is, that if we once admit the divine origin of the Hebrew Scriptures to be fairly ✓ proved—and this hypothesis is common to all the theories of which we have been speaking—we are bound by every law of

reason and religion to hold fast to it, until it can be shown to have been abrogated, not by an ingenious array of probabilities and plausible analogies, but by direct conclusive evidence, as clear and strong as that which demonstrates the original inspiration of the Hebrew Bible. But how immeasurably far short of such evidence does that fall, which consists in showing that a Greek Old Testament was greatly needed, and that Christ and his Apostles used it as a storehouse of religious phraseology and a source of illustrative quotation. All this might have been done with an inspired and faultless version; but it might also have been done with a human and imperfect one; and therefore the bare fact that it was done can prove nothing, either one way or the other.

From the publication of this volume we should be happy to anticipate two benefits. The first is the confirmed belief of the true doctrine, which it labours among others to demolish. The second is a general return to the enlightened, rational, and diligent study of the Septuagint version, not apart from the Hebrew text and in a kind of opposition to it, which can only lead to such results as those developed in the book before us, but in such connection with it and subordination to it, as will furnish the best safeguards against both extremes, that of ignorant or prejudiced depreciation, as well as that of overweening admiration and idolatrous attachment.

ART. IV.—*Communion—The difference between Christian and Church Fellowship, and between Communion and its Symbols; embracing a Review of the arguments of the Rev. Robert Hall, and Rev. Baptist W. Noel, in favour of Mixed Communion.* By G. F. Curtis, A. M., Professor of Theology, Harvard College, Ala. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, in Arch Street. 1850.

WE are not surprised that the subject of Free Communion is beginning to attract the attention of the American Baptist brethren in this country, as it has of the churches of that de-