

**FRANCIS HUYSHE**

**Vindication of the Early Parisian Greek Press**

*A Correspondence extracted from:*

**The British Magazine (London) Vol III. 1833:**

**pp. 283ff., 427ff., 548ff., 658ff.**

**and**

**The British Magazine (London) Vol. IV. 1833:**

**pp. 29ff., 161ff., 276ff., 411ff., 530ff., 632ff., 757ff.**

**An examination of the sources and methods of Robert Stephens in  
his production of the Textus Receptus Editio Regia**

to propose as a paraphrase of the passage—"Rejoice not, &c.," for times may alter; yourself as well as your enemy are in the hands of God; his prosperity may be restored; yours, through the justly incurred displeasure of the Almighty may be removed, and then what will become of your short-lived triumph? *with what shame and confusion of face when you see him shall you then be covered?* That this would be the thought which would instantly occur to Jewish readers, may, I think, be inferred from Micah vii. 10, confirmed by a great variety of other texts with more or less of parallelism, which any concordance may supply, *e. g.* Job viii. 22; Psalm lxxxvi. 17, cxii. 10.

That either King Solomon, or an apostle when he inculcated the best course of action, should suggest, amongst others, 'motives' not exactly the 'best,' considering the very different modes of instruction in which the spirit of truth has condescended to make its appeal to the human heart, may readily be allowed; but that in any instance the same spirit should suggest one essentially, however slightly, corrupt, would imply a contradiction in terms to suppose. And more particularly with regard to the personal character of St. Paul; that under any inducement he should be content to compromise for the reservation of a single corner of the heart, where an evil affection might yet linger, is what I cannot imagine. Would he not think it compromising that universal law of love, which no writer has ever more energetically enforced? Or can we suppose him at variance with James ii. 10? Not only when he is directly exhorting or giving precepts, but when even yielding to a weaker brother, when waving non-essentials, when becoming all things to all men, or when speaking after the manner of men, is not this principle in his own language, "the fulfilling of the law," virtually always avowed, always inculcated, always acted upon? With a mind thus affected, and so strongly evidenced in his writings, I can no more than the self-named *Amathes* conceive 'any qualification' of the Divine precept, which forms the very burden of the paragraph he is writing, under any circumstances compatible.

I am, Sir,  
Your grateful reader,  
S. S.

#### VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIAN GREEK PRESS.

*To the Editor of the British Magazine.*

SIR,—Mr. Greswell's view of the Early Parisian Greek Press, in my opinion, makes a most valuable addition to English literature. The press, when it was first applied to Greek and Latin, had an effect, naturally to be expected, but very little attended to—the destruction of the documents which it followed.

The multiplication of the printed copies took away the value of those written ones; and when future editions wanted them, they were many of them no longer to be found; they existed only in the printed copies.

Hence the high value of early editions, and the absolute necessity of a full investigation of the character and circumstances of the persons who superintended these editions. The learned have not been without this aid; but it has hitherto been confined to them, and has been made such a matter of dry detail, that few will make further use of such works than mere books of reference. Mr. Greswell, by mingling the history of the times, which really belongs to the subject, has the high merit of producing a book that will inform and please every reader.

In the "View," however, "of the Greek Parisian Press," there is one point which ought most deeply to interest all—viz., its editions of the Greek Testament. And this concerns not only those who read the received Greek text, but all who accept the authorized version as the Word of God. I was pleased, therefore, at observing so large a portion of Mr. Greswell's work employed in the lives of Robert Estienne and his son Henry; to whom sacred criticism is under such deep obligations; but to whom such a measure of black ingratitude and foul aspersion has been repaid. In this work of unceasing defamation, it is with feelings of deep shame I say it, England has been pre-eminent. The prince of critics, who once dreamt of taking an incomparably higher place in sacred criticism than even that which he obtained in classical, could say (Phileleutherus Lipsiensis, xxxii) "The present text was first settled, almost 200 years ago, out of several MSS., by Robert Stephens, a printer and bookseller, at Paris," and in his celebrated letter to Archbishop Wake, April 1716, "After the Complutenses and Erasmus, who had but very ordinary MSS., it has become the property of booksellers. Robert Stephens's edition, set out and regulated by himself alone, is now become the standard. That text stands as if an apostle was his compositor," (p. 232, Burney.) The last and still greater Richard, can talk of "the craft of printer and editor," Letters to Travis, p. 56; and again, p. 58, of editors and printers practising, "the tricks of their profession." His Vindicator, Crito Cantabrigiensis, p. 396, speaks of "the old printer." Bishop Marsh, also, (Lectures, vi. p. 106) of the editions of Robert Stephens, "a learned bookseller and printer at Paris." I have no more wish for "a protestant pope" in sacred criticism, than any of these great men. I have no more desire for "Prescription" than Wetsten had, vol. ii. p. 852, 1st ed. p. 166; but I deprecate the wilful rejection of any one of the means of obtaining the true text; and I feel deep obligations to Mr. Greswell for letting the world see "what a printer and editor" was in 1546—1550; by which, perhaps, they may be induced to examine on which side the tricks of trade actually lie; and when I observed Mr. G.'s undertaking, in the contents of his thirteenth chapter, I turned to it in high hopes that his commendation of the Parisian Greek Press would be no longer confined to classical literature, when he so justly says, (Preface, p. v.) "Many of its primary productions commend themselves to the learned of our times, as the representatives of MSS. now no longer found." When I was told that we should have the "honesty of Robert vindicated from the imputations of Mr. Porson," I expected to see the fact distinctly

shewn that more than one half of the MSS. out of which "the printer and bookseller" "settled the present text, almost *three* hundred years ago, have never yet been ascertained." Such I distinctly and fearlessly say is the fact; for the story of Stephanus's editions is simply this: Upon his petition to his high-minded patron, Francis I., he was accommodated with the use of fifteen MSS. from the royal library; out of these, and some one private MS., he formed the text of the "*O mirificam*," of 1546. This stock he nearly doubled while he was preparing for the glory of his life, the folio of 1550; and when the text of that splendid edition had been formed from it, he selected seven of the fifteen royal MSS. and six of the private, numbered 2—14, to give opposing readings to his first volume (the Gospels and the Acts) which together with those of one of the previous editions, No. 1, are given in the inner margin. As a sufficient number of these thirteen MSS. contained the epistles of St. Paul, and the remainder of the third part of the sacred text (the catholic epistles) there was no alteration made in the opposing materials for giving various readings thus far, in the second volume. But in the Revelations (the 4th part of the sacred text) all the thirteen of the first selection failed. A new selection then became necessary, and No. 15 was taken out of the royal MSS., and No. 16 out of the private MSS., with the printed edition, to furnish opposing readings to the new text, there. A reading or two was given from each of the two last selected MSS., in the previous part of the work, probably (as I have imagined) to shew that the royal MS., No. 15, contained the whole of this second volume; and that the private one, No. 16, contained the whole New Testament. The original set of MSS. then amounted to little more than half of what were obtained in the whole, for the text of the folio; and exactly half of that set, (viz., eight of the royal MSS.) and about one half of those that were obtained afterwards, together with the Complutensian *print*, made up the set that was taken first and last to oppose the text of the folio in the marginal readings. Such was the theory of a pamphlet entitled "*Specimen of an intended publication &c.*," namely, that Stephanus had fifteen MSS. from the royal library, but that he had, in all, 16 MSS., "*posterioribus diebus*," for the first edition of 1546; that these were increased, as might naturally be expected, by his keeping his son so long searching the libraries of Italy, to thirty, and more, for the folio; and that a selection was made out of the whole, to furnish opposing readings in the margin. This was so natural in itself—it so perfectly accorded with every fact that had been obtained from every source—it so perfectly corresponded with the internal evidence of the editions themselves, that Crito Cantabrigiensis and the rest of the families of the Critos, had no means of meeting the pamphlet, but by representing its theory to be that Stephanus had only two sets of documents, and that the documents of the one were wholly different from those of the other, one of these sets being for the margin of the folio, the other to furnish the varying text of all the editions. And it was easy for them to knock down this monstrous fiction of their own when they had set it up.

No critical reader can need to be told that the hypothesis which,



by the zeal and ability of Stephanus's enemies, has passed current during the 18th and the 19th century, if not earlier, makes him to have had the opposing documents of the margin for the formation of all his editions, and nothing else. I have never been able to discover any reason for this hypothesis, but that it serves to convict him of the most gross violation of the sacred text. It goes on the assumption that he could not select any documents, printed or manuscript, to oppose the text of his folio of 1550, but what he had used for forming that of the 16mo of 1546. And this involves another assumption, viz.—that he could not have added one single copy to his original stock during those four years. Moreover it carries falsehood upon its face: the very first document of the set selected for the margin was the *newly-printed* Complutensian, whilst that from which the text of the "O mirificam" had been compiled, consisted of 16 *very old written* copies.

Mr. Porson, however, proceeds upon this hypothesis in the heavy charge, which Mr. Gresswell records, p. 328—"Another instance of this management, says our learned professor, may be seen in the preface to the first edition of Robert Stephens's *Nov. Test. Gr.* (ann. 1546, in 18mo), where he says, that he has not suffered a letter to be printed, but what the greater part of the better MSS., like so many witnesses, unanimously approved. This boast (adds Mr. Porson) is indeed utterly false, as all critics agree, who have taken any pains in comparing Stephens's editions. They know that Stephens has not observed this rule constantly, because his editions often vary from one another, and his third edition often from all his MSS., even by his own confession." p. 57.

"As all critics agree," says Mr. Porson. Yes; all our modern critics do agree that the solemn profession of Stephanus, of Erasmus, of the Complutensians, of all those who published the old critical editions, shall be "*utterly false.*" They cannot decide precisely what degree of authority is due to each of these editions, in their calculations of evidence for their own texts; so they solve the difficulty by determining to give none to any one. All critics agree that the boast of all the early editors is "*utterly false.*" I do not hesitate to say that the world never saw a more atrocious conspiracy than this; and I did hope that the historian of the early Parisian Greek Press would have enabled me to add—nor a more infamous one. How does he rebut it in the case of Stephanus?

"Now an advocate of Robert's may be permitted to ask in reply, Can it then be fairly deduced, from the above cited words of that preface, that he either boasts, or pledges himself to a resolution never to vary at all in any successive edition from the first? Those words cannot surely be so understood." p. 329.

Can an advocate of Robert content himself with this mere negative? When Robert pledges himself to a resolution "not to give a letter that is not sanctioned by the greater part of his best MSS., did he not pledge himself to vary whensoever the preponderance of his increasing evidence varied in favour of a different reading from that which he gave at first? Might not the advocate have said, with perfect

justice, that in any case except that of old critical editions of the Greek Testament, the simple circumstance that the editions often vary from one another" would have been held to be sufficient proof that the materials from whence they were formed had varied? Yes; the editions themselves say, that the hypothesis of the identity of the materials "is utterly false."

Your's faithfully,

FRANCIS HUYSHE.

Talaton, near Honiton, Feb. 11, 1833.

(To be continued.)

#### PROMETHEUS VINCTUS.

To the Editor of the *British Magazine*.

SIR,—An awful responsibility attaches to those who are engaged in the tuition of youth. If the pupil be not at an early age duly imbued with reverence for the Holy Scriptures,—if he be allowed or encouraged to look upon them only as he would upon any merely human production, and not as an inspired work, as the word of God, directing him in the way of salvation, and furnishing him with the principles of his faith and practice,—the loss of an immortal soul may be the result of his preceptor's negligence, and severe will be the account demanded at the hands of him who has so unfaithfully discharged his important trust!

I have been led into these reflections by having lately read an edition of the Prometheus of Æschylus, forming part of the "School Classics." I am well aware that to review editions of classical works forms no part of the design of your excellent miscellany; but I conceive the following remarks will not be inconsistent with your plan of supporting the principles of Christian faith and Christian morality in general, no less than the doctrine and discipline of the United Church of England and Ireland in particular.

That many of the fables of pagan mythology are nothing more than perversions of scriptural truth is evident to all who are acquainted with the elaborate works of Grotius, Dickinson, Gale, Bryant, and Ireland. Perhaps in some of these the inclination to trace the resemblance has been occasionally carried too far. These perversions it is advantageous to the pupil to be called upon to deduce, or for the master to point out. But this should be done with that reverence which is due to the truth, and particularly to revealed truth. That this is not the case in the "Prometheus, designed for the use of Schools and Colleges," I now proceed to shew; and am sorry that I have to point out a levity and flippancy in some of the remarks which render the intentions of the writer (to use the mildest term) very equivocal.

Note on ver. 4—"While Vulcan was said by some to be the son of Juno alone, there were certain ἀστέιοι, οἱ μὴ τῆς Ἥρας μόνῃς υἱὸν αὐτὸν ποιοῦντες, ἀλλὰ ὁμοῦ μὲν Ἥρας καὶ Διὸς, πλὴν ἀπὸ κλειψιγαμίας, ὅτε φίλους λήθοντε τοκῆας εἰς εὐνὴν ἐφόιτων: a solution similar to that which

one man all the year round. The profit from such holdings is so inconsiderable, that, in very many cases, the occupiers work harder and fare harder than the labourers themselves—the feeling of independence, and the fact of being their own masters, making a sufficient compensation to them for this inferiority to induce them to refrain from reverting to the condition of workmen. If, therefore, exemption for persons rated at less than a certain sum be preferred to a fixed allowance, such as that I have recommended above, five pounds is decidedly too small a sum. Nothing which should much fall short of the average rating of a farm of twenty acres of arable land would really meet the just exigencies of the case; and, in strictness, the degree in which the limit of exemption should fall short of this amount, should be regulated by the magnitude of the *surplus* remaining after making due provision for the cultivation of the soil, and the share of *that surplus* which would fairly fall upon the holder of such an occupation.

I have one more observation to offer, which is this—if the labour-rate is so calculated as to absorb the *whole* of the labouring population, the idle labourers will be apt to feel that their masters *must* continue to employ them, or leave some portion of their rate unredeemed. I, therefore, think it desirable that a *slight* surplus of labourers should be left, to be employed in any way that the parish officers may find most convenient, in order that a fear of losing their situations may operate as a salutary check upon that description of persons; which, of course, is more likely to be the case when the masters have the power of making a selection than when they have not.

I trust the importance of the subject will excuse the freedom with which I have expressed my opinion upon many points of the plan suggested by your former correspondent; and I also trust that those who object to the sentiments I have myself expressed will canvass them with equal freedom. I am convinced that most extensive benefit may be derived from the adoption of plans of this description, and I look forward with somewhat sanguine anticipations to the improvements which the experience and the discussion of this year may enable us to introduce in the following season.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,  
X.

#### VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIAN GREEK PRESS.

(Continued from p. 287.)

[In the last Letter, p. 284, for *printer and editor*, read, *a printer and editor*; and, p. 285, for *posterioribus*, read *superioribus*.]

WE shall find another opportunity to consider Mr. Porson's assertion, that the man who boasted that he never "suffered a letter to be printed but what the greater part of his best MSS. approved, himself confessed that his third edition often varied from all his MSS."

Mr. Greswell proceeds, p. 329: If in the exercise of the *δευτεραις φρονιμῶς* he was led to think less highly of some of his readings, and

to adopt others, whether from MSS. or from printed copies to which he attributed the authority of MSS., ought this to be made the ground of such severe reflections?

Is this the way in which "the honesty of Robert is vindicated from the imputations of Mr. Porson." Stephanus professes not to give a letter but from the best of his MSS., and Mr. Greswell intimates that he adopted readings from printed copies as well as MSS. Does not he then establish Mr. Porson's position, that Stephanus's boast is false? An advocate of Robert's may be permitted to ask for some better proof of this, than the fact of the editions often varying from one another; he may decline taking the word of the conspiring critics; he may ask to see the wonderful confession of Stephanus; let it however be proved that, after all his professions, he did adopt readings from printed copies, and no reflections upon him can be too severe. Mr. Porson, indeed, having destroyed Stephanus by his three grand arguments, makes use of him, as lawful prey, to mask his battery against the Greek Apostolos, at p. 232. The Professor having at last ventured to say there, that the Apostolos "was interpolated in printing," expects to be told by his correspondent, that this was making the editor to be a cheat. "But, says Mr. P., I do not accuse the editor of being a cheat. Who ever called R. Stephens a cheat, because he retains many readings in his edition, which he found in no MS.? Every editor, unless he makes actual profession to the contrary, is at liberty to follow the text of his predecessors." Well, then, did not Robert "make actual profession to the contrary?" can words convey a stronger "profession to the contrary" than those of Stephanus, which Mr. Porson records, when he is pleased to say, that this boast is utterly false? When, therefore, the Professor asks "who ever called R. Stephens a cheat,"—why is there no Nathan to say, "Thou art the man"? Cheating there is *somewhere*—either on the part of Stephanus, by his giving "many readings in his editions, which he found in no MS.," when he "made actual profession to the contrary" in such strong terms; or it lies with the critics, when they assert that he did so, if their accusation is "utterly false;" and no reflexion can be too severe against the party, whichever it be, that is guilty of the cheat.

I am well aware of the unparalleled triumph of Mr. Porson's wit, in actually bringing his Cloten (as he calls him, p. 64) to add a note to his third edition, at p. 188, saying, that it was Stephanus's "plan to accept, by whatever hand it might be offered, that which appeared to him to be the genuine reading of Scripture;" and Dr. Hales ("Faith in Trinity," vol. ii. p. 19) even surpasses Mr. Travis (see specimen, pp. 26, 27). But where did Stephanus lay down any plan, but in the words referred to by Mr. Porson? and can words be found to declare more plainly, that his plan was not to accept of a single letter from any hand whatever, but that of the writers of the best MSS.? Mr. Greswell talks of "printed copies, to which he attributed the authority of MSS." But where did Stephanus give the most distant hint of his taking a letter of his own text from them? He says, "Adjuti præterea sumus cum aliis, tum vero Complutensi editione;" but this is in

the preface to the "O mirificam," where he makes the boast that Mr. Porson records. Crito Cantabrigiensis observes, p. 397, that "Robert Stephens particularly mentioned the assistance which the Complutensian edition had afforded him in his undertaking." Yes, he mentions the Complutensian *and others*, and I cannot at once admit Crito's deduction, that it must have been used to furnish the text of 1546, because it was selected out of the other printed copies to oppose the text of the folio of 1550, which he lays down in the words immediately following:—"Since then the Complutensian edition was deemed a MS. in Stephens' third edition; it must have been thought of equal value in his first edition," p. 398. The opposing set of the margin actually does contain about half of the stock of MSS. ultimately acquired—and half too of the original stock; it contains also one of those printed editions, the assistance of which is particularly mentioned by Stephanus. But neither Crito, nor any other of the conspiring critics, has shewn me the least ground to say it was necessary that he should take for this purpose any one of the copies that had been used to furnish the text in 1546. My own opinion is, that he might have taken documents of any sort—print, manuscript, version (the Marquess Velez did afterwards take the Vulgate)—to furnish opposing readings to his folio; and this, if he had not seen one of them in 1546. And here I have Mr. Porson with me, who is pleased to assert, p. 89, that Stephanus ought to have given the 5th of Erasmus a place in his margin, which would make one more than his vindicator wants. It is plain what assistance these editions that had been printed from MSS. (cum aliæ tum vero Complutensis) would afford a man who boasted that he gave not a letter but from the best MSS. of the Royal library. They would decide for him where the weight of his own MSS. was nearly balanced; and if, in the collation of his additional materials, he found that the preponderance was no longer against the reading of printed editions, which he had at first quitted, it would be his duty to return to those readings. But Stephanus valued those editions merely as proof that the MSS. which the editors used, accorded with his own; for he adds of the Complutensian, "quos cum nostris miro consensu sæpissime convenire ex ipsa collatione deprehendimus."

Mr. Greswell's concession is, I am aware, only hypothetical. But if he had said nothing to corroborate it, still this, as far as it goes, corroborates Mr. Porson's assertion, that Stephanus's boast is utterly false. And the conspiring critics will not fail to take it as an acknowledged *historical fact*, that Stephanus, in forming his text, attributed the authority of MSS. to printed copies, and adopted readings from those printed copies as well as MSS. This is exactly what the Ithacan of modern criticism would wish; its two princes [Wetsten and Griesbach] would have given the world for it. What else was the object of the mighty Porson himself in his "*imputations*"? The Professor had no personal pique to occasion his "many severe reflexions on Robert Estienne." Mr. Gibbon himself was influenced by no hatred of heretic Greek at the time of his writing his inimitable note, which Mr. Porson undertakes to defend. All that was wanted

VOL. III.—April, 1833.

3 H

was to cut out one hated passage; and with the concession that Robert "quits all his MSS. to follow his printed guides" (Por. 59), his pretended friends would have no interruption in chanting his praises. But, to apply Mr. Greswell's own words, "a more exact inquiry into Robert's history," which he himself has made, ought to "have induced our *historian* to forbear" (p. 323). And before he made such a concession, he ought to have glanced his eye over the pamphlet that professes to examine the first part of Mr. Porson's fourth letter, written whilst the work of Crito Cantabrigiensis, in vindication of Mr. P., lay suppressed. Mr. Hartwell Horne, iv., p. 487, of his sixth edition, for reasons which no one can be at a loss to guess who will collate this part of his sixth edition with the fifth and the preceding, asserts that Crito has "vindicated the Professor from the strictures of the Rev. Francis Huyshe." But Mr. G. would have found, if he had looked at Crito himself, that he does not meddle with one of those strictures; though the little finger of the "Devonshire clergyman" is thicker than the loins of the amiable prelate, whose mild and temperate remarks excited so much of Crito's wrath; and it might have been expected that the pen of every admirer of Mr. Porson, who could persuade himself that the Professor was delivering his own serious judgment, would have leaped into the ink to repel the scorpion lashes. The flood-gates of Billingsgate are opened upon the specimen and its author, to sweep them into the common sewer of oblivion, in the "Monthly Repository," May, 1828, p. 330, &c.; in Mr. Oxlee's P.S. to his "Letters to the Bishop of Salisbury; and in the "Memoir of the Controversy respecting the 3 h. w.," by Criticus. But this should of itself have gained a hearing for the examination of what Mr. Porson had said "of the MSS. used by R. Stephens and Beza," before such a stigma was branded on the "Early Parisian Greek Press," in what is incomparably its highest glory.

Your's faithfully,

FRANCIS HUYSHE.

(To be continued.)

#### THE RAINBOW A PROPHETIC SIGN.

(Continued from p. 279.)

THE argument from analogy, as already stated, seems to prove that the rainbow was a phenomenon unknown to the antediluvians; and the general argument, now to be brought forward, does not appear to be at variance with the supposition that there was no rain before the flood.

A literal application of the words of scripture to support a system of natural philosophy, and a total disregard to them concerning a physical fact, are extremes equally faulty; and those over zealous persons who convicted Galileo of heresy for teaching the annual and

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

The Editor begs to remind his readers that he is not responsible for the opinions of his Correspondents.

---

## VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIAN GREEK PRESS.

(Continued from p. 430.)

I HAVE not seized upon a mere single slip in one unfortunate passage to bring this charge against Mr. Greswell. At p. 321 he gives his assent to the slander which Mill, 1228, throws on the folio; where he makes the text to be taken in various passages from Colinæus, the Complutensian, and Erasmus. I esteem Mill's Prolegomena to be an invaluable store-house of learning; and I think that a real critic could not employ his talents more usefully than in publishing an edition of them with notes. But all Mill's acuteness seems to have failed, when he came to speak of the old critical editions; and this the most lamentably upon those of Stephanus. With respect to Stephanus's folio, the margin itself decides more than a hundred times over whether the documents, the various readings of which are there given, comprehended the whole of those from which the text had been formed; for the critics themselves tell us,—and tell us truly,—that all the documents, both printed and written, there brought to give opposing readings, actually do oppose the text. I should think, then, that it required no mighty exertion of mind to understand, that the man who published this to the world, and had boasted that he did not give a letter but what was sanctioned by the greater part of his best MSS., had some other MSS. which would bear out his text against the whole of those that he himself brought to oppose it. No: Mill takes the contrary for granted; and upon the strength of that pretty assumption, vents the charge that Mr. Greswell records, of Stephanus taking the text of his folio from the printed editions of Colinée, Froben, Complutensian, &c. And let it be observed, he does this, furnishing his own confutation, 1258; where, speaking of Beza's annotations, he tells you, that they give the readings of ten more MSS. than the fifteen of Stephanus's margin; the readings of those ten being avowedly obtained from no other source than Stephanus's book of collations. This is most wonderful; but it is nothing to the astonishment I feel at the world being held in the full conviction of Stephanus's guilt, by the addition of the little possessive pronoun "*his*" to the word "*all*" in the margin, "his third edition often differing from *all his* MSS., by his own confession"—(Mr. Porson's words, to which we stood pledged to recur)—an improvement this, which is religiously followed by Messrs. Travis, Hales, & Co.; who say for the "book-seller," "All my MSS. are against my text." And Griesbach, after he had been "insulted" by Travis, "because he took this point for granted," (Porson, 58) says, in his 2nd ed., p. xviii. 7, Lond. xxx:—"Hujus vestigiis [Erasmii] sæpissime *contra omnium codicum suorum fidem ac auctoritatem in-*

hæsit; quod qui negare vellet, nihil aliud efficeret rei notissimæ ignorantia, quam ut risum commoveret doctorum et prudentium. Stephanus ipse textum, quem edidit, a codicibus suis *omnibus* plus centies dissonare ingenue in margine professus est." *Εν πασι*, says Stephanus; you have merely to add the possessive *suis* to *omnibus*; and instead of his saying that he had other MSS. for the formation of his text, besides all those that he has here taken to oppose it, he makes this ingenuous confession. It is Mr. Porson himself who says, p. 147, "Would you have the writer of the MS. inform his readers, by a marginal note, that he had inserted a spurious verse in his edition?" I say then, would you have the editor inform his readers, by more than a hundred marginal notes, that he had inserted a reading in violation of his most solemn engagements? Mr. P. adds, "An editor would hardly be mad enough to become such a *felo de se*." (1217.) I shall hold my disbelief, then, of Stephanus having ingenuously professed to have cheated more than a hundred times. I shall think that the "Docti et Prudentes" have done this, once for all, by the addition of the possessive to the word *all*—"all *his* MSS." The word *all* (*εν πασι* or *π.*) never occurs in the 4th part of the sacred text (the Revelations); but only in the three first parts. I have never seen any attempt made by the learned critics to account for this. But the reason is obvious, from the fact of the first selection of the thirteen written copies having none of them gone beyond those three parts; and a new selection, viz., of No. 15 and No. 16, having been made for the Revelation. It could only have tended to perplex and mislead the reader, to refer any longer to them, when you had the reading of two others, besides *all* of them. Where the text is against all the three documents (*α, υ, ις*), selected to oppose it in the 4th part (the Revelations), the expression is *εν τοις ημετεροις αντιγραφοις*, as at Rev. vii. 5. In the former parts, where the first selection continues, when the expression is given at full length, it is, as at the end of Rom. xiv., *εν πασι τοις αντιγραφοις*. But Stephanus never combines the two words *πασι* and *ημετεροις*,—he never says, *εν πασι τοις ημετεροις αντιγραφοις*, as the Docti et Prudentes do for him—"All my MSS." The words that he does use could not any where mean more than the documents that are collated in that place; and they themselves distinctly lay it down, that in the gospels, where the number was the greatest, it amounted only to ten. In the gospels, therefore—the part most favourable to them—the "ingenué in margine suo professus est" was really saying, that his text there was contrary to *all the ten* opposing MSS. Wetsten knew, and every one who has read what Wetsten said on the Codd. Barberini, knows, that *εν πασι* never could signify more than this. This collation of Caryophilus was to be set aside, like all the old editions; and the means that Wetsten takes to effect this, is by making the Barberini Codd. to be nothing more than those of Stephanus's margin. The number that Caryophilus had in the gospels, and in the epistles, exactly coincided with those of Stephanus's margin. This was enough for Wetsten. Though Caryophilus had four in the Revelations, while Stephanus's second selection of MSS. was only two, this was easily settled, by assuming that Caryophilus took in two errone-



ous references there, whilst he was supposed to have corrected all the similar errors in both the former parts. The number, then, in the different *parts*, for Stephanus and Caryophilus, thus becoming the same, Wetsten makes no difficulty in assuming that the number of the different MSS. must be the same for each; and from the identity of number it is nothing to assume the identity of the MSS. Now, from the lucky circumstance that Wetsten thus took Stephanus for getting rid of Caryophilus, arises his own testimony against himself, and the rest of the Docti et Prudentes, in favour of Stephanus. Bengel made an objection to Wetsten's theory, in answering which the truth was elicited. No. 112, p. 62, 162 Semler, he says, Dissentit hic a nobis I. A. Bengelius, ratione tamen non satis firma usus, "Unum" inquit Introd. in Crisin, p. 440, [sec. xxxix. p. 76,] "dabimus exemplar. Io. I. 42, citantur *Bareriani decem*, ubi differentia articuli Vulgatum non tangit, et Stephani margo plane vocat." Fateor Stephani marginem vacare, at hoc ipso argumento Caryophilus ductus putasse videtur, inde consequi, Stephani codices *decem*, i. e., omnes legisse ὁ Χριστός cum articulo, uti in textu editum est—contra editionem Complutensem et Erasmi quæ legunt Χριστός sine articulo." Here we have the fact, under the hand of the Docti et Prudentes themselves. It is, "*decem*, i. e., omnes." They set the man down to be "mad enough to become such a *felo de se*" as to vary in his third edition often from all his MSS., even by his own confession—"contra omnium codicum suorum fidem et auctoritatem;" and in their exultation over the *confitentem reum*, they add, "nec quicquam sive ab ipso sive ab admiratoribus ejus prolatum legimus quo servile excusari posset obsequium." And what is infinitely beyond this, the "servile obsequium" is admitted, and prolatum legimus ab admiratore ejus, A. D. 1833,—"If in the exercise of the δευτεροὶ φροντιδές, he was led, &c., ought this to be made a ground of such severe reflections?" (329.) When the peal of laughter has abated, with which the Docti et Prudentes will salute the man who still thinks that Stephanus's boast was not utterly false, he will whisper the words of Wetsten, "*decem*, i. e., omnes," and, "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Push the conspiring critics a little, and they are themselves forced to admit, that the bookseller's hundred-fold confession of guilt is no more than "*decem*, i. e. omnes;" and in other cases, no more than *octo*, i. e., omnes. Stephanus's words tell you—and by no possibility can they tell you more—that ten out of the first selection for opposing the folio—or eight of them, as the case may be—are against his text,—that is, at the utmost, not one-third of the whole number that he had to form the text of that edition, and only two-thirds of those that were taken, at both the selections, to oppose it. Curcellæus, misled, I suppose, by good father Morin's insertion of the possessive "*suis*," missed this, at the fourth page of his Preface. "Imo aliquando observavi, et miratus sum, ipsam in textum recepisse lectiones quibus nullum prorsus istorum xvi. exemplarium favebat." This is rather more than any one can assert; say the first xiv. of them, if you please. Wetsten makes use of Curcellæus as a decoy duck, "Observavit atque suo jure miratus est," (p. 142, first edition,

and continued Prol. 145, Semler 374,) after he had himself said, "*decem*, i. e., omnes." But let it be observed, to the honour of Curcellæus, that he says, "*Nec facile possum conjicere quænam istius rei fuerit causa.*" We have no horse-laugh from him, because Stephanus "*ipse textum quem edidit, a codicibus suis omnibus plus centies dissonare ingenue in margine suo professus est.*"

Michaelis, I suppose, thought it rather too much to make the man *ingenuously confess* his guilt more than a hundred times over, by his expression *εν πασι* in the margin, with his first selected thirteen MSS.; so he takes his words on the second selection, in the fourth part of the sacred text. He says, (ii. 323,) "This, at least, is certain, that in places where he had less temptation to interpolate, than in the celebrated passage above mentioned, (1 John v., 7, 8,) he has inserted words in the text which are warranted by no manuscript. "*Quæ cum ex plurium suorum nullo conveniebant.*" (Morin, p. 119.) We may even produce him as evidence against himself. Rev. vii. 5, 6, 7, 8—both in the first and third editions, he has inserted in all these verses, *εσφραγισμενοι* after *ιβ χιλιαδες*, though in the margin of the edition of 1550 he himself testifies that the word *εσφραγισμενοι* was contained in none of his MSS., from *φυλης ρυβην*, v. 5, to the end. He expresses himself as follows, "*υτε ενταυθα, υτε εν τοις εξης γεγραπται το 'Εσφραγισμενοι εν τοις ημετεροις αντιγραφοις.*" Nor is it found in the Complutensian Bible, his codex *a*, and yet he presumed to obtrude it on the text."

Whatever might be the "*temptation to interpolate*," which made Stephanus "insert words in the text" at Rev. vii. 5, &c.; which, according to this representation, "are warranted by no MS.;" it proved also too strong for the virtue of Bengel, Wetsten, and Griesbach, who agree with him. And this alone, I think, might have served to moderate Michaelis's severity. But for the charge, as it concerns him, Michaelis himself tells us immediately afterwards, that "Stephens, as being a bookseller, of course avoided what might prevent the sale of his publication." Well then, would you have him "inform his readers, by a marginal note, that he had inserted a spurious word in his text," if it were but this once? Could Michaelis really believe that "we may produce him as an evidence against himself" in this palpable manner? Michaelis's opinion how a bookseller must act so perfectly accords with that of Mr. Porson for an editor, that I shall still think he "would hardly be mad enough to become such a *felo-de-se*;" but that the murderous blow to the character of his publication is directed by the hand of some other assassin. Is it he, or is it some other, who says for him, "that the word *εσφραγισμενοι* was contained in *none* of his MSS.?" What was Stephanus's business in his margin, but to give the opposing readings of the MSS. with which he was immediately concerned?—in the three first parts of the sacred texts, to state of those of the thirteen first selected MSS., together with those of the printed document; and in the Revelations, those of his last selection? The first selection, indeed, is so numerous, and its collation extends over so large a space, that the man who has faith enough to bear a hundred-fold confession of guilt, might be brought to believe

that all of *them* were "all his MSS." that had the passage in question. But a glance shews you that, in the Revelations, the margin contains no other document but  $\alpha$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\iota$ , (except a universally acknowledged erratum or two.) Add to this the marked difference of expression in the second selection, and, I think, every one must see here, that Stephanus could refer to nothing beyond those three. The least consideration here must bring you to what Bengel's objection elicited from Wetsten in the gospels, "*duobus*, i.e. omnibus." And how did Michaelis extend the expression, to make him say "in *none* of his MSS." Where did he find the word *none*? Not in the second selection; but he went back for it to the first; the rest of the Docti et Prudentes came to this part for the word "*his*." He inserts  $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota$  here, where Stephanus says,  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \eta\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\gamma\gamma\alpha\phi\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , as they do  $\eta\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , in the first selection, when S. says,  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\sigma\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\gamma\gamma\alpha\phi\omicron\iota\varsigma$ .

Michaelis adds, 824, "A man who acts in this manner would surely make no scruple to interpolate 1 John v. 7, which is actually in the Complutensian Bible, though he found it in none of his MSS."

The object of *cutting out* 1 John v. 7, 8, has sharpened the wits of the Docti et Prudentes against the "bookseller;" from the time that they took first to the scheme of having a Latin origin for it: *ex uno disce omnes*. "A man who acts in this manner would surely make no scruple" to invent any charge to get rid of such an evidence of its actual existence in the Greek—a man, let it be observed, who no more followed the "Complutensian Bible" in that passage than he did any of the first thirteen selected MSS.

"An advocate, then, of Robert's may be permitted to ask" (329) that the Docti et Prudentes shall be debarred from the privilege, that they have exercised, of adding the word "*his*" where the man tells us that "all the documents" (i.e. those of his first selection that had the passage) were against his text—and again, that of adding the word "*all*" where he tells us that "his documents" (i.e. those of his second selection) omitted what his text gave. This request being granted, the margin of the folio presents an unanswerable confutation, more than a hundred times over, as far as that edition is concerned, of the assumption of these conspiring critics, that Stephanus must have precisely the same copies for the formation of editions which varied so much in their date and in the text which they exhibit; and again, that these copies must be the exact documents, printed as well as written, which were taken to oppose the new text of the folio. With respect to the "O mirificam" of 1546, that could not itself give a collation of its text with the documents that were selected for the margin of the folio four years after. But Mill has done the work, 1177—1187; and the result of his collation is precisely such as might be expected from the fact, which we have before stated, that the set for opposing the folio contained exactly one-half of the set for forming the 16mo in 1546. The assumption of the critics, who all agree that Stephanus's boast shall be utterly false, (Pors. 57,) is here again weighed in the balances, and is found wanting. If ever there was a point clearly made out by a man against himself, it is here seen that Mill had been collating the text of 1546 with the wrong set. And I am unable to

conceive how Mill could be under such a delusion as not to see this from his own words. Having described the printed and written documents, selected first and last to oppose the folio, he says of the "O mirificam" 1177, "In textu ad hos codices formando ita se comparatum ait Robertus, ut religiose ac plane ad literam sequeretur plures ac meliores e *Regiis*." He takes a set of documents, one-half of which exactly consist either of print or of private MSS., and says that Stephanus formed his text out of *them*, so as to follow religiously the majority of the best copies that he had received from the royal library. Did a man of Mill's judgment and acuteness ever before write any thing so inconsistent? He was right in saying, that Stephanus declared, his text of that edition "religiose ac plane sequeretur plures et meliores e *Regiis*." As he had justly observed, 1156, "Sola Regia memorat in hæc præfatione:" therefore he must be wrong in taking the documents of the margin as being those which Stephanus had, "superioribus diebus," for forming the text of the "O mirificam." And if Stephanus's boast was not "utterly false," the result of his collation of the text with the other set of documents (those of the margin), must necessarily be what he found it. The Docti et Prudentes are prudent enough to avoid Mill's self-contradiction; but they cannot give the words of Stephanus without giving their own confutation. Wetsten, 142, first edition, continued Prol. 145, Seml. 374, says, "Quicquid Stephanus in prima et secunda editione jactet, nempe ad Regias codices recensitas esse, revera tamen nonnisi rarissime, et ubi omnes aut plerique codices contra Erasmianam conspirabant, in textu emendando illos adhibuit." Griesbach xviii. 7. Lond. xxx. 100, "Etsi suam in constituendo textu summis laudibus ipsa prædicat, eumque e codicibus, quorum copiam Bibliotheca Regia suppeditaverit, ita recensuisse se profitetur, ut nullam omnino literam secus esse passus sit, quam plures iique meliores libri tanquam testes comprobarent [Observe, this is the Preface to the "O mirificam"], vanissima hæc omnia sunt atque falsissima." Now, if I admit that Wetsten and Griesbach ascertained those seven of the royal MSS. which came into the first selection for the margin, and the other which was taken in the second selection, where are the remaining seven? They do not avow it like Mill; but, instead of them, they actually take the seven private MSS. of the margin. Which then is it that is "vanissima atque falsissima,"—the boast of the old editor, or the audacious contradiction of the modern ones? The one or the other is empty and "utterly false," and I boldly ask, which is it? Under these circumstances of extreme difficulty, it is delightful to observe Mr. Porson: by his *management*, (to adopt his own expression,) he avoids the self-contradiction of Mill, and the self-confutation of the two others. The Professor effects all, without specifying "*e Regiis*,"—"not a letter," says he, "but what the greater part of the better MSS. unanimously approved." "*The better MSS.*" will serve equally for the meliores e *Regiis*, and for the private MSS. of the margin, which are to be slipped into the room of seven e *Regiis*. I have hitherto left Mr. Porson in full possession of this advantage, by using an expression equally vague, and saying merely "his MSS." But, having learnt of Mill,

and Wetsten, and Griesbach, from whence *his MSS.*, that were used "superioribus diebus," actually came, I crave leave to add to Mr. Porson the words "from the royal library;" so that it may stand Stephanus "says that he has not suffered a letter to be printed, but what the greater part of the better MSS., *from the royal library*, unanimously approved." Mr. Porson does not undertake to shew that *this* boast is utterly false. Will any of those persons, who profess to believe that Mr. P. was doing any thing more than playing the advocate in his attacks on the old critical editions, undertake to shew that Stephanus's boast was false, when he solemnly declared that he had not suffered a letter to be printed in the "O mirificam," but what was warranted by *the royal MSS.*? I think not; because his professed vindicator, Crito Cantabrigiensis, has not meddled with "plures et meliores e Regiis." Crito decides that he may neglect all other evidence whatsoever that bears upon Stephanus's editions, if he can only manage Stephanus's own testimony. And, having proved to his own satisfaction and that of his brother critics, that a newly-printed edition was one of the sixteen very old written copies [vetustissima sedecim scripta exemplaria] which Stephanus had "superioribus diebus," for the "O mirificam," he concludes (p. 402) "that the said Robert Stephens had but one single set of MSS., consisting of sixteen copies, for his various readings as well as for the text of his three editions,"—not, you will observe, "one single set of sixteen manuscripts;" but "one single set of MSS., consisting of sixteen copies [print and MS.]" And not a word does he say respecting what the greater part of the better MSS. *from the royal library* approve. No attempt to solve any difficulty his readers might have about the seven private MSS. and that *very old written* copy, the Complutensian, coming from *thence*.

FRANCIS HUYSHE. ♀

(To be continued.)

#### ON THE EVILS OF AN ALTERATION OF THE LITURGY.

To the Editor of the *British Magazine*.

SIR,—IT has often surprised me that whilst so many proposals for alterations in our liturgy are continually appearing, it seems never to occur to any of the authors of them to consider the evils which would follow the adoption of any of their plans. It may not, therefore, be unseasonable to direct the attentions of those who are advocates for change to some of those evils, which would I think be so great, that even if our present liturgy were really as defective as, from the multitude of *improvements* suggested, it might be supposed to be, still it would be better to tolerate those defects than to attempt to remedy them at such a cost.

One great evil would be the unsettling of the minds of the people, which would, I fear, be the certain consequence of a change in the liturgy. I can hardly, indeed, conceive a measure which would do more to detach them from the church than such a change. The great mass of

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

The Editor begs to remind his readers that he is not responsible for the opinions of his Correspondents.

---

## VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIAN GREEK PRESS.

(Continued from p. 554.)

## ERRATA IN LAST LETTER.

P. 551, par. 2, the quotation from Moriu ought to have been in brackets, for it is not given by Michaelis; and for *ex plurium*, read *exemplarium*. P. 551, line 6 ab im, for "in the three first parts of the sacred texts, to state of those of the thirteen," &c., read "in the three first parts of the sacred text, to state those of the thirteen." P. 549, line 14, for 1217, read 147. P. 550, line 14, for Bareriani, read Barberiniani. P. 550, line 15, for vocat, read vacat. P. 553, line 14, for hæc, read hâc.

AND this deference of Crito to the "plures et meliores e Regiis" is not more than what Bishop Marsh had paid to it, whatever may have been the case, since, Letters to Travis, App. I. p. 170, Note 25, the Archdeacon is rebuked for a mistake which he is told runs through his whole book: "You constantly take it for granted, that R. Stephens adopted no reading in his edition of 1550, which was not supported by good authority; that the readings of his MSS. were his guides in the formation of his own text; and that it is allowable, therefore, to argue from his readings of the latter to those of the former." What! had Mr. Travis ever the sense to find out the truth? No, no. If he had, woe to the dealers in *historical facts*. (Pref. to Letters, p. xv. Lecture xxvii. p. 23.) We have seen Mr. T.'s Note (p. 188), in which he said, it was Stephanus's "plan to accept, by whatever hand it might be offered, that which appeared to him to be the genuine reading;" and that "he did not, in any culpable sense, desert his MSS." Instead of taking his stand on the impregnable text of the O mirificam, formed, every letter, from the majority of the best *Royal MSS.*, and on that of the folio, for which there were those fifteen *Royal MSS.*, and a still greater number of private MSS., chiefly collected by Henry in Italy, he could (p. 186) accept the enumeration of Dr. Benson, who said, that in settling the text of the New Testament, R. Stephens made use of sixteen ancient MSS. [vetustissima *sederim* scripta exemplaria.] Instead of those that Stephanus made use of for settling the text, he accepts those that were taken, in the two selections, to oppose it; and thus, in fact, for all the three first parts of the sacred text, he accepts seven of the *Royal MSS.* and six of the private. Let it be observed, that Mr. Travis's learned correspondent does not proscribe here the rest of Stephanus's editions in general, but that of the folio alone. In conformity with this, the note proceeds to state Stephanus's boast, that the text of the O mirificam had been religiously formed from the majority of the best of the MSS. *from the Royal Library*; and it adds, p. 171, "This declaration he repeats in the preface to his second edition, printed in 1549 [no great wonder, as this is the very preface to the

first edition of 1546]; but in the preface to the edition of 1550, which contains a very different text from the two first editions, the whole sentence is omitted." \* \* \* \* \*

Observe, "*a very different text.*"—Such was the language of all the critics from the time of Mill's collating them: thus Wetsten, 146, 5, Seml. 376—"tantopere a se ipso dissensit Stephanus." But so *very different a text* is not quite convenient for a writer who decides "that a pretty good defence may be made for those persons—though held by Mr. Huyshe, as we have seen, in great contempt—who have hitherto believed that the said Robert Stephens had but one single set of manuscripts, consisting of sixteen copies [printed and manuscript] for his various readings, as well as for the text of his three editions." (Crito Cantab. p. 402, as above.) A reader who thought that "tantopere a se ipso dissensit Stephanus," might believe him when he boasted that he had religiously followed the best of the Royal MSS. in his first edition; and also believe the declaration of his son, after he had made the collations for the third, that he had more than doubled them—"plusquam enim triginta vidi, partim in Regis Galliæ bibliotheca . . . partim in Italicis." So, either the fact of the diversity of the texts of Stephanus's editions, or the theory of the identity of the materials, must give way. No wonder, then, that Crito should have found the critics to have been all wrong in this; and that he should lay it down, as the basis of his theory, (389,) "The three editions, with a few variations, gave the same text throughout." If such be the fact, undoubtedly Crito's theory of the same MSS. for all of them, is in perfect accordance with it. But the pamphlet, which certainly does treat it with great contempt, takes for granted, as Bishop Marsh here states it, that "the edition of 1550 contains a very different text from the two first editions; and follows the collator's mode of accounting for it, viz. that it had nearly, if not quite, double the stock of MSS. for its formation that the first edition had. The bishop, we see—admitting the boast, that there was not a letter of the *O mirificam* which was not warranted by the best of the MSS. from the royal library—contends, that "Stephens does not even pretend to have formed the text of his third edition from his Greek MSS." But what, I ask, if he had not made any formal assertion respecting the folio, in particular, was it not sufficient for him to have made it once? If he was bound by it to form his text in his *O mirificam* from his Greek MSS., that he then had from the royal library, had not the readers of the folio a right to consider him bound, in like manner, to form the text of that edition from the increased stock, unless he distinctly warned them to the contrary? He expressed his sense of this duty most strongly at first, where he refers to his past conduct—"Quo quidem in opere excudendo, eandem quam in cæteris solemus diligentiam, majorem etiam, ut par erat diligentiam præstitimus"—and I think the more of these words, because they are never quoted by his accusers. And I cannot believe that, when he embraced a religion which refuses to take what any power on earth might think fit to propound as the will of God, this awful feeling of the sanctity of his written word would be diminished. What was to alter his

feelings with respect to "the greater part of the better MSS." from *the Royal Library*, but his finding the reading of the smaller part of them so strongly supported by his new materials, that it could no longer be allowed to stand against that of the old editions. Then again, for what purpose did he keep his son in Italy, if he did not intend to make due use of those that should be discovered "in Italicis?" And assuming, with Mr. Porson, that Stephanus's "editions do often vary from one another," though his *Vindicator* so flatly contradicts him, I contend, in direct opposition to the Professor, that he has "observed constantly the rule" which this sacred awe made him lay down; "because his editions often vary from one another." Yes; the extraordinary deviation of the folio from the first edition, which had been formed so scrupulously from the majority of the better MSS. that he had received *from the royal library*, affords the stronger presumption of his having followed the more than doubled stock which he had then acquired. And let it be observed that Stephanus held firmly to the text of his folio, in his fourth edition, where Mill (1234) notices only the variation of one word in Matthew and Mark, in which he returns to the reading of his first edition against his second and his third, and against Erasmus.

All this, I think, might serve to convince the most prejudiced; even if Stephanus had made no particular declaration respecting the folio. But when the note says, "Stephens does not even pretend to have formed the text of his third edition from his Greek MSS.," it must be taken to mean that he does not pretend to have formed it from the MSS. of the margin, i. e. those that were taken in the two selections, to *oppose* it. But if it be really meant, that Stephanus never made any declaration that it was formed from the set out of which these were selected, it is a complete mistake. It accords admirably with the hundred-fold confession extracted from the margin, "textum quem edidit, a codicibus suis omnibus plus centies dissonare." *This*, however, is just as much founded on fact, as *that* is on the words of Stephanus. What Mr. Gresswell says, p. 322, of the other mighty correspondent of Mr. Travis, is equally applicable to both. We have here a "reflection upon Robert Estienne, which a more exact inquiry into Robert's history would probably have induced our great modern critic to forbear." The fact is, that Stephanus's own testimony of his having "formed the text of his third edition from his Greek MSS." is stronger than even that which he gave of the *O mirificam*. (See *Specimen*, p. 19.) But take it from the *Historian*, p. 324—"Let the impartial reader consider what Robert has incidentally recorded in his *Responsio ad Censuras*, p. 35, *seq.* 'This work (his N. T. Gr. of 1550, folio) I carry to Castellanus (Du Chastel). He sharply reproves me for not having submitted it to the examination of the divines, and accuses me of contumacy. I defend myself by observing that the senior judges of this body knew little or nothing of the Greek language; and that the sacred book of life could not be suspected of heresy; mentioning also, as an additional motive for declining such a measure, that some of them had required from me an alteration of that passage, 1 Cor. xv. 51, 'We shall not all sleep,



but we shall all be changed.' Here Du Chastel again blames me, because I had not complied; pretending that the question was merely about a various reading; but I declare to him, that no consideration could ever induce me to change any thing contrary to the faith of all the MSS., and thus to be found a falsifier." Mr. Greswell has justly observed, that this was incidental; we are indebted for it entirely to the attempt made to seduce Stephanus. But, powerful as it is, he gave us something much beyond it. Mr. Greswell (p. 331) informs us that "the bishop [Du Chastel] now divested himself of all moderation towards Robert; and informed the faculty that his former protection of him had been the effect of misconception; he had been deceived in the man, and now abandoned him; that it was their province to consider what measures ought to be adopted in consequence of this impression of the New Testament." The measures that the Sorbonne did adopt, when he had thus lost his last patron, proved that there was ground for all his fears; and if he was so obstinate that no consideration could ever induce him to change anything contrary to the faith of all his MSS., there was a consideration that would induce him to change the air of Paris for that of Geneva. Nothing but the abandonment of his situation and his country could save him, after such *contumacy*. And when he did thus pretend to have formed the text of his third edition from his Greek MSS., as well as that of the O mirificam, and thus acted upon these pretensions, I cannot easily believe that it is he who will be found the falsifier.

The note proceeds (171)—"Nor could Stephens have repeated this declaration in the third edition, without transgressing the bounds of truth." No; most certainly. Not, however, for the reason here assigned,—"for his third edition is little more than a re-impression of the fifth of Erasmus." A pretty notion, this,—that a man who had himself published a critical edition from the best MSS., of which he says, "quorum copiam nobis *bibliotheca regia* facile suppeditavit," and who had kept his son from that time searching for farther MSS. "in Italicis," would make the glory of his life "little more than a re-impression of the fifth of Erasmus." His lordship here trusts on the staff of a broken reed—on Bengel, who contradicts himself afterwards, and on Wetsten, whose "verba hyperbolica" can be softened by no "commoda interpretatione," so as to bring them within sight of truth. Just look at the declaration in question. When Stephanus's boast in his first edition was, that he "had not suffered a letter to be printed, but what the greater part of the better MSS.," from the royal library, "unanimously approved;" there was, I think, no great want of Bengel and Wetsten's assistance to discover why Stephanus could not "have repeated this declaration without transgressing the bounds of truth," in an edition, for the text of which these fifteen royal MSS. made not half the stock of materials. Notwithstanding however it cannot be said that it does not contain a letter which the majority of the royal MSS. does not warrant, I shall still believe that Stephanus adopted no reading in the edition of 1550, any more than in that of 1546, "which was not supported by good authority;" that the readings of his thirty MSS. and more, that he had now obtained, "were

his guides in the formation of his own text," and that it is allowable therefore to argue from the readings of the latter to those of *some* of the former. And when Mr. Porson, at p. 59, bids us no more pester him with the stale common places of honour, honesty, veracity, &c., and asserts that Stephanus would have the "vicious complaisance" to "quit all his MSS. to follow his printed guides," I have not the *virtuous* complaisance to take the Professor's word for it, though I see this *servile obsequium* (as Griesbach justly styles it) admitted "ab admiratoribus ejus," and I am told by some that "this censure is praise," by others, that it ought not "to be made a ground of such severe reflections." I ask, whether accusers or admirers can pretend to have ever had the collation of more than half of Stephanus's MSS. for either of his editions. How much do they know of the sixteen MSS. for the O mirificam, beyond the eight royal MSS. of the margin of the folio? how much do they know of the thirty and more for the folio, beyond the fifteen of the margin? and have they had the "honour, honesty, veracity, &c.," to bring to account the little that they do know? There was a man, who had the means of judging, who had the whole of Stephanus's collations before him, which his own work made him examine in all its parts. This was Theodore Beza. Mr. Greswell gives his testimony, from his *Icones*, at p. 398; where, after speaking in the highest terms of Robert's exertions in classical literature, he adds, "Sed hæc sua præcipua laus est, quod non inanis gloriæ, non lucri cupidus, officinam suam sacris præsertim excudendis Bibliis consecrasti, quo in opere toties recudendo, emendando modisque omnibus illustrando teipsum quoque superasti." If ever there were old critical editions of any ancient work that carried with them proof of being executed with integrity, Stephanus's editions do so. He makes distinct appeal, in his O mirificam, to the MSS. from whence he took his text; they were from a great public library, where, of course, they were open to inspection, and he was fortunately driven himself to record the number of these royal copies. In pursuit of farther MS. stores, he sent his son to Italy, and kept him in that country during far greater part of the interval between that edition and the folio; and his son has incidentally recorded his success "in Italicis." He has expressed the highest feeling of the duty of an editor of the sacred text. He made the strongest professions of having performed that duty, both with regard to the O mirificam and the folio. These professions were tried to the utmost; and rather than make shipwreck of a good conscience, he abandoned his honourable and advantageous situation, together with his native country.

FRANCIS HUYSHE.

(To be continued.)

#### THE CITIES OF THE PLAIN.

To the Editor of the *British Magazine*.

SIR,—The cause of the destruction of the Cities of the Plain is implied in their history by Moses, and expressed by Jude. But it is remarkable that the book of Leviticus contains a series of prohibi-

of doctrine, a work which he himself compares to a fairy tale. In this work, however, he finds the following passage :\* "*The first thing we have to do, is to observe the commandments of God. If, afterwards, man wishes to add thereunto any good work, (aliquid boni in the Latin,) such as fasting, he will receive the greater recompense (majorem dignitatem in the Latin.)*" "Here," our traveller exclaims, "we have satisfaction to God by good works." Where? Fasting is called a good work; when practised in a spirit of humility, as a means to a moral end, it certainly is a good work, acceptable in the sight of God through the merits of Christ, and, therefore, having the promise of a recompense. But where does Hermas say, that a man by fasting can make satisfaction to God? With this specimen of the hardihood with which our traveller jumps to a conclusion, I shall close my present letter.

He has discovered a pope, relics of saints, apostolical traditions, a corporeal eucharist, and satisfaction to God by good works—all in the first century. Of the last two, I find no trace whatever; with respect to the first three, I find a bishop, not in the modern acceptation of the word, a Pope of Rome; I find that the bones of Ignatius were collected and deposited in a coffin, not exhibited to the people as objects of veneration. I find mention of apostolic traditions, but have yet to learn that the Romish traditions are apostolic.

I am, Mr. Editor, your obedient servant,  
PHILALETES CANTABRIGIENSIS.

#### VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIEN GREEK PRESS.

(Continued from p. 662, Vol. III.)

BUT Mr. Greswell furnishes still stronger ground than any of the quotations we have yet seen for our denying that Stephanus had the "vicious complaisance" which Mr. Porson ascribes to him, and that he would be ready to adopt readings, "whether from MSS. or from printed copies." Mr. G. distinctly records the fact, which at once confutes those who depend on the number of the MSS. of the margin, and presume to assert that "Stephanus's boast was utterly false," when he declared that the text of his *O mirificam* was, every letter of it, taken from the royal MSS. At p. 332, Mr. G. records an interview of Robert with the Sorbonne when he lays his folio before them. This leads to the important information of the number of the MSS. that he had received from the royal library; and Mr. Greswell thus tells us that they amounted to fifteen:—

"They demand, however, that the original copy or MS. shall be laid before them. Robert answers that it was impossible; that the original was not one MS. merely, but fifteen; which had been already carried back to the royal library, whence he had been indulged with the use of them." And Mr. G. quotes unexceptionable authority for his statement—what Robert himself published in his *Responsio*, p. 37.

\* Our Traveller here indulges in great laxity both of quotation and interpretation. The passage is in *Similitudo* v., section 3.

"Postulant afferri vetus exemplar, scilicet in quo legerent. Respondeo non posse fieri, quod non unum esset, sed quindecim, relata in Bibliothecam Regiam, quæ mihi precario data fuerant."

How little conscious soever Archdeacon Travis was of the value of the fact here established, that the grant from the royal library amounted to fifteen; and how much soever he might have despised it, if he had seen it,—his two illustrious correspondents could not but be sensible that it establishes the authority both of the *O mirificam* and of the *folio* against all the ingenious substitution of the documents selected to give opposing readings in the margin for the MSS. that were used to furnish the text in either edition. And, when Stephanus himself declared that the "*copia*" amounted to fifteen, which "*Bibliotheca regia facile suppeditavit*," I should have thought it utterly hopeless to have it still admitted that they were the eight royal MSS. of the margin, and the seven "*quæ undique corrogare licuit*." To adopt Bishop Middleton's words (on the article 653), "I contemplate with admiration and delight the gigantic exertions of intellect which have established this acquiescence." Observe the exquisite "management" of Mr. Porson. He says, p. 75, "R. Stephens affirms two things: 1st, That he once had fifteen MSS. [not sixteen]; 2nd, That he now had them no longer, but had sent them to the King's library. There is indeed a small inaccuracy in this account, but of no consequence."

Thus speaks Mr. Porson, correcting the small inaccuracy. The same unrivalled skill, by which he steers clear of the "*plures et meliores e Regiis*," in Stephanus's first *boast*, carries him safe from the *quindecim* in this. Stephanus is to be wrong in both boasts; only the "act, that roars so loud and thunders in the index," in the first, here sinks into a *small inaccuracy*. By this inaccuracy, owing to his not having had Mr. Porson's correction, he "affirms two things: 1st, That he had fifteen MSS. *from the royal library*; not the whole sixteen," (*vetustissima sedecim scripta exemplaria*), out of which he formed his text "*superioribus diebus*." 2nd, "That he now had them no longer, but had sent them *back again* to the King's library." But if the inaccurate printer chose to mention the number *fifteen*, he ought not to have said that they came from the *King's library*; and, of course, ought not to have said that they were sent *back* there. If he chose to state the circumstance of MSS. having been sent him from the royal library, and his having returned them, he ought either to have held his tongue about the number, or to have only told the number of those that he had selected out of them to furnish opposing readings to the *folio*. He ought to have said, "*non posse fieri quod non unum esset, sed octo, relata in Bibliothecam Regiam,—*" as the "*small inaccuracy*" of the *quindecim* stands corrected, Musch's *Le Long*, p. 208, s. xxix., "*codices nacti aliquot ipsa vetustatis specie plane adorandos, quorum (octo) copiam nobis Bibliotheca Regia facile suppeditavit*."

If there is a small inaccuracy in this account of Stephanus's, there is a small omission in that of his corrector. Mr. Porson has forgotten to inform us how he discovered that there was any inaccuracy. And neither he nor *Le Long*, when they correct him, and say *eight*, though he says *fifteen*, has told us what renders the correction necessary;

whether it be because fifteen MSS. from the royal library is inconsistent with what Stephanus himself has said elsewhere, or with certain inferences that have been drawn from the assumption that he had only fifteen in all. But, assuming the inaccuracy, Mr. Porson has undertaken to shew how it might take place.

"Stephens probably spoke from memory." Yes. Though he had his book of collation, which would have shewn the whole of the fact, there can be no doubt that he would speak from memory respecting the number of the royal MSS. which he had thrice collated, and just then returned. And from what do his correctors speak?

"The MSS. had been long returned." Qu. How long? They could not have been returned till they had been collated (now the third time) for the folio that was just then printed.

"And it concerned not his examiners, who required him to produce them, to know the exact history of every MS., its quondam possessor, &c. It was enough to tell them, in general terms, that he was unable to comply with their demand; that the MSS. were gone out of his hands; that they belonged to the royal library, and were now restored."

Stephanus was of a different opinion. He did not think it enough to tell them, in general terms, that he was unable to comply with their demand. Being now called upon for his authority, he thought it right for his own honour, and that of his different editions, not merely to repeat his former boast of having received MSS. from the royal library, but to come to particulars, and now to glory in the number that he had from thence. He could appeal to the royal library itself; and it was not one MS. merely, as they talked, but his *copia* amounted to fifteen. But whether Mr. Porson was right or Stephanus in this, it matters not. The man, in reality, acted upon this opinion; whether it was necessary or not, he did not content himself with the "general terms" of his former boast; but actually did commit himself to the particular number that he had received from the royal library. Now whatever may be said of the difficulty of detecting him in his first boast, of his not having printed a letter that was not sanctioned by a majority of the best of the royal MSS., if it were "utterly false;" when he now glories in having so many as fifteen of them, if he had been in the slightest degree inaccurate, he might have been confuted and exposed with no more trouble than that of a walk to the library. And I think the good Doctors of the Sorbonne might have had credit for zeal enough to make the inquiry. Stephanus too, in my opinion, had sense enough not to have laid himself open to be thus certainly exposed for having exceeded the truth, not only in his conference with the Sorbonne, but afterwards by publishing this boast of the number of the royal MSS. in his Latin *Responsio*, and again in French.

Mr. Porson could not but be aware that his hypothesis, with all its plausibility, might easily be confuted by considering thus the circumstances of the case; so he has another to succeed it. Stephanus, he suggests, might never have said quindecim to the Sorbonne. The Professor says, "Or he might, perhaps, forget the precise words of his answer to the examiners, and only retain the substance."

Whatsoever Stephanus might forget, I think he might be able to

recollect, though at the distance of two years, whether or no he had told his examiners that he had received more MSS. from the royal library than the whole that he had taken, first and last, to furnish opposing readings to his folio ;—and I am confident of his recollecting that, if his boast now of having seven more were inaccurate, they would not fail to expose him. Besides, with respect to this new plea, though Mr. Porson is fully justified in assuming that Stephanus would “speak from memory” when he told the Sorbonne the precise number of the MSS. that he had received from the royal library, he is not warranted in assuming now that the man wrote from memory in his *Responsio*. The treatise has all the appearance of having been written from notes, which it is reasonable to suppose he would make at the time of the different transactions ; but particularly after this most momentous scene.

High, then, as my admiration is of the exquisite skill with which Mr. Porson prevails on his readers to take his account of the number of the royal MSS. in preference to that of Stephanus, I still hold to the statement of the “editor and printer,” who I think was, upon the whole, full as likely to know the real number, and who was so deeply concerned to be *accurate*. And I cannot agree with Mr. Porson in thinking it so “small an inaccuracy,” and of “no consequence.” It is, I think, of infinite importance to decide on which side the *inaccuracy* lies. Stephani “De morte et sanguine certant.” If the inaccuracy is with Stephanus, so that he boasted of having had fifteen MSS. from the royal library, when Mr. Porson could shew that he had only the eight of the margin, then, although it be still impossible to make sense of Mill’s words, “In textu ad hos codices, &c.,” still the Professor was right in his charge that he would “adopt readings,” whether from MSS. or from printed copies to which he attributed the authority of MSS., (as Mr. Greswell gives it,) and after his solemn declaration in the *O mirificam*, repeated to Castellanus after the folio, and published both in Latin and French in his *Reponsio*, “*falsarius deprehenditur*.” But, on the other hand, if it lies with his correctors, Le Long and Mr. Porson, so that Stephanus really had the MSS. that he claimed, then he had seven more royal MSS. than he took at both selections for the margin of the folio. Till the reading then of these seven is ascertained, there is not the shadow of any ground for questioning his having followed, to a letter, the “*plures et meliores e Regiis* ;” then the declaration in the *O mirificam* accords perfectly with that in the folio, of his having had, at that time, “*vetustissima sedecim scripta exemplaria* ;” there was only one private MS. to interfere with the majority of the royal—not as the *Docti et Prudentes* have it, “*editio quæ fuit excusa*,” and seven written copies, “*quæ undique corrogare licuit* ;” then we see why Stephanus said, in that very striking manner, in his advertisement at the end of Beza’s notes, “*ea omnia, quæ in regis Gallorum bibliotheca extant*”—an expression for which nothing else will account. Then there is an unanswerable reason why Mill must find those very great discrepancies that his collation exhibits. Then, even supposing that Stephanus never added a single MS. besides those of the margin to the royal MSS., these seven

of them will shew that, when he says any where in his folio that he has given a reading that was not found in any of the documents that he had selected to furnish opposing readings to the text of his first volume, he does not thereby *ingenuously confess* that he gave a text contrary to all his documents printed and written; whether the Docti et Prudentes choose to laugh or to cry at this testimony. It is, in fine, not Stephanus who is either the fool or the falsifier.

Duly to appreciate Mr. Porson's inimitable "management," the reader ought to see the same difficulty, with the same mode of escape, in the hand of some other of the Docti et Prudentes. This is fortunately to be found in the "Monthly Repository," before referred to, No. XVII., May, 1828, p. 331. The editors say, "That it is difficult to reconcile with one another all the statements which Robert Stephens made respecting his MSS. is true."

You will never find in Mr. Porson such a clear indication of the consciousness of the Docti et Prudentes, that it is absolutely impossible to reconcile their theory respecting Stephanus's MSS. with his plain distinct statements. With all due deference to the learned critics, I can furnish them with an infallible method of reconciling all Stephanus's statements with one another, with all the facts recorded by others, and with the internal evidence of the editions themselves. Take his words in their plain literal sense, neither adding to them nor diminishing from them. When he says in his margin merely *omnibus*, do not add *nostris*; when he merely says *nostris*, do not add *omnibus*; when he says *Regia*, let them be royal MSS., and not those "*quæ undique corrigare licuit*." When he says *scripta*, let them be *written* documents, and not *impressa*; and let *vetustissima* mean very *old*; and (putting them together) let *vetustissima scripta* not mean *printed editions*, published only twenty-four years before. Let *quindecim* mean fifteen, and not eight. And, as for "small inaccuracies," since the greatest man amongst you admits them to be *small* and of "*no consequence*," be so good as to let them stand without correction, and I will be answerable for the consequence. I am fully aware of the evils that will ensue from such a course; I simply say that all difficulties with respect to Stephanus will vanish. Follow the rule, and where is the slightest inconsistency in Stephanus's statements?

The learned critics reply, "In the context of the passage which we have quoted from his answer to the divines of Paris, he says he has returned his *fifteen* MSS. to the King's library; though, in his preface, he professes to have received only eight from it." A reader, not well versed in such publications, will perhaps think it is "difficult to reconcile" with common sense, his being thus called upon to believe, that Stephanus laid before the Sorbonne a book just printed, in which he "*professes to have received only eight*" MSS. from the royal library; and that he would at the self-same moment tell them that he had received *fifteen*, and had *returned* them to the library. But he must admire the felicitous tact of Mr. Porson, if he will do—what he ought always to do upon such occasions—examine quotations for himself. He will find that Stephanus, in his preface, merely tells us what MSS. he has selected to furnish opposing readings to the text of his folio, eight

VOL. IV.—July, 1833.

†

of which were from the royal library, so that our canon would cut off this *profession* of having *received only eight*. I have never yet heard of the Docti et Prudentes finding it "difficult to reconcile with one another all the statements that Robert Stephens made respecting his *printed documents*." In the *O mirificam* he says, "*adjuti sumus cum aliis, tum vero Complutensi editione;*" but we do not find any of the *others* quoted in the margin: still I have never heard it asserted that in the preface he professes to have had the Complutensian *only*. The critics are perfectly ready to admit that the Complutensian was *selected* out of the different printed editions to furnish various readings. It is only in the case of *written* copies, where Stephanus says that he had seven *others* from the royal library besides the eight of the margin, that the discovery is made of the impossibility of his having any documents but those that were taken to give opposing readings. The critics, having accomplished their object by representing the selection of eight out of the fifteen royal MSS. to be "professing to have *received only eight*," add, "He had an evident motive for representing all his MSS. as completely gone out of his own power, as this afforded the best reason for refusing to gratify an inquisitorial curiosity." "It is the usual support of folly," says Warburton, in his own energetic manner, "to throw its distresses upon knavery." Thus do these gentlemen argue, who chose openly, as Mr. Porson here expresses it, "to give Stephens the lie," (p. 75.) But they have not thought fit to inform us how Stephanus's asserting that he had received fifteen MSS. from the royal library, if he really had only eight, would stop inquisitorial curiosity respecting those which the preface (at that moment laid before the Sorbonne) distinctly mentioned, as "*quæ undique corrogare licuit*." And, with respect to those that belonged to the royal library, if they were "gone completely out of his power," they were gone completely into the power of the librarian, who would have been able to state what the number actually was. Bishop Marsh justly observes (*Michaelis*, ii. 792, n. 289,) "As these very MSS. were at that time a subject of public controversy, it is wholly incredible, if he had asserted a falsehood, that it should have remained undetected."

No one, then, will wonder that his Lordship himself took a different method with this most troublesome "*Quindecim*;" (*Letters*, p. 235, note 140,) and that he would lead his readers to believe that Stephanus never did boast of having had *fifteen* MSS. from the royal library. The success was complete on Dr. Hales, who (let it be remembered) esteemed Griesbach's censure of Stephanus to be praise. Dr. H. (*Faith in Trinity*, ii. p. 159,) gives this translation of the words of the *Responsio*: "I answered, (says Stephens,) that there was *not one*, but *fifteen*: that those which had been lent me from the King's library were returned . . . . ."

It should be observed that Dr. Hales places a colon here after the word *fifteen*, so as to form a new sentence in the ensuing words; and that, at p. 161, where he reprobates poor Travis for omitting a comma, he himself makes this insertion of a colon, in Stephanus's own words, after "*quindecim*," cutting it off from "*relata*," the word that agrees with it in construction: professing to give the sentence as it *stands in the original*, he still prints it, "*quòd non unum*



eset sed *quindecim* : relata in Bibliothecam——." But what is the most surprising is, that the good Doctor ventures at all on giving a translation, when it was so wisely omitted by the acute Letter-writer himself, and also by the critic who follows him, "Christian Observer," No. 64, April, 1807, p. 225, note. It was sufficient for them to give their warrant to Dr. Hales's colon by making a separate sentence out of the subjoined clause, "relata in Bibliothecam," "which had been already sent back to the royal library," as Mr. Greswell renders it; they would hardly commit themselves to the actual rendering of Stephanus's words, as if they had been "*Ex his autem relata esse in Bibliothecam Regiam ea quæ.*" The very mode in which this cutting up of the quotation is introduced by the learned inventor might have served to save Dr. Hales from his translation. Letters 236, note 140, he says, "I own that it is obscure." Yes; and a schoolboy would have been flogged for making such an obscurity. But the note adds, "But Stephens had good reason for not being explicit on this subject. If he made particular mention of the MSS. which he had procured from his friends, he might have exposed those friends to the same persecution as he himself underwent." This is said when there was the sanction of the King himself in giving MSS. for the undertaking, as the Pope had done previously for the Complutensian; and Stephanus, at that very moment, laid before his examiners his folio, which actually "made particular mention of some of the MSS." which he had thus procured; and this in a manner not, I think, very likely to commit any friend who had furnished him any MS. Then follows the obscurity which the learned writer's plan makes for you. "He says, therefore, only in general terms that he had used fifteen MSS.; that he had returned to the King's library those which [*ea, quæ*] he had borrowed from it, and then suddenly breaks off without naming the rest." Now take Stephanus's own punctuation, and render the passage exactly as you would render it if they were not the words of an old editor giving a statement of materials that he had for his critical editions; and what can you have more plain and clear? Look at Mr. Greswell's construction above; look at Maittaire, in his account, prefixed to the London edition of Stephanus's Dictionary, which Dr. Hales had before him, "respondet fieri non posse; nec unum esse, sed quindecim in Regiam Bibliothecam relata, quæ ipsi precario data fuerant." And Maittaire is so far from finding any *obscurity* in thus following Stephanus's punctuation, as the cutting the words into two different sentences does produce, that he says, *Annales Typographici*, tom. ii. pars i. p. 456, note(c.), "Hic attende lector, Robertus Stephanus disertis verbis aperit *Exemplaria quindecim ex regia Bibliotheca ipsi precario data et in eandem relata.*" If you would prefer the opinion of a good staunch Humanitarian, take that of Mr. Lindsey. In his paper, signed Sosipater, in *Commentaries and Essays*, No. V., an. 1786, he gives a translation of a considerable part of Wetsten's note on 1 John v. 7; and so is brought to this passage; for let it be noted, Wetsten gives the words of the Responsio, and, therefore, knew that Stephanus had seven more MSS. from the royal library, than those which he quoted in his margin. Mr. Lindsey, then, at p. 522, renders the passage

thus—"They require me to bring them my ancient MS. ; I answer, that it cannot be done, because it was not one only, but fifteen, that I made use of, and which were lent me out of the King's library, where I returned them." Another writer, also, who has ranked, I believe, still higher with those gentlemen,—Mr. Belsham,—at p. 8 of the highly extolled introduction of his Improved Version, at once gives testimony to Mr. Greswell's rendering of Stephanus's words, against one of Mr. Travis's mighty correspondents, and to the accuracy of those words against the other. "A.D. 1550. Robert Stephens, a learned printer at Paris, published a splendid edition of the New Testament in Greek, in which he availed himself of the Complutensian Polyglot, and likewise of the permission granted by the King of France, to collate fifteen MSS. in the royal library." There is, however, a work, which I think Dr. Hales was bound to have consulted before he inserted his colon in Stephanus's words, or gave his version of them, because the learned author who suggested that version to him thus called his attention to it. Letters, p. 236, n. 140, as above—"Perhaps in Stephens's Answer to the Paris Divines, which he himself published in French, at the very same time that he published it in Latin, the sentence is so worded as more fully to explain the matter." If the reader wants to have the matter more fully explained, let him take the passage as it stands in the French: "Ils demandent qu'on leur apporte le vieil exemplaire, pensez que c'estoit pour y lire. Je respond qu'il ne se peut faire, pource qu'il n'y en auoit point vue tant seulement, mais quinze, qu'on auoit reportez en la librairie du Roy, lesquels i' auoye eu par grand priere: les ayant bien deligemment conferez, que i' auoye imprime cestuy ci selon le debvoir que i' auoye tant enuers le Prince que la republique."

FRANCIS HUYSHE.

(To be continued.)

---

#### ON THE COMING OF THE SON OF MAN.

SIR,—The office of verbal critic, upon which I ventured, is quite distinct from that of the interpreter of prophecy: although it is only upon the humble labours of the one that the fair superstructure of the other can be raised with any security. If the following remarks should contribute in any degree to illustrate the phraseology of the "Prophecy of our Lord," their purpose will be fully answered; but as they involve a particular mode of interpretation, I have written them with a strict attention to this excellent rule which has been laid down by your correspondent "H.," without any reference to the present question, in a judicious paper concerning the "Millenarian Denomination," vol. ii. p. 364. He that allegorizeth Scripture "is in duty bound to evince, by reasons, and by the diligent removal of objections, that he has not lightly taken the bolder and more responsible part; and, even when he has acquitted himself of that task, he is not entitled to impose his refinements upon others by way of dogma,

be useless: the dishonesty and faithlessness of mankind render them necessary. Christians, therefore, may use them; but they must not imitate the heathen practice of engraving upon them instruments of war, which are ill-suited to the peaceful character of the gospel; or indiscreet figures, or idolatrous symbols. The engraving on their seals must be of a Christian character,—a ship sailing with a prosperous breeze, to denote the passage of the Christian over the stormy sea of life to the haven of heaven; a fish, which, by reminding him of the element in which he was baptized, may remind him of his baptismal vow. In like manner as the gentiles represented on their drinking cups the figures of their god, stories borrowed from their *heathen* mythology, &c., the Christians engraved on their cups the figure of the good Shepherd, bearing the lost sheep on his shoulder, &c.\* The tradition, then, to which our Traveller appeals in the present instance, is not apostolic, but pagan, tradition—a tradition to which the Romish church has been said, in other instances, to be largely indebted. The early Christians derived from their heathen ancestors the fashion of ornamenting their cups and seals with figures and devices; but, instead of using heathen, they used Christian emblems. *Ergo*, concludes our Traveller, they venerated images. Having now accompanied him through the second century of Christianity, I shall close my present letter.\*

I am, PHILALETHES CANTABRIGIENSIS.

#### VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIAN GREEK PRESS.

(Continued from p. 36.)

UPON the whole, then, when Le Long says (Letter to Martin, April, 1720; *Journal des Sçavans*, lxxvii. p. 650; and Emlyn's Works, ii. p. 274), and so many of the Docti et Prudentes say after him,—“Robert Estienne declare, p. 36, de sa reponse au Theologiens de Paris, qu'il a remis dans la bibliotheque du Roi les MSS., qu'on lui avoit confiés,”—it is the truth, but not the whole truth. He makes no *obscurity*, but tells his readers fairly that Robert speaks in this place of MSS. which he had received from the royal library; and this contents him. He acts on Mr. Porson's principle (p. 75), “It was enough to tell them so in general terms.” If he had descended to particulars, he might have told us the number that Stephanus said he had received from the royal library. But the saying—“les quinze MSS., qu'on lui avoit confiés,” would hardly have suited Le Long's undertaking, in this letter, concerning a certain text that stands in *all* Stephanus's editions, viz., “J'assure seulement icy qu'il n'est dans aucun des MSS. dont Ro. Estienne s'est servi pour l'edition Grecque du N. Test. de 1550.” Again, when we are told (Michaelis ii. 792, note 289, referred to above, et passim) “In his Answer to the Paris divines, p. 37 (Wetstenii N. T., vol. ii. p. 724), he declares that he

\* The Editor takes the liberty of expressing his hope that these learned and admirable letters may be continued, and afterwards separately published.

had returned all his MSS.," this is rather more than the truth. Stephanus does not declare that he carried back to the royal library those MSS. that did not belong to it, but to either private persons or to other libraries; he declares that he carried back those fifteen which had been granted to him from thence upon his petition. Still farther, when we read—Letters, p. 235, note 140, referred to above, Michaelis, ii. 795, et passim—of "the eight which he borrowed from the royal library," let it be remembered that these are "*ea omnia*" of which Robert says in his advertisement at the end of Beza's first edition—"quæ in regis Galliarum bibliotheca extant." You must bear in mind on the perpetual recurrence of this expression—"the eight which he had borrowed,"—that it means "eight of those that he had borrowed," namely, those which he selected, first and last, out of the fifteen that he had received, to furnish opposing readings to the text of the folio. For I must hold Stephanus to have been accurate in his statements, till something more shall be brought against him than the bare assumption that he is inaccurate; and I correct the correctors. For Le Long's "*octo*," I take Stephanus's "*quindecim*," and say, "quorum copiam (quindecim) nobis bibliotheca regia facile suppeditavit"—*ea omnia* quæ in regis Galliarum bibliotheca extant:" and I give to each his own: "the small inaccuracy" of saying *eight* when the man actually had *fifteen*, I give to Mr. Porson; the *obscurity*—the groping in the noon-day as in the night—belongs to Mr. Travis's other illustrious correspondent; whilst I leave the wilful falsehood with its devisers, the gentlemen of the "Monthly Repository;" and I ascribe to Stephanus the intention of giving the actual number of the Regii, that he had before boasted of, *ea omnia*, which he followed to a letter in the text of his first edition; out of which he selected eight, just as he selected one printed edition out of "cum aliis tum vero Complutensi editione,"—or, as Beza expresses it, in all the editions of his *Adnotationes*,\* "omnibus pene impressis,"—to furnish opposing readings to the text of his folio; in the same manner, also, as we now proceed to shew, he selected the seven other MSS. of the margin out of those "quæ undique corrogare licuit."

Here Mr. Greswell assists us with facts, as he has with the express words of Robert himself, in the case of the royal MSS. It does appear to me most wonderful, that any one should believe he could be so long time preparing for his grand work of the folio, without adding one single MS. to the stock with which he began—with merely the general view that Mr. Greswell gives of our "printer and editor's" conduct, of which, as Mr. Porson would express it, he himself *boasts* in his *O mirificam*—"qua in cæteris uti solemus diligentiam." But I have declared, as I have always felt, that the opposite to what Wetsten says is the truth, though, as we have seen, adopted by

---

\* *Adnotationes*.] The reader will do well to attend to this distinction; Beza himself very properly numbers his editions from his first *Annotations*, for these shewed sufficiently what text he would have given. Wetsten takes Beza's own statement, as he ought. Succeeding critics have introduced sad confusion, by numbering the editions that he gave with a Greek text.

Mr. Porson—"Levitatis ejus hoc est indicium, quod nullo novo testimonio accedente, intraque triennium, tantopere a se ipso dissensit Stephanus."—Prol. 146, 5; Seml. 376. "Levitatis indicium"—aye, lighter than vanity must the mind of Wetsten's dupe be, who can actually be persuaded "*nullum novum testimonium accepisse, tantopere a se ipso dissentiente Stephano;*" and I have exulted, I have triumphed, in the testimony that we have had from Crito Cantabrigiensis to this retort, where he so flatly contradicts the great man whom he undertakes to vindicate; and asserts, 389, that the three editions, with a few variations, gave the same text throughout, making this the groundwork of his "pretty good defence for those who have hitherto believed that R. Stephens had but one single set of MSS., consisting of sixteen copies [printed and written], for his various readings, as well as for the text of his three editions" (402).

The proof is greatly strengthened by the observation of the Docti et Prudentes themselves, that Henry Estienne boasts so much of what he had done for his father in the work of collations. What time, and in what country Henry was thus employed; we may learn from Mr. Gresswell's 22nd chapter. We find that Italy was the country where he was sent to make these collations, and that he was kept there almost the whole of the time between the first *O mirificam* and the folio, passing from one storehouse of MSS. to another. These collations "in Italicis" were not made, as Griesbach represents, xvi. 4. Lond. xxviii., by "*octodecim annorum puero,*" adopting the misrepresentation of Wetsten, 143, 369, Seml.; Henry was not, as Michaelis (ii. 316) is pleased to say, "at that time too young, too impatient, and too little experienced in criticism, for an undertaking of that nature." From these random assertions, we may appeal to the scattered notices which Henry has himself left of his collations, particularly in his *Greek Thesaurus*. Several of them are collected by Wetsten himself, Prol. 143, 144; Semler, 370—372; and let the reader judge whether Wetsten could actually believe that the collations were made by "*tunc temporis octodecim annorum puero,*" and whether Michaelis could really have thought they betrayed the impatience and inexperience that he is pleased to charge upon their author. These specimens, brought together by no friendly hand, may serve to shew that he was not unworthy of being sent to Italy upon such a work, but that he deserved the encomium which Beza bestowed on a book given him by his father: "*ab Henrico Stephano ejus filio et paternæ sedulitatis hærede quam diligentissime collatum.*" And let it be observed, that the productions of "the Early Parisian Greek Press," under his superintendence afterwards, proved that he had enough of the "*paterna sedulitas*" to extend his inquiries beyond his father's present object, and to embrace the Greek classic writers also. The exertions, then, of Henry in Italy, might, I think, have saved his father and the intended folio from the apology that Mr. Gresswell offers, i. 330, if we could speak of them only in these general terms. I am aware of the persecutions that Thuanus records, in the passage quoted by Maittaire, *Hist. Stephan.*, p. 71. If these, however, made him renit his own personal exertions in despair, he recovered his spirit and pursued

his grand object with renewed ardour. As Maittaire says, quoting Robert's own *Responsio*, "Theologis obmutescens, opus interruptum repetit, editionem scilicet Novi Testamenti Græcam, majore forma, quam anno sequente perfectam emisit." And let it be observed, that he did not recal his son from Italy; the collator steadily pursued his work, safe from all these storms.

By singular good fortune, however, we are not left to form guesses of our own, what must be the effect of such a man being so employed, and in such a country. It is from Henry's own testimony that we are warranted in what has been already stated; viz., that the original grant of the fifteen MSS., "*ea omnia*, quæ in regis Galliarum bibliotheca extant," was more than doubled at last. A fact snatched from oblivion, so fortuitously, and so undesignedly—a fact, which speaks so highly to the honour of those, whom Mr. Greswell loves to honour, the Stephani, father and son—so deeply interesting to all who profess to value the writings of the New Testament, ought to have graced the pages of the "View of the Early Parisian Greek Press." Though Henry published a small Greek Testament in 1576 (Greswell, ii. 325), he gives no notice whatsoever of the materials from which his text is formed. At the end of his learned preface, he offers some conjectures of his own, which are animadverted upon by Mill, 1264, 1265; and he contents himself with solemnly assuring his readers, that he had admitted no such alteration in his text.—See 6th vol. *Critici Sacri*, p. xxxi. But Henry published another edition in 1587 (Greswell, ii. 353). Speaking in the preface of the summaries or headings, *κεφαλαια*, of old MSS., he is fortunately led to say, "Plusquam enim triginta vidi, partim in Regis Galliæ bibliotheca (quorum auctoritatem et fidem pater meus in illa cujus paulo ante memini editione secutus est) partim in Italicis, qui eadem iisdem in locis *κεφαλαια* habebant." This was known to his father's modern accusers. It is referred to by Wetsten, Prol. 143 and 144; Semler, 369 and 373. In the next paragraph, Henry proceeds to speak of *κεφαλαια*, in Greek hexameters; where he says, "Eos ego cum nuper in mea bibliotheca reperissem potius quam invenissem (vix enim recordabar ex eorum numero quæ pater meus ex illis exemplaribus describenda curaverat, hos etiam esse versus)...." This so decidedly brings into Robert's possession what the "paternæ sedulitatis hæres" had been investigating "in Italicis," in the interval between the publication of the *O mirificam* and the folio, that Wetsten does not meddle with this part of Henry's testimony, to which, however, his attention had been distinctly called by Bengel, *Introd. in Cris. s. xxxix. 13*; *Appar. p. 82*. How then does Wetsten meet the inference that Robert had for his folio this accession to his original stock of materials? He had luckily got an anonymous censurer, who dated these collations of Henry in Italy, "post editionem an. 1550," (Prol. 143, Seml. 370), i. e., after Henry had left Italy, and when the collations could be of no use. Wetsten has an easy task in demolishing such an absurdity; and this is to pass as a proof of his old assumption, that there never were more than the MSS. of the margin of the folio—never but one collation—and that this single collation of this single set was made by Henry "tunc tem-

poris 18 annorum puero." "Si Henricus Stephanus codices bibliothecæ regis Galliæ et Italicos contulit, et si pater ejus Robertus ea collatione usus est cum N. T. Græcum et parvo et magno volumine excuderet, manifestissime consequitur illam collationem non post annum 1550, sed ante annum 1546 fuisse factam,"—Prol. 144, Seml. 372, where it will be observed that Wetsten repays his critic in his own coin. His sapient opponent makes Henry collate the MSS. "in Italicis" after he had left the country; Wetsten is even with him, by representing Henry to have collated the MSS. "in Italicis" before he had ever seen the country. "Italicos contulit . . . ante annum 1546." And you are to take this as a good and sufficient answer to what Bengel quotes from Henry's Preface, "Hæc cum partim sciret, partim facillime scire potuisset J. A. Bengelius, nescio qua de causa ad veterem cantilenam rediens, xvi., inquit, *Codices contulerat Robertus; igitur ix. plus minus Henricus.*" [Bengel takes Beza's reckoning, "xxv. plus minus."] "Nescio qua de causa," says Wetsten, with all possible simplicity. Why, then I will tell you; it was because he took Henry's word for his having seen these MSS. with the same *κεφαλαια* in the royal library and in those of Italy; and as for the time of Henry's seeing those in Italy, Bengel would take it to be whilst he was in Italy. "Ad veterem cantilenam rediens," says Wetsten. Aye, you must come back at last to the old tune. Robert declared to the Sorbonne, that the "copia" which the royal library supplied was fifteen; and as he had sixteen for his text, "superioribus diebus," he must have added one to them. As these were collated "iterum et tertio," Henry might be concerned in that work for the second O mirificam, "parvo volumine;" indeed, he has left proof of his knowledge of those royal MSS., which were not taken, first or last, for the margin. But the examinations "in Italicis" were, except in one instance, entirely his own, and they were made ("inter utrumque tempus") neither before he went to Italy, nor after he had left it, but during the time that he resided in that country, and whilst they could be available for the purpose that carried him to search for such MSS.,—as Bengel observes, "memorat nonnulla, quæ ipsius pater ex his exemplaribus describenda curaverat."

We may regret that Henry's statement is so jejune; let us remember, however, that he had no intention of furnishing us with an account of the materials of his father's folio. He is speaking only of the summaries or headings (*κεφαλαια*) of ancient MSS. But if there could be any doubt that his knowledge of those "in Italicis" was obtained by making preparations for the folio, the succeeding statements of transcripts being made for his father, cuts off that doubt completely. Whatsoever, then, was Robert's own personal acquisition, between the editions of 1546 and 1550, the exertions of his son alone, in Italy, had more than doubled the original fifteen of the royal library. Neither the fact, then, of there having been fifteen royal MSS. for the first edition of 1546, nor that of these being more than doubled "in Italicis" for the folio, are given in that full manner in which they would have appeared, if it had been the object to state them. But the value of the testimony, which is thus casually obtained,

is incomparably greater; malignity itself cannot assert that they were given for the purpose of enhancing the authority of these editions. They lie so much out of all regular information respecting Stephanus's editions, that it is in my opinion clear that neither Mill, nor Curcellæus before him, nor father Morin himself, had the slightest suspicion of either of these testimonies; nor, indeed, do they appear to have been sufficiently acquainted with the history of the Stephani to be aware of Robert having sent his son into Italy to obtain materials for his folio. It is nothing more than justice to mention this distinctly, as it tends so much to extenuate the fault of the earlier critics in the erroneous statements which they have given respecting Stephanus's editions. But what is to be said of those, who can persevere in inculcating the inconsistent slanders of these men, when the facts which so decidedly confute them have been brought to light. But so it is. Robert, in the most solemn manner, declares respecting his first edition, that "he had not suffered a letter to be printed but what the greater part of the better MSS. *from the royal library* unanimously approved." The Docti et Prudentes agree that this shall be "*utterly false*;" they give Robert's words—"e codicibus quorum copiam bibliotheca regia suppeditaverit"—and say, "*vanissima hæc omnia sunt et falsissima*:" and thus they have not merely the honour of keeping up the absurdity of their predecessors, in applying a set of documents selected four years afterwards, for a totally opposite purpose, half of which consists either of private MSS. or of print—to an edition professing to be formed from *royal* MSS.,—but they do this knowing that there were seven more royal MSS. than the eight which they have applied to that edition. Again, with respect to the folio, Robert holds so firmly to his first pledge of giving his text from MS. only, that he declares, under the most trying circumstances, "no consideration could ever induce him to change anything contrary to the faith of all the MSS., and thus be found a falsifier." Yet we are to be told that he shews a "partiality" for printed editions—"vicious complaisance"—"cœcus impetus"—that, "in the exercise of the *δευτεραι φροντιδες*, he was led to think less highly of some of his readings, and to adopt others, whether from MSS. or *from printed copies*, to which he attributed the authority of MSS." And in this the Docti et Prudentes do not merely adopt the palpable absurdity of ascribing the text of two editions, that vary so much from each other, to the self-same materials; they do not merely adhere to this, when they see the folio itself declaring, more than a hundred times, that the text in those passages was formed out of MSS., different from every one of those which they assign to it. They not only assume, with their predecessors of olden time, that such a man as Robert Estienne could be four years in preparing for his folio, without adding a single MS. to his original stock, but they can do this with their own actual knowledge of the fact, that the man had kept his son almost the whole time searching the Italian libraries for MSS.; and that his son was thus enabled to say he had seen above thirty MSS. in those libraries and that of the King of France, with the same summaries (*κεφαλαια*); so that no doubt could exist what collations Henry was



sent to make; nor could there be any doubt for whom they were made, when he speaks of extracts "*quæ pater meus ex illis exemplaribus describenda curaverat.*" Henry's edition of 1587, in which this decisive testimony appears, was reprinted in the same year in London, by Vautrollier, which, we are told, was the first time the Greek text issued from an English press. But the reader may satisfy himself without procuring either edition. The preface is given in the 6th vol. of the *Critici Sacri*, p. 2063, and the *κεφαλαια* follow, which, I suspect, would alone decide whether Robert has been "*found a falsifier.*" I have not been informed that any one of the marked MSS. of the margin has these old metrical *κεφαλαια*.

Here our discussion might terminate. This is my case. Thus does it stand between Stephanus and his accusers; both those of the old school and those of the new. Nothing, however, ought to be omitted to give full assurance of understanding on a point of such vital importance to every one that nameth the name of Christ, and does not abandon himself to what others may choose to *propound*. Dr. Cardwell, in his masterly exposure of misrepresentations respecting our printed Bibles (*Brit. Mag.*, March, 1833, p. 329), justly holds that "there is nothing more deserving of respect and protection, than the confidence with which an unlettered peasant looks upon his English Bible, as expressing to him the genuine word of God." What then ought to be our feelings respecting those editions of the Greek Testament, upon which not only our English Bibles but those of every Protestant church are founded? I may be pardoned, then, for still requesting the reader's attention to the testimony of Stephanus's accusers against themselves. I may be allowed to hammer a plate or two for the covering of the altar, out of the censers of these critics, which are hallowed, against their own souls.

FRANCIS HUYSHE.

---

#### ON THE COMING OF THE SON OF MAN.

SIR,—This globe of earth has been permitted by the Lord of heaven and earth to become the stage of warfare between a powerful evil spirit and the Son of God. The reason why this is so has not been revealed; but the sure word of prophecy discloses to us, that the great periods of this eventful history, like the acts of a drama, have been all methodically arranged and carefully provided for by the Almighty disposer of events. And, though the contest may appear in itself both long and perilous, yet certain victory is held up in the distance to the view of the believer: the eye of faith sees, as in a glass, the Son of God going forth conquering and to conquer.

The different preparatory steps to this victory are clearly marked out by definite eras in the prophetic history, and in each of them there is gained a visible advantage over the power of Satan. Each of these ages closes in a time of general disturbance, when the principles of the evil one are set in open array against the principles of holiness. But

type, figure, sign, &c., as applied to the eucharist, is to be found neither in the Scriptures nor in any of the *pure* Christian writers of the two first centuries. I believe that Clement of Alexandria is usually mentioned among the Christian writers of the second century, and I find in him the following expression: "Scripture has called wine a mystic *symbol* of the holy blood."\* Perhaps Clement was not, in our Traveller's estimation,† a *pure* Christian writer, or perhaps he accommodated his language to the secret discipline to which the Romish writers always flee, as to their last refuge in cases of difficulty. But the consideration of this important subject, the *Disciplina Arcani*, must be reserved for a future letter. I cannot, however, conclude the present without noticing our Traveller's bold attempt to bring forward Origen as a witness in favour of the real, corporal presence. If anything is certain, it is that Origen acknowledged only a spiritual presence of Christ in the eucharist.

I am &c., PHILALETHES CANTABRIGIENSIS.

#### VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIAN GREEK PRESS.

(Continued from p. 167.)

[P. 162, l. 9, insert *not* before *en omnia*. P. 163, l. 5, for *accepiisse* read *accessisse*.]

TURN first to Michaelis ii. p. 861, note 43, where you will read this avowal—"We sometimes say [Nos Docti et Prudentes] that the number of manuscripts quoted by Stephens amounted to sixteen, at other times we say that they amounted only to fifteen, according as we include the Complutensian edition or not." An honest Irishman might talk of sixteen printed copies, in which he included fifteen that were manuscripts; or sixteen MSS., in which he included one that was printed. But what motive could induce men of the highest acquirements, and the most brilliant abilities, to imitate him? Besides, Paddy would be consistent in his diction. He would not, for one particular occasion, always include the printed edition, and assert that Stephanus took sixteen *written* copies to give opposing readings to this text of his folio; and, on all other occasions, contend that he never had but fifteen written copies in all, for furnishing the text either of the O mirificam or the folio itself. But what say the Docti et Prudentes? "We sometimes" have to identify the different kinds of authorities, "*quoted* by Stephens," for his marginal readings (viz. the edition, selected from "*omnibus pæne impressis*," and the written copies, selected out of the thirty and more that were obtained at last) with the materials from which the text of the first O mirificam was obtained, (viz. the *fifteen* royal MSS. and the other private one.) Then "we include the Complutensian edition," and "say that the

\* Μυστικὸν δὲ αὐτὸν σύμβολον ἢ γραφὴ αἵματος ἁγίου οἶνον ὠνόμασεν. *Pædagog.* 1.2. cxxxiv. 9. Ed. Potter.

† Our Traveller somewhere says, that Clement, when speaking of the Gnosis, breathes all the spirit of Gnosticism.

number of *manuscripts* quoted by Stephens amounted to sixteen; at other times" we have to speak only of the accompaniments to the folio, and do not want to confound them with the materials for the O mirificam: then *Je ne puis rien nommer, si ce n'est par son nom*; (Porson, p. xxiii.) manuscript is manuscript, and print is print: we tell the truth, and "say that the number of *manuscripts quoted*" "amounted *only to fifteen*." Now, courteous reader, without stirring from the preface of the folio, if you are not satisfied respecting the charges of the Docti et Prudentes, from this their own avowal, "*much learning*" has affected your mind also; and if I had, not merely all Stephanus's books of collations to lay before you—"quæ describenda curaverat,"—but all the Italian MSS. themselves, that Henry collated, all the private MSS. in France, which he himself obtained—and "ea omnia (all the fifteen) quæ in regis Galliarum bibliotheca extant"—"all those, as Mr. Porson says (Kidd, 353), which are extant in the King of France's library,"—and none of these Cod. MSS. "mutilatos aut laceros"—(Griesbach, ii. p. [3] note, Lond p. 687)—so that I could shew you in them all the hated readings of Stephanus;—still, not one word should you hear from me, to disturb your most holy faith, that "Etienne a été un fourbe, un homme digne du dernier mepris, un infame;" no attempt would I make to stop your laughter at the man, "qui negare vellet." I shall only weep at seeing a Barnabas also carried away with their dissimulation. Yes, I say it with shame, second only to that which I feel when Mill, having given the seven MSS. "quæ undique corrogare licuit," and the printed Complutensian, says, "in textu ad hos codices formando ita se comparatum ait Robertus, ut religiose ac plane ad literam sequeretur plures ac meliores e *Regiis*,"—Mr. Greswell can say, i. 320, "Robert professes to give in the margin of this splendid book select various readings (for so, I conceive, his words imply) of sixteen MSS., of which, however, the printed Complutensian was to be reckoned as one."

It is not only from Michaelis's Rt. Rev. translator that we have such decided testimony respecting the Preface to the folio. Michaelis is scarcely less explicit himself: ii. p. 317, in his own note, he says, "from the expression *scriptis exemplaribus*, Martin attempted to prove that Stephens had sixteen manuscripts beside the Complutensian bible, not merely fifteen, as is generally supposed." Martin was able to read. And as he read "*superioribus diebus*.....N. T.....cum vetustissimis sedecim scriptis exemplaribus .... collatum .... excudimus," he saw that Stephanus had *sixteen ancient written* copies to form his text in 1546; but, as unfortunately he was a component part of Mr. Porson's "couple of Clotens," (p. 64,) he did not conclude that these sixteen, of 1546, could not be the fifteen selected to oppose the text of 1550; but, following Stephanus's accusers in identifying the two sets, he adds one to the documents of the margin: and the Docti et Prudentes make good use of this piece of wisdom in him and his brother Cloten. But mark what Michaelis is obliged to admit:—

Note continued ii. 317—"Now it cannot be denied, that if we abide by this expression alone, the inference deduced by Martin is

very natural." "It cannot," you see, "be denied, that if we abide by this expression alone"—even without referring to the "*plures et meliores e regiis*," the "*quindecim*," that were sent back to the royal library, "*ea omnia*,"—and to the "*plus quam triginta*" of Henry; the Docti et Prudentes are stopped *in limine*. Michaelis admits, what I have so pertinaciously maintained, viz. that a newly printed edition cannot be said to be a *very old written* copy; so that "if we abide by this expression" *vetustissimis* and by *scriptis*, Stephanus in fact declares that he had sixteen *very old written* copies, for the text of his O mirificam, "*superioribus diebus*;" and that alone will be rather *against* a set which contains the Complutensian edition, "*editio... quæ fuit excusa*."

Just however as I am crying "Io triumphe," Michaelis checks me, and shews why we must not "abide by this expression." He adds "—but as Stephens explains himself soon after more clearly, it is certain that his codex  $\alpha$  signifies the Complutensian bible, and that he had only sixteen copies, inclusive of that bible; an inaccurate expression therefore cannot be used as an argument in favour of an assertion which contradicts itself." Michaelis "*explains himself*" very "*clearly*," when he thus decides, that what Stephanus says of a set of documents selected in 1550 to give opposing readings to the folio, is to explain the account he had given of the MSS. that he had for the formation of his O mirificam of 1546. Michaelis, like the rest of the Docti et Prudentes, has omitted to inform us why Stephanus must (as they assume) select for opposing his text, in 1550, precisely those documents, out of which he formed his text in 1546. Nor has he explained how it was possible for Stephanus to have had, in 1546, the MSS. "*quæ undique corrogare licuit*," between that time and 1550. "It is certain," says Michaelis, "that he had only sixteen copies, inclusive of that bible." It is certain that he selected only sixteen in all, print and manuscript, to oppose the text of the folio: but I again ask, what has the selection of documents for opposing the text of the folio in 1550, to do with the forming the text of the O mirificam in 1546? Michaelis himself saw this distinctly. At p. 319 a. he says, "It appears that Stephens collated only sixteen codices, or at least that he has given no extracts from more than sixteen." Again, "—an assertion," says he, "which contradicts itself." The assertion of Stephanus, that he had sixteen very old written copies in 1546, pretty flatly contradicts his slanderers, who say he never had, in all, but fifteen. But neither this nor his son's assertion, that he had about double the number at last, contradicts his selecting only fifteen to give opposing readings to the folio—any more than the assertion that he had almost all the printed editions, contradicts his selecting one of them only for that purpose. And Michaelis, when he talks of contradictions, has not informed us what he makes of "*Quindecim*" in Stephanus's second *boast* respecting the royal MSS., where he brags of the number—nor yet how he disposes of "*plures et meliores e Regiis*" in the Preface to the O mirificam. I say to those who talk of contradictions and inaccuracies, take the whole of Stephanus's assertions, and shew, if you can, any inaccuracy, any improbability. For one

moment suppose "*quindecim*" to be no "small inaccuracy" for *eight*; and "*vetustissimis scriptis*" to be no "inaccurate expression" for denoting newly printed editions. I ask then, is the number of MSS. in the royal library so small, that Stephanus's boast of having had fifteen of them must be "*verba hyperbolica*," as Wetsten would say when he meant to give you the lie? Having fifteen "*e Regia*," might not Stephanus be able to boast that he had not given a letter in his *O mirificam*, "but what the greater part of the better MSS. *from the royal library* approved"? Having made such a boast in his first edition, would he not continue it, when speaking of that edition in the preface to the folio; and so use that expression (*vetustissima scripta*) which our modern critics "cannot abide"? Again, having fifteen from the royal library, might he not have had sixteen very old written copies in all, for the *O mirificam*? and if he kept his son for years searching "*in Italicis*," might he not have increased the number, so as to be able to select seven from those, "*quæ undique corrogare licuit*," as well as eight from the fifteen royal MSS., when he thought proper to give opposing readings to the new text of the folio? I have never found any one of the correctors of *small inaccuracies* who has ventured thus to pit his own accuracy against that of Stephanus.

Dr. J. Pye Smith manages to make Stephanus contradict himself in a more skilful manner than Michaelis. The Eclectic Review, Jan. 1810, p. 68, says, that Stephanus, in the margin of his folio, "professed to mark the various readings of *sixteen very ancient MSS.* (*vetustissima scripta exemplaria*), but to shew us that this expression was not meant to be very exact, he soon subjoins that the *first* in the list was the Complutensian *printed* text." Mark Dr. Smith's happy expedient. "*Vetustissima scripta exemplaria*"—that is what Stephanus says of the materials that he had "*superioribus diebus*," for forming the text of the *O mirificam*: and Dr. S. substitutes this, for what the man actually does say, in his account of the documents that he took in 1550 for the margin of his folio. By this piece of dexterity, Dr. S. can *abide* by Stephanus's actual *expression*, and still identify the documents selected to oppose the folio with the MSS. from which the *O mirificam* was formed. No matter that the "*vetustissima scripta*" were used *superioribus diebus*; that is easily slipped. No matter that Dr. S.'s comment makes his text to be a heap of inconsistencies; that is settled by saying, that the "*expression was not meant to be very exact*." If, however, Dr. Smith's "*expression was meant to be very exact*," when he is pleased to assert that Stephanus "*professed to mark the various readings of sixteen very ancient MSS.*," then Stephanus has the impudence to contradict him flatly. Dr. P. Smith would have been perfectly safe if he could have been content with asserting, "*that the number of manuscripts quoted by Stephens amounted to sixteen*." He would have had plenty of learned and skilful gentlemen to bear him out. We have just seen their scheme in Michaelis, ii. 861, n. 43. And Dr. S., I think, might have seen from their statements, that he ought not to have talked about what Stephanus *himself* *professed*. There stand the man's own words to speak for themselves. As if he had foreseen that the conspiring critics

would not abide by his expressions *vetustissimis* and *scriptis*, in his account of the materials that he had for the O mirificam, when he came to speak of the various readings in the margin of the folio, he *professed* to take *them* from *fifteen* written copies, and one which he particularly described as "*editio*" and "*quæ fuit excusa*."

Allow the Docti et Prudentes thus to dispose of *expressions by which* they cannot *abide*, and what is the consequence? Michaelis gives it at p. 319—"It seems as if the learned Robert Stephens degenerated in this instance to a mere printer, whom pecuniary motives induced to have his edition ready as soon as possible; and who, directing his chief attention to the beauty of the types, and the neatness of the impression, neglected the accuracy of a critic, not expecting so severe an examination before the tribunal of the modern literati." Observe, Stephanus is induced by pecuniary motives to have his edition ready as soon as possible.—This is said of the man who was between three and four years preparing for this edition, and who kept his son, during almost the whole time, searching the Italian libraries for MSS. I can readily believe that Stephanus could not expect such "an examination before the tribunal of the modern literati." He could hardly be prepared for literati who themselves admit that they must "sometimes say, that the number of *manuscripts* quoted by Stephens amounted to sixteen," when "at other times" they assert, in the most decided manner, that the whole stock out of which the *quoted* MSS. were selected, "amounted only to fifteen." I, who know them, I imagine, tolerably well, am utterly at a loss to say "*quo teneam nodo*," either for Stephanus or Cyprianus; either for the editors at Alcalá, or for the confessors at Carthage. By what possible means was Stephanus to establish his innocence before a tribunal that will call his statements "small inaccuracies," and judge him from their own corrections,—that will not abide by his expressions; or if they do, will substitute what he says of the materials that he had for forming the text of one edition, in the statement that he makes of the documents selected for giving opposing readings to the different text of another?

We have these distinct avowals "of the modern literati," that the preface to the folio alone would be destruction to them, if our canon could be enforced: that they cannot "*abide by the expression*," either of *vetustissimis* and *scriptis* in the account of the materials used "*superioribus diebus*" for the formation of the O mirificam—or of "*editio . . . quæ fuit excusa*" in the enumeration of the documents that were now selected to oppose the text of the folio.

But "the modern literati" are not merely obliged to admit that they are confuted, if they abide by the expressions of Stephanus: they are confuted by what they themselves lay down. According to them, the whole work of collation was performed "*ab Henrico filio octodecim annorum puero*" (Gries. xvi. 4.) This has led them to declare, with one voice, that the first MS. of the margin (marked  $\beta$ ) was collated by Henry: "*a filio ipsius Henrico tunc temporis Italiam perlustranti in ipsa Italia repertus*," says Wetsten, p. 22, 1st ed., continued Prol. 28, Seml. 79, who assumes that it is the same as his own D; and he is followed by Semler himself, n. 45 & 46, by Porson, p. 57,—and

by the notes on Michaelis, ii. p. 690, n. 113; note 114, p. 694, 696, 699; note 116, p. 703; note 122, p. 712. In vain Robert assigns other collators of this MS. As Michaelis observes, ii. 238, note (m), "his father says expressly" in *Italia ab amicis*. But Michaelis's translator can no more "abide by this expression," than Michaelis himself can abide by *vetustissimis scriptis*, (see ii. 690, note 113)—nor yet can Mr. Travis's other mighty correspondent: here again Mr. Porson is obliged to make an exception to his rule that he lays down at p. 232 (as we have seen) of not making "R. Stephens a cheat." Henry is to be "sole collator of the MS.," (p. 56,) and his father disguises the fact, not fairly confessing, or openly violating the truth, (p. 57, note.) Well then, see an exemplification of the admonition addressed to St. Paul, "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." The Docti et Prudentes establish that  $\beta$  was collated "a filio ipsius Henrico tunc temporis Italium perlustranti;" but Henry never went to Italy till his father's O mirificam had been published. Why then, at the moment that they are contending *pedibus atque unguibus*, that the fifteen MSS. of the margin of the folio, and the edition that had been printed only a few years before, were the sixteen very old written copies, which Robert had "superioribus diebus," and that he never had any MSS. but those,—they were themselves distinctly laying down, that one of the MSS. of the margin had been acquired afterwards. To refer then again to Crito's pretty good defence that he says may be made for those persons who have hitherto believed that Robert Stephens had but one single set of MSS., consisting of sixteen copies, for his various readings, as well as for the text of his three editions (402), though "tantopere a se ipso dissensit Stephanus." These believers, as Crito justly observes, are held by Mr. Huyshe in great contempt. "Horum simplicitas miserabilis;" they are at the beck of "the modern literati" at one moment to "say that the number of manuscripts quoted by Stephens amounted to sixteen;" and at all other times to say that the whole stock "amounted only to fifteen." But what defence will Crito find for those who make the assertion he speaks of, and never believed a word of it?—who by their own theory represent Henry to have acquired one of the marked MSS. of the margin for his father, while he was searching for MSS. "in Italicis," after the publication of the O mirificam; and can still identify the fifteen marked MSS. with the "vetustissimis sedecim scriptis," from whence Stephanus took his text "superioribus diebus"? The reader may judge what Crito thought he could do, when, at p. 403, he expressly declines to enter on the question, either of the MS.  $\beta$ , or of Henry's collation, which make so large a part of the six pages of Mr. Porson's IVth Letter that are examined in the Specimen, and avowedly leaves the Professor to its tender mercies: these are questions which "the reader will easily forgive him, if he does not attempt to determine."

But it may be said that the fact of  $\beta$  having been added to Stephanus's stock after the publication of the O mirificam, is a deduction of my own, from the doctrine of the opposing critics, of which they themselves might not have been aware,—and that I have engaged to

give their concessions. Take then their own avowal, (Michaelis, ii. p. 856, note 37)—“Now it is generally supposed, and it is likewise asserted by our author, in treating of the Codices Stephanici, that all the sixteen manuscripts (including the Complutensian edition) which are quoted in R. Stephens’s edition of 1550, had been collated previous to the first edition of 1546. But we must except at least the codex  $\beta$ , which could not have been collated till after the year 1547, because this MS. was collated in Italy, and H. Stephens did not go into Italy before that year.” I beg the reader to consider this, and then say, whether I am not warranted in my assertion, that the Docti et Prudentes give only their *exoteric* doctrine, when we read as follows: “Stephens had only sixteen copies even inclusive of the Complutensian edition,” (Letters to Travis, by the Translator, p. 134, note 16.) “It is certain that Stephens had only sixteen including the Complutensian edition,” (Michaelis, ii. p. 666, note 47;) and upon particular parts of the sacred text—“in the Catholic epistles, Stephens has quoted only seven MSS.: consequently, in these epistles he collated only seven, for, if he had collated more, he of course would have quoted more.” (Letters, Pref. p. 20.) Griesbach, too, p. xvi. 3, Lond. p. xxviii., bringing his courage to the sticking place, asserts “codices quidem manuscriptos eum consuluisset, sed quindecim tantum,” where he had timidly given it in his first (p. xxv., c.) only thus—“sed satis paucos;” though Wetsten had tried the ground for him, and, with his characteristic boldness, had ascribed to Beza, of all men that ever existed, the knowledge of this “xv tantum,” 148. Seml. 380. When the learned critics were unanimously pronouncing this, were they not as well aware as Michaelis himself, that the *giving extracts* in the margin of the folio could not shew what MSS. were collated for the text of the O mirificam,—much less what was the whole stock amassed for the folio? And was not Crito most judicious in avoiding  $\beta$ , as carefully as he does Stephanus’s solemn declaration in the preface to the O mirificam,—that every letter of it was printed after the majority of the best MSS. *from the royal library*? What could he do more than give a smile of complacency at the biting, insulting sarcasms thrown out, Specimen, p. 17, on the abject necessities of Mr. Porson, which placed him on a level with his Cloten, in construing Stephanus’s words? When Crito still holds to the old assertion that  $\alpha$  and the seven copies, “quæ undique corrogare licuit,” were half of Stephanus’s materials for an edition, in which he boasted that he had not given a letter but what was sanctioned by “plures et meliores e Regiis,”—he certainly did his part in undertaking to prove that the Complutensian was a *very old written* copy. It might fairly be left to some other Vindicator to commit himself by denying, that “if  $\beta$  is to form one of the sixteen copies in the gross,” as Mr. P. calls *that* set of MSS. from which the first edition was formed, (p. 63,) and it was collated for that edition by Henry, in 1546; then “in Italia,” by an easy substitution of Cis-Alpine Gaul for Trans-Alpine, must be construed “*at Paris*.” Specimen, p. 18.

The note 37 (Michaelis, ii. 857) after telling us, that codex  $\beta$  could not possibly have come into the “*vetustissima sedecim scripta exem-*



plaria," from which the O mirificam was formed "superioribus diebus," adds, "nor does R. Stephens say a syllable about any MS. collated in Italy, in the preface to his two first editions, though he particularly mentions the MSS. borrowed from the royal library." No, most certainly. It was not till after he had published his little edition of 1546, that he began to think of his folio, and of making use of his son; whom he sent into Italy, to search for MSS. "in Italicis." He could not at that time talk of what "describenda curaverat," from the stores of that country. But as fifteen, out of the sixteen, that he had "superioribus diebus" had been "borrowed from the royal library," "he mentions them so particularly," as to declare that he had not given a letter but what was sanctioned by the best of them. Hence the accurate expression in this note—"we must except at least the codex  $\beta$ :" for all but one, of those that were used for the first edition, were particularly mentioned, as being borrowed from the royal library, we must except five at least, as well as the codex  $\beta$ , of those "quæ undique corrogare licuit," that could not have been "collated previous to the first edition of 1546."

The note proceeds—"It is true, [It is false,] that in the preface to the edition of 1550, he pretends to have regulated the text of his two first editions by the extracts from all the MSS. which he quotes in the third." I take the liberty of substituting the word *false* for *true*, because the preface of 1550 is perfectly consistent with what was said in the O mirificam, respecting the "copia" (the *quindecim*) which "bibliotheca regia facile suppeditavit." There is not a word in it which can be distorted by the utmost art into any thing like an intimation that the text of the two first editions was regulated by extracts from all the MSS. which he quotes in the third. There is nothing to lead you to a suspicion, that any of the documents of the margin, but the eight royal MSS., had been used "superioribus diebus," in forming the O mirificam. Who the *pretenders* are, may be seen from Michaelis's acknowledgement, (ii. 317, note,) which we have just considered, that they cannot identify the MSS. for the formation of the O mirificam, with the documents selected to oppose the folio, if they abide by his expression of *vetustissimis scriptis* alone; and not less decidedly from Dr. P. Smith's ingenious transplantation of these words, from Stephanus's account of what he had done respecting his text, "superioribus diebus," in the room of what he actually says in his statement of the opposing documents of the margin of the folio. And I am supported in my decision, that Stephanus is not the *pretender*, by the Monthly Repository, May, 1828, (quoted above,) p. 330—"It is true that, speaking afterwards of his various readings, he says 'in margine interiori varias codicum lectiones addidimus,' and does not expressly say, *eorundem codicum*." No, gentle critic, and I am inclined to say, that when you made the observation, you and I did not differ much in our private opinion, viz. that if the materials used four years before, and for such a totally different purpose as the forming the widely different text of another edition, had been *pretended* to be the same as those taken now to oppose the text of the folio, the man must have said "*eorundem codicum*," or something like it. As

you will observe, he does not say *eorundem*, and I will tell you what he does say, to every reader who will abide by his expression; he says that they were not the same. It is some other pretenders, who can "say that the number of *manuscripts quoted* by Stephens amounted to sixteen," and we have seen how they justify such a pretence (Michaelis, ii. 861, n. 43.) The man himself tells you that he took "*editio*" — *quæ fuit excusa*" (words which do not find their way into any of these criticisms), and he has thus as decidedly proved to you by his statement that you must at least except the codex  $\alpha$ , as Bishop Marsh has shewn you, that, by *your own*, you must except at least the codex  $\beta$ .

FRANCIS HUYSHE.

#### ON PATRONAGE OF LIVINGS.

*Furneaux Pelham, July 10.*

MR. EDITOR,—Existing calls for churches, we are often told, would more commonly be answered by opulent individuals, if such persons had a reasonable prospect of securing the patronage of their foundations. Remarks of this kind naturally direct attention to the mode in which calls for churches were anciently answered. No doubt, the great bulk of men loosely attribute this to some legislative enactment; but those who have read and thought upon ecclesiastical subjects, are unacquainted with any such enactments. Nor, probably, have they failed of remarking that the topography of Doomsday does not very exactly correspond with the parochial topography of modern England, and that the mention of village priests is somewhat rare in that venerable record. Hence, it seems reasonable to infer, that our parishes could not have assumed their present appearances at the Conquest; and, consequently, that the legislative liberality which is thought to have overspread our land with churches, must have occurred, if it ever occurred at all, at some period when transactions of far less importance, being abundantly recorded, are accurately known.

The following verse, preserved by the ancient canonist, Athon,\* may, probably, throw some light on these difficulties:—

"Patronum faciunt Dos, Edificatio, Fundus."

The *dowry* of a church appears from the following passage in Lindwood to be the Glebe: *Gleba . i . terra in qua consistit dos ecclesie*. (Provinc. Guil. Lindewode, Antw. 1525. f. 184.) The *building*, is obviously that of the church, or parsonage house, or of both: most probably, however, the *building* intended is that of the church. *Fundus* appears to mean *the estate of some landed proprietor*. Thus Matthew Paris, (Hist. Angl., Lond. 1640. p. 138,) in his abstract of the canons enacted in the third council of Lateran, in 1179, has the following passage:—*Quod patroni ab ecclesiis in suo fundo constitutis, exactiones non faciant*.

\* *Constitutiones legitime ecclesie totiusq. regionis Anglicane ab legatis a latere summorum pontificum collectæ: et a do. Johanne de Aton diligenter explanatæ. De his qui pact, &c. f. 105.*

Disciplina Arcani, which induced the early Fathers purposely to resort to ambiguous expressions in speaking of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Eucharist, rests on no solid foundation. They spoke with all the clearness and distinctness which the circumstances demanded; and any vagueness or inconsistency discoverable in their language may be accounted for by the fact, that the nice precision in the use of terms, which is the fruit of controversy, had not yet been introduced. I purposely abstain from examining the proofs of the application of the Disciplina Arcani to the eucharist, which our Traveller brings from the Fathers of the fourth and following centuries. If the object of that discipline was, as he affirms, to guard the Christian mysteries from the profaning scoffs of the heathen, the necessity for enforcing it must have gradually decreased as the empire became gradually Christian. But our Traveller's appeal is chiefly made to the Fathers of the fourth century. This was to be expected; for in the fourth century we find manifest traces of the operation of that policy which the Romish church afterwards pursued with unremitting perseverance and signal success—the policy of establishing the absolute dominion of the priesthood over the understandings and consciences of the laity. One, and not the least effectual, part of that policy was to throw a veil of mystery around every religious act performed by the priest, especially around the administration of the sacraments.

I shall conclude this letter with observing, that if the Roman catholic theory of the Disciplina Arcani is well founded, our Traveller might have spared himself the trouble of appealing to the authority of the Fathers. Why do we read their writings? Partly, in order to ascertain their opinions upon certain important points of doctrine. But, say the Roman catholics, this cannot be done; they frequently concealed their real sentiments, in compliance with the secret discipline of the church. You must come to us in the first instance to be told what their real sentiments were: you may then proceed in safety to the perusal of their writings; otherwise you will run the hazard of being misled, from your inability to distinguish between that which is said *bonâ fide*, and that which is said for the purpose of *mystification*,\* from motives of policy. No wonder, Mr. Editor, that the Roman catholics lay great stress on the Disciplina Arcani.

I am your obedient servant,

PHILALETHES CANTABRIGIENSIS.

---

#### VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIAN GREEK PRESS.

(Continued from p. 284.)

WE have observed that the “modern literati” are never at a loss for a motive to induce a printer and bookseller to any thing that they

---

\* Our Traveller, in a note, p. 118, sneers at Whitby for adopting in matter-of-fact seriousness that allegorical and anagogical mode of interpretation which Clement of Alexandria and Origen employed to *mystify* their hearers.

are pleased to lay to his charge. The note 37 concludes p. 857, "but this was probably done with no other view than to enhance the value and promote the sale of his former publications." There are those who have "no other view" in their statements than to *depreciate* these publications. I can easily understand how this latter object would be promoted by assigning a false set, as that by which "he regulated the text." How such a cheat should "enhance the value" of them I have yet to learn.

But whether the giving these false statements would serve to enhance the value of the two O mirificam editions, or to damn them—whether it be Stephanus who "pretends to have regulated the text of his two first editions by the extracts from all the MSS. which he quotes in the third," or it be the Docti et Prudentes who set up such pretension,—the learned and acute note writer has shewn, that by their own theory the fact is, as I have always contended, that the pretension is "utterly false." They themselves "must except at least the codex  $\beta$ , which [by their own hypothesis] could not have been collated till after the year 1547." Well then, whether the learned writer would agree with me, that nothing could be more absurd than Mill's "in textu ad hos codices. . . ut religiose ac plane ad literam sequeretur plures ac meliores e *Regiis*,"—still he agrees with me in deciding it to be false that Robert actually did form the text of his O mirificam "ad hos codices;" and, consequently, the vast discrepancies that Mill found between them and the O mirificam, only proved the magnitude of his own mistake. Under this conviction, the learned writer, as we saw in the note that we considered (*Letters*, p. 171, note 25) gave Robert full credit for his solemn protestations of having formed the text of the O mirificam religiously according to *the greater and better part of the Royal MSS.*, and set aside the folio because it contained no such asseveration. "Stephens," says he, "does not even pretend to have formed the text of his third edition from his Greek MSS., and therefore you cannot argue to the text of that edition from a declaration made only of the two first." Now turn to *Lecture VI.* pp. 106, 107. In the preface to the first edition which was printed at Paris in 1546, says Robert Stephens, "having obtained from the royal library several MSS., which, from their appearance of antiquity, are almost entitled to adoration, I have formed from them this edition in such a manner, as not to print even a single letter which is not confirmed by the greater and better part of them." "But with all this ostentation, Robert Stephens's first edition is little more than a compilation from the Complutensian and the fifth edition of Erasmus." Where "the greater and better part" of the "copia"—the fifteen royal MSS.—gave readings in accordance with the Complutensian, the fifth, or any other of Erasmus, the Aldine, Colinæus, it is in the true spirit of modern criticism to assert, that Stephanus copied from any of these editions, to the accuracy of which in reality his MSS. bore testimony. As half of the royal MSS. have never been ascertained, it might have appeared very safe to make such charges. The same game, however, had formerly been played with Colinæus; but Mill had the good judgment and good feeling, in that case, to keep to the words

of truth and soberness. Upon Colinaeus's accordance with former editors Mill speaks thus, n. 44—"Apocalypsis enim Complutensis, aut Frobenianæ, aut saltem *exemplarium cum istis congruentium*, vestigiis fere insistit;" and mentioning some readings that he deemed suspicious, he says of them, 1145, "Fieri potest, ut etiam in istis habuerit vir doctus *Exemplaria* quæ sequeretur." Even for this however Mill receives a castigation. Colinaeus's edition was not likely to "commend itself to the learned of our time, as the representative of MSS. now no longer found," (Greswell, VI.) Wetsten had discovered two of his MSS. to be amongst Stephanus's selection for his margin; moreover, he was won by the modesty which Colinaeus displayed on a particular passage, that shall be nameless,—"*ea fuit modestia ut locum . . . . textui suo inserere non auderet*," Prol. 142, Seml. 366. There was a wide difference between him and the man who had between fifteen and twenty MSS. that have never yet been ascertained; besides, Stephanus was so immodest as to follow those MSS. in that passage, and give it in his *O mirificam*, as Bishop Marsh tells us, (Lect. xxvii. p. 27,) in a different form from any preceding edition. Colinaeus therefore is vindicated; and Wetsten adds, "in hac sententia multum fui confirmatus, ex *decem locis*, quorum nullum in codicibus apparere vestigium Millius, sed timide, suspicatus est, *sex* in codicibus Stephani *ea et ad legi*prehendissem," 141, Seml. 366. With respect to Stephanus and the *O mirificam*, Mill gives no such intimation as that which we have had respecting Colinaeus; he never says, that as the man solemnly declared that he had not printed even a letter in it which is not confirmed by the greater and better part of the MSS. *from the royal library*, the passages where his text accorded with an Alcala, a Genevan, a Parisian edition, might have been taken out of "*exemplarium cum istis congruentium*"; and where Stephanus has adopted a reading that might have seemed peculiar to some edition, it is not touched with the "*timid* suspicion" that admits "*fieri potest, ut etiam in istis habuerit bibliopola iste exemplaria quæ sequeretur*;" but because the *O mirificam* does not accord with a set of documents, one half of which consisted either of print or private MSS., Mill comes to the distinct positive accusation against it, of being copied from all the preceding editions, and this decision was never controverted till the year 1827. Bengel, Appar. s. xxxvi. p. 71, singles out the Complutensian; Wetsten takes Erasmus's editions for Stephanus to have copied; the Right Rev. Lecturer, we see, takes both together:—"little more than a compilation from the Complutensian and the 5th of Erasmus." Now what led to this extraordinary change in the Lecture, from the admission in the Letters (p. 171) of Stephanus's boast, that he had given every letter in the *O mirificam* after the best "*copia*" (15) which the royal library supplied? Had the learned writer, in the time that elapsed between the Letters and the Lecture, ascertained the whole copia of royal MSS. that had been granted to Stephanus—"ea omnia, quæ in regis Galliarum bibliotheca extant"? We have not been told of any examination having been made; and if any other valid reason can be assigned, it ought to be stated. If none be stated, "his utere mecum." Take it that it was in deference to Griesbach,

who suffered the two first editions of Stephanus to escape unscathed in his first edition, but gave the criticism that we have already considered, in his second edition, (p. xviii. 7) Lond., p. xxx. And what induced Griesbach to change his tone in his second edition?—why, his bringing himself, as we saw, at last, to do, what he could not do in his first edition—repeat Wetsten's "quindecim tantum." Now if this be all that can be assigned for the Right Rev. Lecturer's change, and for his joining in the cry of "vanissima atque falsissima," on the O mirificam; see how it is refuted by himself. Turn back to the note, Michaelis, II. 856, n. 37, and you see the falsehood of this "quindecim tantum" demonstrated, upon Griesbach's own hypothesis. Crito's dupes, whose creed is, "that Robert Stephens had but one single set of MSS., consisting of sixteen copies, for his various readings as well as for the text of his three editions," may learn from thence, that they "must except at least the codex  $\beta$ ." Let the instructors have all the advantage of sometimes saying, that the number of *manuscripts quoted* by Stephens amounted to sixteen, and at other times saying that they amounted only to fifteen;" and let the pupils be brought to talk of one single set of manuscripts, consisting of sixteen copies, printed and written; still, by their own shewing, the "editio . . . quæ fuit excusa" and the fifteen manuscripts, which were selected to oppose the folio, were not the "vetustissima sedecim scripta exemplaria" out of which Stephanus formed the O mirificam.

And it is not merely in respect to the O mirificam that this compliment is paid to Griesbach. Mr. Porson, having spoken of the charge that Stephanus has given a text in his third edition which differs often from all his MSS., says, p. 58, "But because Mr. Griesbach took this point for granted; (*i. e.* in his first edition;) not foreseeing that a man would be found so hardy or ignorant as to deny it, you insult him." The Archdeacon's insults would, I presume, hardly have moved Mr. Griesbach; but when this observation came from his correspondent, it was impossible for Mr. Griesbach any longer to pursue the plan that he had so judiciously formed, of *taking this point for granted*. Wetsten had adopted Morin's felicitous expedient, of inserting the possessive pronoun in Stephanus's words, where he wanted to chastise the fellow's *immodesty*; and had said, ii. p. 724, "Primo ipsa Stephani editio palam testatur, editorem a lectione omnium *suorum* codicum recessisse, non solum quoties ipse lectionem ab ea quam recessit diversam in ora notavit *ex rari* in omnibus codicibus reperiri sed sæpiissime alias." But Wetsten "in the eagerness of his zeal, partly against the *verse*, and partly against" [Stephanus], (Porson, p. 207,) had given, with this, the proof from the Responsio, that Stephanus had seven more royal MSS. than *the whole* of the eight that were taken first and last, whose readings "in ora notavit," in any of the divisions of the sacred text. Griesbach, however, was now driven to offer some proof, and he came at last to this in his *second* edition, Prol. xviii. 7, Lond. xxx., where it is certainly brought forward with all that boldness that a man assumes at his last expedient, and with success proportioned to that boldness. And this is adopted by the Right Rev. Lecturer. Indeed, when the change was made

respecting the O mirificam, which we have noticed, the old ground that had been taken in the letters could not well be maintained. The letters, p. 171, note 25, as we saw, condemned the folio, on the sole plea, that it did not contain the same engagement for the genuineness of its text that we find in the other. But what became of this, when the O mirificam was to be made "*vanissima atque falsissima*"? And where was there any other reason to be found for condemning the folio? Nothing remained but this old popish trick of Morin, which bold Wetsten himself did not venture to produce after all, in his *Prolegomena*; and which Griesbach only ventured upon, at his utmost need, when bearded not merely by the poor archdeacon, but by the archdeacon's mighty correspondent. What however was to be done? It was this or none—Stephanus's guilt could no longer be taken for granted; and if his own confession of it cannot be extracted from *εὐ πασι*, the culprit must be dismissed. His Lordship seems now to think that the engagement in the O mirificam to form his text "entirely on the authority of Greek MSS.," would bind the "printer and editor" in his future editions; and says, lect. vi. p. 107, "In fact, Stephens himself has openly contradicted his own declarations; for, in the margin of this edition, there are more than a hundred places in which he has quoted *all* his authorities for readings different from *his own*." With this glaring evidence, evidence which requires no collation of manuscripts, but only a superficial view of the edition itself, in order to be perceived, it is extraordinary that credit was ever attached to the pretensions of the editor on the formation of the text." I agree with his lordship in calling this "*glaring evidence*," yea, the most glaring I happen to have ever witnessed; and the reader has my reasons for this,—*Brit. Mag.* p. 548, &c., and Specimen 26, &c. I am willing to leave him, with that, to say whether this scheme of the Docti et Prudentes for extracting a confession of guilt from *π.* be a whit less flagrant than their calling the newly printed Complutensian a very old written copy. But no man can safely despise the "*risus Doctorum et Prudentium*," especially when Griesbach leads the band; and when the evidence is produced as the palmarian argument, in such glowing terms, *ex cathedra*, by that divine who holds the first rank among our English critics, as Dr. Carpenter so justly admits, one word more must be addressed to such honoured names. Morin, let it be remembered, actually and honestly thought that all Stephanus's MSS. contained the whole of the sacred text; therefore he firmly believed what the critics so firmly assert—that Stephanus "quoted *all his* authorities for readings different from *his own*," when he applied his little possessive pronoun in the service of holy mother, catholic and apostolic, to get rid of heretic Greek, and (let it be well noted) with it, of all the heretic versions: "*quæ cum exemplarium suorum nullo conveniebant, in textu tamen ab eodem relicta sunt, et in hæreticorum versionibus expressa*;" these are the words of Morin, p. 119, ed. Paris, 1633, (25 years before Curcellæus's N. T.) where you have "*Hæreticorum*" with "*versionibus*," though it does not find a place in Wetsten's quotation, either Prol. 1st ed. p. 168, or at ii. p. 853. But suppose that I, or any other *indoctus* who should presume to suspect

that Stephanus might have been an honest man, could, with respect to *any one* place whatsoever out of the "plus centies" where he has affixed *εν πασι* to a reading, have asserted that "*he has quoted all his sixteen marked authorities for*" that reading, would not these learned men have exclaimed at the consummate ignorance of such a notion? Would they not have found out that Stephanus's notation could never mean more than *all those authorities which he has quoted* in that division of the sacred text where the reading occurs?—"Lecons qui ne s'accordoient avec aucun des MSS. qu'il produit," says Simon, N. T. ch. xxix. p. 346, even where he is stating Morin's argument. Would they not have instantly discovered that it was worse than Travisian stupidity to say in these days that the reading was in those *qu'il ne produit pas*. Again, suppose that when Stephanus's accusers say that there are more than one hundred places in which he has quoted all his *manuscript* authorities for readings different from his own, and conclude that he must have taken his text there from *print*, I was to turn upon them, and say, in a tone of equal triumph, that in those identical "plus centies" he has quoted *all his printed* authority for readings different from his own, and therefore must have had his text from *manuscript*: would either Griesbach or his lordship have been so dazzled with my "*glaring evidence*," as to have been unable to see a way to answer me? Should I not instantly have been told that the print which Stephanus quoted in the margin, was *selected out of* "*omnibus pæne impressis*"? Should I not have been told that the man who could argue that this was *all his printed authority*, "*nihil aliud ageret, nisi ut risum commoveret doctorum et prudentium*"? There are those, I doubt not, who have been fully convinced by the "*glaring evidence*," having been drilled into calling the newly printed Complutensian a very old manuscript; and having been assured with respect to the *written manuscripts* of Stephanus's margin, that "if he had collated more, he of course would have quoted more." But if I am right in my opinion, that *εν πασι* hardly affords a strict demonstration that Stephanus had no printed edition but the Complutensian, and it should still be admitted to have been possible for him to have been assisted in deciding between the conflicting testimony of his MSS., "*cum aliis tum vero Complutensi editione*," I would ask these gentlemen whether they think that their laughing instructor can forbear an occasional smile on their docility? After all, I refer back for the folio, as I did for the O mirificam, to the decision of the Docti et Prudentes themselves, as it stands in the note, Michaelis, ii. 856, note 37. Suppose me to be wrong on the point that I have held with so much pertinacity, viz., that the Complutensian was not a very old manuscript, but new print,—suppose me to be unjust in my protestations against the popish insertion of "*suis*" with "*omnibus*,"—still I am not wrong in the inference itself that I have drawn, namely, that when Stephanus gives *εν πασι* in the margin, he does not say that all his written authorities have there a reading different from his own, whatever may be the case with respect to *printed* documents. By the authority of the conspiring critics themselves, in identifying the "set of MSS., consisting of sixteen copies," (as, according to Crito, we are to call the Complu-



tensian and the other fifteen documents of the margin,) with the set of *sixteen manuscripts*, used "superioribus diebus," "we must except *at least* the codex  $\beta$ ." There was then *at least* one of the set of *sixteen manuscripts*, *qu'il ne produit pas*,—one *at least*,—which was never cited in the margin. If the laughing critics then could make good these words, and shew that every one of the sixteen documents of Stephanus's margin gave readings different from his own, there was still this one *at least* which, by their own theory, might have given the readings in accordance with the text. Here then was fresh cause for Crito's declining to say a word upon  $\beta$ , and the reader will not wonder that the "glaring evidence" passes equally without notice, though it occupies so much space in the Specimen. A vindicator, who intimated that Mr. Porson's letters shew "the most pure and inflexible love of truth," could not have been very well pleased with the observations (Spec. p. 21—26, and 39) on his usual consummate skill in coming to "all the MSS.," (*i. e.* "all the MSS." that the Professor had himself ascertained,) in the instance which he produces to prove what he had asserted after Morin, and what he himself had observed "Mr. Griesbach took for granted,—namely, that Stephanus," in his third edition, often varies from all *his* MSS., even by his own confession." But the man who makes the observations escapes with the simple notice from Crito, that his decisions are "accompanied with the most unwarrantable reflections upon the living and the dead."

FRANCIS HUYSHE.

#### THE PROPHECY OF ENOCH.

ALTHOUGH the complete and final accomplishment of Enoch's prophecy is yet in futurity, it received a partial and typical fulfilment at the flood, and is represented by St. Jude as bearing a similar application to his own times. We are, therefore, led to expect some analogy between the character and fate of the respective generations at the close of the antediluvian and Jewish ages. In fact, both sets of men were licentious infidels, and drew down upon themselves a direct judgment from the Almighty:—a judgment, in mercy long foretold, and executed only against the continued impenitence of unbelief. It is my object to illustrate the earlier and more obscure of these events by means of the fuller information which we have of the second.

I begin with considering the prevalence of unbelief, and the judgment it drew on, in the last days of the Jewish age. The sin of that generation was not only (as is commonly supposed) the rejection of Jesus as the Messiah, but infidelity generally and gross licentiousness. "Shall not God avenge his own elect? I tell you that he will *avenge them speedily*; nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find *faith* on the earth?" (Luke, xviii. 7.) The destruction of Jerusalem is represented by our Lord as a judgment upon the unbelieving Jews, and their consequent loss of civil power as a great deliverance to their believing brethren. "When they *persecute* you in this city, flee ye into another, for verily I say unto you, Ye shall

VOL. IV.—Oct. 1835

3 H

the Leibnitzes,\* the Sir Thomas Moores,—and exclaims with pious fervour, “Let my soul be with theirs.” I marvel not at the wish; though I greatly doubt whether, if the Pascals and Fenelons could rise to life and pursue the work of their admirer, the wish would be reciprocal; whether, disposed as they might be to look with an eye of fervour upon any effort made in support of what they deemed the true faith, they would think its defence safely entrusted to one who could comment, as our Traveller has done, on the pretended miracle described in the following passage:—

“Il (Marc)† avoit deux vases, un plus grand et un plus petit; et mettoit le vin destiné à la célébration du sacrifice de la messe dans le petit et faisoit une prière; un instant après le liquide bouillonnait dans le grand vase, et l’on y voyait du sang au lieu du vin. Ce vase n’étoit apparemment que ce que l’on appelle communément la fontaine des noces de Cana; c’est un vase dans lequel on verse de l’eau, l’eau versée fait monter du vin que l’on a mis auparavant dans ce vase et dont il se remplit.” This pretended miracle is represented, by our Traveller, as an effort of the Marcionite‡ heretics to outbid, if he may so say, the orthodox altar in its marvels. This is not the language which the Pascals and Fenelons would have used respecting the miracle of the eucharist. But it seems that our Traveller has also his secret discipline, and that this language is intended for the initiated, to intimate to them the degree of credit which he attaches to miracles in general; while he is *mystifying* the unlearned by his laboured defence of the miracle of transubstantiation.

I have now gone through that which our Traveller apparently intended us to consider as the argumentative portion of his work. Henceforward he lays aside his assumed character of an inquirer after religious truth, and proceeds to assail Protestantism with the weapons of calumny and abuse. His desultory remarks do not deserve, even if they admitted, a regular answer; but it may be worth while briefly to notice some of the fallacies and misrepresentations which are purposely scattered among them.

I am, &c.

PHILALETES CANTABRIGIENSIS.

#### VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIAN GREEK PRESS.

(Continued from p. 417.)

[ERRATA IN LAST LETTER:—P. 413, line 3, for n. 44, read 1144; line 38, for GENEVAN, read BASIL; line 8 ab imo, for the best copia, read the best of the copia.]

BUT there is a marked MS. of much more importance to us than β,—I mean α; because it testifies on that division of scripture, where

\* Why is the Lutheran Leibnitz thus honoured with an introduction into Roman catholic company?

† The reader will find an account, both of Marcus and of this pretended miracle, in Irenæus, l. 1, cap. 9, 10.

‡ Our Traveller appears here to confound Marcus with Marcion.

the Docti et Prudentes make their grand attack, viz. the Acts and the catholic epistles.\* It proves what I have asserted, that so far from Stephanus having taken *all his* MSS. to furnish opposing readings in his first volume, where 96 out of the "plus centies" occur, he did not take the whole even of the marked MSS. ; that he took only the first thirteen of them,  $\beta$ — $\delta$ , which he continued in the second volume, as far as they lasted, i. e. in the remaining part of the third division, and in the second ; so that if either the fourth part (the Revelation) had been printed, as in previous editions, without opposing readings in the margin, or any two of the first selected thirteen MSS. had happened to have contained that part, the margin would have given no more of  $\alpha$  and  $\epsilon$  (the 15th and the 16th document) than it does of the other MSS. that did not come into the first selection. The avowal that we have already had from Griesbach, xxiii., Lond. xxxiii., might be sufficient for this. "Ex Actis, epistolis catholicis, et epistolis ad Romanos, Ephesios, Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum et Philemonem [*add to these, ad Hebræos*] plane nullas, e reliquis Paulinis per-paucas lectiones decerpit ;" and the same may be said of  $\epsilon$ , with the exception of the 1st ep. to Timotheus. It is true that the critics, making, as we have observed, the third part the object of their grand attack, have pretty sturdy declarations that Stephanus had no more MSS. of it than those seven which furnished the opposing readings to the folio in that division. Thus Wetsten, ii. p. 724, "Observandum, secundo, non xvi. MSS. codicibus epistolæ Johannis Stephanum fuisse usum sed non nisi septem," as it is rendered by Mr. Lindsey. "I would observe, that Stephens had the use, not of sixteen MSS. of the first epistle of St. John, but only of seven." Bengel on the same passage (1 John v. 7) §. v. "Stephanus ad epp. Paulinas et Canonicas non alios cod. MS. habet, atque  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ , nam Steph.  $\alpha$  est ed. Comp. ; in reliquis codd. Steph. non erant epistolæ." Dr. Benson, in his *Corrections* on vol. ii. p. 149, "But upon examining the matter more narrowly, it has been found that none of those eight MSS. [the other marked MSS. not cited in Acts and Cath. Ep.] had any part of the epistle of St. John." Michaelis ii. 316 bott. "—the seven MSS. quoted by Stephens,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ , which were all the MSS. he had of the first epistle of St. John —." And Griesbach, 1st ed. p. 226, continued in his *Diatrise*, p. [6] Lond. 690, "—extra omnem dubitationem positum jam est Stephanum non habuisse codices epistolarum catholicarum manuscriptos plures quam septem illos,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ , —." And who can wonder at this hardihood of assertion, which pervades the writings of all the Docti et Prudentes ? It was a case of no trifling urgency ; for if you admit that Stephanus

\* See particularly Michaelis, on the Acts, at ii. 496—498 ; see also 271, 444, 509. See him also *passim* on the major part of *two verses* in the Cath. Ep. ; wherein he is joined by his learned translator, though so justly corrected by him, ii. p. 888, n. 14 : "By our author's assertion that Acts, x. 6, is contained in no manuscript whatsoever, must be understood, that it has hitherto been quoted from no manuscript."

had one marked MS. which contained this division of the sacred text, but did not come into the original selection to furnish opposing readings, it is evident that the other, which stood in the same circumstances, might contain it also; and what was still worse, why might not *five unmarked* MSS. that came into neither of the selections for the margin, have contained this division, so as to double "*septem illos*"? The declarations, then, of these learned men are as decisive as possible against us; and I am undertaking to bring them forward as supporting us. Turn then to Griesbach, Proleg. xxii., Lond. xxxiii., and I think you will find that Stephanus had even a marked MS., containing this division, which was not taken to oppose the text of the folio. "Steph. *u*, auctoribus Le Longio et Wetstenio, regius quondam 2869, nunc 237; nobis in Actis et catholicis epistolis 10." Turn to Wetsten, "De codicibus junioribus Actorum Apostolicorum et epistolarum catholicarum;" and to Griesbach's catalogue on this division, "codices minusculis literis scripti;" and look at this same No. 10, and what do you see there? If I have not erred—"Steph. *u*," to which Griesbach adds, "Ex Actis et Epist. Cathol. nullas lectiones decerpserat Stephanus; denuo contulit Wetstenius;" no possibility therefore of mistake. Are you satisfied? are you convinced that Stephanus had, in no division of the sacred text, more MSS. than those which he cited in the margin? If it be not yet placed "*extra omnem dubitationem*, Stephanum non habuisse codd epistolam catholicarum manuscriptos plures quam septem illos, *δ, ε, ζ, θ, ι, ια, ιγ*," turn to the disputed part of the *two verses*, 1 John v. 7, 8, both in Wetsten and Griesbach, and think how the "*risus Doctorum et Prudentium*" will be moved at you, when you see this same *u*, No. 10, quoted as having the epistle, but without the passage. Seriously I would ask the true disciples of the Docti et Prudentes on this their favourite division of scripture, whether their laughing masters must not have smiled at their implicit belief that Stephanus must of necessity have given his text contrary to *all his* MSS. wherever it does not coincide with any of these seven cited MSS.

Now if you have a particle of my almost-idolatry for Mr. Porson, you will be anxious to know how he steers amidst these terrific rocks. He must go on the position of the Docti et Prudentes, "Stephanum non habuisse codd MSS. plures quam septem illos:" his whole argument indeed rests upon it; see, for example, p. 82, and with his usual unrivalled skill he did, what Mr. Griesbach had done at first, on the glaring evidence, but was not equal to here,—“he took this point for granted, not foreseeing that a man would be found so hardy or ignorant as to deny it,” p. 58. Observe with what a delicate touch he just glances at what Mr. Griesbach here gives so broadly and coarsely, and how he escapes any collision, by interposing the words of his correspondent. P. 68 the Professor says, "I shall therefore, sir, *request your permission* (p. 16) to believe that Stephens had only seven MSS. of the Catholic Epistles, and that if any of them omitted 1 John v. 7, they all omitted it;" and then he rides off triumphant on the back of his Cloten, who dreamt of nothing but cited MSS., and whom nothing

could satisfy but the testimony of every one of those that were marked. But did Mr. Porson make use of the solicited permission, and actually in earnest believe that Stephanus had only seven MSS. of the Catholic Epistles? You may, as far as I know, try every page of his book without producing any thing like proof of such faith, and Mr. Porson, you may be sure, would not shew himself upon the spot to be an infidel, as Wetsten and Griesbach do: but turn to Mr. Porson's "Reproof Valiant," Gentleman's Magazine, Feb. 1790, p. 131, 10 (in Kidd, p. 362), and you will find Saul also among the prophets. "With respect to Stephens's, No. 15, if Le Long had added that it contained the Apocalypse, there would have been no real difference between him and Wetsten. Le Long, presuming that Stephens collated the MSS. throughout, says, from the evidence of the margin, that it only contained such and such epistles. Wetsten, finding the MS. itself, says that it contained more, but was not collated to the other parts of the New Testament. And then poor Le Long, forsooth, must suffer for having a better opinion of Stephens's accuracy than fact and experience will justify." We see that as Mr. Porson and Michaelis corrected "small inaccuracies" in Stephanus's words, Le Long corrects one in his plan. I, however, am no more able to discern inaccuracy in his conduct, in making a selection of documents to oppose the text of his folio, than I was to find any in his language where he calls the fifteen royal MSS., and the sixteenth private one, that were used "superioribus diebus," *vetustissima* and *scripta*, or, when in his second boast of those royal MSS. he vaunted before the Sorbonne of their number, and asserted that he had fifteen of them. I think that he had a right to take what authorities he liked to oppose his text; and that if, instead of the thirteen,  $\beta$ — $\delta$ , that he did select to oppose his first volume, he had taken either the seven royal MSS. alone, leaving out the six private, or the six private, leaving out the seven royal, no man had a right to complain; and I hold that Le Long and his defender might as well have censured him for not forestalling the Marquess Velez, and giving the opposing readings of the Vulgate. And I am the more pertinacious in this opinion, because, as I have observed, I have never heard it argued that the Complutensian must have been the whole of his print; nor yet have I ever heard any complaint against him for his selecting only the Complutensian, except from Mr. Porson; and let it be well noted, that his censurer himself is so far from complaining of his *inaccuracy* in making a selection, that he himself selects, and would have had Stephanus take the fifth edition of Erasmus to give opposing readings in the margin, p. 89. After all, be it accurate or inaccurate, such was Stephanus's plan, and according to that plan he has a right to be judged—according to what "*fact and experience will justify*;" and poor Le Long suffers justly, when he condemns the man on his own notions of accuracy, which Mr. Porson here admits are not justified by the one or the other. "It contained more, but was not collated to the other parts of the New Testament." If these words want a comment, Wetsten and Griesbach, as we have seen, each of them furnish

it. It will, however, be best explained by a note of Mr. Porson himself, which does not appear *Gent. Mag.* 1789, vol. i. p. 514, but is added in the reprint, p. 73, when the Professor, with all his caution (for who is sufficient for these things at all moments?) thought not of the request that he made to Mr. Travis for permission to believe that Stephens had only seven MSS. of the catholic epistles. The note, in which you will perceive that Mr. Porson could still "make bold to believe" that Stephanus had an eighth even of his marked MSS., containing the Acts and Cath. Ep., is as follows:—"Le Long is mistaken in making Stephens's No. 15 contain only seven epistles of Paul, which contain also the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse." Le Long was forced to make the *mistake*; he could no more "*abide* by the fact than Michaelis could by the expressions *vetustissima* and *scripta*."

As to Mr. Porson himself, when I consider these open *accuracies* of Le Long, Wetsten, Griesbach, &c. &c., I can only express my adoration of his skill in what he says, and of his judgment in what he does not say, in his argument upon the most arduous case, as I esteem it, that advocate ever had. But, to use the beautiful language of scripture, Mr. Porson has fallen asleep; and admirers live, who will intimate that his Letters display "an invincible love of truth,—an inflexible probity;" notwithstanding what is surely no inexplicable hint, which the Professor thought it right to give, p. xxii., of his making no pretensions that "Truth was the sole aim, object, and end" of his inimitable Letters. A most powerful writer, who calls himself the vindicator of Mr. P.'s character, is speaking of *two verses* that stand in the Acts and Cath. Ep. of the O mirificam, and he says, "Mr. Porson infers that, as the MSS. cited by Robert Stephens did not contain the verse, he must have inserted it without MS. authority." (*Crito Cantabrigiensis*, p. 391.) Yes, this is really Mr. Porson's argument; it is, at length, set naked before you; the Professor infers that, as the *cited* MSS. did not contain a certain passage, the *uncited* could not. If Mr. P. could have foreseen that he should have a vindicator who would thus openly state his inference, he would have foreseen also, "that a man would be found so hardy as to deny it;" and he would scarcely have thanked the friendly hand that tore off the veil which he had flung with such exquisite art over the paralogism. "The MSS. *cited* by Robert Stephens," in opposition to the text of his folio—"septem illi δ, ε, ζ, θ, ι, α, γ," did not contain a certain passage of the Acts and Cath. Ep.; and Mr. Porson, as we are here fairly told, was driven to the abject necessity of contending, that this was proof of Stephanus having been guilty of inserting it without MS. authority, in the O mirificam, for which he had eight manuscripts from the royal library, that were none of them *cited* in this division of scripture; the Professor actually knowing and having avowed, that the only one of these eight that has been ascertained, actually did contain that division. Now, then, I ask, whose boast is it that is proved "utterly false"? Is it that of the man who boasted that he had not given a letter in his O mirificam

that was not warranted by the *copia*, which the "bibliotheca regia suppeditavit," and boasted, in the second place, that this *copia* "*ea omnia quæ in regis Galliarum bibliotheca extant*" amounted to fifteen; or is it that of the great man who undertook to prove the printer and editor to be guilty? Mr. Porson proscribes the word cheat in this case, (Letters 232, Reproof Valiant, 128.)—*craft* or *management*, (to use his own ever well-chosen words,) "better suits the purpose," (48.) Who is it, then, that shews the management? Is it he who, "in *Italicis describenda curaverat*," or he, whose unrivalled powers I idolize, in *establishing acquiescence* in his inference, that where "the MSS. cited by Robert Stephens did not contain" a passage in his O mirificam, "he must have inserted it without MS. authority," when there are not merely more of Stephanus's MSS. that are never cited at all, than those that are, but when there are two MSS. perpetually cited in a subsequent division, both which probably contained the division\* where the O mirificam gives the passage (Acts and Cath. Ep.), and "*fact and experience*" (as the great man himself states) shew that one of them actually did contain it; but neither of them are once cited in it.

One word more on Le Long, whom I esteem, after all that has been said by him, and all that has been said for him, as one of our strong authorities. Prior to his undertaking to get rid of Stephanus, ["J' assure seulement icy qu'il n'est dans aucun des MSS. dont Ro. Estienne s'est servi pour l'edition Greque du N. Test. de 1550," Letter to Martin, Apl. 1720, in Emlyn ii. 273,] and prior to his various feats in the royal library for that purpose, he shewed his knowledge that Stephanus might have *uncited* MSS. for his text—"des MSS. dont s'est servi"—which he did not *cite*. When it is asserted, that "*extra omnem dubitationem jam positum est Stephanum non habuisse codices epistolarum catholicarum manuscriptos plures quam illos δ, ε, ζ, θ, ι, α, ιγ,*" (Emlyn ii. 284,) let it be observed, that Le Long was as perfectly convinced as Wetsten, or Porson, or Griesbach himself was, that "this boast is utterly false." Yes; in his *Discours Historique sur les Bibles Polyglottes*, Paris, 8vo, 1713, Article Walton, p. 221, speaking of marked documents of Stephanus, (the print and manuscript that he took in both selections to oppose the folio,) he says, "Le 10 et le 15 contiennent les Actes et les Epitres des Apôtres, mais le 15 a encore l'Apocalypse." And again—neuf, ou

\* I fancy that I have better reason for believing that ιγ had the Acts and Cath. Ep., than the learned critics have for asserting that it had not. I have never heard of any great number of MSS. containing the gospels, Paul's epistles, and the Apocalypse, which had not the whole New Testament: And I think I have Mr. Porson with me. The latter part of the note, p. 73, quoted above, says that Le Long errs 2, "in making No. 16 contain two of the gospels, which contains only the Apocalypse." When the best evidence of its contents, indeed the only evidence (Stephanus's margin), gives readings from it in the gospels and Paul's epistles, the Professor would never have committed himself in saying that it "contains only the Apocalypse," unless he had felt that the admission of its containing the three divisions from which Stephanus has quoted, would lead to the conclusion that he had an unknown MS. containing the Acts and Cath. Ep.; and, to use Mr. Porson's own quotation, "that way madness lies."

Robert Estienne a trouvé les épîtres canonique [namely, the Complutensian, the seven MSS. mentioned above and *æ*] quoi qu'il ne se soit pas servi du 15, qu'il ne cite jamais sur les Epîtres, et qu'il cite très souvent dans l'Apoc.: et trois qui comprenoient ce dernière Livre."

My last, but, after all, my highest authority on this MS. is the second mighty correspondent of Mr. Travis. Michaelis, who, as we saw, declares so firmly, ii. 316, that the seven cited MSS. "were all that Stephanus had of the first epistle of St. John," says at ii. 310, No. 214, Regius 2869, at present 237, Stephani codex *æ* . . . contains the Acts, Epistles, and Revelation. This account is given by Wetsten, on whom we may depend, as he has used the MS. itself, and collated it more accurately than Stephens. Fleischer also says, expressly, "it contains all the catholic and all the epistles of St. Paul in the usual order; last of all, the Revelation of St. John." This statement from the two separate collations of Wetsten and Fleischer might seem a sufficient confirmation of Le Long's previous confutation of his own "*proinde*" that he gives in his *bibliotheca sacra*, to get rid of Stephanus,—"*Cum non nisi septem codices, præter Complutensem editionem, iidemque qui complecterentur epistolas canonicas ad oram hujus editionis [and he shews that none of these seven had that passage of the Acts and Cath. Ep. before-mentioned] proinde totum illud comma in nullo codice quo usus est Stephanus extitisse.*" With such evidence laid before the world, in such a book as that of Michaelis, it requires some acquaintance with the Docti et Prudentes to believe it possible for them to venture to assert, what we see asserted, Eclectic Rev., Jan. 1810, p. 68, "In the catholic epistles Stephens has quoted only seven MSS.; consequently, in these epistles he collated only seven."

What, then, does Michaelis's most learned translator say to this fact? Does he admit that all the heavy charges against Stephanus are confuted,—that the "*fact*" of *æ* containing the Acts and Cath. Ep. shews that there never could have been any reason for asserting that Stephanus had only seven MSS. which had that division?—that there must be some cheat in the intrepid conclusion, that as the "*cited*" MSS. (those *qu'il produit*) did not contain a certain passage—"*proinde totum illud comma in nullo codice quo usus est Stephanus, extitisse?*" that the number of MSS. which Stephanus has "*quoted*" could not possibly form any criterion of what he had "*collated*" for the text of the O mirificam, much less of those which he had "*collated*" for the text of the folio? Does he say that, by "*fact and experience*," "*extra omnem dubitationem positum jam est,*" that there were "*des MSS. dont Ro. Estienne s'est servi,*" "*qu'il ne cite jamais sur les Epîtres?*" No. But with the Acts and Cath. Ep. in *æ* open before you, the assertion is continued with unabated boldness, that it is "*with reason supposed*" that "Stephens had seven MSS. only of the catholic epistles." And rather than admit that the man's accusers have failed in establishing their atrocious charges, you are to call in question the decisions of the first critics, who have identified the MS. by actual collation; and you are even to doubt their own admissions against themselves.



Wetsten's self-confutation, from his own actual collation, is to be thus disposed of.

Michaelis ii. p. 782, note 275—"If Wetstein's Codex 12 in the second part, 10 and 2 in the third and fourth, be the same as that which at present is noted 237 in the royal library, it is a manuscript containing Scholia on the Acts, Epistles, and Revelation, accompanied with the text; but Wetstein is silent in respect to the Scholia." If Wetsten had been "silent in respect to the Scholia," which happens not to be the case, in his fourth part; still I should say, that the MS. which he collated might be that "which at present is noted 237 in the royal library;" for I think that Wetsten would esteem it a MS. containing the text of the three parts, St. Paul, Acts and Cath. Ep., Revelations, accompanied with Scholia, and not "Scholia, accompanied with the text." And, in confirmation of my opinion, that the MS. which he collated might have Scholia on Acts and Cath. Ep., though he is "*silent* in respect to the Scholia" in his description in that part, I would observe, that Wetsten is not silent in his commentary; at Acts xix. 12, he quotes Ammonius in Cod. 10, 11, 16, 36. Let it be observed, also, that Wetsten, Prol. 144, Seml. 372, gives a quotation from Henrici Stephani Thesaurus, of nearly the same marginal note, of which he says, "*ex iis autem exemplaribus antiquis, quæ ad N. T. editionem undique conquisiverat pater meus, unum hæc margini adscripta de vocabulis illis habebat [Acts xix. 12].*" Now, if this was not *æ*, what was it? Let Wetsten, however, be wrong, if you please, in ascertaining *æ*; still, it is fact, that he held No. 15 of Stephanus to be a MS. which had the Acts and Cath. Ep. So far, then, from his actually believing that Stephanus could have only the MSS. cited in the margin of that division, (— non nisi septem) he gave it as his deliberate judgment, after collating the supposed *æ*, that one of those taken to furnish opposing readings in the Revelations, though never once cited in the Acts and Cath. Ep., might still have that division. What says the learned translator to this?

The note proceeds (p. 782, n. 275)—"There is a circumstance relative to this manuscript which is worthy of notice. Wetsten, Griesbach, Michaelis, with other eminent critics, are of opinion, that it is the very manuscript which Stephens quoted by the title Codex *æ*. Now, if this be true, it necessarily follows, that Stephens had not seven only, as is generally, and with reason, supposed, but eight manuscripts of the catholic epistles." The conspiring critics fixing, as we have said, on the division of the Acts and Cath. Ep. for their grand assault, have not only generally, but uniformly supposed, that Stephanus had in no place more than the MSS. cited in the division where it occurs; and, of course, they have laid it down, as we have seen, that he had seven only of the catholic epistles. And reason good for such an assumption: upon that, and that only, could they overturn the "*credit*" that was "ever attached to the pretensions of the editor on the formation of the text." (Lect. vi. p. 108.) But can they assign any other reason for their disciples *believing* such an assumption but the *ipse dixit* of their masters? I have looked with some anxiety, and the only one that I have seen offered, is in the translator's Letters, Pref. p. xx. "In

VOL. IV.—Nov. 1833.

3 z

the catholic epistles, Stephens has quoted only seven manuscripts; consequently, in these epistles he collated only seven; for, if he had collated more, he, of course, would have quoted more." The proof rests, then, on the axiom, that if he had collated more documents, he would have quoted more. Well, then, suppose I were to face round here on Stephanus's accusers, upon their favourite object of attack, as I did upon the "glaring evidence," and were again to say, Stephanus has quoted but one printed document, consequently he had but one, for if he had collated more, he, of course, would have quoted more; therefore, in all those places where you tell me he followed "printed guides," if he did not copy from the Complutensian, (a charge that is now out of fashion, except for the Revelation,) he must have had his text from manuscript. Would this most acute writer have hesitated one moment in exposing the cheat? Would he not have told me, that citing for opposing readings to the folio was not collating for the text of the O mirificam, and that the Complutensian was *selected* out of "omnibus pæne impressis"? But the Docti et Prudentes tell us, that they sometimes say the number of MSS. quoted by Stephens amounted to sixteen, and at other times that they amounted only to fifteen, according as they include the Complutensian edition or not, (p. 861, note 43.) Would they, then, be pleased to include the Complutensian on this occasion, and say that Stephanus had only eight manuscripts of the catholic epistles of *both sorts*, both of those that were written and those "*vetustissima scripta*" which the bookseller himself denominated *editio*, and described as "*quæ fuit excusa*," and which the vulgar, at this day, call *print*? I suspect not. I suspect that they would admit that he might have "*collated*" some MSS. of the same sort as the Complutensian, and yet not have *quoted* them. I think also that they might be induced to allow that some of these might possibly contain the Acts and Cath. Ep.; why, then, might not this be the case with the other sort of MSS. which the bookseller and the vulgar call *written* copies? Why might not *æ* and *α* both of them have the Acts and Cath. Ep., though they did not come into the selection of opposing MSS. to the first volume? By the learned translator's own acknowledgment, Wetsten, Griesbach, Michaelis, with other eminent critics, are of opinion, that *æ* had the Acts and Cath. Ep., though they themselves condemn Stephanus for frequently giving his text in this division "without MS. authority," upon the sole ground of his having only the *cited* MSS.—"*non nisi septem*." Let me, however, have been totally wrong in so pertinaciously controverting the axiom, that an editor who gives various readings could not make a *selection* out of his documents for that purpose; still, by some means or other, the learned translator has been, like Le Long, ascribing to Stephanus an *accuracy* which, as Mr. Travis's other great correspondent shews, is what *fact and experience will not justify*; and it is upon this that he has been pronouncing the "bookseller" to be guilty. And for this fact and this experience we stand on pretty high ground, when we heap Ossa upon Pelion,—when we base the testimony in Le Long, and pile up Wetsten and Griesbach, and Fleischer and Michaelis, and surmount the whole with Porson himself; all declaring, that when

Stephanus has been found guilty on the ground that "non habuisse codices epistolarum catholicarum manuscriptos plures quam septem illos δ, ε, ζ, θ, ι, α, γ, one of the fifteen *cited* MSS., one of those that was selected to furnish opposing readings to the next division (Revelations) actually had the Acts and Cath. Ep., though never cited in it. Still we have that which overtops this Himmaleh of criticism. The learned writer himself has carried the identity of ε to such a degree of certainty as never was attained in any other case, and never can be again, except α, whenever it may be brought to light out of the "obscurity in which it is at present buried." See Appendix to Letters, p. 220—232. The poor Archdeacon had exulted in finding that a reading, for which Stephanus quoted ε at 1 Cor. i. 6, did not appear in the royal MS. now numbered 237, formerly 2869; whereas the reading of one of the unmarked MSS. might so easily be ascribed to ε, where the MS. was not taken to be regularly collated with the text of the folio, but only a few chance readings set down. But, as Griesbach justly says, "Cum vero ex Apocalyps, ingentem lectionum copiam attulerit Wetstenius, qui huncce libellum totum perlegerat, facile dijudicare potuit, utrum Regius iste 2869 idem codex sit, quem Stephanus ε appellaverat. Nulli igitur dubitamus assensum præbere Wetstenio Le Longii testimonium confirmanti." Prol. xxiii., Lond. xxxiv. And the learned translator of Michaelis himself, having shewn how slight Le Long's proof was respecting the eight royal MSS. that Stephanus selected to oppose his folio, observes upon what different grounds Wetsten's labours place us with respect to that and one other; ii. p. 791, note 289, "Two of them, namely, the Codices Regii 2861 and 2869, which Le Long supposes to be the same as the Codices Stephani η, and ε, have been completely collated by Wetsten, whose collation strengthens the opinion of Le Long. As far as concerns, therefore, the Codex η and the Codex ε, we have additional evidence in favour of the opinion that they are the same as the Codices Regii 2861 and 2869, because Wetsten has found that, not four only, but the readings quoted in general in Stephens's margin from the Codices η and ε are found in the Cod. Regii 2861 and 2869." And above all, with respect to ε, Mr. Travis stands thus rebuked by his correspondent, p. 220, note 119—"This is an admirable specimen of critical judgment. A single contradiction is to prove non-identity in the case of a MS. which Stephens has quoted in the Apocalypse alone two-hundred-and-forty times." Still, we are told, "it is *with reason* supposed" that Stephanus had those seven MSS. only of the catholic epistles, and on that reason the man's guilt is maintained as stiffly as ever. Yes, with all the Addenda et Corrigenda that are prefixed to these notes of the second volume, in the first edition, Cambridge, 1793, and with all the other corrections made in the second edition, 1802, this note 275, p. 776, first edition, is continued without the change of a letter, second edition, p. 782, and in the subsequent editions. And "in the case of a MS. which Stephens has quoted 240 times in the Apocalypse," doubts are inculcated, which I think the Cloten himself would hardly have dared to insinuate in a subsequent edition.

FRANCIS HUYSNE.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

The Editor begs to remind his readers that he is not responsible for the opinions of his Correspondents.

---

## VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIEN GREEK PRESS.

(Continued from p. 530.)

READ and admire p. 782, bottom : " But there is a circumstance which weakens the opinion of these eminent critics—namely, that Stephens has not quoted his Codex  $\alpha$  in one single instance in the catholic epistles, which he would hardly have neglected to do (especially at the celebrated passage, 1 John, v. 7) had the Codex  $\alpha$  contained them." No ; " Stephens has not quoted his Codex  $\alpha$ ," nor  $\epsilon$ , the other MS. that he was obliged to take for the Revelations, " in one single instance," in the Acts and Cath. Ep. And the learned writer himself gave us the reason, Letters, p. 137—" Now, Stephens has not stated that the *whole* verse [the whole of the two verses] existed in *any one* of his MSS. ; his whole statement is confined to seven MSS." Stephanus's margin could not possibly state that the whole of the two verses " existed in *any one* of his MSS. ;" for the business of the margin was to give *opposing* authorities ; and he " has not quoted " a document " in one single instance " throughout the New Testament for the text that he gives. It must be from some other source that you must seek for information respecting the MSS. that furnished the reading of his text. And with respect to the readings that were against it, he took, as we have observed, the first thirteen marked MSS.,  $\beta$ — $\omega$ , to furnish them ; and seven only of these thirteen contained Acts and Cath. Ep. Accordingly, as the learned writer so justly observed, *his whole statement is confined to those seven* ; and what business had his margin with the readings of  $\alpha$  or  $\epsilon$ , or either of the five unmarked MSS. that contained that division ? In fact, the wonder is, that Stephanus should have given so many readings of  $\alpha$  in St. Paul, as six in 1 Cor., and one a-piece in 2 Cor., Gal., Phil., and Colos. It would have been enough to have done as he has with  $\epsilon$ , from which he took a couple of readings in the gospels, and a couple in his second volume from St. Paul's epistles.

" (Especially at the celebrated passage, 1 John, v. 7.)" I would observe, that it is modern criticism alone that has a different rule for celebrated passages. Stephanus's " whole statement is confined to seven MSS." As we have already observed, he never, from first to last, tells you any thing of what MSS. agreed with his text ; and as for readings that disagree with it, he confines himself, with only three exceptions that I know, to the first thirteen marked MSS., of which seven, and seven only, had the Acts and Cath. Ep. ; and he does not take more or less for celebrated passages. If you wish to know how he acted on celebrated passages, none in *that* day was more so than 1 Cor. xv. 51 ; and what do you find there in the folio ? Exactly what you ought, where none of the first thirteen selected MSS. gave

any thing different from his text—a vacant margin. And it is only from his having been tried to the utmost upon this really “*celebrated passage*” to make him give a reading conformable to the Western Recensions, (European and African,) that you learn the fact of not one of the *plusquam triginta* having given that reading, and that no motive was strong enough to induce him to print Greek contrary to their united testimony. As to the passage in the two verses, 1 John, v. 7, 8, though it was very celebrated in 1802, the learned writer’s tacit inference does not hold, that it must have been celebrated in 1546—1550. The fact is, (and it is a fact which the reader will do well to remember,) that no passage which has ever been disputed was less *celebrated* at that time. Indeed, so little attention did Stephanus pay to it, that, as the critics themselves shew, he made a typographical error, if he did not make two, in his text, 1546, not noticed in his table of *Sphalmata*; and also an error in the critical marks of the folio. Lee, who made some puling complaints at Erasmus’s two first editions, respecting 1 John, v. 7, 8, joined with it 1 John, iv. 3, as an equally lamentable loss. Now, suppose Archdeacon Travis, after the Appendix I. of the Letters by the translator of Michaelis, had contended that his learned correspondent had failed on *u*, and, failing on that, could of course deserve no credit on any of the others,—assigning as a proof of the failure on *u*, that Stephanus has never quoted it, in one single instance, in the catholic epistles, which he could not have neglected to do, especially at the celebrated passage, 1 John, iv. 3. The rebukes which the Cloten so often receives in words that burn, may furnish some faint notion of what would have been inflicted on him in such a case. It is, however, only for the sake of shewing to what the Docti et Prudentes will condescend, rather than abandon their charges against Stephanus, that I offer any argument. I know that, “as Stephens has no where quoted the MS. *u* in the catholic epistles, the learned writer once thought that this circumstance in some measure weakened the arguments for the opinion, that it was the MS. 237, because this MS. contains the catholic epistles.”—(Letters, 232, note 137.) But at that time (in 1795) he had discovered the futility of such an argument “to prove non-identity in the case of a MS. which Stephens has quoted in the Apocalypse two hundred and forty times.” This straw—this straw burnt with fire—is indeed still trusted to in 1803, and in all the subsequent editions of Michaelis, as a reason for clinging to those calumnies against Stephanus which are founded on the assertion that he had seven MSS. only of the Acts and Cath. Ep. And we are nevertheless assured, as we have seen, that “there are more than a hundred places in which he has quoted *all* his authorities for readings different from *his own*.” I shall, however, place full confidence in the learned writer’s own unanswerable identification of *u* with the MS. numbered 237, in the royal library: without looking to the unmarked MSS., that the Docti et Prudentes have themselves quoted, I shall say, that, by their own acknowledgment, and by their own proof, “Stephens had not seven only, but eight *marked* MSS. of the catholic epistles,” and, in all probability, a ninth also, viz. *u*; so that in this division, of all others, the paralogism is most

flagrant, of those who can openly avow their inference, "that as the MSS. cited by Robert Stephens did not contain" any passage, "he must have inserted it without MS. authority." With this incontrovertible proof, that even the marked MS. *æ* contained the Acts and Cath. Ep., and yet was never cited there, if I had nothing else to offer respecting the passages where *ἐν παντί* occurs in the margin, I should request permission not to believe that Stephanus was "*felo de se*," by "openly contradicting his own declarations" (Let. vi. 107) 118 times. I should question the axiom laid down, Letters, p. xx., that, "if he had collated more, he of course would have quoted more;" I should contend that he actually had MSS. which he does not cite, and that the margin of the folio never could in any place say more than that *all the MSS.* which he *cites* in that division, wherever it may be, give "readings different from his own."

I must not quit *æ* without making due acknowledgment of my faults, and of my obligation to this note (ii. 782, note 275) for its having made me sensible of them. An abominable blunder pervades the Specimen, which blindly follows the Docti et Prudentes, in representing the whole of the fifteen marked MSS. to have been taken to furnish opposing readings to the first volume of the folio. I trust that in future I shall have enough of that *σωφρων ἀπιστία*, which Mr. Porson so justly recommends, p. 163, never again to trust to their representations. Wherever the marked MSS. of Stephanus's margin are mentioned in the specimen, the reader will now see that instead of xv. which the pamphlet gives, it ought to have been "*the first thirteen*;" and he is requested to correct it accordingly.

To these concessions, as recorded by Michaelis and his learned commentator, we must add one, of no less moment, from Wetsten, who says, Prol. 144, Seml. 373, "Hac occasione duæ difficultates, quæ me diu torserant, sunt expediendæ. Altera est de *numero codicum Stephanicorum*; cum enim Ro. Stephanus in præfatione et in margine editionis in folio, nonnisi xvi. codicum faciat mentionem, inter quos editio Complutensis primum occupat locum; cumque T. Beza in annotationibus non plures Stephani codices ad testimonium citet: qui factum ut Henr. Stephanus scriberet se *plus quam xxx. codices vidisse* et Beza testaretur, exemplar Henrici Stephani ab eo cum xxv. plus minus codicibus diligentissime collatum fuisse?" The gentlemen who work themselves up to say on the catholic epistles, "*non nisi septem*," and for the whole N. T. "*quindecim tantum*," are here most certainly put upon the rack by two awkward testimonies—one from the man who had a book of the collations, and reported from it all through the N. T.; and the other from the man who was concerned in making the collations, both for the second O mirificam, and soon afterwards for the folio "*minutioribus typis et parvo volumine . . . . . mox autem grandibus characteribus et magno volumine*." And yet there was a third testimony, "*de numero codicum Stephanicorum*," viz. that of Robert himself, in his second boast respecting the royal MSS., when he vaunted before the Sorbonne, as we have seen, of the amount of the "*copia*," that "*bibliotheca regia facile suppetitavit*." But Wetsten is tortured enough by the other two, to think of meddling here with Robert;

though, as we have observed, he quotes that testimony in his note on 1 John, v. 7. It is curious to observe how opposite the conduct of Mr. Porson is to that of Wetsten, in this particular. The Professor, with that consummate judgment which marks his inimitable work, enters the lists only with Robert; and, with respect to him, never notices the "*plures et meliores e Regiis*," according to which every letter of the O mirificam was given, nor the marked distinction between the *whole* of that set, "*ea omnia quæ in regis Galliarum bibliotheca extant*," and those eight that were selected for the margin of the folio. Mr. Porson makes no attempt upon the chief collator, and the man who used the collations, in their statements "*de numero codicum Stephanicorum*"; though at p. 56 he quotes the testimony of Beza as valid, exactly as Wetsten quotes that of Robert. But he was engaged with "a grave and reverend gentleman" (60) who could accord with him in making the point at issue to be, "whether Stephens had sixteen or only fifteen MSS. *in all*?" (p. 64.) Wetsten could hardly expect to succeed like Mr. Porson; he could not hope to make his readers say that there was "a small inaccuracy" in the number of the royal MSS. vaunted before the Sorbonne, and to substitute a number of his own for that which Robert himself gave under such circumstances; so he makes no acknowledgment of having been racked by the *fifteen* royal MSS.—he will submit only to Henry and Beza. Well, then, go on, ye tormentors; give him another turn. To escape from them, we see Wetsten proceeds upon two assumptions: the first is, that "*Stephanus in præfatione et in margine editionis in folio nonnisi xvi. codicum faciat mentionem*." As for the *margin*, we shall see more of that hereafter. It is enough at present to observe, that this is said when the preface distinctly mentions a set of sixteen very old written copies used in former days to furnish the text of the O mirificam, and fifteen taken now to furnish opposing readings to the new text of the folio; so that, in fact, it requires some consideration to see that the margin does not mention thirty-one MSS. instead of fifteen only. But whoever will combine with it what is said of the first set in the preface of the O mirificam, will see that the eight royal MSS. of the margin were selected out of the "*copia*" which he then followed to a single letter. These eight, then, being common to both sets, are to be deducted from the sum total. The remainder, however, will be sufficient to confute Wetsten; and if any thing more could be wanting, we might refer back to Bishop Marsh's decision respecting  $\beta$ . (Michaelis ii. 856, note 37.) Wetsten's second assumption is even still more in opposition to fact; viz. that "*Beza in annotationibus non plures Stephani codices ad testimonium citet*." For the confutation of this, I gladly avail myself of the note where Wetsten's assertion of "*quindecim tantum*" is maintained by the translator of Michaelis, Letters, p. 134, note 16. The learned writer is opposing two quotations that his correspondent had given from Beza, on John vii. 53, and on 1 Cor. vii. 29; and he says, as "*Stephens had only sixteen copies, even inclusive of the Complutensian edition, the word septendecim alone would have betrayed Beza, had he asserted (which, however, he had*

not) that he had Stephens's MSS. in his possession, because in that case he would have known their precise number, and would not have made them amount sometimes to sixteen, (as in his note 1 Cor. vii. 29,) at other times to seventeen."

Now, would the profoundly learned and most acute writer have ventured upon this, and upon the assertions in the following note that rest upon it, if he had not been addressing a Cloten, who, as Michaelis, I believe, says, was a century behind in criticism, and to whom (to the great disgrace of the times) the cause had, by universal consent, been so completely entrusted? Was it possible for such a scholar as this not to see that the making the amount of Stephanus's MSS. different in the different divisions, was a proof that Beza did "know their precise number" in each, from Stephanus's book of collations, which "he had in his possession;" and that it was the strongest corroboration of his honesty, in his account of their total amount? Though the Cloten who had got the fact of Beza having "made them amount," in one division, "to sixteen," and in another "to seventeen," was so utterly unable to make use of it; yet suppose the case to have been otherwise, and that Beza could have given the *same* number for all, would his illustrious correspondent have failed to urge it as the fullest possible self-confutation? With this fact merely before him of Beza's quoting different numbers of MSS. in the different divisions, was it possible for him actually to believe that "Beza, through want of experience, *supposed*" that Stephens's sixteen copies [the opposing documents of the margin] contained the *whole* N. T.\* as he alleges in the very next note, p. 136, note 17? No; no more than he believed that Stephanus had only fifteen MSS. in all, or believed the "glaring evidence," when he himself stated that in identifying the opposing documents of the margin of the folio with the "*vetustissima sedecim scripta exemplaria*" that furnished the text of the first edition in 1546, we must except at least the codex  $\beta$ . But he did know that the wretched Cloten whom he opposed believed it himself, and so could never meet him with a denial of the absurdity; he knew also that, to the deep disgrace of the times, the cause was completely entrusted to this creature. Take it, however, if you like, that the learned writer did think that this stating a different number in the

---

\* Beza, who goes through the whole of the book of collations, quoting from it in every part of the N. T., must see all the first thirteen selected MSS. stop with the catholic epistles. He must see the margin take two fresh MSS. to give various readings in the Revelation. Yet, according to the Letter-writer, he is, "through want of experience, to *suppose*" that all the fifteen equally contained that division. And he is to die in this belief, with his own three MSS. before him. I protest as strongly against the *ignorance* that our Docti et Prudentes ascribe to Beza, as I do against the *knowledge* for which they are pleased to give him credit—Cum ex praefatione sciret. I hold that Beza did not know what every one may see to be false. I hold that he was not ignorant of what none but an idiot could doubt, with such means before his eyes. If (*more Doctorem et Prudentium*) I were to assert that Beza, "through want of experience, *supposed*" that there never was a MS. that contained the *whole* N. T., what shadow of an argument could they have to confute me, but that  $\alpha$  must have had the whole?



gospels and in St. Paul's epistles actually betrayed Beza, still it betrayed some one else. As Beza, right or wrong, did quote seventeen written copies of Stephanus in the gospels, and sixteen in St. Paul's epistles, Wetsten shewed himself rather more anxious to escape from the rack, than to adhere to truth, when he was pleased to assert that Stephanus had only fifteen MSS., and that "T. Beza in annotationibus non plures Stephani codices ad testimonium citet." Supposing all the fifteen of the margin to have contained the gospels, here were two more cited by Beza; supposing all the fifteen contained St. Paul, here was one more, that Beza found in his book of collations. But has it never been declared, that no man could find more than ten of the gospels, or eight of St. Paul's epistles, in the fifteen MSS. of the margin? and then, what think you of Beza's having found seventeen of the gospels, and sixteen of St. Paul, recorded in his book of collation? Have I at all exceeded bounds in my admiration of Mr. Porson's judgment for not exposing himself to such a rack as this?

Wetsten having fortified himself with these two little assumptions, takes courage and faces the tormenting statements of Henry and Beza—"de numero codicum Stephanicorum;" he proceeds, Prol. 144, Seml. 373, "Respondeo facile hæc et secum et cum veritate conciliari posse, si dicamus Henr. Stephanum ultra xxx. quidem codices *vidisse*, sed nonnisi xvi. a capite ad calcem cum editis *contulisse*; verba vero hyperbolica Bezae esse commoda interpretatione mollienda." As for the "*secum*"—the reconciling the two accounts—nothing can be easier. Beza does not intimate that the book of collation stated how many MSS. in the whole were collated; his expression shews uncertainty; it is only a calculation of his own. "*Cum veritate*"—*Veritas* means Wetsten's groundless assertion of *quindecim tantum*, which has in so many ways been shewn to be false; it is evident, therefore, that it must be absolutely impossible to reconcile this with the two plain, independent statements of the chief collator, and of the man who himself had the book of collations, which he examined "*a capite ad calcem*." As for Beza, he has said so much, and is such a positive fellow, that the only method which can be pursued towards him, upon all occasions, even where he is giving an account of his own MS. (D), is flatly to give him the lie; a summary method, but, as Mr. Porson, I believe, observed, and certainly felt in the present case, rather dangerous to be made too common. As the case stands between Wetsten and Beza, there are most hyperbolic words, on the one side or the other, which no gentle interpretation can possibly soften. Beza found in his book of collations, as we have seen from Mr. Travis and his correspondent, seventeen different MSS. quoted in the gospels; though, as I imagine from the preface to the edition of 1598, he discovered afterwards that two more were quoted in that division, and in St. Paul's epistles, sixteen. To these add, from the same source that they drew their information, thirteen in the Acts and the catholic epistles, and four or more in the Revelations. Now, Beza did not

follow the calculation of the modern critics on the Barberini codices;\* but set down Stephanus's MSS., which furnished these numbers in the different divisions of the sacred text, to have been "xxv. plus minus" in the whole. And whether these were *hyperbolic words*, or his calculation was not too small, let any man judge, who will consider what the critics state of those fifteen which were selected to give opposing readings to the folio. Hyperbolical as Wetsten may please to call them, they actually fall short of what the collator himself gave, "plusquam xxx." And this statement by Henry of the total amount, after his success "in Italicis," scarcely bears a greater ratio to the whole selection for the margin, than "*ea omnia* quæ in regis Galliarum bibliotheca extant," which Robert himself boasted to be fifteen, do to the eight royal MSS. of the margin. As all the separate accounts, then, accord so well together—viz., Beza's statements of the number that he found in the different divisions of the N. T.—his *calculation* of the whole—Henry's positive statement of this amount—and Robert's statement of the amount of the "copia" supplied from the "bibliotheca regia,"—it might have seemed that they must all stand or fall together; that they must all be "small inaccuracies"—*verba hyperbolica*, as Wetsten expresses it—or all be admitted to be fact. But Wetsten judged it prudent not to include the Stephani, father or son, in the hyperbole. The father's account, as we have seen, remains untouched by him; and the son is allowed to have actually seen "plusquam xxx." of what they had from the royal library, and what he himself discovered "in Italicis;" but for *collation*—"a capite ad calcem contulisse." "Ah! no more of that, Hal, if thou lovest me." But if Henry saw these thirty MSS. and more, at all, why should he not look into the inside of them, as well as the outside? If he looked into them at all, why not see whether they would not furnish some various readings? Supposing the "small inaccuracy" to rest with Mr. Porson, and Robert to have been right when he said that the "bibliotheca regia" supplied seven more royal MSS. besides the eight that are cited in the margin; why do you think that they were not used for the text in the three different collations, for the different editions, 1546—1550? If Henry saw more than that number "in Italicis," what is your reason for imagining that he did not collate them, or get them transcribed for his father's folio? For what purpose was his long abode in Italy? Was it to look at the outside of the MSS., or to make collations and obtain transcripts? Wetsten has not assigned any reason for imagining that he did not collate "*ea omnia* quæ in regis Galliarum bibliotheca extant," and as many more that he saw "in Italicis," but that the fact could not be reconciled "cum veritate," i. e. his own assumption of "quindecim tantum." The se-

---

\* We are told that "ten of these MSS. contained the gospels, eight of them the epistles and acts of the apostles, and four the book of Revelation."—Michaelis, ii. p. 212. The critics, admitting the assumption of Petrus Possinus, that no one of these copies could contain two of these parts, sum up 10, 8, and 4, and most arithmetically decide, one and all, that they were 22 in the whole.

lections for the margin of the folio undoubtedly amounted to no more; but what ground had Beza for asserting "*quindecim tantum*" of the materials for the different texts of the different editions? Mill's collation proves incontestibly that these fifteen of the margin of the folio were not the sixteen from which the O mirificam was taken; and Wetsten's own decision respecting  $\beta$  would, as we have seen, require that it *at least must be excepted*. Such a thought could never have been entertained by any one who would *abide by* Stephanus's expressions—either "*vetustissima scripta*" in his account of the one set, or "*editio quæ fuit excusa*" in that of the other; and still less by any man who would attend to either of his *boasts*, either that of the text being formed from "*plures et meliores e Regiis*," or that before the Sorbonne, where he bragged of the number of these MSS. from the royal library, and declared that they amounted to fifteen; a number that justified his assuming the title, "*Novum Testamentum ex bibliotheca Regia*." But, in the second place, to engage still closer with Wetsten, who thinks he can escape from Henry's gripe, if "*scriberet se plusquam xxx. codices vidisse*," knowing something of the powers of the Docti et Prudentes, when they get into these places of torment, I ask, did not Henry write something more—something that might help to decide the point, whether he had looked only at the outside of these "*plusquam xxx*"? Was there nothing to lead you to believe that what we have said might justly be expected of him was absolutely fact? Was there nothing to shew that he was not contented with looking at the binding of these books, but that he did examine them sufficiently "*a capite ad calcem*" to have ascertained that "*eadem iisdem in locis κεφαλαια habebant*"? I do not wonder that Wetsten should stop short at "*in Italicis*;" and that he should think proper to omit the subjoined clause, "*Qui eadem iisdem in locis κεφαλαια habebant*," which would have racked him indeed. Who, that is informed of Henry's having examined the κεφαλαια throughout, in these thirty MSS., would not begin to suspect that he must have looked a little at the text which was comprehended under these headings; sufficiently, indeed, to have enabled him to furnish that book of collations which gave Beza the readings of so many MSS. in the different divisions of the sacred text, as must make them amount in the whole to more than his calculation of xxv.? And when Wetsten had the metrical κεφαλαια before him, which Henry gave, and which you have in the Critici Sacri vi. p. 2069, could he entertain a doubt in his own mind of Henry having collated one MS. at least "*a capite ad calcem*," which did not come into Robert's selection for the margin of his folio? But, thirdly, let us take no more than what Wetsten voluntarily submits to; I will be content with the mere "*vidi*," if we may have what he and the rest of the Docti et Prudentes so firmly assert, viz. that Henry was the sole collator of the cited MSS. As far, then, as this part of the "*plusquam xxx*," they admit that Henry *saw* their various readings "*a capite ad calcem*," and enabled others also to *see* them; whether the MSS. came from "*regis Galliæ bibliotheca*" or from "*Italicis*." Fixing them, then, on this dire machine of Henry's, (than which, Siculi non invenère tyranni Majus tormentum,) I say that

Henry's "*vidi*" is as much applied to "*ea omnia quæ in regis Gallicarum bibliotheca extant*"—to the whole *copia* of the fifteen that are cited in the annotations of Beza—as to those eight of them that are cited only in the margin of Stephanus's folio. And with respect to the "*Alia*"—those which Henry found "in Italicis"—I accept Bishop Marsh's acknowledgment always, and in all places, with all thankfulness, that when the Docti et Prudentes assert "that all the sixteen manuscripts (*printed* and written) which are quoted in R. Stephens's edition of 1550 had been collated previous to the edition of 1546, we must except at least the Codex  $\beta$ , which could not have been collated till after the year 1537." (ii. 856, note 37; see also p. 704, note 117.) And, not content with this, I must say that, when it is asserted, ii. 690, note 113, that " $\beta$  was the only manuscript collated in Italy," his Lordship cannot prove this negative, and I can disprove it, from what he himself says, p. 704, note 116. His Lordship, evidently reflecting on the object of Henry's journey to Italy, and on what he says, "*— quæ pater meus ex illis exemplaribus describenda curaverat,*" there tells us, that "on his return to Paris he might deliver them [his fancied collations of  $\beta$ ] to his father, R. Stephens, *with other papers and extracts made in Italy.*" Without looking, then, at any thing more than the naked "*vidi*" which Wetsten chooses to shew me, I observe that it applies equally to every one of the "*plusquam xxx.*"—to the whole of these "*papers and extracts made in Italy*"—and to the whole *copia* of the xv. that "*bibliotheca regia suppeditavit;*" and that he *saw* not merely the binding of them, but their various readings also; and by his books of collations enabled his father, and, after him, Beza, to *see* them also, and to use them, each in the formation of his text.

FRANCIS HUYSHE.

#### LETTERS ON THE CHURCH OF THE FATHERS.

##### NO III.

THE conduct of Ambrose towards the Emperor Theodosius, on occasion of the massacre at Thessalonica, is the most instructive passage in his history; nay, perhaps in the history of the whole church: for what sight can be more edifying to the Christian, or more impressive to the world at large, than that of a bishop conscientiously and calmly rebuking a monarch; and the monarch humbly confessing and repenting of his sin?

The circumstances which led to this memorable display of the principles of the gospel (Psalm ii. 8—12; Acts ix. 15) were as follows:—Theodosius was of a choleric temper, which hurried him on to visit, with the power of an emperor, insults which every one, prince and subject, naturally feels. In the year 390, a tumult took place in Thessalonica on some supposed grievance, such as commonly excites a populace, which ended in the murder of the commander of the imperial forces, who had given the offence, and other officers. The first burst of the Emperor's indignation was overcome by the interpo-

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

The Editor begs to remind his readers that he is not responsible for the opinions  
of his Correspondents.

---

## VINDICATION OF THE EARLY PARISIAN GREEK PRESS.

(Continued from p. 640.)

[P. 633, l. 33, for margin, read *preface*.—P. 638, l. 26, "*calcem confuisse*," for the full-stop, put a comma.—P. 640, l. 11, for 1537, read 1547.]

WETSTEN does not stand alone in feeling the agonies of this "plus-quam xxx." of the man who was so long employed in Italy, when corroborated by the calculation of the man who made so great use of his collations. Crito Cantabrigiensis, though he does not roar so loud at the torture as Wetsten, has, like him, his "facile hæc et secum et cum veritate conciliari posse," in his note, p. 400. He adopts Wetsten's plan for getting off from the rack, but he inverts the application of it. Certain hints that had been given in the Specimen rendered it rather dangerous to talk any longer of the "verba hyperbolica Bezæ;" so this compliment is transferred to Henry; and the gentle interpretation by which it is to be softened is as follows:—"That Henry Stephens, after an interval of thirty-seven years, should thus swell the number of his MSS., may be attributed to imperfect recollection, if not to a desire of magnifying the achievements of his early years." P. 400, note. There are then two strings to the bow, from which he shoots at Henry's reputation; and Crito is pleased to set his own knowledge and veracity against those of Henry, on the number of the MSS. which Henry himself had collated; and as, according to Mr. Porson, there was a small inaccuracy in the father's boast before the Sorbonne of the amount of the MSS. which he had from the royal library, and the Professor was able to correct his *swelling* them to xv., so his vindicator undertakes to correct the son's falsehood. Judge, then, between the accuser and the accused; and say whether Crito can produce a shadow of a reason to support this new slander, of Henry having "swelled the number of his MSS. 1st, "Imperfect recollection." Let it have been ever so imperfect, was that of Crito likely to be more perfect? What information had he superior to that given by the collator himself? What ground had he for his saying, p. 399, that no attention is to be paid "to what people recollect, or pretend to recollect"? Henry never pretends that his recollection of the metrical κεφαλαία was not very imperfect; but I should think that, even "after an interval of thirty-seven years," he would be able to say whether he had collated fifteen MSS. from the royal library, or only eight; and still more, whether he had collated MSS. in Italy or not. But Crito, I presume, was aware that Henry's memory had been often refreshed upon this subject. I suppose he knew who printed Beza's work, that depended so much upon these collations; at all events he had before his eyes the words, "— quæ Pater meus ex illis exemplaribus describenda curaverat —;" so he

Vol. IV.—Dec. 1833.

5 E

comes to the charge of wilful falsification, from "a desire of magnifying" his achievements. The three independent, but concurring, testimonies of Robert, of Beza, and of Henry himself—"de *numero codicum Stephanicorum*"—are all to be set aside, under the plea of "small inaccuracies," "verba hyperbolica;" and now (*ὕπεροψα ματαιότητος*) "great swelling words of vanity;" the Docti et Prudentes are to "soften them by a gentle interpretation," (Porson, 85,) and upon that interpretation the old critics are to be brought in guilty. Crito agreed in "thinking it would seem, in his day, that dead reputations are fair subjects of the most wanton insults," as Mr. Greswell says of the great man whom Crito undertakes to vindicate. (L. p. 330.) But if the dead feel not, the "nominis umbra," under which the vindication appears, is equally invulnerable. I hesitate not, then, to retort this charge in full weight and measure, as it gives great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme; and, under it, every empty infidel scoffer (for an instance, take the Rev. Robert Taylor) can call upon the humble pious believer to be a *traitor* of his *Bible*, as containing cheats by the early editors, from their own forging of Greek. Has Crito any thing more to produce for Henry's want of honesty than for his want of memory? If the "interval of thirty-seven years" would blunt his recollection, it might also have served to blunt his feelings of vanity, if such had ever existed on the "achievement" of collating fifteen or sixteen MSS. during a three years' residence in Italy. But surely, if such had existed, opportunities had occurred, during so long a period, of indulging them. The work of collation had been often mentioned; but here, in the second edition of his Greek Testament, we have the first intimation that would lead you to guess the whole number that had been procured for his father's folio. And I think that whoever will take the trouble of reading it—not as the account is garbled by all the critics, but as it stands in the *Critici Sacri*, VI. p. 2066—will see that we should never have had it at all if the *κεφάλαια* had not fortunately been mentioned. So far from vanity appearing in it, no testimony was ever more incidental. Can Crito shew any improbability in it? Does he doubt of Henry having been sent to Italy? Will he intimate that the Italian libraries would not have furnished him with sufficient stores to have doubled his father's original stock? Will he allege that Henry did not visit the whole of them? Will he say that the man was not kept there a sufficient time for such "*achievements*"? Will he suggest that the "*paternæ sedulitatis hæres*" "was at *that* time too young, too impatient, and too little experienced in criticism, for an undertaking of that nature"? (Michaelis, II. 316) No. Henry's anonymous slanderer does not venture to close with him upon any of these points. There is one, I acknowledge—and there is but one—where Crito says any thing to establish Henry's guilt. If Robert's object in keeping his son so long in Italy had been answered, and Henry had not "*swelled the number of his MSS.*," his *achievements* would have shewn themselves in the altered text of the projected folio; but, according to his accuser, it remains the same as if he had never crossed the Alps. "The three editions," says Crito, "with a few variations, gave the same text

throughout." P. 389. This wants only one thing to make it decisive against both Henry and myself,—and that is, truth; and, as we have already noticed, (Brit. Mag. vol. iii. p. 659,) it is Wetsten and both Mr. Travis's correspondents who agree in telling him that it is not true—"Tantopere a se ipso dissensit Stephanus, ut a priori editione in *secunda* sexagies septies recederet, in *tertia* vero ab *utroque* præcedente, juxta Millii calculum, ducenties octagies quater." Wetsten, 146, 5; Seml. 376. Yes; if Mill's reckoning be truth, there stand all these alterations occasioned by Henry's success in bringing accession to his father's materials, to testify that Henry did *not* "magnify the achievements of his early years;" and to tell the man who says Henry "swelled the number of his MSS." that he is a slanderer. For, if there are so many places where the preponderance of Robert's new materials was so great as to overcome the "*plures et meliores e Regiis*," and thus give the stronger evidence, in the folio, to the readings which had been rejected in the O mirificam, I ask, confidently, could the accession from the new MSS. collated by Henry have been less than what the collator states? Most certainly Crito accorded with me in opinion that it could not; otherwise he would hardly have resorted to such means to dispose of the fact that supports the narrations of the two tormentors. And I have Bishop Marsh with me. His Lordship's concession stands recorded, Michaelis II. 860, note 41—"We know that, though only fifteen manuscripts are quoted in Stephens's margin, a much greater number were examined by Henry Stephens, if not collated." But whether Henry gave the true number of the MSS. that he had collated, or a false one, if the collation was made for the folio,—if the three years spent in examining the MSS. "*in Italicis*" added the collation of a single one to his father's stock, it would torture Crito as acutely as it had Wetsten. All Crito's labours, in demonstrating that the Complutensian was a *very old-written* copy, would be given to the winds; and the "*historical fact*" for which his whole book was composed, would become a lying legend. As Wetsten, therefore, would admit only of Henry's taking a look at any MSS., whether they were "*in regis Galliæ bibliotheca*" or "*in Italicis*," but what came into one or other of the selections for the margin,—so Crito, who is compelled to admit the actual collation of some of them, must provide that the man who sent Henry to Italy to collate should not benefit by it. Accordingly, Henry is not merely to "swell the number of his MSS." from vanity, which had lain asleep for "an interval of thirty-seven years," but he is to have given the collation of those that he is admitted to have examined, in such a way as *not to swell* the amount of his father's stock. Crito's method of escaping from the tormentor is given in a previous part of the note. The collation of these uncited MSS. that he is allowed to have had, is not to be at the only time when it could be made "*in Italicis*," it is not to be at the only time when either he or his father could have thought of instituting it, i. e. when he was sent to Italy, and when it was wanted for the folio; but it is to have been after the publication of the folio; and, to secure this, he represents the collation to have been made in the margin of the printed book. "Now, in the interval between R. Stephens's third edition (1550) and Beza's first (1556), Henry Ste-

phens may have recorded, in the margin of the folio edition, the readings of such MSS. as he happened to meet with; and this may be the 'exemplar' mentioned, as above, in Beza's prefaces;" i. e. the passage where B. acknowledges Robert having furnished him with his book of collations. Now, I again ask, was any Sicilian machine half so bad as that of Henry's and Beza's, when Crito, with all acknowledged learning and acuteness, can catch at this baseless fabric of Mill's visionary blundering (1258), for a little ease? Yes; you are not only called upon to believe that there was not one single MS. added to the original stock, for that glory of the early Greek Press, the folio, either by Robert's own exertions in the libraries of France, or by those of his son for three years "in Italicis;" but you must say, that within six years afterwards, when the man was an outcast from his country, and had no longer any use for collations, his son "*happened to meet with*" a number of MSS., and to collate them. Which is it, then, that utters the *swelling* words of vanity? Is it the collator, in his reference to his *achievements* "in Italicis," or his accuser, in his opposition to all history, and in his fiction of collations being made when all collations must have ceased? Which is the cheat, the man who, having at last to speak of the *κεφαλαια* of MSS., tells you how many of the collation had all of them the same; or he who garbles the man's words, and cuts off that part which would have satisfied every reader by the internal testimony that it bears, and can resort to that wretched fiction, though admitted by Dr. Hales, II. 157, that the book of collations was "a valuable copy of the edition of 1550, with a great number of critical remarks"? Mill was guilty only of a random assertion in a case where he was totally ignorant of the fact; and Wetsten, as we saw, (Brit. Mag. iv. 164,) had, most happily, a censor who was pleased to employ this, as fact, against him. Wetsten's powers then were called forth to confute; and the confutation would have been all that heart could wish, if he had not himself an equally false and equally absurd theory to maintain, viz. that the collation was made before 1546; which is done by closing his eyes not only to the "*iterum et tertio cum iisdem collatum*," which is said of the sixteen original MSS. used "*superioribus diebus*" (Pref. folio); but also to the edition of 1549 itself; and so making "*parvo volumine*" necessarily to mean the O *mirificam* of 1546, in Henry's words, where he says, "*primo quidem minutioribus typis . . . mox antem [the next year] grandibus characteribus*." (Prol. 144, Seml. 372.) This is their foolishness, and their posterity praise their saying. The modern Docti et Prudentes infer, from "*parvo volumine*," in Henry's words, that he was concerned in the *two* small editions, though Henry distinguished that of 1549 by saying that his collations were for that which was published just before the folio. It is true that, notwithstanding the proof that the book of collations which Robert gave to Beza was what he had used in forming his text of 1550, Wetsten, when he speaks of this *autograph of Henry*, as Mr. Porson justly styles it, p. 83, can assert, upon Beza's editions (Prol. 146, Seml. 377)—"*ad-jutum se fatetur* [yes, he actually says, *se fatetur*] . . . R. Stephani codice A° 1550 cum V. L. editio," with just the same reckless inconsistency, and owing to the same cause that leads him to say (II. p.



'24), "MSS. codicibus Epistolæ Joannis Stephanum fuisse usum . . . . non nisi septem," when, as we have seen, he himself had quoted another, even one of the *marked* MSS. of Stephanus, in that very note, as having that epistle. I may venture to assert, that the only passage in Beza's N. T. where there is any reference to "V. L. a R. Stephano A° 1550 editas" is in Stephanus's own advertisement at the end, quoted by Wetsten, 148, Seml. 381, where those royal MSS. "quorum fides et autoritas in his annotationibus sæpissime citatur" (the whole "copia" of the fifteen) is distinguished from the eight selected first and last for giving opposing readings in *his own margin*, by "ea omnia quæ in regis Galliarum bibliotheca extant." And where is Stephanus's printed book mentioned? Supposing me to meet the Docti et Prudentes with the counter assertion, that Beza never saw it, can you find any reference to it by him, sufficient to confute me? If you can, you have had luck, which has not attended my searches. I have long looked in vain, with some attention, for any notice by Beza himself, of the collation in Stephanus's margin, being convinced that, if he ever did speak of the "V. L. a R. Stephano A° 1550 editas," he would shew as decided distinction between the *whole* "plusquam xxx.," cited in his own Annotations, ("xxv. plus minus," according to his own guess, from the numbers found in the different divisions,) and the selection which is cited in Stephanus's margin, as Robert's advertisement makes between the whole "copia" from the King's library, and the eight royal MSS. selected from them. Wetsten, however, might have said, under the rose, in the words of King David, "What have I now done, is there not a cause?" Suppose he had not retained, in his second edition, what he said in his first, (p. 144)—"In prima et secunda Editione adjutum se fatetur . . . . R. Stephani codice A° 1550 cum V. L. edito"—but had now substituted for it, what Beza actually did say in *all his editions*, so that his reader should know that the man never did make a confession about any printed book, with various readings from fifteen MSS. and one single printed edition; but that he did assert at first, and never ceased to assert, that it was a book of collations of *twenty-five* plus minus MSS., and almost all the printed editions. Suppose, also, that a reference had been made, in the second edition, to pp. 143, 144, Seml. 370, 372, so that his reader should have before him here the proof which had now been given in the discussion on Stephanus, that these collations were used by Robert in forming the text of his folio, and some of them, at least, even in that of the small edition of 1549,—then, what would have been thought of "*foedissimum* denique illud est quod circa V. L. a R. Stephano A° 1550 editas commisit, 1, Cum enim ex præfatione Stephani sciret xv. tantum MSS. codices ab eo consultos et cum editis collatos fuisse, non veritus est eorum numerum augere, de *viginti quinque* plus minus MSS. Stephani codicibus in præfatione locutus." Prol. 148, Seml. 380. "*Fœdissimum*," most foul, as every one must admit; and, I think, no one, in that case, could have hesitated to say to which party it belonged. Again, 3, on Beza's not constantly saying that he was quoting Stephanus's MSS., "quod incauto lectori," says Wetsten, "fucum facit, ac si nempe ipse Beza

non editionem Stephani A. 1550, sed ipsos MSS. codices inspexisset." "Editionem Stephani A. 1550;" here, I think, it would have been tolerably apparent *who* "incauto lectori fucum facit." Wetsten most *feelingly* said, "verba hyperbolica Bezae esse *commoda* interpretatione mollienda;" so these accusations must stand, and, of course, "adjutum se fatetur . . . R. Stephani codice A° 1550 cum V. L. edito," just the same as if Beza had said something that could be distorted into a colourable pretence for such an assertion, and as if he himself had said nothing to shew its absurdity. Still, if the man who undertook to vindicate Mr. Porson was not as little acquainted with Wetsten's Prolegomena as the Cloten whom the Professor undertook to expose, there stood the confutation of the anonymous censor's "Constat Henricum Stephanum post editionem an. 1550 codd. MSS. undique conquisitos contulisse," and of his own "adjutum se fatetur R. Stephani codice A° 1550 cum V. L. edito"—not in a few slight words, introduced by some chance occasion, in a strange corner of the work; but a proof by facts, drawn both from history and from all the writings of Henry himself, with which Mill was totally unacquainted. It stands in the very place where a man, sitting down to write upon Stephanus, must instantly turn to refresh his knowledge; and where a man, going to write against Stephanus, would apply for arguments. It is referred to by Mr. Porson, at p. 56, in a very strong manner; and whoever will look at it, will see that it does honour to Wetsten's great learning, industry, and ability, in shewing, past the possibility of doubt or cavil, "Ro. Stephanum . . . jam anno 1550 collatione usum esse," and fully justifying what he quotes from Curcellæus in the next page (145, Seml. 374), "— ex Bezae annotationibus, qui iisdem cum Roberto Stephano codicibus usus —" i. e. (as Wetsten corrects it, in his previous quotation from Morin) iisdem codicum collationibus. Crito might also have seen a confutation of his plea by Bishop Marsh. Michaelis II. p. 859, n. 41, and p. 861, n. 43. But, above all, there stood the heading of the very IVth Letter of Mr. Porson, that he undertook here particularly to vindicate—"Of the MSS. used by R. Stephens and Beza"—to check him, and cry, "Back to thy punishment, false fugitive." But I think you may see, from his language, whether he hoped to be delivered from it by such means. Careless as a man writing under "*nominis umbra*" is of being confuted in a good bold assertion, by which he might expect to escape from a tormentor, he only says, "Henry Stephens *may* have recorded"—"this *may* be the exemplar mentioned"—"*something of this kind appears* to be the natural meaning of the words." It appears to me that he was aware that neither *natural* nor *artificial* meaning would suit him. And Crito's text, in this place, (p. 399,) exhibits, to a man who has eyes to see, a very sufficient acknowledgment, that he could devise no means of escape. Having declared that "the materials employed for this edition [the folio] *were all in sight*," when he himself had Robert's account of  $\beta$ , and Henry "in Italics" *in sight*, he says (what I referred to when I asserted that he would admit no evidence but such as he chose to take from Robert himself), "If therefore, we perceive, in subsequent times, any unsteadiness of lan-

guage touching this edition—any tendency to assign to Robert Stephens more MSS. than he has taken credit for [in his statement of the printed and written documents, that he selected, first and last, to give opposing readings in his margin]—we may most assuredly conclude that there is something wrong in the later representations." Here we have, not indeed quite so open an avowal as that which Michaelis gives of their not being able to *abide by* Stephanus's own declarations, "*vetustissima*" and "*scripta*," but we have as decided an avowal that they *cannot abide by* the testimony either of Stephanus's chief collator, or of the man who made so great use of the collations.

FRANCIS HUYSHE.

#### LETTERS ON THE CHURCH OF THE FATHERS.

##### NO. IV.

As Athanasius was the great champion of catholic truth, during the incursions of Arianism upon it, so were Basil and Ambrose, in the east and in the west, the chief instruments in the hands of Providence for repairing and strengthening the bulwarks of the church, when the fury of the inroad was over. Both had to contend with an Arianized clergy and an Arian sovereign; and both gained their victory by the same means—their popularity with the laity and the vigour of their discipline. From Milan, which had been in heretical possession for twenty years, "round about unto Illyricum," Ambrose preached in the west the gospel of Christ. Basil was called to a still more arduous post. Asia Minor had from the first been over-run by the Arians, and was, by the middle of the fourth century, in a deplorable state of religious ignorance. Hilary, who passed some time in banishment there, and is our informant in this matter, also speaks of the immoralities of Christians, and that in the case of the higher clergy as well as of the laity. This district was the scene of Basil's labours, first as priest, then as Bishop of the church of Cæsarea and Exarch of Capadocia, from A.D. 358 to A.D. 379.

At the former of these dates, Dianius was in possession of the see. He was personally known to Basil, who speaks warmly in his praise, expressing the affection and respect he felt for him, and the pleasure he took in his conversation; and describing him as a man remarkable for his virtue, as frank and generous, nay, bold, while he was amiable and agreeable in his manners. However, he fell in with the fashion of the age, and had for nearly twenty years sided with the court faction against Athanasius and his sacred cause. Accordingly he signed without scruple the formulary of the council of Ariminum, which was presented to him A.D. 360, and in which the orthodox test of the Homöousion being given up, the catholic doctrine was evaded under the pretence of expressing it only in terms of scripture. Basil was at this time a reader in the church of Cæsarea, having been appointed to the office by the Bishop. However, on this occasion, he hesitated not at once to retire from all intercourse with him, nor did he come near him till two years afterwards, when Dianius sent for him to at-