A DISCOURSE
Concerning the Integrity and Purity of the Hebrew Bible;
By the Author of a Discourse concerning the Antiquity of the Hebrew Points, Vowels and Accents.

The PROEMIUM: Containing the Cause, Occasion, and Method of the Ensuing Discourse.

That we have a certain Rule to direct us in the Knowledge and Service of God, is the only Support of Religion in the World; For though by the Light of Nature, we know there is a God, yet who he is, and what is his Will we cannot tell, till it be Revealed to us; And being naturally prone to depart from God, we must needs so do, when we have no Rule of Obedience; and thereby neither Hope of Reward, nor Fear of Punishment. So that on whatever pretence it be, that the certainty of our Rule of Life is denied, all Religion, is thereby opposed. But so unpleasing is entire Subjection to the Will of God, that Men seek all manner of Pleas to extricate themselves.
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selves from Submission thereunto; one of which being the Occasion of this Discourse, it may not be amiss to recount some of them.

1. First, They hope God will not concern himself so much about silly Mortals, as to exact Obedience of us; but themselves expect from their Children, Servants, and Friends, Returns of Love and Service; and much more may be that made, and doth preferve them, expect the same, as their own Consciences declare. And as every wise Agent hath a Design and End in all he doth, so be that made all things, must needs have a Design, as Wise as his Work was Great, which could be no other than his own Glory: And what hath Man Reason, Love, and Knowledge for, if not to Know, Love and Serve the Author of his Being? He then who is the first Cause, must needs be the last End. So that if there be a God, he must be obeyed.

2. To avoid this, Men question the very Being of God, but yet know, they could neither make themselves, nor by Accident; for when they were newly born, they knew not their Right Hand from their Left; when Grown, cannot add One Cubit to their Stature; and at last cannot keep off Death's Arrest one moment, but began in Corruption, and do end in the same; therefore could not make themselves. Nor could they be by Accident; For the Curious Order and Aptitude of all those Organs and Members, whereby we See, Hear, and Act all the Motions our Occasions require, plainly shew, that an Intelligent Agent was the Author hereof; we came not so by Chance. He then that wisely framed, and powerfully preserves our Being, is our God.

3. But if there be a God, who also will be obeyed, 'tis hoped the Priests may obtain his Favour for themselves, and others, being paid for the same. But these are no more than Creatures, who have enough to do for themselves. We are all made alike capable of serving God, and therefore must every one give Account of himself to God. Saints and Angels are but our Fellow-Servants, and Priests and Princes must stand at the same Bar with Beggars, and have more to answer for on their own Account than the meanest Peasant.

4. But if we must serve God in Person, and not by Proxy, 'tis hoped he requires no more than what our own Reason dictates and directeth us. But as we neither know him, nor his Will, by Nature, so the Idea we have of his Goodness, that be will reveal what he doth require, and the Expectation we have of the future Judgment of God, with respect to our Conformity to his Will, gives us Ground to believe he hath Revealed it to the Sons of Men; and the Scripture, which declareth it self to be that Revelation, hath evidently proved, that so it is.
The PROEMIUM.

5. Yet seeing other Books pretend to come from God, such as the Alcoran, and the Mishna, they would defer their Subjection to the Bible. But by the Scriptures, God hath made so full and Glorious a Revelation of himself, his Holy Will, and most Secret Counsel, as Infallibly evinceth their Procedure from God alone. Whereas the Alcoran sheweth, That a Lecherous Villain was its Author; and the Jewish Mishna is condemned by the very Bible themselves embrace and adore, as also by the Karcans, a Sect of their own Religion and People; so also are the Unwritten Traditions of the Papists, exploded by those very Scriptures themselves receive.

6. If the Bible must be the Book, 'tis enquired how we know these Books are all, and no more than all those very Writings of Moses, the Prophets and Apostles, they declare themselves to be.

Resp. Ist. These Books having proved themselves to be the very Word of God, their Testimony of themselves is true, speaking in the Name and Authority of God, as well in every thing as in any thing they say.

2. If God had either altered his Will since that time, or if those Scriptures, whereby it was at first Revealed, had been so altered, as to contain more or less than was his Will they should, he would have acquainted us therewith for the same Reason he at first Revealed it, viz. because it should be known and observed.

7. They say, 'tis too strict for them to observe. But it is impossible for God to allow Men in any thing contrary to his own Nature, who is Infinitely and Unchangeably Holy.

8, and 9. They count it too obscure and imperfect; but it self declares it is plain and perfect.

10. But the Suggestion, that is the Cause and Occasion of the ensuing Discourse, is this, That the received Original Hebrew Copy hath had many Alterations in Letters, Words and Sentences, either designedly made by the Jews, or accidentally committed by the Mistake of the Scribes, and the like; which places the Learned must first agree, whether the Vulgar Latin, the Seventy, the Chaldee Paraphrase, the Samaritane, or what other Ancient Translation may be used to correct the same; or whether every Learned Critick may mend those places according to his own Judgment and Fancy? Indeed the Articles of Faith are allowed to be contained in every Bible; but if the Words whereby they are expressed, are of uncertain Original, we have no Certainty of any thing therein contained, and till it be determined, what the places are that have been altered, and what have not been altered, and how the Alterations may be infallibly restored and amended, we have no certain Rule of Obedience, which is the only Support of Religion, as we observed. So that all Religion stands and falls, as we can defend and prove the Integrity of the Hebrew Copy, or not; and which becomes necessary to be done, being very lately opposed.
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Tho it hath not been questioned till the Reformers Restored Religion by it; whereupon the Papists pretended, there were many Alterations befallen the Text, but were fully refuted by some of their own Party and Profession, as also by the Leaders of the Reformation; yet still promote the same Opinion, as appears by their Errata to the Protestant Bible, and other Discourses lately printed, being encouraged by our Modern Critics, the Atheism of the Time, and the Annotations of Ludovicus Capellus, dedicated to all the Clergy of the Church of England, and other Inducements. We intend therefore to state the Question plainly, and examine the Opinion of Capellus, the Ringleader of the Party, and others, as also to prove the Integrity of the Hebrew Copy, as fully as these Three Sheets, whereunto we are confined, will permit.

CHA P. I.

§ 1. Six Several Questions, distinct from the Subject under Consideration, premised. § 2. The Question in Controverse plainly stated: The first Opinion of our Adversaries, viz. That the Jews have willfully corrupted the Text related. § 3. Several Arguments produced against that Opinion. § 4. And divers Objections Answered.

THAT it may be known wherein the Stress of the Question in Controverse doth consist, it is necessary, First, to consider, wherein it doth not so do.

First then, we say, it is not here enquired, whether the Scribes were Infallible, or not; God having only required and instituted their Religious Care and Diligence, as a sufficient means to convey the Text in its Original Purity, unto our Time.

Secondly, Neither is it enquired, whether some Words were not written, at first, sometimes full, and at other times defective; sometimes regular, and at other times irregular; but were still the same Words, yielding one and the same Sense: Nor yet, whether sometimes one Word be not in the Line, and another Word in the Margin; but in the one or the other is the true Reading, the Jews following the Margin, and the Christians which they think best.

Thirdly,
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Thirdly, Neither is it enquired, whether every Hebrew Bible is without any Typographical Error of the Press, which yet may be easily corrected by other Copies.

Fourthly, Nor whether any one Individual Copy be so infallible, seeing the Majority follow the Agreement of the best Corrected Copies, and so should we.

Fifthly, Nor whether the Eastern and Western Jews did not differ about some Letters: and Ben Afher, and Ben Naftball about some Points. But neither these Letters, nor Points, making any Alteration of the Sense of any one Word; the European Jews following the Reading of the Western Jews, and Ben Afher.

Sixthly, Nor whether there are some insignificant Accidental Mistakes, through the Length of Time, or Humane Frailty of the Scribes, crept into the best Copies, provided the Sense of one Word, or Sentence in all the Bible, be not obscured, impaired, or altered thereby. None of these things do we here debate; but the Question in Controversie is as followeth;

§ 2: Whether the Hebrew Bible, as it is Corrected by the Malora, from Ezra's Time, and downwards, to this present, is a True, Authentick, Pure and Perfect Copy of the First Original Writings of the Old Testament, and hath been kept to this Day, so free from any material Error, or Alteration, as that it still is, and ought to be the only sufficient Rule of Faith (together with the Writings of the New Testament), and the certain Standard, whereby to make and mend all Translations, in all places, and on all occasions.

This we affirm, and this our Adversaries deny, saying, That many Points, Letters, Words and Sentences, have been altered in all the best Hebrew Bibles that are Extant.

Some tell us, the Jews designedly did it, in hatred to Christians, and others say, it was done by Accident.

Those who say, it was designedly and maliciously done, are several Papists, such as Melchior Canus, Lindanus, Gordon Huntley, Johannes Marinus, and others, as also Isaac Pashius, a Protestant. But these have been Answered by our Reformers, and by the Papists themselves, such as Johannes Isac, Arius Montanis, Marius, Marinus Brixianus, Simon de Muis, Bellarmine, and others; And therefore to refute this Opinion, we need do no more than produce the Arguments that are collected by Cardinal Bellarmine, against those of his own Communion, on this Account, which are as followeth;

§ 3. First, If the Jews designedly altered the Text, they did it either before the Coming of Christ, or since; but they did it not before Christ's Time, because he does not blame them for so doing,
A Discourse concerning

1. Neither did they do it since Christ's Time, because the Places alleged by Christ, and his Apostles, out of the Bible, for to prove the Gospel, are now found in the Hebrew Bible, as they had alleged them to be: Whereas, if the Jews would have altered any thing, in hatred to Christians, they would have altered these Places.

Secondly, The Jews neither would, nor could alter the Bible; therefore did not alter it.

1. They would not alter it, it being against their Religion, to alter one Letter of it, for a World, and against their Interest, to deprive themselves of God's Word, only to do us an Injury; For they believed the Text to be True or False; if True, they durst not alter it; if False, they could not themselves believe it to be both True and False.

2. They could not alter it, if they would, 1. Because they are dispersed over all the World, and their Bible with them, which they could not combine to alter, without Observation of some or other. 2. The Karkeans, and Rabbanists, who mortally hate each other, would immediately discover such a piece of Villany of either Party; and on this Account the Majorites were never able to impose any Alterations of the Bible on all the Jews, as some conceive.

3. The Jews could never, by Force or Fraud, get up all the Hebrew Bibles out of the Christians hands, which yet must be done before all the Copies still extant among Christians, could be altered.

Thirdly, The Jews cannot be charged with altering the Text, because the greatest Concern they have in the World, is to conform to it, and preserve it from the least Alteration, who even adore it as a Deity; and if it happen to fall on the Ground, appoint a Publick Fast for the same, and would die an hundred deaths rather than alter a Tittle of it.

Fourthly, If the Jews had corrupted the Bible in hatred to Christians, then they would have altered those Texts, that prove Jesus Christ to be the true Promised Messiah, both in the Hebrew Copy, and in the Chaldee Paraphrase. But these places are not only the same they are in the Vulgar Latin and in the 70, so that the vulgar Latin is condemned likewise by this Opinion; which makes Bellarmine say, they have more Zeal than Discretion who suppose the Hebrew Corrupted. But moreover, the Hebrew Copy and
and the Chaldee Paraphrase do more amply prove the coming of Christ, and the great Doctrines of the Gospel, than any Christian Translation whatsoever. As for instance, in Psalm 72, the Vulgar and 70 read receive Discipline, where the Hebrew readeth Kips the Son, &c. 50 in Isa. 53, and else where.

Fifthly, The Providence of God which extendeth to all things, but more especially watcheth over the concerns of his own Glory, and his Peoples Good, would never have suffered that Rule of Life to be corrupted, which he promised to preserve unto a title till Heaven and Earth pass away, seeing his own Honour and Service and his Churches Salvation depend on its Preservation in perfect Purity.

Sixthly, The Hebrew Copy being enjoyed, and peaceably possessed by the Church of Jews and Gentiles, as the true Authentic Original, ever since there was a Bible, until the Council of Trent made a Decree about the vulgar Latin; the fence of which Decree is debated by the Papists themselves. It is therefore not meet to suspect the Hebrew Bible to be altered in any place, until it be clearly proved so to be: But this hath not been done, as shall be in the following Chapters more fully declared.

§ 4. But hereunto it is objected,

First, That the Fathers charge the Jews with Corrupting the Text Rej; they speak only of the Greek Translations, and not of the Hebrew Copy, which none but Jerom and Origen understood.

Secondly, That the Jews confess some places are altered, viz. the 18 Tikkun Sopherim.

Resp. 1st. The Jews do not say these places were altered, the Masorites and Aben Ezra call them Tikkun Ezra, the Amendments made by Ezra: Both these and the Tikkun Sopherim are no other than what the Text was from the beginning.

2. These Tikkun Sopherim, &c. are found in the Vulgar Latin, &c. just as we have them in the Hebrew Bible; therefore could not be any late alteration.

Thirdly, 'Tis said there are some places of Scripture that appear designedly altered.

1st. That there are 8 Verses left out of Psalm 13. mentioned by the Apostle, Rom. 3, and are found in the 70.

Resp. 1st. Jerom sheweth in Pref. on Isay, lib. 16. that these Verses do not properly belong to the 13th Psalm, but are alleged by the Apostle out of divers places of Scripture, and were afterwards Translated by some Person out of the Psalm to the Psalter; for the 1st. and 2d Verses are found in Psalm 5. The 3d in Psalm 139. The 4th in Psalm 9. The 5th, 6th and 7th in
The second Opinion, viz. That the Bible hath been altered in many places by the negligence of the Scribes, &c. Considered; the first Argument of Capellus for the same, Answered. § 2. Several Texts of Scripture supposed to have been altered, briefly Vindicated. § 3. His Argument taken from the quotations of the New Testament, Answered. § 4. His Third Argument from the Keriu Kerib Answered. § 5. As also that about the Eastern and Western Jews, Ben Asher and Ben Naphthali. § 6. And from the Typographical Errors in the Printed Bibles.

The second Opinion of our Adversaries, supposeth that many Alterations have befallen the Hebrew Copy; not by the Malice of the Jews, but by the negligence of the Scribes, the length of time, and the like; of this Persuasion are Cardinal Bellarmine and other Papists, and among Protestants Ludovicius Capellus and his Followers; and seeing the said Capellus in his Critica Sacra hath comprised what hath been advanced on this account.

The 8th, in Psal. 35. Jerom further, faith that these verses are not in the 70. Some say that they are found in an ancient English Hebrew Copy; but the words are apparently added, being not expressed after the way and manner of the Hebrew Tongue.

2. 'Tis said, Gen. 8. A Crow or Raven went out, and returned, but the 70 and Vulgar say, It did not return. Resp. The Hebrew Copy doth not mean that it returned into the Ark, but that it flew about, and returned to the top of the Ark till the Waters abated; and some Latin Bibles read it, going and returning.

3. 'Tis said that Psal. 22. 17. is altered, it being Caari, as a Lion, instead of Kaaru, they pierced. Resp. 1st. The final Masoretick Note on Kaari, plainly shewed that they understood Kaaru, to be meant by it; for they say, it doth not here signify as a Lion, and therefore it must signify Kaaru, or nothing.

2. 'Tis read Kaaru in some Copies, as R. Jacob Ben Chaim observes.

3. Kaari, may be written for Kaaru, for u, as it is in Ezra 10, ult.
count, we shall briefly examine his Arguments therein produced.

First then he fays there are many places altered, as may be seen by comparing of Parallel Texts, which contradict each other. Resp. 1st. The question is not, Whether some places are hard to be Reconciled, or not; 'tis the Work of the Ministry to Explain them: That Text which Instructs the Humble, doth oft offend the Proud; 'tis too bold to say a place is altered, if it be not understood or approved.

2. If one Place be wrong, then t'other is right, and we need go no further than the same Copy, to explain or rectify such Mistake.

3. These are not various Readings, seeing all Copies agree about them.

4. These might be so written by the Holy Pen-men of the Text: For 1st. In Repeating a matter, none are confined to a Point, or Letter, or to a Word or Sentence; but enlarge or contract, omit or add, as occasion requireth.

2. Some Words alter their Sound, by length of time, difference of places, different writing of it, from the common pronunciation of it, as Chyrurgion for Surgeon, and the like.

3. Some Men and Places had divers Names, and were called sometimes by one, and sometimes by another.

5. That the Scribes did not alter these Places, is evident; 1. Because neither the Eastern or Western Jews, Ben Acher, or Ben Naphthali, nor yet the Maimonites, or any other Jews or Christians, take any notice of any such thing, who would never have concealed it, if so it had been, seeing they observe the most minute matters, and though they knew that these places were difficult, yet durst not imagine the Text was altered.

2. The Scribes must be allowed to take what heed they could in so great a Work; But if they made these Alterations, 'tis certain they neither used their Eyes, or their Ears, but were frequently deceived by like, shape, or sound of Letters, who yet were bound to look on the Copy every Letter they wrote.

3. These Alterations are so innumerable, so great, and so universal in all Copies, that it was impossible to be effected without the General Consent of all the Scribes, in all places, to corrupt the Bible; which the Authors of this Opinion will not charge them with, and therefore ought not to suppose such Alterations were made by them, as could no otherwise arise.

§ 2. But seeing some of these places, that are produced by Capellus, are also repeated in the Prolegomena to the Polyglott Bible, in the Preface to Dr. Lightfoot's Works, though directly contrary to
the Opinion of the Deceased Author; and in divers other late Critical Authors, whose Writings are abridged in the Young Student’s Library; we think it convenient to vindicate those places which are so supposed to have been altered.

1st. ’Tis said, 2 Kings 24. 8. that Jebojacbin was Eighteen years Old when he began to Reign; But in 2 Chron. 36. 9. ’tis said, he was but Eight years Old when he began to Reign.

Resp. 1. R D Kimchi observes, That his Father Jebojacbin Reigned Eleven years, 2 Kings 23. 36. And ’tis like he took his Son to Reign in Conjunction with him, after the First year of his Reign, and the Eighth of his Son’s Life; and thereby Jebojacbin was Eight Years Old when he began to Reign with his Father, and Eighteen when he began to Reign by himself.

2. But if it could not be so Reconciled, that proves not its being Altered.

3. But if Eighteen be right, and Eight be wrong, the right is in the Bible, we need go no further for it.

4. This is no Various Reading, being alike in all Hebrew Copies.

5. The Scribes could not mistake Eight for Eighteen, the words being written at length, and not in figures.

6. It could not be universally altered in all Copies, unless the Scribes had agreed so to do, which they dare not affirm. And the like Answers may serve for the places following, such as,

2dly, ’Tis said, 2 Chron. 22. 2. That Azariah was Forty Two years Old when he began to Reign: But in 2 Kings 8. 26. ’tis said, he was but Twenty Two years Old when he began to Reign.

Resp. 1st. Kimchi, and others, explain this like the former, and suppose his Father Reigned, after some sort, many years more than he is said solely to Reign, and to have taken his Son into Conjunction with him Twenty Two Years, though he Reign’d freely but Eight Years.

2. Others say, That by Forty Two Years was not meant the Age of Azariah, but of the Rule of his Family, by the Mother’s side; for from Omri, his Great Grandfather, to his Reign, were Forty Two Years.

3. If it cannot be reconciled, this proves not the place to have been altered, unless it were proved, that there were no Difficulties in the Bible from the Beginning; and that all Men might understand all things in it, without God’s Assistance. But the contrary is fully declared therein; and therefore, as we have not Time, so there is not need here to reconcile these places from all Exceptions: It would require more room so to do, than is allotted for.
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for the whole Discourse. At present, the same Answers that served the former place, may serve this well enough, That this is neither a Various Reading, nor can it be a Mistake of the Scribes.

3. 'Tis said, 2 Chron. 16. v. 1. That in the Thirty Sixth Year of Asa, Baasha came up, and built Ramah; but in 1 Kings 15. 33. 'tis said, That Baasha began to Reign in the Third Year of Asa.

Resp. 1st, Kimchi supposeth, the Third Year of Asa was not meant of his Reign, but of his Wars. 2. And that the Thirty Six Years of Asa, are to be numbered from the Death of Solomon.

3. Not only do all Copies of the Hebrew agree in this Number Thirty Six, but also the Greek Seventy, the Vulgar Latin, &c. have it likewise.

But of these things see at large in Buxtorf's Anticritica, lib. 2. cap. 2. and Glascius Philologia Sacra, lib. 1. Tract. 1. pag. 78, 80, 81, 82. as also what was said to the places before it.

4. 'Tis said, Exod. 12. 40. That Israel sojourned in Egypt Four Hundred and Thirty Years; Whereas they dwelt in Egypt but Two Hundred and Ten Years.

Resp. The Words are in the Hebrew as they are Translated in English; thus, Now the sojourning, or dwelling of the Children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was Four Hundred and Thirty Years. The Text doth not say, how long they dwelt in Egypt, but how long they were Sojourners; and that was from the giving of the Promise to Abraham, which was to be Four Hundred and Thirty Years.

5. Some suppose they could mend the Hebrew Poesy, and thereby mend the Text.

Resp. 1. Such have need to mend themselves, but the Text they cannot mend.

6. Some think some Verses were omitted, such as Josh. 21. 36, 37. but they are found in 1 Chron. 6. 78, 79. and we need go no further for them. So Psal. 145. v. 13. Grotius and Simon suppose a Verse wanting, that should begin with Nun, only because a Verse begins with every Letter of the Alphabet besides that.

Resp. At this Rate there would be no End of Mens Conjectures.

2. This could not be by Mistake, as is supposed, but must be designedly done, which yet they will not affirm.

§ 3. 2dly, Capellius saith, That many Quotations out of the Old Testament, brought by Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, are not
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now to be found, as they were by them alleged, either in any Hebrew or Greek Copy, and therefore must have been altered since that time.

Resp 1. This must have been willfully done, that so many places should be so signally altered in all Copies, which yet they dare not affirm.

2. Jesus Christ and his Apostles express the Sense of the Place, their business being not to Translate, but to Expound; which they did not do by the help of Grammar, as we must, but, 2. by the immediate Inspiration of the same Spirit of God that gave forth these Writings they refer unto.

When any quote a passage for some particular purpose, they are seldom very exact in their Quotation about any thing else, than what they produce it for to prove; nor is any thing more expected from their Testimony, than to prove what it is alleged for.

§ 4. Joly, Capellus, in his Critica Sacra, lib. 3. insists on the Various Readings of the Keri u Ketib, the Eastern and Western Jews, Ben Acher and Ben Naphtali, of divers Hebrew Copies, and the like.

Resp 1. In general, we do not debate what divers Readings are found in the Hebrew Copy, but allow what can be proved; therefore these things do not belong to the Question in Controversie, yet something may be spoken to each in particular.

1. As to the Keri u Ketib, he owns, the Jews own their Antiquity, about which they hold Four Opinions, i. That of R. Chaim, That they were placed when the Text was first written by Moses and the Prophets. 2. That they were kept by Oral Tradition from that time, and written by Ezra, as Elias supposeth. 3. That they were made by Ezra, by the different Copies of their Time, as Kimchi thinketh.

4. That Ezra made them designedly, as Abarbanel believeth, in order to restore and preserve the Text exactly; but all own they were as Ancient as Ezra; yet Capellus conceives they were most of them made by the Majorites, A. D. 500.

1. Because Jerome makes no mention of them.

Resp 1. Nor doth Jerome make mention of the Chaldee Paraphrase, which yet was long before his Time.

2. There are still many Bibles without the Keri; the Law is kept without it, though read by it. And before Printing came up they might be scarce, and more scarce in Jerome's time, who with great difficulty got a Jew much more the best Copy.
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3. Many Commentators at this Day do not mention them, and yet they are in being; and so Jerome might know them, tho' he spake not of them.

4. Yet Jerome oft follows the Keri, and takes notice of it as on n's for ה יי ליי v. 5.

5. The Chaldee Paraphrase, long before Jerome's time, often followed the Keri.

2. Because, faith Capellus, the Talmuds mention only the Keri & to Ketib.

Resp. 1. That was pars pro toto, a part for the whole.

2. It mentions others also, as Hag. i. v. 8. כֹּלָה, where ה is in the Keri.

3. They generally follow the Keri, which sufficiently shews, That it was long before their Time, even as ancient as Ezra, or they had not received it into the Text.

3. Because, faith he, many of the Keri u Ketib, are Critical Amendments of the Text, where it was anomalous, and favours more of Masoretick Nicety, than is fit to ascribe to Ezra.

Resp. 1. These might as well arise from the difference of Copies in Ezra's time, as others.

2. Ezra being an Exact Scribe, might note those Words that were written anomalous, it being not below Men Divinely inspired, to rectifie the least Word of Sacred Writ, seeing Divine Providence hath vouchsafed to take the Charge of every Letter of it to the World's End, Matth. 5. 18.

3. But if some were but Critical Amendments of Anomalous Words, yet all are not such, nor yet the most part of them; and we may not conclude the whole to be such, because some were.

4. But that the Masorites made none of them, appears,

1. By the Nature of their Notes upon them, which barely observe, that so they were, but not that they had made them so.

2. They always read the Line by the Keri, thereby making of it a part of the Text, which they never dared to have done, had they been their own Notes.

3. Capellus faith, there are many more anomalous words which need the like Keri; and we say, if the Masorites had made these Notes on some, they would have done it on many more, which yet they have not done.

4. Capellus on the Points, &c faith, the Keri u Ketib were made before the Points were invented, and therefore must be before A. D.
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500, and the Tiberian Masorites, who he thinks began the punctuation.

5. If the Keri u Ketib were invented by the Masorites, A.D. 500, why doth no Jew take notice of it? Nay,

6. Why do they all universally own them to be as Ancient as Ezra's time?

7. And how came the Tiberian Masorites to alter all the Bibles that the Kareans, their Enemies, and that the Christians had, and not be observed?

8. Seeing the Copy is polluted, if the least Letter be greater or lesser than ordinary.

2. This objected that 'twere absurd to suppose that Ezra, or the Prophets, made this Keri, for they knew which was the right.

Resp. 1. If they arose only from different Copies, it was so; but then Ezra might place those before the Captivity, and his Successors might place those that were after it.

2. But they might arise from other cause than different Copies, as the Jews believe they did, even such as did well enough become the Pen-men of the Text to make them for.

Some conceive that the Tiberian Masorites collected most of them from ancient Copies.

Resp. 1. Then they would have told us what Copies they were, and not have put them into the Text; for thus they do when they meet with any difference in Copies, as Ben Napthali, the Eastern Jews, and the like.

2. The Chaldee Paraphrase followeth them often, therefore they were collected long before; and so doth the Talmud, and faith, they are of Moses from Sinai.

3. They make them a part of the Text, in reading it by them, which they dare not do of their own Collections, tho out of the best Copies.

4. For these Copies were either as Ancient as Ezra's time, or not; if they were, then was the Keri in them of Divine Antiquity and Authority; But if they were not, then they durst not add them to the Text, for they allow none to add or alter the Text since that time.

5. Then must the Bibles, in the hands of the Kareans and Christians, and all ancient Translations, have been without them; but they all have them, or follow them more or less.

2. As to the number of the Keri u Ketib in general, and in particular of the words read and not written, and that are written one word and read two, and written two words and read one, and that are transposed, and the like; to find out these Capellus turns over the
the Bibles of Bomberg, Plantine, &c., and at last misseth the right Number, and all for want of Acquaintance with the Masora, which he pretends to be solely able to declare the true Original of; and his impertinences are as Learnedly Preserved in the Appendix to the Polyglott Bible, where his Collections are presented us in one View. We may not here enlarge hereon, having given an account of the several kinds of the Keri u Ketib, in our Discourse of the Antiquity of the Points, cap. 10. where the places of many of them are Collected out of the Masora, and if it receive another Impression, we intend to collect them all as they are gathered by the Maforites, which we had not room to do in the first Edition.

Lastly, We deny that the Keri u Cetib, do impair the Authority of the Text in the least degree. For 1st. The true reading of these places is found in the Keri, or the Cetib, we need go no farther for it.

2. The one or the other are followed by all the Jews and Christians.

3. They could not be designedly made no alteration of any one point of Doctrine, being in the least occasioned thereby.

4. Nor barely by mistake, there being fewest in the Law which was written first, and being oft about one word more than another, as Nagerah, a Damself, &c.

5. Their Number and Nature are infinitely short of the various readings that are in all Translations.

§ 5. Capellus insists on the various Readings of the Eastern and Western Jews, and of Ben Aser, and Ben Napthali. Resp. 1st. The question is not about various Readings that are found in the Hebrew Copy; these we allow, and follow the best.

2. It matters not which is followed, for they do not alter the Sense of one Word.

3. The Collection of these little varieties, is a mark of the admirable care of the Jews, in preserving the Text in its Original Purity.

4. The Eastern Jews are those of Babilon, and their Reading is followed by the Eastern Jews. The Western Jews are those of Israel, or Palestine, and their reading is followed by the Western Jews; of all these Countries, there are about 216 insignificant differences about some letters, the Keri and Ketib, the words written full and defective, and the like, Vid Maforet Himmaforet, Pref. 34. 73. And these differences first appeared in Bomberg's Bible, Buxt. Anticriticus, p. 510, 511. The differences between Ben Aser and Ben Napthali are only about some Points and insignificant Accents: These
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were two men that were Heads of two Assemblies of the Masorites; the one was named Jacob Ben Napthali, who was followed by those of the East, and the other was named Aaron Ben Apher, and was followed by the Jews of all those Countries; but the least word is not altered by the one or the other, as to its sense and meaning. Nor yet by any Manuscript Copies, such as that of Sinai, the Pentatuch of Jerico, the Book of Hills, or that of Jerusalem, supposed by Elia to be that of Ben Apher in his Shibree Luchoth, y 2 Mihi.

§ 6. Cæpelus observes that our Printed Hebrew Bibles do in some places differ from each other in Points, Letters and Words.

Resp. 1. They are Typographical Errors of the Pres, and may be easily mended by the agreement of other Bibles therein.

2. The Masoretick Bible is not altered in a tittle in any one of the places he infineth.

3. The Masora itself, on many of the places insisted on, doth expressly confirm the true reading by their Notes on the very places themselves, whereby their unparallel'd care to preserve the Text entire, is made to appear.

4. The J ewish Commentaries confirm the true Reading, and the Christian Copies do the like.

5. None of these places are of any moment which way they are Read. Vid. Buxt. Anticritica, par. 2. cap. 6.

So that from all that hath been Objected hitherto, we may conclude that no differences among the Hebrew Copies that can be produced, are of any consideration, so as to render the Hebrew Copy unmeet to be the Standard of all others, whose various Readings are infinitely more than can be suspected in the Hebrew; for except the Keri u Ketib, of which we have already spoken, all other differences among the Hebrew Copies do not alter the sense of one word in the Bible; and as to the Keri u Ketib in the one or the other, is the true Authentic Original found, as also in all the difficult parallel places, so that there is not one word, either added, omitted, or altered by any difference among the Hebrew Copies.

And as Buxtorf Observes in his Anticritica, lib. 2. cap. 14. the Copies of the Hebrew Bible are every where alike, and are written and read in the same manner by all persons throughout all the World, through Europe, Asia, and Africa, excepting some little differences which do not alter the sense at all; so faith R. Joseph Albo, in Ikkarim, as is observed in Raimundus his Pagio Fidei.
§ 1. Capellus his Argument against the Integrity of the Hebrew Copy, taken from the Differences that are between the most antient Translations, and the present Hebrew Bible considered, and Answered in general. The unfitness of antient Translations to amend the Hebrew Copy discovered. § 2. The unfitness of the Samaritane Pentateuch so to do, particularly considered. § 3. The seventy evinced to be unfit for such a use likewise. § 4. As also the Chaldee Paraphrase, and the Vulgar Latin. § 5. The vanity of attempting to mend the Bible by Critical conjectures. The Opinions of the Jews about the same.

The next proof of the Text, being altered, is brought from the differences that are between the Hebrew Copy, and the most ancient Translations in difficult places, where they are easiest Reconciled in the Translations; and hence 'tis thought the Hebrew should be mended in such places by those Translations, they being supposed to have been taken out of the Hebrew Copies before these alterations befel them.

Resp. In general, this Argument is made up of suppositions that are all impossible to be proved:

As if. They cannot prove when, where and how the Text was altered in any one place of it; they barely say the length of time, the negligence of the Scribes, and the like, hath let it suffer the Fate of all other Books.

Resp. But it was committed to the Religious care of the Church, as a sufficient means to preserve it from any such Alteration, and the special Eye of Providence engaged to attend it, and the great obligation that lay on those who Transcribed the Copies, to use their utmost Diligence to preserve it intire, being the word of the Living God, whereby they must be judged, leaves no room to suppose such alterations in it, as often befal profane Authors.

2. Its supposed hereby, That where any place is difficult to be Expounded or Reconciled to other Texts, there it hath been altered: But the Scripture its self faith many things in it are hard to be understood, and that we must Pray to God to Enlighten our Minds.

3. If in any Copy we might rationally suspect a mistake of the Scribe, our only way is to compare it with other exact, ancient, and approved Copies; but among these there are no material differences at all.
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4. 'Tis granted that the Hebrew Bible, which first came from God, must be preferred before any Translations out of it; but they say 'tis now altered, and those ancient Translations may help to mend it.

Resp. The Hebrew, tho' it be altered, must needs be preferred to any ancient Translations, they being all infinitely more altered from what they were at first, than the Hebrew is altered from what it was; witness their various Lessons in the Polyglott Bible.

5. 'Tis not proved that all these Translations were so ancient as they pretend to be.

6. Nor that these are those ancient Translations, (excepting the various Lessons,) some of them being manifestly lost, as the Seventy, &c. and that long ago.

7. Nor is it proved that they were all taken immediately out of the Hebrew, without which their Authority can avail nothing herein; Nay, it is plain that most of them are taken out of one another, most from the Seventy.

8. Nor is it proved the Translators were known to be faithful Men.

9. Nor that they followed an Hebrew Copy in all those places wherein they differ from our present Copy, which are innumerable, and yet differ from each other.

9. Nor that they undertook Verbatim to Translate the Text.

10. For 'tis plain, some did not Translate, but Paraphrase, as the Chaldee, and others; and that not always Litterally, but oft times Allegorically.

11. In some places it appears they understood neither the Words nor their Sense.

12. Nor had that due regard to either as they ought in some places.

13. Some they designedly altered, as the Jews say the Seventy did 13 places, viz. I will make man, for we will the 6th day for the 7th; Gen. 2. 2. Israel dwelt in Egypt, and in other Countries 430 years, &c. That the Heathen might see no difficulties or absurdities in the Text, and yet these very places would Capellus have thought worthy to Correct our Bible, when 'tis an evident sign of a corrupted Translation to read rather what they like best, than what the Original truly was.

14. Neither Jews nor Christians ever ventured to mend the Bible on these pretences.

2. But to consider each Translation in particular.

§ 2. 1. As, in the Samaritane Pentateuch: The Samaritane own no more than the Pentateuch, but by this some would Correct the Hebrew Copy.

Resp. 1. There
the Integrity of the Hebrew Bible.

Resp. 1. There is no Testimony to prove its Original or its preservation, to have been preferable to the Hebrew Text, that can be compared with that which is produced for the Hebrew Copy.

Who the Samaritans were, is told us 2 Kings 17. 25, 26, 27. To wit, an Heathen People, who getting a Priest, they served God and their Idols together, but never were the Church of God, nor ever had the Oracles of God committed to them, as was unto the Jews, whose Bible came from God, and was preserved by Ezra and the Masorites to a Miracle; whereas Bishop Usher observes the Samaritane Copy was of set purpose, and in many places new dressed and corrupted by one Dositheus a Samaritane Heretick. As for Example, in Deut. 11. 30. they have added Sichem, and Chap. 27. 4. instead of Ebal, read Garizim, to countenance their Idolatry.

2. The Samaritane Codex was never received or esteemed by the Church of Jews or Christians, but the Hebrew only, which was read in their Synagogues every Sabbath day.

3. It hath so many Corruptions in it, as impairs its Authority, as Hutinger hath collected them in his Answer to Morinus.

4. The present Samaritane Copies are not above 400 Years old; whereas the Tiberian Masorites were above a 1000 years ago.

5. We have the universal consent of all Hebrew Copies among Jews and Christians, against the Samaritane; and if these places were altered, they must have been wilfully made, which we have proved they neither would nor could have made; nor do they say they were.

6. Nor is there any need to suppose them altered, because of their difficulty, they may be Expounded and Reconciled without it, as in Gen. 11. 32. Terah liv'd 205 Years, but here 60 Years is cut off, because it being said v. 26 that Terah at 70 begot Abram, Nahor and Haran; and yet Abram was but 75 when Terah Died, which is thus solved, Terah did no more beget all these three Sons in one Year, than Noah begat Shem, Ham and Japhet in one Year, but begat one of them then, which could not be Abram, whose Brother Haran's Daughter being his Wife Sarah, was but 10 Years younger than himself; so that Abraham was Born the 130th year of Terah's Life, and so was 75 at his Death.

That of Exod. 12. 40. is already Explained, and so might the rest be Expounded, had we time and space so to do.

§ 3. 2. As to the 70, This supposed the present Greek Bible called the Septuaginta, was for the main the antient Version which was read in the Synagogues before Christ's time, was followed by Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Fathers, which Bible differs in many places from the Hebrew.
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and in many of these places the cause of the difference was this, that the Copy, from whence they translated, did differ from that we now enjoy in

Hebrew.

Ref. 1. We shall relate the various Editions of the Greek Bible, as Bellarmine himself hath collected them, and then see what certainty there is that ours is the Antient 70.

1. The first Greek Translation was supposed to have been made in Alexander's time, whence Plato learned many things.

2. The 70, who as some imagine, only transcribed the Hebrew; others say, they did translate, yet it was no more than the Pentateuch, which yet they designedly altered in 13 places.

3. The 3d was made by Aquila in Adrian's time, who was first a Gentile, then a Christian, and being Excommunicated for Judicary Astrology, turned Jew; and then made this Translation but of little esteem therefore.

4. The 4th by Theodotion, under Commodus a Marcion Heretic, turned Jew.

5. By Symmachus, under Severus, first an Ebionite, as Eusebius thinks, but a Samaritan, as Athanasius supposeth, and for want of Dignity at home, turn'd Jew, and was Circumcised a second time.

6. Found at Jericho, but anonymous.

7. At Niceopolis, without a Name likewise.

8. From which Origen compiled his Tetrapla Hexapla and Octupla, viz. 1. The Hebrew. 2. The same in Greek Characters. 3. The Seventy Translation. 4. That of Aquila. 5. That of Theodotion. 6. That of Symmachus, which being a fourfold Translation, was called Tetrapla, and being in six Columns, was called Hexapla, and when the two anonymous Translations were added, was called Octupla.

8. Hence is the Edition of Origen, who so amended the seventy by mixing it with that of Theodotion, marked with Asterisks, which are now lost, which Edition is called the common Edition of the Seventy.

9. Is that of Lucian, who amended many Faults in it with great Labour.

10. Is that of Hesychius, who amended it likewise.

Hereupon 'tis enquired what the present seventy is, after all these alterations of it. Bellarmine's Opinion of it is, that tho the seventy be extant, yet 'tis so corrupted and vitiated that it plainly appears to be another de Verbo Dei, lib. 2. cap. 6. Jerome in the 2d Book of his Apology against Rufinus, cap. 8. g. (As Dr. J. O. observes,) tells us, it is corrupt, interpolated, mingled by Origen, with that of Theodo-
Theodotion marked with Afterisks and Obelisks, that there were so many Copies of it, and they so varying, that no man knew what to follow. And so in his Epistle to Chromatius, vid. Maius Pref. on Joshua. J. 0. of the Integrity of the Hebrew Text, p. 341. Father Simon in his Critical Enquiries into the Editions of the Bible, shews, Chap. 15. 16, 17. That the story of the Seventy, by Philo, Joesphus, and the fathers, was grounded on the Book of Aristeus, which was rather a Romance than a History, that Jerom defired a new Greek Translation, the old was so corrupt, that the Apoftles following of it, did not evidence its Excellency, for they and the Fathers followed it as being most commonly understood; the Greek being then the common Tongue, as Tully observed, and as the Writings of the Apoftles, and the Fathers, fully declare; nor yet do the Apoftles quotations always agree with the seventy, but often times fully agree with the present Hebrew Copy, and sometimes agree with neither: so that nothing can be concluded from their quotations any more for the seventy, than the Hebrew: But others suppose the places laid to be followed by the Apoftles, were not so, but that those who Translated the Bible since the Apostles time, had inferred what the Apostles wrote, in the head of a Translation, as may be made to appear by several instances, if we had room to insert them, some of which, viz. Rom. 3. was mentioned by St. Jerome. This we have already observed out of Bellarmine, in the 1st Cap. See Dr. J. O. on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Bootius and others; some suppose it was taken not out of the Hebrew, but from the Chaldee Paraphrase, as R. Azarias believeth, for which he gives several Reasons, Vid. purg. falsi. Who ever did it, 'tis plain they were very Ignorant of the Hebrew Copy, and so were the Fathers, who followed it, because they could do no other. See our Discourse concerning the Antiquity of the Points, in Answer to the Objections brought from the Seventy. Some think the Pentateuch was taken from the Sama- ritaine, or that from it, they so often agree with the Hebrew; however it might be read in the Synagogues as an Exposition or Paraphrase to those who best understood Greek; but it was never read as the Original Text itself, or in its head. And moreover the alterations in this and the rest, are so very great and many, as must have been wilfully made, which we have proved, have not been, nor dare they say they have. Nor yet is it credible that such great alterations should so soon befal the Bible, as by this Opinion are supposed between the time of the 70, and the Chaldee Paraphrase, which Translations so greatly differ from each other. Sh. 4. 3. As to the Chaldee Paraphrase, 'Tis likewise supposed that the Hebrew Copy may be mended by this Translation, as well as by the former.

Resp. 1st. 'Tis a Paraphrase, and not properly a Translation, and they were rather Expositors than Translators.

2. They did not follow the Exactness of Grammar.

3. They oft affected Allegorical and Miftical Interpretations.

4. The Chaldee Paraphrase hath been greatly Vitiated.

5. There were other Chaldee Paraphrases made before this we now Enjoy, and R. Azarias supposeth this we have was taken out of some former Paraphrase. The Tagums of Jonathan, and Onkelos are the Antientest we have; those on other parts of Scripture were some of them 300 years after Christ.

4. As to the Vulgar Latin, Its uncertain Original, Corruptions and Barbarisms, have been sufficiently spoken to by many; however this and all the former Translations differ so greatly from the present Hebrew Copy in many places, that if they follow a better Copy therein, than what we have, ours must have been wilfully corrupted, which we have proved hath not been, neither will they say it hath.

The Journal of the reason why Translations differ from the Original, is delivered by R. Joseph Albo, in Tkkarim, par. 3. cap. 22. who saith, if the Bible in other Nations be found so differ from that which is in our hands; this cometh to pass for want of skill
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in the Translators among those People; for the Jews are most exact about their Law, and about the very Letters of it, and they glory in the Knowledge of the number of the Letters and sounds of the accents and those things they write in the Margin of their Books, and call it the Masora, whereas no other Nations do any such thing, and for this cause the Scribes were called Sophorin Numnerares, because they numbered all the Letters in the Law, which is a sign that it was kept in their hands without Alteration, as it was given to Moses; and this further appears by this, that it is now found in the hands of all Israel, that are dispersed throughout all the World, from the East corner to the West corner thereof, and in the same Copy, without any alteration.

Seft. 5. As to the Altering the Text barely upon Conjecture,

Cephalus would likewise impose the Text might be altered by the Exercise of the judgment and skill of particular Critics, a work he often aff urned to himself, and allowed others.

But as this would reduce us to depend on Humane Reason, and Authority in Divine Matters, and render our belief of the Scripture and the Gospel but Humane and Fable; so the Jews observe that by the same Rule the Text may be wholly altered, and nothing will remain certain if men may mend whatever they think meet.

The Second Part.

CHAP. IV.


Seft. 1. Having Answered what is Objected against the Integrity of the Hebrew Bible, we must here prove the Purity thereof.

That it is now the same it was at first, without any material Alteration, and is therefore of the same Authority it ever was on all accounts.

First. Then it is granted us, That the Bible was at first, given forth from God to his Church in the Hebrew Tongue, except some part in Chaldee, it being the Language of the People to whom it was delivered in Writing, and thence called Scripture.

Secondly, It cannot be in Reason denied, That as it was committed to the Church at first, it was God's will, and his Peoples duty to preserve the same without adding to it, or altering of it, to the end of the World. Rev. 22. 18. Those who own that God would have it still observed, must allow he would have it still preserved; and with those who will not observe it, we shall not here contend; and as God would have it preserved, so is it the Churches duty to keep it pure and perfect, as he would have it kept by them; for to them are committed, the Oracles of God, Rom. 3. 2, 4. Psal. 147, 19, 20. Deut. 10. 3, 5; Heb. 1. 1. 2 Pet. 1. 20, 21, by which they and their Posterity are to Live, and shall be judged.