Jews, which may be named Hebraic Greek; the firſt traces of which we find in the tranſlation of the LXX.

“Every man acquainted with the Greek language, who had never heard of the New Teſtament, muſt im­mediately perceive, on reading only a few lines, that the ſtyle is widely different from that of the claſſic au­thors. We find this character in all the books of the New Teſtament in a greater or leſs degree, but we muſt not therefore conclude that they poſſeſs an uni­formity of ſtyle. The harſheſt Hebraiſms, which ex­tend even to grammatical errors in the government of caſes, are the diſtinguiſhing marks of the bowk of Re­velation; but they are accompanied with tokens of genius and poetical enthuſiaſm, of which every reader muſt be ſenſible who has taſte and feeling. There is no tranſlation of it wſhich is not read with pleaſure even in the days of childhood; and the very faults of gram­mar are ſo happily placed as to produce an agreeable effect. The golpels of St Matthew and St Mark have ſtrong marks of this Hebraic ſtyle; the former has harſher Hebraiſms. than the latter, the fault of which may be aſcribed to the Greek tranſlator, who has made too literal a verſion, and yet the goſpel of St Mark is written in worſe language, and in a manner that is leſs agreeable. The epiſtles of St James and St Jude are ſomewhat better; but even theſe are full of Hebraiſms, and betray in other reſpects a certain Hebrew tone. St Luke has in ſeveral paſſages written pure and claſſic Greek, of which the four firſt verſes of his goſpel may­be given as an inſtance: in the ſequel, where he deſcribes the actions of Chriſt, he has very harſh He­braiſms, yet the ſtyle is more agreeable than that of St Matthew or St Mark. In the Acts of the apoſtles he is not free from Hebraiſms, which he ſeems to have never ſtudiouſly avoided; but his periods are more claſſically turned, and ſometimes poſſeſs beauty devoid of art. St John has numerous, though not uncouth, He­braiſms both in his goſpel and epiſtles; but he has writ­ten in a ſmooth and flowing language, and ſurpaſſes all the Jewiſh writers in the excellence of narrative. St Paul again is entirely different from them all; his ſtyle is indeed neglected and full of Hebraiſms, but he has avoided the conciſe and verſe-like conſtruction of the Hebrew language, and has upon the whole a conſiderable ſhare of the roundneſs of Grecian compoſition. It is evident that he was as perfectly acquainted with the Greek manner of expreſſion as with the Hebrew, and he has introduced them alternately, as either the one or the other ſuggeſted itſelf the firſt, or was the beſt approved.”

Michaelis has ſhown that the New Teſtament not only contains Hebraiſms but Rabbiniſms, Syriaſms, Chaldaiſms, Arabiſms, Latiniſms, and Perſian words, of which he has exhibited many ſpecimens. To theo­logians, whoſe duty it certainly is to ſtudy the language of the New Teſtament with attention, we would ſtrenouſly recommend the peruſal of this work, which in the Engliſh tranſlation is one of the moſt valuable acceſſions to ſcriptural criticiſm that has yet appeared. We ſpeak of the Engliſh tranſlation, which the large and judicious notes of Mr Marſh has rendered infinitely ſuperior to the original.

To the obſervations which have been made reſpecting the language of the New Teſtament, a few remarks may be added concerning the peculiarities of the ſtyle

and manner of the ſacree writers, particularly the hiſtorians. Theſe remarks extend to the Old Teſtament as well as to the New.— The first quality for which the ſacred hiſtory is remarkable is ſimplicity in the ſtructure of the ſentences. The firſt live verſes of Geneſis furniſh an example, which conſiſt of eleven ſentences. The ſubſtantives are not attended by adjectives, nor the verbs by adverbs, no ſynonymas, ſuperlatives, no effort at expreſſing things in a bold, emphatical, or uncommon manner.

2. The ſecond quality is ſimplicity of ſentiment, par­ticularly in the Pentateuch, ariſing from the very nature of the early and uncultivated ſtate of ſociety about which that book is converſant.

3. Simplicity of deſign. The ſubject of the narra­tive ſo engroſſes the attention of the writer, that he himſelf is as nobody. He introduces nothing as from himſelf, no remarks, doubts, conjectures, or reaſonings. Our Lord’s biographers particularly excel in this qua­lity. This quality of ſtyle we meet with in Xenophon and Cæſar.

The Evangeliſts may be ranked next to Geneſis for ſimplicity of compoſition in the ſentences. John and Matthew are diſtinguiſhed for it more than Mark and Luke. But the ſentiment is not ſo remarkable for ſimplicity in the Evangeliſt as the Pentateuch. The reaſons of this difference are, the ſtate of the Jews was totally changed; their manners, cuſtoms, &c. ſplit into factions both in religion and politics. 2. The object of our Lord’s miniſtry, wſhich is the great ſubject of the goſpels, was tο *inculcate a doctrine and morality* with which none of their ſyſtems perfectly coincided: beſides, being conſtantly oppoſed by all the great men, the greater part of his hiſtory conſiſts of inſtructions and diſputes. 3. As it is occupied with what our Saviour ſaid and what he did, this makes two diſtinctions of ſtyle and manner; that of our Saviour, and the ſacred penman’s. In their own character, they neither explain nor command, promiſe nor threaten, praiſe nor blame. They generally omit the names of our Lord’s enemies; thus directing our hatred at the vices they committed, not at the perſons. They never mention ſuch perſons without ne ceſſity; which is the cafe with the high-prieſt, Pilate, Herod, and Judas: the three firſt for the chronology, the fourth to do juſtice to the eleven.

Herodias is indeed mentioned with diſhonour but her crime was a public one. On the other hand, all perſons diſtinguiſhed for any thing virtuous are carefully men­tioned, Joſeph of Arimathea, Nicodemus, Zaccheus, Bartimeus, Jairus, Lazarus, Mary, and Martha. They record their own faults (Peter’s, Thomas’s), nor do they make any merit of their confeſſion. In one uni­form ſtrain they relate the moſt ſignal miracles and moſt ordinary facts.

From the narrative is excluded that quality of ſtyle which is called *animation.* Nothing that diſcovers paſſion in the writer or is calculated to excite the paſſions of the reader. Every thing is directed to mend the heart.

But in the diſcourſes and dialogues of our Saviour the expreſſion, without loſing any thing of its ſimplicity, is often remarkable ſor ſpirit and energy. Reſpecting harmony and ſmoothneſs, qualities which only add an external poliſh to language, they had not the leaſt ſolicitud