



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.



A N
A N S W E R
T O A
L E T T E R

F R O M

The Rev. T. RUTHERFORTH,
D. D. F. R. S.

*The King's Professor of Divinity in Cambridge,
And Chaplain to
Her Royal Highness the Princess Dowager of Wales.*

B Y

BENJAMIN KENNICOTT, D. D.
Fellow of *Exeter* College.

L O N D O N,

Printed : And sold by Messrs *Fletcher and Prince*, in
OXFORD ; *Thurlbourn*, in CAMBRIDGE ; *Rivington*,
Payne, Doddsley, Griffiths, and *Fletcher*, in LONDON.

M D C C L X II.



MEminerit is, qui reprehensionem parat, se quoque hominem esse : neque minus labi posse reprehendendo, quàm potuerit auctor operis scribendo. Quanquam longè plus veniæ debetur ei, qui, prodesse studens, in ingenti opere dormitavit alicubi, non assequutus quod voluit ; quàm ei, qui in alieno libro, cupiens ingeniosus videri, venatur quod carpat, et tamen hoc ipsum perperam facit : dumque falsos aliorum errores exagitat, ipse suos veros prodit.

ERASMUS

In Tractatu Contra Morosos.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607
U.S.A.

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you regarding the possibility of your being employed by the University of Chicago. I have been informed that you are currently unemployed and that you are seeking employment. I believe that your qualifications and experience would be a valuable asset to our department.

I would like to discuss the details of this opportunity with you. Please contact me at your earliest convenience. I can be reached at the address above or by telephone at (773) 492-3200.

I am sure that you will find this opportunity very interesting and that you will accept my offer. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,
[Name]

A N
A N S W E R &c.

MR PROFESSOR,

I Have received the Present of your printed Letter. And I make no doubt, but you will condescend to accept this Answer; which, in regard to *the Work*, in which I have the honour to be employed, in respect to the many and great *Patrons* of it, and in justice to *myself*, seems to be indispensably necessary.

Your first Advertisement, which gave notice that your Letter was *in the Press*, preceded, by more than *two months*, the notice of its being published: which contrivance of advertising so long before the appearance of your Pamphlet, if it be not strictly singular, is at least very uncommon.

But, Sir, the nature, as well as the earliness, of your Advertisement was very extraordinary. The charges of *Injudiciousness* and *Inaccuracy*, being in this case particularly injurious in their tendency, should not have been advanced at all, without *many* and *gross* instances of both to justify the accusations. And the boast of them, if proved, should have followed the proofs themselves, at the close of your Pamphlet: but ought by no means to have been inserted in an Advertisement, for the perusal of many thousands, who will never read

your Pamphlet, or any Reply to it. There was another thing in your Advertisement, still less expected, Mr Professor, from you; which relates to a want of *Logical Precision* — in your placing *my Defence of the Samar. Pentateuch* before *my Second Dissertation on the Heb. Text*, as if they were different things; tho' the former certainly makes a part of, and is contained in, the latter.

The substance of this remarkable Advertisement of yours forms the *Title-page* of your Pamphlet; excepting the notice there given of a *Post-script*, occasioned by my advertising, before your Letter was printed, that I had an Answer to it in the Press. As this Advertisement of mine is mentioned in your *Title-page*, it may be proper to take notice of it in this place. That such an Advertisement should occasion surprize in some Readers, was not at all unlikely. But it was presumed, that *all men of candor* would forbear to pass precipitate censures; and that Readers in general would decently suppose, *there might be reasons*, which they could not then be acquainted with.

Your Advertisement, Sir, being published as soon as your Letter was sent to the Press, was likely to stand forth against me for a long time: and it contained injurious charges, unaccompanied by the least proof. Besides: notwithstanding your Advertisement, it was not certain you would ever publish at all. And, if you did; you were likely (and the event has strongly confirmed the conjecture) to publish at a time of the year, when it would be impossible for me to reply, on account of my necessary preparation for, and attendance in, London.

Dr RUTHERFORTH 7

London. The charges therefore, which you had so early and so peremptorily proclaimed in the News-Papers, might have done me some disservice, by their influence *at home*; but (as our News-Papers pass into other countries) they might have been highly detrimental, when read *abroad* by those, who were exerting uncommon endeavours to assist me in my Collation. For these Gentlemen, being *Strangers*, might have drawn very unfavourable inferences from such an Advertisement, signed by a Person so eminently dignified; whom they might have supposed to be a still more considerable Writer, and a very fair Adversary.

It seemed therefore incumbent on me to take early notice of your Advertisement; which I did, by acquainting the Public, that *there was in the Press, and would speedily be published, an Answer to your advertised Letter*. I suppose, every one will allow, there could be no impropriety in this step; provided, I then knew the particulars you had to object: and which therefore would form the substance of your publication, if such a thing was actually intended. And, as to the single point of an *early* Advertisement; I will also suppose, that every one can see the difference between an *attack* upon another man's character, and the necessary *defence* of it. But, that my other Readers may the better judge of this whole affair; I shall mention the following particulars.

During my stay in London, last winter, I was made acquainted with the endeavours of one of your Friends, to represent me as having been very

careless in what I had published upon the Hebrew Text. This attack, which derived its authority from *your* discoveries, not a little surprized me; but my surprize was greatly augmented, at hearing of a Letter, written by you, to a Person of considerable Dignity in the Church, containing a severe censure on my last Dissertation.

After these notices, I went in February last to Cambridge. And there I often heard — of your having preached one, if not more Latin Sermons, *De Textu Masoretico* — of your obliging a Gentleman to dispute with you, in the School of Divinity, on the subject of *Gerizim* and *Ebal* — of the manner, in which your warmth had frequently exerted itself, in conversation — and of one article of your behaviour, for which I thought it necessary to expostulate with you in a particular manner. — As to the Letter before-mentioned; I thought I had a right to enquire, and therefore asked you for the proofs of that *great Inaccuracy*, with which you had therein charged me. You mentioned several particulars: which, tho' they did prove *want of care*, proved it to have been wanting in *Yourself*.

On my return to Oxford, I wrote you a Letter; enumerating all the particulars you had mentioned, relative to my *Inaccuracy*; with short remarks upon each article: which Letter was dated *March 30th*. On *May 28th* you sent me an Answer, contained in four sheets of paper; in which were remarks upon the particulars in my Letter: but it produced no one new proof of *Inaccuracy*, not any one instance more than I had before enumerated. And,

Dr RUTHERFORTH 9

as there had passed *seventeen months*, from the time you received my second Dissertation to the date of that Letter; it might be reasonably concluded, that you had, during this long interval, finished your own discoveries: and, if so, there could be little doubt, but you had then set forth *all*, or at least *the most weighty*, of your objections. And therefore I might be then fairly supposed to know what particulars you had to advance, in support of your charge. But, should it be still insisted, that I might not at that time know *all* your objections; I reply, that this did not seem at all necessary. I apprehended, it would be easy to invalidate, and retort upon yourself, the objections you had then produced; and that, when this was performed, but little attention would be given by the Public to a few new objections, if any such should have been superadded in your Pamphlet.

There was another circumstance, which inclined me to an early publication; namely, that I could then have done it, without alienating much time from my necessary employment: *as I had by me* (prepared several months before) *an Answer to your long Letter*. 'Tis true, this Answer had not been sent to you; which might possibly lead you to think, that your Letter was unanswerable: in consequence of which mistake, a printed exhibition of your Letter was resolved upon. But it is as true, that, about a week after its arrival, I drew up an Answer; which I was advised by some Friends to send to you in print. This however I declined; not choosing, that the first notice of your

your hostility should be conveyed to the News-Papers by me.

Having thus stated the notice I had received of all the objections to my Accuracy, which you had discovered, or thought proper to acquaint me with, after seventeen months examination; and having thus apologized for my own Advertisement; I shall remark here, that *the only jest* in this serious affair is, that *you could possibly take it for a jest*; and complain of it, as such, with repeated emphasis, in the Postscript to your printed Letter.

But there is still one part of my Advertisement, which in *your* opinion requires a particular apology; and it shall have one: I mean, *the Motto*. It appeared to me, Sir, that a cure from the same hand, which gave the wound, would be particularly proper in the case before us. And surely, to exhibit you to the Public, as having pronounced me *very extraordinarily diligent* and *singularly sagacious*, in 1753, would greatly invalidate the vehemence of your testimony in proof of my *grievous carelessness* and *absurdity*, in 1759. You will please to remember, that to this extract from your Letter I subjoined the true date; which must have prevented every attentive Reader from considering your Applause as given to the second Dissertation.

You object, that the extract from your Letter (which forms the Motto) relating only to my *first* Dissertation, is here *nothing to the purpose*. But indeed, Sir, it seems to be very pertinent; particularly,

cularly, for the following reason. You were pleased to assure me, *you saw in my (former) Dissertation the strongest marks of singular Sagacity.* Now *Sagacity* is not a transitory, or accidental, quality; present, to-day; absent, tomorrow; and returning on the day following: but it is inherent, and permanent; lasting (wherever it is once certainly found) till the powers of the mind decay, thro' the infirmities of age, or the effects of disease. And therefore if, as you say, I gave *the strongest marks of singular Sagacity*, in 1753; it must be justly questionable, whether I could, in 1759, be fairly charged with *singular Injudiciousness* — at least, by You.

You object further, that *the extract* (which formed my Motto) *is taken from a Letter, which contained your objections to several passages in that first Dissertation.* It is so: but they were such objections, as were not thought inconsistent with this extract, because the same Letter contained both; and yet, as these had no necessary connexion with one another, it could not be unfair to quote either part separately. If your remark here is of any use; it serves greatly to enhance the energy of your former commendation: which, it seems, was not contained in a merely *complimental* Letter, but in a Letter filled with truth. And indeed here (in your printed Epistle, p. 173) you insist so much on being thought *sincere*, in your applause of my *Diligence* and *Sagacity*, as to give that applause much greater weight than it had before.

As

As you complain so heavily of this Motto's being detached from all the rest of your Letter; I shall obviate this complaint by one or two farther extracts from it. In that same Letter, you honoured me also with the following eulogy——

“Whoever therefore would undertake to give us a critical edition of the Heb. Bible, would undertake

A VERY USEFUL WORK; and I cannot help adding, that you have proved, without designing it, that YOU ARE EVERY WAY EQUAL to such an undertaking.”

And, in another part of the same Letter, immediately after mentioning the strongest marks of my very extraordinary Diligence and singular Sagacity, you were pleased to add—that *“in most of the IMPROVEMENTS, which you have made in the VERSION of such passages as came in your way, I agree with you: I am satisfied too, that most of your CRITICAL CORRECTIONS have as much evidence in their favour, as is necessary to recommend them to a JUDICIOUS READER.”*

How these strong testimonies in my favour, thus derived from You (tho' their date be a few years ago) will operate upon my other Readers, I can only conjecture. But, to say the truth; I should have assumed to myself much greater consequence from these testimonies, had I not been mortified with several proofs in the same Letter—that *a man of Complaisance may not always be a man of Judgment.* To give one instance: Your words are these—*“You have, I think, proved beyond contradiction, that there have been corruptions in the Heb. Text; and that we may and ought to have*

“ recourse

“recourse to the four great helps of antient MSS, an-
 “tient Versions, parallel Passages, and critical Con-
 “jectures—Tho’ I have mentioned four helps for as-
 “certaining the true Sense of the Text, and FOR
 “CHANGING THE READING, WHERE IT IS NE-
 “CESSARY; yet the evidence arising from any of these
 “helps will be found to be little more than the evidence
 “arising from THE LAST of them” sc. Conjectures.
 But, Mr Professor: if the evidence of any or all
 of these helps can amount to no more, or but to
little more, than Conjecture; how can they possi-
 bly prove any thing, much less prove beyond con-
 tradiction? For one of the first lessons, taught by
 sound Philosophy, is this — that *Conjecture can*
prove nothing.

Having thus in some measure redressed the ge-
 neral grievance complained of with regard to my
 Advertisement, and the particular one relating to
 my Motto; having offered a few remarks on
 your own Advertisement, and your Title-page;
 and having acquainted my other Readers with
 other necessary Preliminaries: I proceed now to
 your printed Letter.

You begin it with saying, that *When I was last*
at Cambridge, I had heard of your having said, that
my second Dissertation is in many instances INJUDICIOUS
and INACCURATE; and that I let you know, that I
looked upon this to be very injurious treatment, unless
you would publish your OBJECTIONS. This first sen-
 tence is unfairly stated; and yet it relates to a
 point of considerable consequence. So far from
 calling upon you to publish your objections, rela-
 tive

tive to my *Injudiciousness* and *Inaccuracy*, both which you here include; I told you repeatedly, that I desired to have my book considered as divided into two parts, *one* as containing MATTERS OF MY OWN OPINION, *the other* as containing MATTERS OF FACT — that, as to *the former*, I readily allowed myself fallible; and with my *opinions* I had given my reasons, which I submitted to the judgment of the Public: all these therefore I left to take their chance; which I did with the greater tranquillity, because I had found, that where some learned men pronounced me certainly wrong, others pronounced me certainly right — but that, as to *the latter* charge, tho' I should be sorry, if my Book contained *many* and *gross* instances of *carelessness*; yet, if it did, I would much rather know them than not; and, as you had advanced the charge, I called upon you for your proofs of it. And, at last; after hearing all the particulars you had to produce, or thought proper to produce, in support of this charge; and after considering, how frivolous as well as groundless they really were, tho' they had been sedulously propagated with the air of great importance: I told you, that, *tho' you had much injured me already, yet you would prove still more injurious, if you should continue to attack me in every possible way, excepting only in that one, which might put it in my power to defend myself.* In short, my application to you was only this, *that you would, for the future, make your objections more public, or less so;* and I spoke *only* of your objections to my *Accuracy*.

When

When therefore, in your 2d page, you charge me with inconsistency; in first *calling upon you to publish*, and then declaring (with respect to another person—for I do not take *You* and *Philaethes* to be the same) that *I have no time for Controversy*; this is only heaping up error upon error. Your charge here arises from your not attending to the obvious, and necessary, distinction between *matters of opinion* and *matters of fact*. Mr Johnson, in his Dictionary, justly observes, that *Controversy is an agitation of contrary Opinions*. Or the word, if it can want explanation, may be explained by your own question, in p. 79—*Is not it so much a matter of taste, as to leave us room to dispute about it for ever, without being able to come to any determination?* Such a kind of a thing is Controversy; but this I expressly and repeatedly disclaimed to you. I told you, I enquired not after *your opinions* concerning *my opinions*, but after your proofs of my frequent and gross *inaccuracy* in stating *matters of fact*. And as disputes about *these* must lie in a small compass, and are easily determined; surely I might with clear consistency call upon you to publish these, and yet declare against all Controversy. What ideas therefore, Mr Professor, must arise in the mind of every Reader; as to your being either unable, or unwilling, to distinguish between things so essentially different! This, Sir, is a point of particular moment to me. And I cannot conclude it without expressing real concern, that a Person in your Station should thus, in the very opening of his Pamphlet, study to excite in my Patrons a persuasion, that I was very desirous to give up to

Contro-

Controversy that time, which is due in the strongest manner to my Collation: a persuasion — than which none would more justly and extensively injure me, if it were really true; and therefore it is such, as no man, tender of his own character, should have endeavoured to propagate, if it were *absolutely false*.

Your second sentence is full as extraordinary as your first; but in a different way. You say, that *for your own part; you then thought, and still think, that you have a FULL RIGHT of speaking your sentiments about any books, which you have read, and especially about any of this sort, without being obliged to give an account of yourself to the public for what you have said of them.* But, do you then really think, that you have a full right to say what you please; a full right to censure and defame, without a previous enquiry made with diligence and great care? I have now before me an author, who will recover you from this mistake: for he determines thus — *The definition of Damage (says he) extends to a man's character and reputation; the diminution of which gives him a right to demand reparation from those, by whose fault they have been diminished.—In rating the damage sustained, we are to estimate something more than the present advantage, which is lost; for the expectation of future advantage is worth something— Besides the person, who immediately does the injury, others may be so far concerned in it, as to be under an obligation with him of making reparation— As a man may be injured by scandal or defamation, the damage is repaired by asking pardon, by a public acknowledgment*

knowledge of his innocence &c. — Lastly: tho' there is no degree of malice in an action, by which another is injured, yet it may arise from some faulty neglect or imprudence in him who does it: and when any person has suffered, for want of his taking such care as he ought to have taken; the Law cannot but oblige him to undo, as well as he can, what harm he has been the occasion of. See pages 400, 406, 407, 415 of Vol. I. of *Institutes of Natural Law*, by Dr RUTHERFORTH.

The 2d sentence in your Letter goes on with saying, that you should have made no difficulty about promising me, that you would print such of your remarks, as appear to you to justify BOTH parts of your assertion; if you had not been afraid, that the necessary business of your office would have prevented you from putting them together in such a manner, as to make them intelligible. But the leisure of a vacation has given you an opportunity of obliging me. What a fortunate event was this same unexpected VACATION! A time of happy leisure, which (it seems) could not have been possibly foreseen! For, could you at all have flattered yourself with hopes of the time, which this vacation gave you; you would not have hesitated a moment at promising me (what, by the way, I never asked of you) to print your remarks on both parts of your accusation! But this whole Vacation, Sir, brought leisure very insufficient. If you had had more time, you say, you might have been able to have brought them (meaning, I suppose, your remarks) into a narrower compass, and perhaps to have made them clearer. And, to say the truth, I

B

can-

cannot but add my own wishes to those of some other persons, that you had waited for another possible Vacation: for, in case of such another season of leisure, perhaps *eight* parts out of *ten* in your Pamphlet might have been set aside, even by yourself, as being nothing to the purpose; not at all relating to the proofs of my *Inaccuracy*, which alone I requested. And, after so extensive a proscription; *the few pages*, which had contained the remainder, might have stood a chance of being rendered *clear and intelligible*; which (and it must be owned, you seem very apprehensive of it) they by no means are at present.

The second page of your Letter contains these words — “ I assure you, that I think the collation of
“ *the Hebrew MSS a very useful work, and that I*
“ *heartily wish you success in it: but the success, which*
“ *I mean, does not wholly consist in obtaining your own*
“ *benefit by a large subscription, &c.*” For the first part of this declaration I own myself obliged to you; and shall refer to it again hereafter. The last part might, perhaps, have been prudently omitted: as the words *large subscription* will probably lead many of your readers to think, you have here given them a clue to resolve many difficulties, and to infer that *hinc illæ lacrymæ*. But surely, with *the large Subscription*, mention might fairly be made of *the large Expence*, attending this work, in England and several other parts of Europe.

What pity it is, that a Gentleman, who so *heartily* wishes me success, should be so fond of throwing out things, which are likely to prevent the very
success

success he wishes! — Sometimes, by talking a great deal about what *he knows is not intended*; and at other times, about what *he cannot know to be intended*. One instance of the former relates to what you are pleased to call *new-modelling the Hebrew Text*, pag. 169, 173: and one instance of the latter we have in your 2d page; where you say — *If in the new edition of the bible, which I propose to give, I design to suggest any principles for determining which reading is most likely to be genuine &c.* Now, Sir, tho' *the suggesting of principles* is a phrase not very comprehensible; yet as what you injuriously suggest may raise an unfavourable surmise in the minds of some sincere Friends to my Undertaking: I declare, that no particular marks of preference are intended to be applied, at the bottom of the several pages; but that there shall be subjoined the several Various Readings, concerning all which the preference will be judged of by *the learned and critical Readers*. And as none but such as *these*, as none but *Men of very considerable Learning and Judgment* will be able to examine these Various Readings; it is indeed a sublime (tho' perhaps an unintended) compliment paid to me, when you say, that if *I were to set marks of preference amongst the variations, unless this is executed judiciously* i. e. if this be done injudiciously, *it will be likely to mislead my readers* i. e. Readers, the most learned and the most judicious, will probably be misled by my injudiciousness *i. e.* my folly will prove superior to their wisdom! —

Tanti est non sapere!

Your third page acquaints the reader, that *I had taken singular pains to represent you, as having highly injured me by making such futile objections, as I answered, even to your own satisfaction, as soon as I heard them.* It is very true, that when I was acquainted at Cambridge with your objections, I was surprized to find them so insignificant; and to find likewise, that several of them proved great want of care and attention in yourself. After my replies to some of your objections, you were silent; and I could not but think, that to silence *such* an Opponent was nearly the same as victory. After discussing others of your objections, you did (and I speak it to your honour) you did indeed own yourself wrong in two or three instances. I will not however assert, that I answered at all to *your own satisfaction*; for I should apprehend that, amidst the great variety of Oppositions and Answers you have been troubled with (upon other occasions as well as upon this) you were never *satisfied* with any one of them. But as you seem to call upon me here, in relation to what I have said, as to *your confession of your own Inaccuracy*; I will specify one proof in this place.

This instance shall be *the acknowledgement* you condescended (or, to speak more properly, were compelled) to make; as to the charge brought against me, of having said that *the famous word in the 16th Psalm was printed plural universally.* When I asked for your proofs of my Inaccuracy, I told you — I could guess at one, and only one, of them; which had been brought against me by a friend of yours, in London, repeatedly and publickly; but

that

that I had been astonished to find, that your friend could have ventured so studiously to propagate an accusation, which was absolutely false: for that, so far from having asserted, that *every printed edition* had the word plural; the expression in my book was *almost universally*; and that I had in the same book expressly specified *two* printed editions, which had the word singular. This last circumstance you denied. Upon my affirming it a second time, you said; I had indeed mentioned *one* such edition, but no more. I replied, that *that one* should have secured me from any such attack, as had been made: but I added, that if you yourself had not been *careful and accurate* enough to find out the *two* editions mentioned in my book, I would shew them to you. I did shew them; and you, not a little disconcerted, said — *You had not observed, or recollected, the second instance.* Upon which, I could not help then desiring you to consider this as one proof — *how very cautious men should be of charging others with Carelessness, for fear the charge should at last lie at their own doors.*

In page 3, you say, that *now you have, as I required you, submitted your objections to the judgment of the public, our readers will be able to determine for themselves &c.* I must here again protest against your representation. Had it been true, as you repeatedly state the matter, that I required you to publish your objections, as to my want both of *Judgment* and of *Accuracy*; and you had accordingly published a large Pamphlet (or as you call it *a work*) of 174 pages: you might then with some

reason have expected a reply from me to the whole. But indeed, Sir, you should have remembered, and other Readers are desired to attend to, the just distinction already made between *matters of opinion* and *matters of fact*; which I repeatedly made to you in person. As to the *latter*; I shall soon take at least the chief of your objections into consideration. And, as to the *former*; we have both (to use your own words) *submitted our opinions to the judgment of the public, and our Readers will be able to determine for themselves*. I shall only add, as to this point; that, should You and I, who both declare so readily, that *we have very little time to spare*, enter into *Controversy*; or should I follow your example, and encourage any proneness to acrimonious contention, concerning *matters of opinion*; I humbly apprehend that the Public, instead of deliberating *which of us two is the wisest man*, would determine *us both to be very absurd wranglers*.

In this third page you begin your attack in form; which opens with your observing, that *you meet with several instances of inaccuracy and injudicious reasoning in my first chapter, relating to Deut. xxvii, 4*. As this is the first passage, which has any tendency towards particular proof of my second Dissertation being *injudicious*; I shall here make one general declaration. Whatever I have offered to the Public, which contains matter of *my own opinion*, I readily submit to the judgments of all those, who are properly qualified to determine thereupon. The man, who is most fallible, may hit upon things, which may chance to prove useful: and he,

he, who is least fallible, should propose his discoveries with deference. 'Tis the duty of every man to exert his abilities, be they more or less considerable; and whenever these are exerted with diligence and fidelity, good men will approve the attempt, tho' the execution be attended with some imperfections.

I should humbly apprehend, that, where *any* writer offers his sentiments on a *great variety of difficulties*; the probability is, that he will be *sometimes wrong*. Pray, Mr Professor; how think *You* concerning *your own* Publications? Can't *You* allow the possibility of *some* instances of *Injudiciousness*? — But, however the case stand with *You*; after long experience of *my own* fallibility, I make no scruple to grant, that *I may have given my opinion improperly*, in several parts of my last Dissertation. And, as often as I am happy in meeting with a Friend, who has superior Judgment, and sufficient Regard for me, to state any particulars to me more properly; he is sure to receive my grateful Acknowledgments.

If therefore I have (as I make no doubt but I have, and it would be astonishing indeed if I had not) given my opinion *injudiciously*, in some parts of my last Volume; I am very ready to own myself wrong, when I am fairly proved so. I need not, however, trouble *you*, Sir, with many acknowledgments upon this head. And, I shall only add; that, wherever an opinion may prevail in favour of *your judgment*, there I desire it may be remembered — that I have been pronounced by *You singularly sagacious*,

and every way equal to the undertaking a Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible.

Having thus dismissed the whole charge of *Injudiciousness*; I proceed now to the charge of *Inaccuracy*. Not that I mean to scrutinize your Letter, with the design of extracting *all the particulars*, which might be intended to reflect upon my care; especially those, which cannot well be separated from *matters of opinion*. Such a minuteness, as would attend an universal examination (if I had time for it) cannot be necessary; and it will probably with great readiness be excused, after the *principal* parts of this charge have received fair and sufficient Answers.

Possibly, Sir, you may be inclinable to represent me, as refusing to attend to *all* your particulars (on this head) either out of an apprehension of danger from their number, or thro' an unwillingness to own myself mistaken. I therefore beg leave to premise, that, at the end of my second Dissertation (p. 571, 576, &c.) I chose to mention *all the mistakes I then knew of*, which had not been before noted in the Book itself: and I will now add, that the whole sum of the *Inaccuracies*, which I have since discovered, amount to *Ten*. All these *certain errors* (not *one* of which have you discovered) I here voluntarily make you a Present of; tho' I cannot say, they are of much importance: and yet some of them are more considerable than most of those, which your diligence has found out and enumerated.

Page	Line	
211,	26.	<i>seven</i> should be <i>five</i> .
229,	9.	1601 should be 1610.
451,	9.	<i>no particulars</i> —except one instance.
526,	18.	1371—probably much older.
527,	14.	313 should be 312.
527,	15.	1032 should be 1302.
537,	2.	<i>the variations</i> —only select ones.
540,	10.	<i>Vatic</i> : should be <i>Barberini Library</i> .
572,	4.	12, 28 should be 12, 38.
Index—		<i>Ben.</i> (Michaelis) should be <i>John Henry</i> .

In the seventh page you begin with an article, which makes five or six pages; and is referred to again afterwards, as a point on which you have been particularly brilliant. In my second Dissertation, at p. 47; I observed, that, if the wilful corruption as to Gerizim and Ebal was charged upon *the Jews*, it would not be the first charge against *them* of this nature. My first authority to prove this was derived from *St. Jerom*, in his comment on *Galat. iii. 10.* where *St. Paul* proves the Jews to be under the curse of their own Law, for not observing *all* its commands, or performing *universal* obedience to it.

The Apostle's words are these — *It is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things, which are written in the book of the law to do them.* In this sentence, the word *every* is not at all essential; because *cursed is he that*, and *cursed is every one that*, amount to just the same. But in the latter part of the sentence the word *ALL* is of real consequence; as it furnishes out the very circumstance,

on

on which the Apostolical argument turns. Now, tho' the Apostle says, *It is written*; yet the Hebrew word, implying this universality, is not found in the present Hebrew Text. St. Jerom however supposes, that *St. Paul would not have so expressed himself*, if the word had not *then* been in the Hebrew Text: and this supposition seems perfectly rational, on account of the great difference made in the sense, by the insertion or omission of the word in question. *You* say indeed, that the sentence, *with* the word ALL or *without* it, *has the same meaning*. But, to convince you of the contrary; let it be supposed, that a third person was to say — *Dr Rutherford is very inaccurate in his pamphlet*; and that I was to pretend to give *the exact sense* of this charge, by quoting it thus — *Dr Rutherford is very inaccurate in ALL his pamphlet, or thro' his WHOLE pamphlet*: surely it might be said (in your own words) *they must be very ignorant or very perverse, who do not see*, that this could not be fairly justified. You will therefore grant now, that the word for *all*, in the quotation made by St. Paul, is of real moment: and this word is not at present in the Hebrew Text.

St Jerom adds; that, upon referring to the *Samar. Pentateuch*, he *there* found the very word כָּל, which may be rendered either *omnis* or *omnibus*. He does not say, he found the word twice; but he shews evidently, that he found it *once* only, and in the *latter* part of the sentence. His words are these — *Frustra igitur illud tulerunt Judæi, ne viderentur* (he does not say *omnes*, but *ne viderentur*) *esse sub maledicto, si non possent OMNIA complere &c.*

And

And as the word, thus discovered by St. Jerom in his Samar. Pentateuch, was clearly in the *latter* part of the sentence ; so I observed (*Dissert. p. 51*) that the same word כּל, which signifies *omnis*, is now found in both the printed copies of the Samar. Text and its Version, and also in the present Samar. MSS.

After this comes Dr Rutherford, and assures the public that, tho' I say, the word is in the *French* Polyglott, both Text and Version ; *it is* (in the place where I mean) *in neither* — that, tho' I say, it is in the *English* Polyglott, both Text and Version ; *it is in neither* — and that, tho' I say, it is likewise in our Samar. MSS ; the MSS *are probably without this word* as well as the printed copies.

But will not other readers be greatly surprized, when *every preceding assertion of mine* is still affirmed to be *true*? The word כּל, which signifies *omnis* (and must be so rendered, when taken by itself, unconnected with other words) is found in the very same place, which is pointed out by St Jerom (*i. e.* the *latter* part of the sentence) both in the Samar. Text and Version in both the *French* and *English* Polyglotts, and in our Samar. MSS!

You must have heard, Mr Professor, that there is such a thing as *proving too much*. And for you to endeavour to represent me as asserting, that a very material word is found in several MSS and in four different places in printed books ; when this word does not exist in either of them — this is such a charge, that many of your readers must have suspected some *unfairness*. And, to say the truth, a stronger specimen of it is not very easy to
be

be met with. 'Tis certain, that Dr Rutherford is persuaded, that the *latter* part of the sentence is meant both by St Jerom and by me; and *there* the word is found, and found in *every one* of the authorities which I before quoted. And yet, tho' convinced of the truth of this, how does he labour to persuade his readers, that I mean the *former* part of the sentence; where the word \aleph is not found at all, nor ever was pretended to be found, in any Hebrew or Samar. copy, by any one! *This is strange indeed!*

But what makes it still more strange is, that this matter does not rest upon probability, or upon what the Professor must have clearly seen to be intended; but *it is expressly confined, in my book itself, to the LATTER part of the sentence.* For, in the very place where I have quoted the words of St Jerom, and pointed out the word *omnia*, by printing it in a different character; I have subjoined a Note, which determines the very place meant beyond almost the possibility of mistake, except it be made wilfully. For my Note is, that *our English Version* here inserts this necessary word *all* in a different Character: which word is in our Version, not in the former part of the sentence, but *the latter*. And yet *this whole Note of mine is passed over, in the Professor's printed Letter, with profound silence!* The surprize, which must be excited by such treatment as this will be still augmented; when it is remarked farther — that the Professor, who can thus state a material article, can also assure his Readers in the last page of his Pamphlet, that *he has all along been willing to take the favourable side!*

As

As to the existence of this word in our Samar. copies, my words are these — they read כֹּל *omnis*, agreeably to those Samar. MSS examined by St. Jerom. The word כֹּל, being here expressed by itself, is given in Latin, independent of any connection with other words, and is therefore rendered *omnis*; tho' when construed with other words, it may be rendered *omni*, *omnem*, &c. just as we say דְּבַר *verbum*, when mentioned by itself; tho', in construction, it may signify *verbi* or *verbo*. But even admitting, that this customary mode of writing were not a sufficient apology; if this single word might have been expressed with more exactness; yet *the meaning of the whole passage was too obvious to be mistaken*: and the word was guarded in this place, not only by my NOTE, but also by the reference to St Jerom, who confines it to the *latter* part of the sentence by saying — *ne viderentur esse sub maledicto, si non possent OMNIA complere &c.*

As to Cellarius; I frankly own, that his words were not sufficiently attended to, and that I mistook his meaning. And as I never doubted, but there were some Inaccuracies in a Book, of near 650 pages, containing quotations and references almost innumerable; so I acknowledge this of Cellarius to be one instance. Some writers would not dislike the discovery of an error, even in themselves; provided, it led an adversary to say what is far more censurable. But I rejoice at no such consequences: and as to the proper inferences from the whole of this article, I had rather leave them to my Readers, than attempt to specify them myself.

In page 60 of your Letter we have the beginning of a very uncommon Episode or Parenthesis, which consists of about 8 pages, containing several articles in proof of my Carelessness. The first of these witnesses is to give evidence as to the famous Samar. MS at Naplose; which, I had said, was thought to be about 500 years old, when examined (in 1690) by Dr Huntington: to prove which point (i. e. Huntington's opinion of the age of this MS) I refer'd to his 33^d and 35th Epistles; in the former of which he says — *Legem tenent a 500 forsan annis exscriptam.*

In relation to this matter you advance two charges; the first of which is, that in my first Dissertation I speak of this MS as written by *Phineas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron*; whereas it should have been said — *Abisha, the son of Phineas, &c.* I reply first: that, if this were an inaccuracy; it exists, not in my second, but my first Dissertation: which, you say, contained *the strongest marks of very extraordinary diligence.* But secondly: 'tis certain, that *Walton* and *Wolfius* mention the name of *Phineas*, and not of *Abisha*; when speaking of this very MS. And therefore thirdly: the only way to be quite sure, would perhaps be for one of us two (*Yourself*, rather, as the more accurate and authoritative Personage) to set out upon a tour to *Naplose*; and there, to put every Samaritan to his oath, as to the tradition about the real writer of this MS. And after all, when this *authentic document* shall appear in England; the misfortune will be, that no one man of sense will think it worth his reading.

Your

Your second charge is, that I speak of this MS as examined in the year 1690. This you represent yourself (thro' several lines) as vastly puzzled to account for: and yet you knew perfectly, at the same time, the true reason of this date; and you give the very reason yourself, after a deal of conjectural talk about it. The date was (as you say) taken from the end of the 33d Letter. And, since not the least thing depended upon a small variation in this case; I readily adopted the date of that Letter, as nearly pointing out (which it really does) the time of the transaction therein mentioned. You have taken solid pains to ascertain exactly *when* Huntingdon *did* examine this MS; or rather, *when* he *did not*; and tell us, that he could not examine it in 1690, because he returned to England before 1683. But, Sir; if he returned home before 1683; how comes his 12th Letter to be dated from Aleppo, in 1687? You will perhaps, say, *this must be a false date*. But your *saying*, and your *proving*, are not necessarily the same thing: and 'tis certain, that this date is not corrected (as wrong) amongst the Errata. If you should refer to *Smith's life of Huntington*; how are we sure, the date is more right there, than at the end of this 12th Letter? To fix the date in Smith's life of Huntington, you may perhaps refer me to the life of Smith himself, or to the lives, or to the letters of some persons who were contemporary; and from these, to other books corroboratory of the former: and so on to half an hundred volumes——and all this, to ascertain with great profusion of time and pains a circumstance, which (like that in the former article)

ticle) is not of the least importance to the argument in my Dissertation. Men of very operose diligence in labouring to ascertain points, which are not worth the knowing, seem far more reprehensible than those, who may have been inaccurate, here and there, from a desire to publish early such works, as are allowed to have *a very useful* tendency. A celebrated Classic writer says of himself —

*Quorum mulari exoptat negligentiam
Potius, quam istorum obscuram diligentiam.*

And it may safely be referred even to you; whether I myself (for instance) ought to have deferred publishing my last Dissertation till the present year, or till ten, or it may be twenty, years hence; merely for the sake of being exact in such things as you here object to, and call *inaccuracies*; because, if so, I should not have been now engaged in the prosecution of what you allow to be *a very useful work*, and in which (you say) *you heartily wish me success*.

There is a third inaccuracy, charged on this same extensive article of Huntington; which is, that in my catalogue of MSS, I have referred only to *one* Samar. MS at Naplose, but should have referred to *two*; because two were seen there by him. I answer now (as I did to you in person at Cambridge) that as the Samaritans presented one copy to Huntington, which is now in the Bodleian; the remainder of two, one being taken away, could be but one — that, had there been two left after this present was made (which you have not proved) there would not be therefore an inaccuracy in

my catalogue; because that was given, not as being perfect, but as confessedly incompleat — that, had Naplose contained two MSS at the end of the last century, it would by no means follow, they must both be still there, beyond the middle of the present century — and that, as Le Long and Wolfius mention only one MS, as being now at Naplose, and as Mr Ufgate (whom I mentioned p. 541) endeavoured very lately to purchase that one, saying nothing of any other; 'tis highly probable, there is but one (if that one be really existing) now at Naplose. It would therefore have been clearly wrong to have referred now to that place, as containing more MSS than one. And, had this been done; your accusation then would undoubtedly have been — *that I had multiplied MSS without full and sufficient authority.* And indeed, this is the very next charge exhibited, in proof of my inaccuracy.

You say (p. 63—66) that I have inserted in my Catalogue *one MS, as being at Pekin, in the library called Pan King Tchong; and this, without any authority, or without sufficient authority, or without authority properly referred to.* But, Sir, a reference of so particular a nature as mine would have led any candid man to suppose, there must have been some authority for it. I observed in my Dissertation, at p. 517, that *no one MS was inserted there without authority;* which shewed, that I did not intend to mention my authority for each MS; much less more authorities than one, tho' I might have more than one, and had very frequently. As to this *Pekin MS,* I referred to *Purchas's Relations, Vol. v,*

p. 150. This reference was made agreeably to the set of books I then borrowed, and made use of; the 1st Vol. of which, being reprinted after the other four, is (and was then) lettered on the back, as the 5th Vol. And, in the page I referred to, you allow there is mention made of a *Hebrew Bible at Peking*; which is not said to be, but which you presume to be, a printed one.

Now, Sir, as you are so desirous to know, what authority there may be for this MS; I will oblige you, by mentioning it — tho' there is one circumstance, which you may possibly dislike, in your particular character of *F. R. S.* For this Royal Society (of which you have the honour to be a Member) has obliged the World with many excellent Volumes, under the title of *Philosophical Transactions*; which Volumes you do not appear to have perused with the attention they well deserve: at least, you have forgot one very remarkable article, in a volume printed no longer ago than 1759. For in Vol. L. part II. p. 704, is begun a long and curious account of *F. Gaubil's* late description of *Peking*; and in p. 722 and 723, we read thus — *The Jews of Caifong fou first told the Jesuit Missionaries, that they conceived, that the Hebrew Bible was preserved at Peking in the place called Fan King Tchang — When I passed thro' Caifong fou, the Jews assured me, that I should find the Bible in the Fan King Tchang. These Jews had not been at Peking. What they said was in consequence of what they had been told by old Jews, who were deceased. When arrived at Peking, I made inquiries myself, and caused inquiries to be made by others;*

others; but I could not find the Bible. It is not yet an hundred years, since there were at Peking some Jewish families; which afterwards turned Mahometans. A Mahometan, who was a man of parts, assured me several times, that the Bible was in the possession of the Mahometans here, whose ancestors were Jews. &c. Hence therefore it seems clear, not only from the ancient tradition of the Jews, but also from the same enquiries made by F. Gaubil, and the assurances given to him at Peking, that some remarkable MS of the Hebrew Bible is, or was, at Peking; particularly in the library called *Fan King Tchang*, or kept together with the books called by the name of that repository, in which foreign books had been preserved. And such an account was abundantly sufficient to justify the mentioning a MS of the Hebrew Bible at Peking.

The next proof of your charge (in p. 66) is this — that in the library of *Trinity College*, Cambridge, are *three* Hebrew MSS; whereas I have mentioned but *one*. This article makes a very indifferent figure even here, after all your reformations of it: for it is in truth much corrected, since it was produced twelve months since. At Cambridge you began it with saying, that there were other Hebrew MSS in England, besides those mentioned in my Catalogue. I answered, I knew it very well; but that my Catalogue was intended to contain such MSS only, as were written before the invention of printing: and that, as to these, the Catalogue was confessedly given as incompleat; and I should be obliged to you, if you could acquaint me

with any ancient MSS, which I had not discovered. I soon found, you thought me careless in omitting the two other MSS in *Trinity Library*. You had not then seen these MSS; and I could not but acquaint you, there were four things you should have been certain of, before you had advanced this charge — that the two MSS were now in that library — that they were there, when I examined that library about nine years before — that I could have found them, when I examined — and that, if found, they were old enough to have been inserted in my catalogue. I added, that I well remembered my extracting the titles of all those three MSS from the printed catalogue, just as you had done; and my enquiring after all three: that I would engage, I either *could not find the other two, or found them too modern* for my purpose: and that I had some remembrance of finding one of them, which was written so lately, as not to be worth mentioning. But you yourself have now examined them; and you repeat this charge in your printed Letter. The points to be proved are — that *I could have found these two MSS*; and that *both of them were old enough to have been referred to*. As to the first point: it does not at all follow, that because they were to be found readily a few months ago, therefore they were to be found as readily ten years before: because the books may be now better disposed; and the College-Catalogue may have been new-modelled, or might not be then visible. And as to the second point: you allow *one of these little MSS to be very modern*, just as I had told you. And, as to the other; no one proof, or even presumption, do you venture

venture upon to fix its antiquity : but it is left in disgrace, with this humiliating recommendation, that *it is, you think, older than some which I have described*. So that the amount of this whole business is, that one of these MSS *is owned to be properly left out*, and the other *is not proved to be worth inserting* : and thus stand I convicted of having carelessly omitted these two valuable MSS!

This proof is (in p. 67) succeeded by another : which you likewise persevere to advance, tho' somewhat less satisfied with it than with the article preceding. When I was at Cambridge, after you had been silenced as to the Trinity MSS, you proceeded to remark — that there were *two Hebrew MSS in Gresham College*, but *I had taken no notice of either* ; tho' *they were both mentioned in the printed Catalogue of the MSS in England*. I answered, I had mentioned *one* of them. You replied, that this could not be, because the word *Gresham* was not to be found in my whole book. This led me to mention (another circumstance, which you ought particularly to have known, as being *F. R. S.*) that the MSS, formerly in *Gresham College*, were now in *Crane Court*, in the library of the Royal Society : and in this library I had found one of these MSS (and inserted it in my catalogue) and had also enquired after, but could not find, the other. You were greatly disturbed about this removal to *Crane Court* ; and emphatically demanded my authority. However, the very next day, you condescended to express your conviction, that *the Royal Society was formerly held at Gresham College*.

But you still insisted, that the MS, which I had mentioned in Crane Court, could not be the same with either of the two MSS formerly in Gresham College; because my description of it *did not agree* with the description of either of the others, as given in the printed catalogue. This assertion, decisively pronounced at first, is repeated both in your written and printed Letters. And your Readers have probably inferred, (as I myself did at first) that both the Gresham MSS certainly were described as containing *some book* or *books* of the old Testament, different from what I had described as being in the MS at Crane Court. And yet I must acquaint my other Readers, that one of the MSS at Gresham College, N^o. 474, is described in the very printed catalogue referred to by you, as containing *the Pentateuch* and no other book of the Bible. And, as the MS in Crane Court is described by me as containing *the Pentateuch*; it is strange you could so repeatedly assert, that these descriptions *did not agree* together. It will be in vain for you to endeavour to support your assertion, by saying, that *the Haphtaroth* are mentioned in the Gresham description, and not in mine; because *the Haphtaroth* make no book of the Bible: and even these detached sections are (I apprehend) imperfect in this MS. But, had these been compleat; *the descriptions* of the two MSS could not fairly be pronounced *different*; if they both expressed *the Pentateuch*, and no other book of the Bible. And thus Le Long (*cap. 2.*) refers to this same MS (*Bibl. Norfolc. cod. 474*) under this title *Pentateuchus Hebraeus*. You seem indeed to have had your
 appre-

apprehensions, upon this head; and therefore you not only secrete my description of the Crane Court MS (as not much caring for its being in juxtaposition with the description of the Gresham MS, N^o. 474) but you also very cautiously avoid mentioning even the word *Gresham*, in the text of your Pamphlet; and only slip it in, in the note — not being over-fond of the sight of a word, which must always prove a very mortifying memento.

With a determined spirit of perseverance you proceed (p. 67) to revive two other proofs of my Inaccuracy: which I never expected would have appeared again, as neither of them is capable of assuming even the shadow of an objection. In p. 492, I gave a list of SEVERAL writers, who (*during the PRESENT century*) have acknowledged that there are *corruptions in the printed Hebrew Text*. The accuracy of that list of mine depends entirely upon two points — that it is confined to writers in the *present century* — and that it professes to name *several*, not all, of these. And yet Dr Rutherford, referring to this very place, says — “*there is in your book a list of men of very eminent learning &c.*” first, quite omitting the word *several*; and then representing the list as imperfect, and not drawn up with sufficient care; when that very inaccuracy could only be proved by the absence of that very word, which he himself has dropped in his quotation.

I shall take the liberty here to declare, that there are other places, in which an argument is misrepresented by concealing an essential part of it. And,

to convince even the Professor, that there is an impropriety in this method of quotation; it may not be amiss to quote him himself imperfectly; once in the beginning, and once in the end of a sentence: in the following manner. Dr Rutherford does not care to be determined by the Public: for, in p. 3, he speaks of — *his objections to the judgment of the Public.* And, in p. 1, he says — *he should have made no difficulty about promising me to print his remarks, if he had not been afraid.* In this and the like unfair method, it is possible to make him, or any other writer, say what one pleases.

The Professor proposes to *encrease* THIS *List* (the list of writers in the *present* century) by a name or two, *which* he says *I may add to IT.* And who should the first man be, but *Mr Mede!* — that very *Joseph Mede*, who lived most assuredly (as the Professor here tells us) in the *last* century. Mr Mede therefore was necessarily excluded from the list of the *present* century; because he lived and died the ornament of the last.

'Tis true: the Professor tells me, that, *if I am ever disposed to extend my list into the last century, I may add to it Mr Mede.* But, if Mr Mede be thus evidently confined to the last century; how comes *he* to be at all mentioned, on this occasion (unless to prove an inaccuracy) any more than Bp Walton, and others, in the last century? My list is expressly confined to writers in the *present* century: and 'tis certain, the Professor begins with talking of his *encreasing this list* of mine by a name or two, *which I may add to it.*

As

As to *Dr Mangey*: the omitting *his* name, (tho' he was of the present century) proves no inaccuracy; because my list only proposes to name *several*; and it does name *several*, without him. The truth is; I had not read *Dr Mangey's* book, which is here referred to. — But perhaps the Professor may think it one mark of carelessness, for a man not to have read every book that ever was printed.

The last article, which (in p. 68) finishes what you call *the long digression*, is as extraordinary as any article preceding it. You must acknowledge, that I took a step likely to have prevented you from mistaking this particular. For when you objected at Cambridge, that I had not inserted *Mr Mann's* name in my list; I replied that mine was a list, not of books, but of *authors*; and the pamphlet called *Critical Notes &c.* was *anonymous*. And yet (all premonition to the contrary notwithstanding) you say, *you wonder at my not adding — Critical Notes on some passages of scripture (by Mr. Mann.)*

But, Sir, if this be *your* way of writing, to put a parenthesis at the end of a sentence; I must assure you, it is not mine. If you wonder at my not adding the name of the book; you have your answer — my list contains the names (not of books, but) of acknowledged authors. Your argument (such as it is) is this — I ought to have mentioned *Mr Mann* in my list, (in the body of my book) as the author of the *Critical Notes*; because I speak of him, (near the conclusion) as the author of them, *without any hesitation* — or, as it is expressed in your written Letter, *without the least hesitation*.

Our

Our Readers will judge, whether I speak of him, *without any, or the least hesitation*, as the certain and undoubted author. My words stand exactly thus — *Mr Langford's objections to (Mr Mann's) Critical Notes*. Here, with the titles of two books, are the names of two Gentlemen. But, are they not expressed with two very observable distinctions? Is not *Mr Mann's* name included in a parenthesis? And is not *that* printed in a different character from Mr Langford's; a character, different also from that which expresses both the books? And could these differences escape the critical eye of Dr Rutherford? Could so celebrated a publisher be a stranger to the meaning of those distinctions; could he possibly be ignorant, that they pointed out *Mr Langford* as the *declared* author of one book, and *Mr Mann* as only the *reputed* author of the other? And yet, in this very printed Letter, he affirms, that I speak of Mr Mann, as the author, *without any hesitation!*

Out of 174 pages, Sir, of which your Pamphlet consists, the large portion from p. 3 to 120 relates to the Samaritan Pentateuch (with above 9 pages more, which you say have *some connection* with that subject:) excepting about 8 pages relating to my Inaccuracies, which come in parenthetically, in the middle of your remarks about the Samar. Pentateuch. In p. 120 you say — *you persuade yourself, that you have shewn THE READER, and perhaps may have shewn ME, several instances &c.* So that I myself, to whom your Letter is addressed, and for *whose reading* therefore it should have been particularly intended,

intended, am here considered as *no reader* of it at all: and yet, immediately after, you speak of *my giving myself the trouble of reading* (i. e. I suppose, of being *the reader of*) *what follows*. These odd matters, which might be overlooked in other writers, are worthy of animadversion, when coming from You — who would be thought consummately accurate yourself, and the cause of accuracy in other men. The first article, which you give after your 119th page, relates to *the 13 places altered by the Jews*; which I had supposed to relate to *13 speeches in Exodus*. And concerning this matter, I shall only say — that 'tis surprizing, you should refer to Waiton and Leusden, with regard to places altered only in *the Greek Version* (which places however, as you allow, are *not* altered in the Greek Version) when the words of B. Chaim, which I quoted, evidently refer to *the Hebrew Text*. So that the tradition you mention, relative to the Greek Version, and the tradition mentioned by B. Chaim, relative to the Hebrew Text, proceed concerning quite different matters.

I shall now proceed to that, which you mentioned to me at Cambridge, as the grand proof of my Inaccuracy: an article, which, tho' expanded in your printed Letter, so as to fill several pages, may be fully and yet briefly stated. You objected, that I had misrepresented the Alexandrian MS, by asserting that (in 1 Sam. xvii, 12) it reads εἰπε, where it really reads εἰπεν. I answered, I could be positive I had not misrepresented it; but *bad expressed the word exactly as it stood in the edition I made use*

use of: and this appeared afterwards to be the real fact. I told you, that the edition I used, was *Breitinger's*; and indeed I had expressly given notice of this, in my first *Dissertation*, p. 18. You had not then examined this edition: but you certainly ought to have examined it (as I had declared *that* to be the very edition I used) before you had advanced this charge of a false quotation. I plead therefore, in answer to this capital accusation, that there was no carelessness, in giving the word exactly as it stood in my edition: but that Dr. Rutherford was very defective in his care, not to examine the very edition, which he knew (or ought to have known) I made use of, before he circulated this injurious charge. As to what you did, and do still urge (p. 141) that my reasoning would be much affected by reading *εἰπεν*, I still think (as I thought at first) that your observation as little merits the name of an *argument*, as any thing I ever met with from a writer of eminence: and also, that the reasoning in my *Dissertation* would hold just the same, whether the word be (both in *ver.* 12 and 32) *εἰπε* or *εἰπεν*. But this being a matter relative to *judgment*, not to *care*; I leave it to be judged of by our Readers: and proceed to your next proof of my Inaccuracy, which extends thro' four pages, beginning at p. 150.

And here — give me leave to congratulate myself on the result of your examination, as to *the copy of the Law found by Hilkiab*: an examination, which strongly confirms (the very thing it meant to overthrow) the only point in which my Accuracy could be here affected. I had expressed my opinion, that
the

the words, in 2 Chron. xxxiv, 14 (ספר תורת יהוה) ביד משה) *the book of the law of the Lord in (or by) the hand of Moses*, seem clearly to point out that particular MS, as the original MS in the hand-writing of Moses. And I observed, that the words here are expressed in a manner different from the expression in any other part of the Old Testament. I compared the words in this place with the words in 14 other places, which speak of the Law of Moses in general: and I asserted, that this was the only place worded in this particular manner. These 14 places I quoted, not as all the instances that could be produced, but as very sufficient to point out the distinction in this place. Here, Sir, you have been so obliging as to furnish out (*ex abundanti*) 4 other instances, to add to my 14: but you have been still more obliging, by not producing any instance (on the other side) which invalidates the singular peculiarity of the place I fixed upon. So that the phrase (*the book of the law of the Lord in the hand of Moses*) is virtually owned by you to be fully entitled to that character, of its being *without a parallel*, which I before ascribed to it.

I have thought it my duty, Mr Professor, to acknowledge some obligation to you, under the last article: and yet, what you have there offered is really a trifle, in comparison of what follows thro' 14 pages; from p. 154, which concludes the former article, to p. 168, which concludes the whole body of your animadversions. Permit me therefore to express my particular gratitude for your goodness

nests to me; in the contents of these 14 pages of yours; particularly, in p. 161.

I never doubted, but, when you came at last to reflect coolly on the injury you may have done me by your hasty and groundless accusations, you would be decently concerned; and become desirous of making me Satisfaction. But indeed, I did not expect to find this Satisfaction made so early, as in the very close of your present Pamphlet. And yet, strange as this may seem to other Readers, it is not more strange than true. There is, indeed, one circumstance in this affair, which may possibly lessen the merit of it, with respect to *you*: as it may not appear certain to all your Readers, that this act of Confession was intended. Possibly this matter may want a little elucidation to *you*, as well as to other Readers; and I shall now explain myself, by saying — that You, Sir, *have at last confessed*, that the very Book you have been writing against, that *that* very second Dissertation of mine, *does not contain one single mistake.* — Confession, you know, may be made two ways; either expressly, or by just implication: and the latter is only drawing a true consequence from true premises. Now, Mr Professor, (if I may be permitted to talk a little with you in your own way) the Syllogism stands thus —

You own (in p. 161) that *there is no one instance, in which I have made so many mistakes, as about the various reading, in Psa. xvi, 10.*

But *there is no one mistake, in my second Dissertation, in any circumstance which you have mentioned about this various reading.*

And

And therefore (when this is proved) it will follow from your own Confession, that *there is in that Dissertation no mistake at all.*

This Charge, Mr Professor, being reserved for the close of your performance, as an article of particular consequence, I shall give it particular attention: especially, as you have lavished upon it every ornament in your power both rhetorical and critical. You begin with saying — *To give the reader a full view of this inaccuracy, it will be necessary to carry him back to my first Dissertation:* and thither I accordingly follow you. At p. 496, I began a remark on *Psa. xvi, 10;* observing, that in this verse the word rendered *thy holy one* is almost universally printed plural in the Hebrew Bibles: which plural reading, if it were true, would invalidate the reasoning both of *St Peter* and *St Paul*, on a point of singular importance. But that this plural reading was a corruption of the original Text, and was very happily proved so by far the greater part of the Hebrew MSS now existing. For, that I had examined 24 MSS, which contain this Psalm; 17 of which had the word singular.

That this whole matter may be cleared from the strange obscurity, with which you have involved, and puzzled it, by your own wrong conjectures, thro' near 8 long pages; I shall here give a table of the MSS, with their numbers, as they are marked in both my Dissertations: and afterwards explain the particulars.

1st Dissertation:		2d Dissertation:	
N ^o .		N ^o .	
2	sing.	1	36
3	sing.	4	2
4	sing.	2	3
5	sing.	3	16
6	plur.	16	18
7		18	29
13	sing.	29	wants <i>Psa.</i> 16.
27		32	
31	sing.	32	
32	sing.	33	
33	sing.	34	
34	sing.	35	
35	sing.	37	
36	sing.	38	
37	sing.	39	
38	plur.	40	
53		65	wants <i>Psa.</i> 16.
59	plur.	58	
60	sing.	59	
64	plur.	61	
65			written in 1602.
<i>Camb.</i> 1	sing.	72	
2	sing.	68	
3	sing.	73	
4	sing.	74	
		28	
		71	
		75	
		76	
		77	
		92	
		93	wants <i>Psa.</i> 16.
		94	
		96	
		100	
<i>Lambeth MS</i>		102	

In the preceding table the left column of figures expresses the numbers assigned to the MSS, in my first Dissertation; and the column on the right hand expresses the same MSS, as numbered in my second: the words singular and plural in the inner columns pointing out such of these MSS, as were said in my Dissertations to have the singular or plural reading. Now it so happens, that there are, concerning this matter, two (and only two) mistakes; both which are in my *first* Dissertation, *which you say contained the strongest proofs of very extraordinary diligence*: not one, not a single mistake being here made, in any circumstance pointed out by you, in my *second* Dissertation; in that Book, which you so warmly accuse of Inaccuracy, particularly upon this very article.

One of the mistakes (and a very easy one) is this: my first Dissertation asserts, that I had examined 24 MSS, which contain *this Psalm*; whereas it should have been said — contain *the Psalms*, because some of the MSS were in this part defective. This is the case of N^o. 27; which you allow (p. 158) to be the same with N^o. 29 in my second Dissertation. This MS wants from *Psa.* xiv, 7 to xviii, 11: notice of which I gave in my second Dissertation, at p. 578. And yet You, the infallible corrector of Inaccuracy, have been so very unfortunate as to overlook this essential notice; and have thereby run into a world of wild conceits, perplexing yourself and your Readers with more mistakes than are easy to be enumerated. One thing farther is necessary to be observed here; which is, that N^o. 7 in my first Dissertation should have been reckoned

as having the *singular* reading; which omission, tho' it be an error, is only to be found in my *first* Dissertation.

And now, if we reckon the MSS numbered in the first column; their analysis is this — N^o. 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 60, and the *Cambridge* MSS 1, 2, 3, 4, (all which amount to 17 MSS) were quoted as having the *singular* reading: to which may be now added N^o. 7, which makes the number 18 — N^o. 6, 38, 59 and 64, are the four MSS containing the *plural* reading — N^o. 27 and 53 want the 16th Psalm — and N^o. 65 was never reckoned on either side, because written so late as 1602.

If now we reckon the MSS, numbered in the right hand column, their divisions are — three MSS wanting the 16th Psalm — four having the *plural* reading — and 27 having the *singular*; which number becomes 28, by adding to it the *Lambeth* MS, N^o. 102. Your first quotation (p. 155) from my 2d Dissertation upon this head is — that *I had examined 31 MSS, 27 of which are here singular*: these enumerations are both right, as may be learnt from the preceding table. In p. 156 you observe, that *the whole number of 31 MSS becomes 32, and the 27 singular MS become 28, by the addition of the Lambeth MS*: which particulars are both evidently right, and may be learnt from the preceding table.

In p. 158, you say, *the whole number of MSS of the Psalms appears from the end of my 2d Dissertation to be 35*: this is right, as may be seen by the table. But when you say (in the same page) that *of these 35 there are 33, which have this Psalm*; this is not right,

right, as may be seen by the table: because N^o 29 also is here defective; which you (*at the expence of your accuracy*) have not attended to, tho' I had expressly pointed it out in p. 578.

Thus at last are we arrived at the end of (what you are pleased to call) *this train of Inaccuracies*; relative to this famous word in the 16th Psalm, as expressed in the Hebrew MSS. And it being now clear, that not one mistake is made in my 2d Dissertation, in any circumstance referred to by you, upon this article (all the circumstances referred to by you having been here quoted) it must follow, in fair consequence from your own words, and by regular syllogism, that no one mistake is made in my whole second Dissertation — you affirm, *there are more mistakes here than any where*; and here you have found none at all.

Here then I might fairly take my leave; and retire, with many thanks for this last instance of your goodness to me. For surely, whoever else may prove my second Dissertation to be erroneous; *you yourself* are now become its *advocate*: you must henceforth contend for its being perfectly right; you must allow it to be uniformly, and universally, free from all mistake; at least, from *all mistakes arising from want of care*.

But there are still a few points in your Pamphlet, which it seems necessary for me to refer to: not indeed necessary, for your own sake (for you might be now fairly considered as out of the question) but for the sake of my other Readers. Hav-

ing dispatched the account of *the MSS*, relative to this famous word in Psalm 16; your Letter (p. 162 &c.) gives an account of the *printed* copies. In my first Dissertation I had said, that this word was printed plural *almost universally*; which is true: and yet you, by reckoning up 21 printed Bibles and Pfalters, which have it singular (for 2 of which you are indebted to my Book) would fain persuade your Readers, that almost half the printed copies have the singular reading. Nay, in the transport of your zeal, you represent the singular editions as being *more* than the plural ones. For observe — the plural editions you call *SOME*; but the singular editions you call *SEVERAL OTHERS, SOME of which are capital ones*. Now, as *some* in the latter case is but a part of, and is included in, *several*; (for *multum minus continet in se majus*) it must imply *less*: and if *several* implies more than *some*; then the *several* singular editions are here represented as more than the *some* plural ones. But, Sir, it appears from the Catalogues of *Le Long*, *Wolfius*, and others, that there have been printed of the Psalms about 200 different editions; probably there have been more: and what then becomes of your pompous enumeration? The proportion between 20 editions and 200 is most evidently that of *ten to one*; which proportion fully justifies my assertion, that the word is printed plural *almost universally*. And, as to your remarking, that *some of the capital editions* read *singularly* here; surely the most capital editions, ever published, are the *Antwerp*, the *Paris*, and the *London Polyglotts*, with *Buxtorf's* and *Hou-*
bigant's

Bigant's Hebrew Bibles: and in all these the word is plural.

With regard to my *first Proposals*, in which I observed, that *the printed Hebrew Text invalidates the reasoning of two Apostles*, because the famous word (in *Psa. xvi*) is printed *plurally*: that expression (notwithstanding your objections) is very fairly vindicable. The *Proposals* were only an Abridgment of my *Dissertations*; and it is not usual for an Abridgment to be so large, and so particular, as the thing abridged. In a short general sketch of any scheme, things must be expressed in a general way: as here, *the printed Hebrew Text* evidently means the Text as generally printed. For had the assertion been meant as absolute and unlimited; it would have been said *all the printed editions*, or, *as the Text is printed always*, or *universally*. But if this general expression were really liable to be misunderstood by any, who read *the Proposals only*; yet there must be great forgetfulness, or notorious unfairness, if it be misrepresented by any of *those*, who have read my previous *Dissertations*: in which the general expression is properly limited and circumscribed.

But, tho' I have hitherto contended for no more than this, — that *the word is printed plural almost universally*; I will now advance farther, and (agreeably to the expression in my *second Proposals*) assert, that *this word is printed plural in the Hebrew Text by Masoretic authority*. The Masora being the sacred Rabbinical rule for publishing the Hebrew Bible; when men speak of the perfection of the

Hebrew Text, they speak of it as it is printed *Masoretically*: and I apprehend, that at least one of Dr Rutherford's Latin Sermons, at Cambridge, has been *De Textu Masoretico*. Now, Sir, I here assert, that the word in dispute is printed plural (not *almost*, but) *universally*, in *every* Masoretical edition: and whatever edition has this word in the Text singular, is Anti-Masoretical. For the Masora commands, that in the margin of this verse there be placed this note — יתיר' *abundat yod*: which letter *yod* (here meant) is in the word חסידים the mark of the plural number. Nothing therefore can be more clear than this, that that very Masora, which orders into the Margin this note (*that the plural yod is redundant*) must order the word to be printed with that plural *yod* in the Text: because without that *plural yod* in the Text, the marginal note would be egregious nonsense. And thus (without remarking the absurdities of your own creation, in p. 167, about Keri & Cetib) 'tis manifest, that this famous word is printed plural, by the authority of the Masora, *universally*. Consequently, it must afford very great satisfaction to every other person but yourself, that TWENTY EIGHT out of *Thirty Two* MSS are found to contain a very important reading — agreeable to the *Context* — agreeable to *the Ancient Versions* — and agreeable to *the New Testament* — in a place, where a reading contrary to all these authorities obtains in *almost all* the printed editions, and in *every* edition that is printed conformably to *the Masora*.

There are, Sir, some other matters, which ought not to pass quite unnoticed. In p. 5, you begin a charge,

a charge, which you frequently repeat, *that I am much obliged to Mr Whiston, without acknowledging it.* I reply, that I *expressly referred* to Mr Whiston, as having given *valuable observations* on the very point there treated of. But, there was no occasion to own *obligations* to this or that man for arguments, which did occur to me, and might occur to any man writing on the same subject: (such as, that *Gerizim* was the mount of blessing, and *Ebal* of cursing &c.) which every person may find in the Bible. I asserted (which is true) that Mr Whiston had not touched upon *the strongest arguments*; and of these there is One particularly forcible to persuade us, that *Gerizim* was in fact the mount of THE ALTAR, because it is universally allowed to have been the mount of THE LEVITES, who were the only men to officiate at that very Altar. And, as to some of the other arguments; that the same remarks might occur, and actually have occurred (in the case before us) to others, without their *borrowing* them, I will shew you by a quotation from an Account of my *Second Dissertation*, published by a very learned Professor, in the University of *Göttingen*, in the year 1760.

The first chapter (says he) of Mr Kennicott's Book treats of the authority of the so much impugned Samaritan Pentateuch. The passage in Deut. xxvii, 4. has been constantly alledged as a demonstration, that the Samar. Text improperly reads Gerizim, where the Hebrew Text reads Ebal. And here we have really wondered at ourselves; that we should so long have been taught, and could have been persuaded, that the Samar. Text was to be condemned, for this reason only, because

the Jews were against it. After perusing Mr Kennicott's reasons, and indeed as soon as he had given us notice that we ought to doubt, we were convinced that the Jews, out of hatred to the Samaritans, did very early alter their own Text. Our author's reasons are so very natural, that we partly fell upon them, before we read them in his Book &c. I shall only add farther, from this Account, (in opposition to one of your general charges) that the learned Professor is pleased to say, Mr Kennicott's Continuation greatly excels the first Essay, and his JUDGMENT is much more mature in the SECOND, than in the First Dissertation.

The preceding article of yours leads me to another (from p. 25 to 29) where you strenuously exert yourself to prove, that *Gerizim* was not a *blessed* mount, nor *Ebal* a *curfed* mount. But, why is time to be lavished away, in labouring to prove what is not denied, and to deny what is not attempted to be proved? You yourself allow (p. 28) that I have stated this matter properly: for you say — “*Gerizim* was, AS YOU EXPLAIN YOURSELF, “*the mount, from the top of which, or on the side of which, the blessings were to be proclaimed.*”

I shall only add, as to *Gerizim* and *Ebal*; that, in p. 106 you observe, *if the blessings and cursings related to any place at all, it was not the place, on which the person stood who pronounced them, but the place, towards which he turned his face.* So that you would, it seems, fain at last persuade us to call *Ebal* the mount of *bleffing*, and *Gerizim* the mount of *curfing*! This attempt is, it must be owned, new and striking: and, upon a subject of less impor-

tance, one might have been entertained with so ingenious a paradox.

Of a similar nature is your remark, in p. 17; where you say, that *my looking upon a verse in Samuel as interpolated* (and consequently as of no authority) *is the very reason why you chose to quote it.* And thus again, in p. 54, you assert that *the proper inference from the parable of the GOOD Samaritan, and the history of the THANKFUL Samaritan, is — that the Samaritans in our Saviour's time were in general bad men!*

To this same superior faculty of discernment may be ascribed several other articles in your Pamphlet. Such as your discovering (in p. 173) that *the learned Houbigant has placed his corrections in the MARGIN of his edition*: whereas it was universally believed before, that his corrections were all placed, amongst the notes, at the end of the several chapters. In p. 130 you undertake to prove, that the remark in my second Volume, relative to the first book of *Esdra's, is not new*; and you really seem to think, that you have proved this: but the misfortune is, that, amongst the several testimonies you have produced, not one of them answers the purpose of its quotation. And, in p. 135, you quote Solomon's words — *one man amongst a thousand have I found; but a woman amongst all those have I not found.* Where you ask — *what! only one man — and only one woman —* when yet Solomon speaks of *only one man found, but of no one woman found* at all.

Some short notice should likewise be taken of your abuse upon the venerable St Jerom, p. 10: and of your treatment of the very learned Reland

(p. 94) together with your reflections upon both the *Hebrew* and *Arabic* Languages; in one part of which indeed you have a few writers to countenance you—so prone are some men to despise what they do not understand. But, as the knowledge of one of these Languages is highly useful, and the knowledge of the other is absolutely necessary, for giving us the true sense of the *OLD TESTAMENT*; a great reverence expressed for Both was naturally expected from a Gentleman of your particular character. Your indulging yourself therefore in first forming strange combinations of *Hebrew* words, and then bantering uncertain etymologies as a subject of pleasantry, is indeed matter of some surprize.

If we are not to suppose an *oversight*, or *want of care*, in you; there is then another unexpected instance of your pleasantry, in p. 47; where, in order to shew the greatness of my *inaccuracy*, you spell this particular word with a double N; and, as if pleased with the conceit, you ask me—“*Have you any reason to be offended, if I call it an innaccuracy?*” Should this be declared seriously to be *an error of the Press*; yet even then we must consider, *who it was that corrected the Press*, and revised the publication. And, that this could be no other person than *the Author Himself*, appears fully from the very uncommon number of *cancelled leaves*; instead of which others have been reprinted, as being either *more judicious*, or *more accurate*, than those of the first impression.

It must not be forgotten, that you give a very strange misrepresentation of my words, in pages

169, 170. Since the Hebrew (as well as other) MSS must entirely perish by time, and since some of the Hebrew MSS, now extant, are already become illegible in many places; I observed in my Proposals — that, when the Various Readings in these MSS shall be collected and published, they will form a safe and authentic record; which will be always ready for use, tho' the MSS themselves should entirely perish. In which inoffensive words I am represented by you as declaring, that, *as soon as I shall have collated any MS, IT MAY BE IMMEDIATELY BURNT; for that no body else can ever have any occasion to look into it afterwards* — with which very candid state of the matter, as something in which you have been particularly happy, you conclude your long Letter!

But, before I conclude, I must yet desire the attention of my other Readers to the few following particulars.

In p. 35 you affirm, that *upon the authority of the VATICAN MS ONLY I determine, that 39 verses have been interpolated in Samuel.* After which you ask — *How therefore can I refuse to approve of a reading, which has the authority both of this MS, and likewise of the Alexandrian?* Nothing then can be clearer, than that you here charge me with determining the verses in Samuel to be interpolated, on the authority of the *Vatican MS only*, and *not at all* on the authority of the *Alexandrian MS.* Yet every one, who has attentively read my Book, must know that I lay a very remarkable stress on the *Alexandrian MS* likewise, in the very case you mention.

mention. And indeed (so very repugnant is this part of your Letter to several other parts of this same Letter!) in p. 140 you yourself say — that, *to prove the interpolation of 20 of these 39 verses, I produced the evidence of the Alexandrian MS itself.* So again, in pages 141, 142; you speak of the argument, which *I introduce as a demonstration from the very words of the Alexandrian MS itself.* And farther: you mention again, on this very same point, in that very same 142d page, this very same Alexandrian MS, as having been quoted by me upon this very same occasion. Notwithstanding all which affirmations of yours, about my having referred to the Alexandrian MS; you are found to affirm, that I determine the 39 verses to be interpolated on the authority of *the Vatican MS only!* In your Pamphlet there is the following description of an *Accurate Scholar*: page 168. *To see clearly and distinctly every part and circumstance of the subject, upon which one is writing; to attend to all of them, so as to make all ones reasonings and conclusions about it consistent with them; in reading what others have written on the same subject to take notice of every fact related by them, which has any connection with it, and of every observation, which they have made upon it; and then to remember all these minutely, when there is occasion to apply them.* The equity of your claim, Sir, to this character may be partly judged of from the *clear and distinct* view you had of the several parts of your own Pamphlet; particularly such parts, as relate to my quoting (on the same point) the *Vatican MS ONLY, and the Alexandrian MS ALSO.*

You

You attempt to be very severe (in p. 132) on my having read Le Clerc's *Ars Critica*, either *carelessly*, or *not at all*. But, what will the learned World think, Sir, of *you* — a Writer, who can talk of his own acquaintance with that book, and *with the rules of Criticism* there contained; and yet can offend so notoriously against the grand rule of Composition, called *Consistency*. And especially, such an Author; as can write a Pamphlet of near 200 pages; and, at the conclusion of it, can, by one single concession, *give up his whole performance* — can publish many charges of Inaccuracy against a certain Book, which very Book he virtually acknowledges to contain *no mistake at all!*

Your Conclusion, consisting of two pages, contains one thing not yet taken notice of, which requires particular attention: and it is the only part of your Pamphlet I shall farther remark upon. It relates to the appearance of Contrariety in your Conduct, in your publishing *such* a Pamphlet against *one*, whom you had *recommended to your University*, as a person *well qualified* for the work he is engaged in. It should be carefully observed here, that this recommendation of yours took place, *after* you had perused my *second Dissertation on the Hebrew Text*: after your being acquainted with the contents of that very Book, which you now endeavour to prove so very *injudicious* and so very *inaccurate*.

As to the degree of favour shewn me by *you*, at the time of my undertaking the Collation of the

Hebrew

Hebrew MSS, and *so much pains as* (you tell me in your written Letter) *you took to obtain a Subscription for me from your University*: I find by your printed Letter, that these endeavours of yours were such, as lay me under no very great obligations. You say, p. 168 — *you never from your first reading of my book made any secret of your opinion about it*: that is, I suppose, you publicly declared it to be *very injudicious and very inaccurate*. But, was it, Sir, quite prudent for you (in regard to your own character as well as mine) to have been so very precipitate with your censures upon my Book, as to declare them openly, and without scruple, after *the very first reading of it*? Were not many of the particulars such, as required some thought, and some examination? And, after you had once published the sentence of condemnation; was it easy to bring yourself to retract, if *upon a second reading* you had found yourself mistaken? I have never heard, Sir, that *giving up* is the distinguishing ornament of your character. And indeed, in *your case*, this must have been particularly difficult; because a confession of *being wrong* would come rather ungracefully from the Professorial Chair. On these accounts therefore, and in a case of this particular nature, where a Work was on the point of being undertaken, which you allow will be of *great utility* to the Public; it would certainly have been adviseable for you to have acted somewhat more cautiously, and not to have charged the undertaker of this Work so liberally with Absurdity and Carelessness, upon *the very first reading of his Dissertation*.

But,

But, Mr Professor; as you *never made any secret of your opinion* about my Book, and as that opinion of yours was so mighty unfavourable; surely the influence of your recommendation could weigh but little. Nor was it possible for the worthy Governors of your University to pay any great attention to a Gentleman; who should exhort them to commit a very important Work (the chief merit of which would consist in its *accuracy*) to the care of one, whom the recommender himself, without the least reserve, pronounced *remarkably inaccurate*.

As to the Subscription itself, with which I have been favoured by THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE; I consider it as one of the greatest Honours of my Life, and one of the strongest Sanctions given to my Undertaking: and I think myself particularly obliged to all those, to whose influence this Patronage was principally owing. You will excuse me, Mr Professor, if I say, that there are Two much more considerable Persons, to whom I stand chiefly indebted, and shall ever think myself under signal obligations, for your University Subscription. One of these is *His Grace*, Your Noble CHANCELLOR; who condescended to assure me, that *He had heard the Undertaking so highly spoken of, that he should immediately recommend it to the Favour of the University of Cambridge*. And His Grace was afterwards pleased to assure me, *He had recommended it*; and He acquainted me with the University Subscription.

But tho' I am bound to express *the most grateful Acknowledgments*, where the Obligations conferred

ed are *greatest* (as they certainly are to THE GREAT PERSON just mentioned, and to HIM by whom the affair was recommended to His Grace) yet I hope never to be wanting in proper acknowledgments to all my Benefactors. At the close of your Pamphlet (p. 168, 169) you speak of *the share, which you may have had in recommending my proposals — of your speaking favourably of them to some members of your senate — and of your applying to your University to contribute towards paying me for my trouble, and bearing my expences, in carrying on this work*: for which favours I publickly desire you to accept my thanks.

At the beginning of your Pamphlet (p. 2) you are pleased to speak of yourself as *a Contributor to my success*. But if you can think yourself *a Contributor*, only by pretending to put me more upon my guard; and can suppose, that in consequence of your Pamphlet I may resolve to be more careful; you will certainly be disappointed: for I was before absolutely determined to exert *all the Care in my power*. As to what you speak of, in p. 169, and call *accuracy in the highest degree*; this I will by no means pretend to: and indeed, I know but of *one person* in the world, who thinks himself worthy of such a character. In short: as to your being *a Contributor*, I shall only say farther — that there are, 'tis true, very different ways of contributing to a man's success in the world; and *one* of these no doubt is — by shewing *how little* can be said, *to the purpose*, to hurt him in the good opinion of the Public. And if this, Sir, was your benevolent and kind intention, in publishing your Pamphlet; you are then certainly entitled to my Gratitude.

But,

Dr RUTHERFORTH. 65

But, if the contrary was intended; then, Sir, you will give me leave to say: that, had I been ever so worthy of public reprehension, for my *Injudiciousness* and *Inaccuracy*, yet You — who had pronounced me *very extraordinarily diligent*, and *singularly sagacious* — You, who had declared, that *I have proved myself every way equal to the undertaking a critical edition of the Hebrew Bible* — You, who had acknowledged me to have been happily successful in many of my *Improvements of our English Version*, and of my *Critical Corrections of the Hebrew Text* — You, who (after reading my *second Dissertation*) assured me, that *you had ALWAYS said, the Collation of the Hebrew MSS was a very useful Work, and that I was a proper person to undertake it* — You, who took so much pains to obtain for me your *University Subscription* — You, who were glad to find, that *I would undertake this Work, because you knew of no one so well qualified for it as myself, who would be willing to set down to it* — You, Sir, should certainly have been the last man in England to have been my Censor on this occasion. But,

*Missa hæc faciamus: non Te dignum — — —
Fecisti: nam si ego dignus hæc contumeliâ
Sum maxime, at Tu indignus qui faceres tamen.*

I am,

Mr Professor,

with all due respect,

E Your &c.

LONDON:
Feb. 25th 1762.

P O S T S C R I P T.

IN your Introduction to *The Essay upon Virtue*, you thought proper, Sir, to publish your resolution of not replying to any objections to that Work. On the authority therefore of your own example, I may safely venture to say—that *I do not intend to reply to any farther objections to my Dissertation*. And, considering the Work in which I am engaged, and in which you yourself affirm *you heartily wish me success*—a Work, in which I am honoured, not only with a Patronage beyond example in *England*, but also with the warm Approbation and public-spirited Assistance of the Learned in various parts of *Europe*—considering, I say, this Work, which I am bound by the strongest obligations to prosecute, and with the closest application: I think it my duty to make the preceding Declaration. I shall only add, that the words, in your Introduction before-mentioned, are (on *some accounts*) so particularly applicable, that I shall make no scruple to adopt them; and shall therefore conclude with declaring— that *I have said at once that I design to say*, upon this subject; *for I have neither leisure, nor inclination, to engage in a Controversy*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THERE has been lately printed A State of the Collation of the Hebrew MSS; containing an Account of the Progress made in the Work, with a List of the Subscribers to it, at the end of the year 1761. And the said State will be delivered, gratis, by either of the Booksellers mentioned in the Title page of this Pamphlet.