

Reproduced from the Library of the Editor of
www.theSamaritanUpdate.com
Copyright 2011

*Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible:
With Two Preliminary Lectures on Theological Study and Theological Arrangement.
To Which are Added Two Lectures on the History of Biblical Interpretation.*

By **Herbert Marsh**, D.D. F.R.S. & F.S.A.

Lady Margaret's professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and Bishop of
Peterborough.
New Edition.

London:
Printed for J.G. & F. Rivington,
St. Paul's Church Yard,
And Waterloo Place, Pall Mall
1838

London:
Gilbert & Rivington, Printers
St. John's Square.

(p. 197)

But soon after the publication of Buxtorfs Tiberias a discovery was made, which gave a new turn to the sentiments of the learned, not only in respect to the Hebrew *letters* and *points*, but in regard to the *text itself*. It had been long known, that the Samaritans, originally descended from the ten tribes who revolted in the reign of Rehoboam, and still existing as a separate sect in Samaria and its neighbourhood, possessed the five books of Moses in a form peculiar to themselves. But from the time of Eusebius and of Jerom, who have noticed this Samaritan Pentateuch, no European appears to have *seen* it till the beginning of the seventeenth century, when Pietro della Valle, during his travels in the East, obtained not only a copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch *itself*, but also a *translation* of it into the Samaritan language. The latter he took with him to Rome: the former he sent to Harlaeus de Sancy, one of the Fathers of the Oratory at Paris, who presented it in 1620 to the library of that religious house.

No event in the history of literature has excited more sensation, than the discovery of this Samaritan Pentateuch. It was observed, that, though its *letters* are very different from the Hebrew, it contained the same Hebrew *words* as the *common* manuscripts; and that, though its *text* was in many places different, it manifestly contained the same *work*. It was further observed, that its letters were no where accompanied with vowel points. It was then considered, that, as the Pentateuch is the *only* part of the Bible, which is received by the Samaritans, their copies of it must have been derived, if not from *those of their ancestors*, who seceded from the tribe of Judah, *at least* from some copy antecedent to the Babylonish Captivity. For if their sacred books had been received from the Jews *after* the Babylonish Captivity, they would not have been confined to the five books of Moses. This argument was strengthened by the reflection, that the animosity between the Jews and the Samaritans commenced immediately on the return of the former from Babylonia. It was therefore as improbable, that the Samaritans should *then* borrow from the Jews, as it was improbable, that their *forefathers* should have seceded without *some* copies of the Law, which was the rule both of their *civil* and of their *religious* institutions. Finally, as the Jews, who returned to Palestine at the expiration of the captivity, returned with the language of their Chaldean masters, and the *letters* of this (p. 199) language were the letters, in which the Jews have written since that period, the supposition, that, with their language, they exchanged also their *letters*, while the Samaritans *retained* them, appeared more probable, than that the letters of the Jews were *originally* the same with those of the Chaldees, and that the exchange took place on the part of the *Samaritans*. It was inferred therefore, that the *original* alphabet of the sacred writings was not the *Chaldee*, but the

Samaritan: and as the Samaritan letters are not accompanied with points, it was further concluded, that the points *now* used with the Hebrew or Chaldee letters were the invention of a later age.

Such were the reflections suggested by the examination of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Four years had not elapsed from the arrival of the copy of it in the Oratory at Paris, when Ludovicus Cappellus, Hebrew Professor at the French Protestant University of Saumur, composed his celebrated work, *Arcanum punctationis revelatum*. This work contains almost all the arguments, which have been since used against the antiquity of the Hebrew points; and they are stated so fully and clearly, that the subject appeared to be exhausted in the first essay on it. But as the opinion, that the Hebrew points were of modern origin, was likely, when first advanced, to be regarded as an infringement on the integrity even of the *text*, Cappellus had the precaution to send his work in the manuscript to be examined by Buxtorf, who returned it with the request that it might not be printed. Cappellus then sent it to Erpenius, Professor of the Oriental languages at Leyden, who so approved of it, that with the permission of the author he printed it at Leyden in 1624. Buxtorf made no reply to it: and as he died about five years afterwards, he left it to be answered by his son, who was likewise Professor in the University of Basel. But many years elapsed before the younger Buxtorf had prepared an answer to Cappellus. In the mean time Johannes Morinus, one of the Fathers of the Oratory at Paris, attacked the antiquity of the Hebrew *letters* in his *Exercitationes Ecclesiasticae*, printed at Paris in 1631. And as the antiquity of the *letters* appeared more important, perhaps also more defensible, than the antiquity of the *points*, the younger Buxtorf made his first essay in a defence of the Hebrew letters, entitled *Dissertatio de literarum Hebraicarum genuina antiquitate*. The precise year when this treatise was *first* published is not known: but in 1645 it received an answer from Cappellus in his *Diatriba de veris et antiquis Hebraeorum literis*, in which Cappellus contended, as Morinus had *already* done, that the *true* and the *ancient* letters of the Hebrews (p. 201) were no other than the Samaritan. In 1648 the younger Buxtorf made his reply to Cappellus on the subject of the *points*, in a work entitled, *Tractatus de punctorum vocalium et accentuum in libris Veteris Testamenti Hebraicis origine, antiquitate, et auctoritate, oppositus Arcano punctationis revelato Ludovici Cappetti*. To this work Cappellus prepared an answer entitled *Arcani punctationis Vindicice*. But he died before the publication of it: and his son, to whom it was left in manuscript, did not publish it till many years after the death also of his opponent Buxtorf.

This controversy about the antiquity of the Hebrew *letters and points* must be carefully distinguished from another controversy hereafter to be mentioned, in which Cappellus and the younger Buxtorf were likewise engaged, on the *integrity of the Hebrew text*: for the two controversies, though in some measure connected, and frequently confounded, rest on totally distinct grounds. In the opinion, that the Hebrew or Chaldee character was not used by the Jews till after the Babylonish Captivity, and that the present system of vowel points was introduced in a still later age, the most distinguished Hebrew scholars, with a very few exceptions, have sided with Cappellus.

(p. 202) From the controversy on the *letters and points* we must proceed to the more important controversy, which relates to the *words*. Of *this* controversy, and of the subsequent labours of the learned to provide a critical apparatus for the purpose of amending the Hebrew text, an account will be given in the following Lecture.

(p. 203) CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE. LECTURE IX.

WE are now entering on a question of much greater moment, than the antiquity, either of the Hebrew points, or of the Hebrew letters, namely the integrity of the Hebrew *text*. The *Utters* may have been *changed*, the *points* may be *new*, yet the *words* may have remained *the same*.

To prevent confusion in this inquiry, we should previously determine the meaning of the expression "*integrity of the Hebrew text*." The text of an ancient author may be said to have preserved its integrity, if it has descended to the present age in such a state, as *upon the whole* the author gave it. If we go further, and require a *perfect* uniformity in all the copies of an ancient work, before we will grant, that its integrity is preserved, we require more, than it is possible to (p. 204) obtain: for it is impossible to multiply *written* copies of a work, without *some* deviation from the author's own manuscript. We have seen however that Buxtorf, in the second chapter of his *Tiberias*, carried his notions on this subject so high, as to deny the existence of variations in the Hebrew text; and thus, by placing its integrity on a *false basis*, exposed it to the danger of being questioned upon grounds, which constitute no real cause of impeachment.

The *first* person who combated the opinion of Buxtorf on *this* subject, was not Cappellus, but Johannes Morinus, who, as mentioned in the preceding Lecture, was a priest of the Oratory at Paris, the religious house which possessed the first-known copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Of this Pentateuch Morinus gave a short account in the preface to his edition of the Septuagint, which was printed at Paris in 1628. He gave a more copious account of it, as also of its translation into the Samaritan language, in his *Exercitationes Ecclesiasticae in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum*, published at Paris in 1631, in which he not only maintained (as related in the preceding Lecture) that the Samaritan *letters* were the ancient letters of the Jews, but also, that the

Samaritan *Pentateuch*, or the Pentateuch as written with Samaritan *letters*, contains a (p. 205) more ancient and accurate text of the five books of Moses, than the *Hebrew Pentateuch*, or the Pentateuch as written with the common *Hebrew letters*. In 1632 the Samaritan Pentateuch, with its translation into the Samaritan language, was under the inspection of Morinus printed in the sixth volume of the Paris Polyglot: and in 1633 Morinus published the first volume of his *Exercitationes Biblicae de Hebrcei Graecique textus sinceritate*, which was reprinted many years afterwards (in 1669) with the addition of a second volume.

The object of these *Exercitationes Biblicae* is to show that the Hebrew Bible has descended to posterity in a very imperfect state; not that the Jews had *wilfully* corrupted the sacred writings, but that they had transcribed them so *negligently*, as to have lost in very numerous instances the original and genuine text. To establish this position, Morinus appealed not to any diversity, which might be found in the Hebrew manuscripts; for a collation of Hebrew manuscripts seemed at *that time* to form no part of the business of a Hebrew critic, whether this omission was owing to the circumstance, that the Hebrew manuscripts were chiefly in the hands of the Jews, or that the prevalent opinion in regard to their general coincidence deterred men from undertaking a task supposed to be useless. Mori- (p. 206) nus appealed to the differences between the Hebrew and the Samaritan text in the Pentateuch, and to the differences between the Hebrew and the Septuagint in other parts of the Bible. As he *believed* that the *Samaritan Pentateuch* contained a more ancient and correct text, than the *Hebrew Pentateuch*, he *concluded*, that the latter was incorrect, where it differed from the former. And, as the Septuagint version was made from manuscripts, which must have been older by a thousand years, than the *oldest* of the Hebrew manuscripts extant in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, or from which any edition of the Hebrew Bible could have been printed, he inferred that the Septuagint version had greater critical authority, than either Hebrew manuscripts or Hebrew editions. But Morinus, in preferring the Greek version to the Hebrew original did not consider, that this version has *itself* undergone material alterations. Morinus argued, as if *his* copy of the Septuagint contained the Greek text in its original and unadulterated state. It is only on *this* supposition, that his reasoning from the *antiquity* of that version compared with the age of the *present* Hebrew manuscripts, and the inference, which he thence deduced in favour of the former, to the disparagement of the latter, can have the least foundation. But the supposition is evidently false, as appears both (p. 207) from the testimony of Origen, which was given in a former Lecture, and from a collation of the manuscripts now extant. In fact, before we can safely apply the Septuagint to the emendation of the Hebrew Bible, we must be furnished with a critical edition of the Septuagint itself.—From what has been already stated, it appears that Morinus went as far into *one* extreme, as Buxtorf had gone into the other. But Morinus was not satisfied with going *thus* far: he went still further, and opposed to the Hebrew the authority likewise of the *Latin* version, for which he could have no other reason, than that the Latin is the established version of his own church, the church of Rome. Here then he mixed *religious* with *critical* inquiries, which must always be kept distinct, or every Christian party will at length have a Bible of its own.

In the year following Simeon de Muis, who had written already against the *Exercitationes Ecclesiasticae* respecting the Samaritan Pentateuch, published his *Assertio altera Veritatis Hebraicae*, against the *Exercitationes Biblicae*, and the objections of Morinus to the integrity of the Hebrew text. But the controversy on this subject was soon afterwards transferred to Cappellus and the younger Buxtorf.

In 1650 was published at Paris the first edition (p. 208) of *Cappelli Critica Sacra*. In this work, though the author so far trod in the footsteps of Morinus, that he combated the strict notions of the elder Buxtorf in regard to the integrity of the Hebrew text, he avoided that extreme on the opposite side, into which *Morinus* had fallen. He maintained, and *rightly* maintained, that the Hebrew Bible, like all other works of antiquity, had been exposed to the variations, which unavoidably arise from a multiplication of copies: but he contended not, that the sacred text was thereby rendered uncertain, as a rule of faith and manners. He contended, that the printed editions were not every where so correct, as to warrant the opinion, that emendation is superfluous; but at the same time he admitted that we possessed the *means* of emendation. He considered the ancient versions, when applied under proper restrictions, as *one source* of critical authority in ascertaining the genuineness of disputed passages: but he regarded not, with Morinus, a deviation of the Hebrew from the Septuagint or the Vulgate as a *reason* for supposing, that in such places the Hebrew was incorrect. In short, his *principles* of criticism were such, as the best judges have applied to ancient authors in general. Where Cappellus failed, he failed in the *application* of his principles. He was right in asserting, that the Hebrew manuscripts, from which the Septuagint and other ancient versions were made, had not precisely the same text, as modern manuscripts, or printed editions. But he sometimes ascribed to a diversity of *reading*, what might rather be ascribed to a diversity of *translation*. He was right in asserting, that the authors of the Masora had not established a Hebrew text, which was free from fault: but he was unjust in not acknowledging the services, which they really performed. He was right in asserting, that even the *Masoretic* text had not descended to posterity without variations: but he was

unjust to the authors of the Masora in not acknowledging the care, which they took to preserve it. For if their success has not been complete, either in *establishing* or in *preserving* the Hebrew text, they have been guilty only of the fault, which is common to every human effort. Nor was Cappellus enabled by the actual production of Hebrew manuscripts (a defect indeed rather of the times than his own) to confirm several positions, which in themselves were true.

In these various respects was Cappellus open to attack: and his work had not been published a year, when it was assailed by Arnoldus Bootius, a name now buried in oblivion, and which deserves to be mentioned on no other account, than that his attack was published in the form of a Letter to Archbishop Usher, to whom Cappellus immediately addressed his *Epistola apologetica, in qua Arnoldi Bootii temeraria Criticae censura refellitur*, which was published at Saumur in 1651.

But all other assailants were forgotten in the younger Buxtorf, who in 1653 published at Basel his *Anticritica seu vindiciae veritatis Hebraicae, adversus Ludovici Cappelli Criticam quam vocant sacram, ejusque defensionem*. If Buxtorf had been contented with pointing out the defects, which really existed in the work of Cappellus, if he had been satisfied with showing, that Cappellus was sometimes mistaken in the *application* of his principles, if he had only claimed for the Masora, what is really its due, the victory would have been decidedly in his favour. But he failed of success by attempting too much. Educated, like his father, no less in the *prejudices*, than in the *learning* of the Jewish Rabbins, he adhered to those strict notions on the integrity of the Hebrew text, which can never apply to a work of antiquity. And by refusing to admit, what was indisputably true, he contributed to establish at least the *principles* of Cappellus, by the very efforts, which he made to confute them.

Four years after the publication of Buxtorfs *Anticritica*, Bishop Walton, in his Prolegomena to the London Polyglot, declared in favour of the (p. 211) principles asserted by Cappellus, acknowledged the necessity of forming a critical apparatus for the purpose of obtaining a more correct text of the Hebrew Bible, and materially contributed thereto by his own exertions.

A collation of *Hebrew manuscripts*, like those which have been made of the *Creek* manuscripts, was still wanted: but as the necessity of such a collation began now to be acknowledged, attempts to that purpose were gradually made by the subsequent editors of the Hebrew Bible. In 1661 Joseph Athias, a learned Rabbi and printer at Amsterdam, published a Hebrew Bible (reprinted in 1667) the text of which was founded on manuscripts, as well as on printed editions. And in the Preface, which was written by John Leusden, Hebrew Professor at Utrecht, it is related that one of the manuscripts was nine hundred years old. In 1690 Jablonski, a Lutheran Clergyman at Berlin, published a Hebrew Bible, for which he likewise collated manuscripts, and gave some account of them in his Preface. In 1705 was printed at Amsterdam the edition of Van der Hooght, well known for its typographical beauty, and its convenience for common use. The text was chiefly formed on that of Athias. It has the Masoretic readings in the margin, and a collection of various (p. 212) readings from printed editions at the end. In 1709 Professor Opitz at Kiel published a Hebrew Bible, for which he collated both editions and manuscripts: and in 1720 John Henry Michaelis, Professor at Halle, and uncle to the author of the Introduction to the New Testament, published a Hebrew Bible, for which he collated, beside many printed editions, five Hebrew manuscripts preserved at Erfurt, of which the various readings are quoted at the bottom of the page. These are the chief among the *critical* editions of the Hebrew Bible, which appeared before the middle of the last century: for though the edition of Reineccius, which was several times reprinted, professes on the title page to have been formed at least *partly* on the authority of manuscripts, those manuscripts are nowhere mentioned in it.

Toward the middle of the last century the expectations of the public were considerably raised by the preparations for an edition of the Hebrew Bible by Houbigant, a priest of the Oratory at Paris. Like Wetstein he published his Prolegomena before he published the edition itself. They were first printed in 1746, and were followed in 1753 by a splendid edition of the Hebrew Bible in four volumes folio. The *text* of this edition was copied from the text of Van der Hooght, divested (p. 213) indeed of points, and of every thing which appeared Masoretic. Its value therefore as a *critical* edition must depend, first on the *apparatus*, which the editor provided for the purpose of amending the Hebrew text, and secondly on the mode, in which he *applied* his apparatus. Now this apparatus bore no proportion to the magnitude of the undertaking. If we except the Samaritan readings, which are printed in the margin of the Pentateuch, it consisted altogether of extracts from only *twelve* Hebrew manuscripts, three of which were preserved in the Royal Library, and nine in the library belonging to the Oratory, of which Houbigant was member. They are described partly in his general Prolegomena, partly in the Dissertation prefixed to the Prophets. He says indeed (Prol. p. cvii.) that he *saw* and had in his *possession* some other manuscripts belonging to the Royal Library: but it does not appear that he ever *used* them. Nor did he make *much* use even of the manuscripts, which he *did* collate. Their various readings are not regularly

quoted at the bottom of the page, as is usual in critical editions of the Greek Testament: they are introduced *occasionally* in the Notes, which are subjoined to each chapter: and when they *are* introduced, which is not very often, they are introduced chiefly for the purpose of supporting such readings, as the editor himself preferred. The (p. 214) *general* evidence therefore, which a collation of manuscripts affords, is here withholden. In fact the learned editor himself, as appears from what he says in his Prolegomena, attached little or no value to any of the Hebrew manuscripts now extant: and, though he allows them a *place* among the sources of emendation, that place appears, both from his principles, and from his practice, to have been rather *nominal* than *real*. Like his predecessor Morinus, he attached much greater importance to the readings of the Septuagint, and other ancient versions. Like Morinus too, he uniformly preferred the text of the Samaritan to the text of the Hebrew Pentateuch. Now though it cannot be denied, that the Samaritan Pentateuch is of great importance to a biblical critic, though it is probable that many of its readings are preferable to the correspondent readings of the Hebrew, yet to assume as a *general* principle, that the Hebrew is faulty, or even to be suspected, *because* it differs from the Samaritan, is to regulate our judgment by a *single* evidence, where *other* witnesses are at least entitled to be heard. But there was a *fourth* source of emendation, to which Houbigant had more frequent recourse than to any other, namely, emendation *from his own conjecture*. And here he indulged himself to such a degree, as no sober critic can approve. It is true, that he did (p. 215) not obtrude his conjectures on the *Hebrew text*. But he introduced them in his Latin translation, which not only accompanied the Hebrew but was afterwards printed separately, and is necessarily more read than the original. Though he professed therefore to adopt the *principles* of Cappellus, he had not the *caution*, nor had he the *sagacity* of that eminent critic: and in his opposition to the two Buxtorfs he was most *defective* where *they* were most distinguished. We must not indeed deny the *ingenuity*, which he sometimes displays in his critical conjectures: but if he had *known more*, he would have *conjectured less*. He knew too little of the Masora, to form a judgment of it: and he rejected, as is frequently the case, what he did not fully understand. In short, if we must go into extremes, the extreme of the two Buxtorfs is infinitely wiser and safer, than the extreme of Houbigant: and we had better declare at once, that the Hebrew text *requires* no emendation, than submit the Bible to the critical licentiousness of an editor, who corrects without controul.

In the same year, in which Houbigant's edition was delivered to the public, Dr. Kennicott, then Fellow of Exeter College in Oxford, published his first Dissertation on the state of the printed Hebrew text, in which he endeavoured to show the necessity (p. 216) of the same extensive collation of *Hebrew* manuscripts, as had been already undertaken of the *Greek* manuscripts: and in support of his opinion he exhibited a specimen of various readings from seventy Hebrew manuscripts preserved in the Bodleian Library. In 1759 he published his *second* Dissertation, on the state of the printed Hebrew text, wherein he also replied to the objections which had been made to *his first* Dissertation. And the utility of the proposed collation being then very generally admitted, a very liberal subscription was made to defray the expense of the collation. The subscription amounted on the whole to nearly ten thousand pounds, and the name of his late Majesty headed the list of subscribers. Various persons were employed, both at home and abroad: but of the foreign *literati* the principal was Professor Bruns, of the University of Helmstadt, who not only collated Hebrew manuscripts in Germany, but went for that purpose into Italy and Switzerland. The business of collation continued from 1760 to 1769 inclusive, during which period Dr. Kennicott published annually an account of the progress which was made. More than six hundred *Hebrew* manuscripts, and sixteen manuscripts of the *Samaritan* Pentateuch were discovered in different libraries in England and on the Continent: many of which were *wholly* collated, and others consulted in important passages. Several years of course elapsed, after the collations were finished, before the materials could be arranged and digested for publication. In 1776 the *first* volume of Dr. Kennicott's Hebrew Bible was delivered to the public, and in 1780 the *second* volume. It was printed at the Clarendon Press: and the University of Oxford has the honour of having produced the *first* critical edition upon a *large scale*, both of the *Greek Testament*, and of the *Hebrew Bible*, an honour, which it is still maintaining by a similar edition, hitherto indeed unfinished, of the *Greek version*.

The *text* of Kennicott's edition was printed from that of Van der Hooght, with which the Hebrew manuscripts, by Kennicott's direction, were all collated. But, as variations in the points were disregarded in the *collation*, the points were not added in the *text*. The various readings, as in the critical editions of the Greek Testament, were printed at the bottom of the page with references to the correspondent readings of the text. In the Pentateuch the deviations of the Samaritan text were printed in a column parallel to the Hebrew: and the variations observable in the Samaritan manuscripts, which differ from each other as well as the Hebrew, are likewise noted with references to the Samaritan *printed* text. To this collation of manuscripts (p. 218) was added a collation of the most distinguished *editions* of the Hebrew Bible, in the same manner as Wetstein has noted the variations observable in the principal editions of the Greek Testament. Nor did Kennicott confine his collation to

manuscripts and editions. He further considered, that, as the quotations from the Greek Testament in the works of ecclesiastical writers afford another source of various readings, so the quotations from the Hebrew Bible in the works of *Jewish* writers are likewise subjects of critical inquiry. For this purpose he had recourse to the most distinguished among the Rabbinical writings, but particularly to the Talmud, the *text* of which is as ancient as the third century. In the quotation of his authorities he designates them by numbers from 1 to 692, including Manuscripts, Editions, and Rabbinical writings, which numbers are explained in the *Dissertatio generalis* annexed to the second volume.

This *Dissertatio generalis*, which corresponds to what are called *Prolegomena* in other critical editions, contains, not only an account of the manuscripts and other authorities collated for this edition, but also a review of the Hebrew text divided into periods, and beginning with the formation of the Hebrew canon after the return of the Jews from (p. 219) the Babylonish Captivity. Though inquiries of this description unavoidably contain matters of doubtful disputation, though the opinions of Kennicott have been frequently questioned, and sometimes *justly* questioned, his *Dissertatio generalis* is a work of great interest to every biblical scholar. Kennicott was a disciple of Cappellus, both in respect to the integrity of the Hebrew text, and in respect to the preference of the Samaritan Pentateuch: but he avoided the extreme, into which Morinus and Houbigant had fallen. And though he possessed not the Rabbinical learning of the two Buxtorfs, his merits were greater than some of his contemporaries, as well in England as on the Continent, were willing to allow.

That the mass of various readings exhibited in this edition, which greatly surpass in *number* the various readings collected by the industry of three centuries for the Greek Testament, contains but few of *real importance*, is no subject of reproach to the learned editor, who could only produce what his authorities afforded. Nor is he to be censured for giving *all* that he had without regard to their relative value. His was the first attempt, which was ever made, to give a *copious* collection of Hebrew readings: and he could hardly have been justified, if he had exercised his own discretion in (p. 220) regard to the portion, which should be laid before the public. He wisely therefore afforded the opportunity to his readers of selecting for themselves: and though his extracts are rarely of much value for the purpose of critical emendation, they enable us, both to form an estimate of the existing Hebrew manuscripts, and to draw some important conclusions in regard to the integrity of the Hebrew text.

The major part of this immense collection consists in mere variations of orthography, in the fulness or defectiveness of certain words, in the addition or subtraction of a *mater lectionis*, of a *Vau* or a *Jod*. And if we further deduct the readings, which are either manifest errata, or in other respects are of no value, the important deviations will be confined within a very narrow compass. In short, Dr. Kennicott's collation has contributed to establish the credit of the Masora. We learn from it this useful lesson, that although a multiplication of written copies will, notwithstanding all human endeavours, produce *variations* in the text, the manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible have been so far protected by the operation of the Masora, that all which are now extant, both the oldest and the newest, may be compared with those manuscripts of the Greek Testament, which Griesbach refers to the same edition.

(p. 221) That the integrity therefore of the Hebrew text, from the time when it was fixed by the authors of the Masora, has been as strictly preserved to the *present* age, as it is *possible* to preserve an ancient work, is a position, which no longer admits a doubt. Another question of equal importance is, whether we have sufficient reason to believe, that the Masoretic text is *itself* an accurate copy of the sacred writings. In the examination of *this* question Hebrew manuscripts are of no use: the oldest now extant are younger by some centuries than the Masora itself: and therefore they cannot furnish the means of correcting the faults, which the Masorets themselves may have committed. For though Ante-Masoretic readings should occasionally be found in Hebrew manuscripts, it would be very uncritical to correct the Masoretic text on their authority alone, unless we might take for granted, what we certainly may not, that every Masoretic alteration was an alteration for the *worse*. But if we cannot appeal to *positive* evidence, we must argue from the evidence, which the nature of the case admits. It is indeed one of those questions, which ought to be holden in the *affirmative*, till we have reason to believe the *negative*. Now the learned Jews of Tiberias, in the third and fourth centuries, must have had access to Hebrew manuscripts which were written before the Birth of Christ. We know (p. 222) that they sought and collated them. We know that their exertions to *obtain* an accurate text were equal to their endeavours to *preserve* it. Why then shall we conclude, that they laboured *in vain* ?

Our notions of integrity must not indeed be carried to such an height, as to imply that *no* deviations from the sacred autographs were retained in the Masoretic text, that there are *no* passages in our present Hebrew Bibles, which betray marks of corruption, and still require critical aid. Such passages undoubtedly there are: and we are still in want of an edition of the Hebrew Bible, conducted on the plan of Griesbach's Greek Testament. Kennicott's edition brought us hardly so far in the Criticism of the former, as Mill's edition in the Criticism of

the latter. In the years 1784—1788 John Bernard de Rossi of Parma published four quarto volumes (afterwards augmented by a supplemental volume) of extracts from Hebrew manuscripts, which form a considerable addition to Kennicott's collations: and in 1793 an edition of the Hebrew Bible was published at Leipzig by Doederlein and Meisner, with the most important readings, which had been given both by Kennicott and Dr. Rossi. But we *still* want an edition of the Hebrew Bible, in which the readings of *manuscripts* (p. 223) are united, as in critical editions of the Greek Testament, with judicious extracts from the *ancient versions*. Such an edition would supply the materials, which if carefully used, might enable us in various places to correct what appears inaccurate.

The history of the printed Hebrew text being now brought to a conclusion, it is necessary, according to the general plan, to describe the Authors who have illustrated the Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, according to its several departments. This description will form the subject of the following Lecture.

(p. 224) CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE. LECTURE X.

In the enumeration of the authors, who have best explained the several departments of Hebrew Criticism, we may proceed by a method similar to that, which was adopted in respect to the Greek Testament.

As a *general* and *elementary* treatise on the Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Dr. Gerard's *Institutes* already mentioned in the seventh Lecture, may be again recommended. Though it relates as well to the Interpretation, as to the Criticism of the Bible properly so called, and both subjects are comprehended under one name, yet, as they are not confounded, it will be easy to select such parts, as immediately relate to our present inquiry.

A knowledge of the *editions* of the Hebrew (p. 225) Bible may be best obtained from the first volume of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, as published by Masch. An account both of the original and of the last edition of this work was given in the seventh Lecture, and therefore it is unnecessary at present to observe any thing more, than what particularly relates to the Hebrew Bible. On *this* subject the learned editor is much more diffuse, and much more profound, than in the account, which he has given of the editions of the Greek Testament. In his description of the Hebrew Bible he confines himself not merely to the *external* history of the editions, but occasionally institutes critical inquiries in respect to the formation of their *text*. He has given also a preliminary dissertation *De codicum Hebraicorum diversitatibus*, in which the editions of the Hebrew Bible are divided into two classes, the one called Masoretic, the other Amasoretic. The former class comprises the Hebrew Bibles, which have the marginal readings of the Masora, and is subdivided into two portions, according as those readings are quoted, either wholly, or only in part. The second class comprises those editions, in which the readings of the Masora are unnoticed. An account of the editions of the Hebrew Bible to the year 1730 is given also in the second and fourth volumes of *Wolfii Bibliotheca Hebraea*. De Rossi of Parma has greatly contributed to our knowledge (p. 226) of the early editions of the Hebrew Bibles, both by his *Disquisitio critica de Hebraicae typographiae origine*, published at Parma in 1776, and by his *Apparatus Hebraeo-Biblicus*, published at Parma in 1782. But all the information, communicated on this subject, as well by De Rossi as by Wolf, has been transferred to the *Bibliotheca Sacra* by Masch, either in the first or in the supplementary volume. With no less industry and fidelity has the author of the *Bibliographical Dictionary* (noticed in the seventh Lecture) availed himself of the labours of his predecessors. The *critical* editions of the Hebrew Bible are described in Dr. Kennicott's *Dissertatio Generalis*: and a critical dissertation on the editions of the Bible, which preceded the London Polyglot, is contained in the fourth chapter of Walton's *Prolegomena*. These *Prolegomena*, to which we shall have frequent occasion to refer, and which contain an inestimable treasure of oriental literature, were reprinted in octavo at Leipzig in 1777, by I. A. Dathe, Professor of the Oriental Languages in that University, who accompanied that edition with a valuable preface. The *Dissertatio Generalis* was likewise reprinted in octavo at Brunswick in 1783, by Professor Bruns of Helmstadt, who was Kennicott's chief assistant in the collation of Hebrew manuscripts. and who accompanied the edition both with a preface and notes.

(p. 227) Of *manuscripts* of the Hebrew Bible some account is given in the fourth chapter of Walton's *Prolegomena*. In the folio edition of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, published in 1723, a catalogue of the Hebrew manuscripts is given as far as they were then known. In the second and fourth volumes of the *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, the latter of which was published in 1733, a further account is given of the then known Hebrew manuscripts. To this work should be added *H. F. Koecheri Nova Bibliotheca Hebraica*, published at Jena in 1783 and 1784, in two volumes quarto, as a supplement to that of Wolf. Till the collation was made for Dr. Kennicott's edition our knowledge of Hebrew manuscripts was confined to a very small number. This number however was so increased by that collation, that they now amount to more than six hundred. They are all enumerated by Dr. Kennicott in his *Dissertatio Generalis*; and the learned editor has related in what library each manuscript is preserved, by what mark or number it is there known, what books it contains, in what year it was written (where a date is annexed to it), or to what century he himself refers it (where the manuscript has no

date), whether it is written in Spanish or German hand, and (whenever an account of it has been already published) what author or authors may be further consulted. The *Dissertatio Generalis* therefore is the work, which (p. 228) is always to be examined in the first instance by those, who are desirous of obtaining information on any Hebrew manuscript, which had been* collated before 1770, when Kennicott's collation was closed. A valuable supplement to Kennicott's catalogue is contained in the following work, *Apparatus Hebræo-Biblicus, seu manuscripti, editique codices Sacri Textus, quos possidet novaeque variantium lectionum collationi destinat Jo. Bern. de Rossi. Parmae, 1782. 8vo.*-- But whoever wishes to become more intimately acquainted with the nature of Hebrew manuscripts in general, must consult the following work by Professor O. G. Tychsen, of the University of Rostock in Mecklenburg: *Tentamen de variis codicum Hebraicorum Veteris Testamenti manuscriptorum generibus, a Judaeis et non Judaeis descriptis, eorumque in classes certas distributione, et antiquitatis et bonitatis characteribus. Rostochii, 1772. 8vo.* In addition to the rules, which it prescribes, for judging of the antiquity, country, writer, &c. of Hebrew manuscripts, it has digressions on other points of Hebrew literature, which shall be noticed in the sequel.—In determining the antiquity of Hebrew manuscripts, it may be useful likewise to consult a short treatise by Professor Schnurrer of Tubingen, entitled, *De codicum Hebraeorum Veteris Testamenti aetate difficulter determinanda*, printed in his *Dissertationes Philologico-Criticae*, which were published at (p. 229) Gotha and Amsterdam in 1790, octavo. They, who are acquainted with German, will find the most perspicuous and the most systematic account of Hebrew manuscripts in the second volume of Eichhom's Introduction. Beside the manuscripts in *Hebrew* letters, sixteen manuscripts of the Pentateuch in *Samaritan* letters were collated for Kennicott's edition, of which an account is given in the catalogue of manuscripts in the *Dissertatio Generalis*. It was related in the eighth Lecture, that we first became acquainted with the Samaritan Pentateuch at the beginning of the seventeenth century; that the first known copy of it was deposited in the library of the Oratory at Paris; and that the deviation of its *text* from that of the Hebrew Pentateuch gave rise to a controversy on the subject of their relative value. But an account of the principal authors on this subject will be more properly given, when we come to that department, which relates to the utility and application of various readings.--The Samaritan Pentateuch was first printed in the Paris Polyglot under the inspection of Morinus, and was reprinted by Walton in the London Polyglot. In these editions it is printed in the *Samaritan* character. In 1790 the late Dr. Blayney, Hebrew Professor at Oxford, published it, in an octavo volume, in the *Hebrew* character, which had been already used by Houbigant and Kennicott, in (p. 230) printing the *deviations* of the Samaritan text. Dr. Blayney's edition is moreover accompanied with the readings of the Samaritan manuscripts (collated for Kennicott's edition) which differ from the *printed Samaritan text*.

On the *ancient versions* of the Hebrew Bible, which open a second source of various readings, our means of information are very ample. A considerable part of Walton's *Prolegomena* is devoted to this subject: and they are particularly valuable in respect to the *oriental* versions, which are described in the six last chapters. The second book of *Simon's Critical History of the Old Testament* is wholly employed on the translations of it, both ancient and modern, though the latter are of no value in a critical history of the Hebrew text, on which account the notice of Lewis's and other histories of our *English* translations must be reserved for the second branch of Theology, the *Interpretation* of the Bible. In Carpzov's *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, printed at Leipzig in 1728, quarto, the second part contains also an account of the translations of the Old Testament. A popular account is given of them in the second volume of *Prideaux's Connexion*: and also in Dr. Brett's *Dissertation on the Ancient Versions of the Bible*, of which the second edition was published in London in 1760, (p. 231) and is reprinted in the third volume of Bishop Watson's Theological Tracts. The object of this latter work, as the author declares on the title-page, was to show the excellent use, that may be made of the ancient versions towards attaining the true readings of the Holy Scriptures in doubtful places. But that, which far surpasses all other works on the *critical application* of the ancient versions, is Eichhorn's Introduction to the Old Testament, in which the latter half of the first volume is devoted to this subject.-- The best account of the *editions* of the ancient versions is given in the second part of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, published by Masch. No work contains so many of the ancient versions, and so well arranged, as the London Polyglot.

As the Septuagint is not only the most ancient version of the Hebrew Bible, but is frequently quoted in the Greek Testament, and as it is likewise more familiar to us, than any other ancient version, the Latin only excepted¹, the authors, who (p. 232) have written on it, deserve more particular notice. The first writer, who

¹ The history of the Latin Version has been already given in the second Lecture. It is only the Latin *Vulgate*, made by Jerom from the Hebrew, which can be applied to the Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. The *old* Latin version published by Sabatier (at Rheims in 1743, in three volumes folio,) being in the Old Testament made from the Septuagint, applies imme- (p. 232) diately to the Criticism of the Septuagint. In the edition of the

instituted a systematic inquiry into the Septuagint version, was Archbishop Usher in a work entitled *De Graeca Septuaginta interpretum Versione Syntagma*, printed in London in 1655, quarto. It is divided into nine chapters, and relates to the origin of the version according to the account of Aristeas (then supposed to be genuine), to the time when and the place where it was written, to the alterations which were gradually made in its text, to the corrections of Origen, to the modern editions, and other subjects, with which these are immediately connected. This is a work of great merit; it displays much original inquiry, and may be regarded as the ground-work of later publications on the Septuagint. In 1661 Isaac Vossius published at the Hague, in quarto, his work entitled *De Septuaginta interpretibus, eorumque translatione et chronologia dissertationes*. Isaac Vossius was such an admirer of the Septuagint, that he ascribed to it more authority, than to the original itself. But he met with a very powerful adversary in Humphrey Hody, then a young man and Fellow of Wadham (p. 233) College in Oxford, who in 1685 published in London, in octavo, his treatise entitled *Contra historiam Aristee de LXX. interpretibus dissertatio: in qua probatur illam a Judaeo aliquo confectam fuisse ad conciliandam auctoritatem Versioni Graecae; et clarissimi doctissimique viri D. Isaaci Vossii aliorumque defensiones ejusdem examini subjiciuntur*. This very acute and learned writer has clearly proved his position in respect to the writing which bears the name of Aristeas: some feeble efforts were made indeed to defend the authenticity of that writing, especially by Whiston in an Appendix to his *Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies*: but the opinion of Hody is at present very generally adopted. In 1705 Hody, who was then become Greek Professor and Archdeacon of Oxford, published the work already quoted in the fourth Lecture, *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina Vidgata libri quatuor*. This is the *classical* work on the Septuagint: but there are others which are worthy of notice, especially two publications by Dr. Henry Owen, Rector of St. Olave, Hart Street, the one *An Enquiry into the present state of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament*. London, 1769, 8vo; the other *A Brief Account historical and critical of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament*. London, 1787, 8vo. The author, who is himself an excellent critic, treads closely in the foot- (p. 234) steps of Hody. The last work especially should be read by every man, who wishes to be acquainted with the history of the Septuagint. The following is likewise a very useful work, as it represents both concisely and perspicuously the several topics, which suggest themselves for consideration on the origin of the Septuagint version: *De origine versionis Septuaginta interpretum: auctore S. T. Muecke, Conrectore Lycei Soraviensis. Zullichoviae*, 1788, 8vo.—The authors on some particular subjects connected with the *utility and application of various readings* will be noticed when we come to that department.

The *editions* of the Septuagint are fully described in the second volume of the second part of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, as published by Masch; to which description is prefixed an account of the origin, both of the Septuagint and the other Greek versions of the Bible. It may be proper to observe that there are *four* principal or cardinal editions of the Septuagint, from one or more of which *all* the other editions of the Septuagint have been copied; namely the Complutensian, the Aldine, the Roman of Sixtus V., and Grabe's edition. The Complutensian Septuagint bears the date of 1515; it was printed from a collation of Greek manuscripts, which the editors highly extol, but of which we have no further knowledge. The Aldine edition (p. 235) was published at Venice in 1518, two years after the death of Aldus Manutius. The text of this edition was likewise formed from several Greek manuscripts, but was interpolated in various places from other Greek versions. The Roman edition of Sixtus V., which appeared in 1587, was copied from the celebrated *Codex Vaticanus*, with the exception of such words as the editors regarded in the light of errata. But as such corrections depended wholly on the *judgment* of the editors, and it is of importance to know the real readings of the *Codex Vaticanus*, Dr. Holmes in his edition of the Pentateuch has carefully noted the differences, however minute, between the text of the Roman edition and of the Vatican manuscript. Grabe's edition was taken from the no less celebrated *Codex Alexandrinus*, and was printed at Oxford in four folio volumes at different times from 1707 to 1720. But though this edition has the *Codex Alexandrinus* for its *basis*, it is far from being a mere *copy* of that manuscript: for Grabe (also Lee, who continued it after Grabe's death) adopted many readings, partly from the Roman edition, partly from other manuscripts, where those readings were believed to be genuine. The most convenient edition is that of Breitinger, published at Ziirich in 1730—1732, in four quarto volumes: for it contains the text of Grabe's edition, with the deviations of the Roman (p. 236) edition in the margin.—Hitherto no collation of manuscripts of the Septuagint had been undertaken upon an *extensive scale*. In 1779 Dr. White, Arabic (afterwards Hebrew) Professor at Oxford, published a Letter to the Bishop of London, suggesting a plan for a new edition of the Septuagint. In the same year Mr. Stroth, Master of the Grammar School at Gotha, published in the fifth volume of Eichhorn's *Repertorium* the first part of his *Catalogue of MSS. of the LXX.*, which he continued in the eighth

Bibliotheca Sacra, Part II. Vol. III. as published by Masch, both versions are fully described. Much information on the subject of the Vulgate may be obtained from Hody's work, *De Textibus*, &c.

and eleventh volumes. In 1788 Dr. Holmes (afterwards Dean of Winchester) published at Oxford proposals for a collation of all the known manuscripts of the Septuagint. The undertaking was promoted by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press; a subscription was made toward defraying the expense; literary men were engaged in various parts of the Continent for the business of collation; and Dr. Holmes published annually an account of the progress which was made. In 1798 he published at Oxford the Book of Genesis, which was successively followed by the other books of the Pentateuch, making together *one* folio volume, with one title-page, and *one general* Preface. From this general Preface it appears, that eleven Greek manuscripts in uncial letters, and more than an hundred manuscripts in small letters, containing either the whole or parts of the Pentateuch, were collated for (p. 237) this edition. They are all described in the second and third chapters. And as the *text* of this edition is a copy of the Roman edition of 1587, the deviations from it observable in the three other cardinal editions, the Complutensian, the Aldine, and Grabe's edition, are constantly noted. The quotations which are found in the works of the Greek Fathers, are likewise alleged: and finally, the various readings of the ancient versions, namely, of such as were made from the *Septuagint*, for versions made immediately from the *Hebrew*, can furnish no various readings for the emendation of the *Greek*. The *plan* therefore of this edition is good: it is that which had been already applied by Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach to the Greek Testament. Nor is the *execution* of the plan to be less commended: it displays uncommon industry, and apparently great accuracy. The learned editor died in 1806: but shortly before his death he published the Book of Daniel, both according to the Septuagint version and that of Theodotion, the latter only having been printed in former editions, because the *Septuagint* version of *this* book is not contained in the common manuscripts, and was unknown till it was printed at Rome in 1772 from a manuscript belonging to Cardinal Chigi. Since the death of Dr. Holmes, the continuation of this important work has been undertaken by Mr. Parsons, who has (p. 238) properly resumed it with the historical books as they follow the Pentateuch, and from the specimen which he has already given, the Book of Joshua, appears well worthy of the task, which has been committed to his care. Every friend of biblical literature must wish to see the completion of this edition.—On the application of the Septuagint version to the criticism of the Hebrew Bible may be consulted the two following works: *F. V. Reinhardi Dissertatio de versionis Alexandrinae auctoritate et usu in constituenda librorum Hebraicorum lectione genuina. Vitembergae, 1777, 4to.*—*G. C. Knappii Dissertatio de versione Alexandrina in emendanda lectione exempli Hebraici caute adhibenda. P. I. II. Halae, 1775, 1776, 4to.* -- The authors who have applied the Septuagint to the *explanation* of the Bible, will be mentioned under the *second* branch of Theology.

Having already mentioned *two* sources of various readings, *Hebrew manuscripts*, and *ancient* versions, with the writers, from whom the best information may be derived on those subjects, we may now proceed to the *third* source, which consists of *quotations* from the Hebrew Bible, which are found in the works of ancient authors. Philo and Josephus, who wrote in Greek and used the Septuagint version, if not exclusively, at least chiefly, especially (p. 239) the former, are of very little use in the criticism of the *Hebrew* Bible. The Talmud, and such other *Rabbinical* works as contain quotations from the Hebrew, are alone of any value. The Talmud (a word which signifies literally *doctrine*) may be regarded as the *corpus doctrinae Judaicae*: and the precepts, which it contains, relate not merely to doctrines properly so called, but to ceremonies as well civil as religious, it has not been improperly termed *Judaeorum jus civile et canonicum*. The *text* of it, which is called Mishna, was compiled in the second century by Rabbi Jehuda Hakkadosh; a commentary called Gemara was added to it at Jerusalem, and another commentary bearing the same name was afterwards added to it in Babylon. The *text* of the Talmud is sometimes accompanied with the former, at other times with the latter commentary; and the text and commentary together receive the appellation of Talmud of Jerusalem, or Talmud of Babylon, according to the commentary, which is annexed. For the different editions of the Talmud, the first and fourth volumes of *Wolfii Bibliotheca Hebraea* must be consulted. That of Surenhusius (Amsterdam, 1698—1703, six torn. fol.) contains only the Mishna: but it is accompanied with a Latin translation. The *contents* of the Mishna are described in the second part of the *Antiquitates Hebraeorum*, published by Professor (p. 240) Wanner at Gottingen in 1743, in two volumes octavo.-- It was observed in the preceding Lecture, that the Talmud was collated for Dr. Kennicott's edition: several other Rabbinical works were collated, which are mentioned in the *Dissertatio Generalis*, and of which a more ample account must be sought in the *Bibliotheca Hebraea*.

The fourth and last source of emendation in the Hebrew text is *critical conjecture*. It was asserted in the seventh Lecture, that the words of the *Greek Testament* ought in *no case* to be altered from conjecture: and this rule has been strictly observed by Griesbach. But in the *Hebrew Bible* there are various reasons against the *total* exclusion of conjectural emendation, though no prudent critic will approve of it, when carried to excess. The causes of *accidental* error in the transcribing of *Hebrew* manuscripts were more numerous, as was shown in the eighth Lecture, than in the transcribing of *Greek* manuscripts. Hence the very long period, which elapsed between the time when the books of the Old Testament, especially the Pentateuch, were composed, and the

time, when even the oldest of the now existing Hebrew manuscripts were written, may have occasioned in various places the genuine reading to be totally lost. And the circumstance, that all the Hebrew manuscripts now extant belong, as it were, (p. 241) to *one edition*, renders the probability, that in various places the genuine reading is contained in *no* Hebrew manuscript now extant, still greater. The means therefore of correcting from *authority* are less ample, than in the Greek Testament; and consequently conjectural emendation may be allowable in the former, though not in the latter. Besides, conjectural emendation is not liable to the *abuse* in the *Old Testament*, to which it is liable in the *New*: conjectura *theologica* in the form of conjecture. *critica* does not so easily find room in the former, as it does in the latter. Hence Bishop Lowth in his translation of Isaiah (London, 1778, quarto) not only corrected in many places the common Hebrew text on the authority of manuscripts², but sometimes introduced emendations from mere conjecture. Yet even Lowth has been supposed to have taken p. 242) this liberty too often, especially by Professor Kocher of Bern, in a dissertation entitled *Vindiciae S. textus Hebraei Esaiiae Vatis, adversus D. Roberti Lowthi, Venerandi Episcopi Londinensis, Criticam*, printed at Bern in 1786, and reprinted at Tubingen in 1790. The principles of Houbigant, who carried his conjectures beyond all bounds, have been very ably combated in the following work: *Sebaldi Ravii Exercitationes philologicae in C. F. Hubingantii Prolegomena in Scripturam sacram. Lugduni Batavorum, 1785, 4to*. Indeed before we have recourse to the desperate remedy of altering an author's words from our own conjecture, we should be fully satisfied that no mode of *interpretation* will remove the difficulties, which may present themselves. Under the different modes of interpretation may be reckoned also the different modes of *pronouncing*, or, which is the same thing, of *pointing*, the same word. Michaelis, in his German translation of the Hebrew Bible, has frequently recourse to an alteration of the points: but he made it a rule never to alter the consonants, that is, the words themselves, except in cases of extreme necessity.

The last department of Hebrew criticism, which we have to consider, is the *utility and application of various readings*. This department has been rendered very extensive by the turn, which the criticism of the Hebrew Bible took at the beginning of the seventeenth century. We have seen that the elder Buxtorf denied the very *existence* of various readings to the Hebrew Bible. The history of the controversy, which consequently took place between Cappellus and the younger Buxtorf, on the *integrity* of the Hebrew text, was given in the preceding Lecture, where the works were also quoted, which were published at that period. The *Critica sacra* of Cappellus, which has ever remained a standard work, was again published at Halle in 1775—1786 in three octavo volumes, with very valuable Notes by Professor Vogel at Halle, and Professor Scharfenberg at Leipzig. Another very excellent work is the *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, published at Leipzig in 1795 by Professor Bauer of Altorf. It is in fact a revision of the first section in the second volume of *Glassii philologia sacra*, which relates to the *criticism* of the Bible, as the second section relates to the *interpretation* of it. Glass, who was Professor at Jena in the seventeenth century, had adopted Buxtorf's high notions of integrity, which are properly modified in Professor Bauer's revision of the work. Carpzov in his *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, published at Leipzig in 1728, quarto, adheres likewise too closely to those high notions: but if proper allowance be made on this account, it will be found to (p. 244) be a very useful work, and replete with information on the subject of Hebrew Criticism.

With the inquiries, which have been instituted on the *integrity* of the Hebrew text, two other questions have been mixed, which have no necessary connection with it, namely the antiquity of our present Hebrew characters, and our present Hebrew points; for, as was observed in the preceding Lecture, the letters may have been changed, the points may be new, yet the *words* may have remained the same. But the two Buxtorfs, and other writers who have carried to the highest pitch their notions on the integrity of the Hebrew text, have considered this integrity, which in reality relates only to the preservation of the *words*, as including the unchangeableness of *the forms*, in which the words are expressed. They defended the latter therefore with as much warmth as the former: and represented such critics, as Cappellus and Walton, who denied to the shadow what they allowed to the substance, as men impeaching the integrity of the sacred writings. Hence Professor Wasmuth at Rostock published a quarto volume in 1664, entitled *Vindicace Sacrae Hebraeae Scripturae*, in which he undertakes to defend what he calls *originalis authentia divina, tain vocalium et accentuum, quam*

² It is worthy of notice, though the remark is foreign to the present paragraph, that Michaelis in his *German* translation of Isaiah, which was made about the same time, and of which nearly one half was printed when Lowth's Isaiah appeared, has in most places, where he has preferred a various reading to the common text, agreed in the choice of that reading with Lowth. This coincidence, without previous concert, between two such eminent critics, argues strongly in favour of the adopted readings. The readings here meant are readings really *existing*, either in manuscripts, or ancient versions: for on the subject of *conjectural* emendations Michaelis and Lowth did *not* agree.

ipsarum literarum sacri textus Hebraei; and this defence is conducted, (p. 245) as he further says on the title-page, *adversus impia et imperita multorum praejudicia, imprimis contra CappeUi, Vossii F., et Waltoni, auctoris operis Anglicani πολυγλώττου, assertiones falsissimas pariter et perniciosissimas*. But in later times these questions have been discussed with greater calmness, in proportion as the defence of them appeared less necessary for the purpose of religion. With respect to the *letters*, the controversy between Johannes Morinus and Cappellus on the one hand, and the younger Buxtorf on the other, has been already related in the eighth Lecture. The opinion of the two former, that the *Samaritan* were the ancient letters of the Jews, was very ably supported by Walton in the third chapter of his *Prolegomena*. On the other hand, Steph. Morinus, a French protestant clergyman, in his *Ejxercitationes de lingua primaeva* (published at Utrecht in 1694, quarto,) and Wolf in the second volume of his *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, have defended the antiquity of the *Hebrew* letters. The latest and most useful work on this subject is, *Josephi Dobrowsky de antiquis Hebraeorum characteribus dissertatio. Pragae, 1783, 8vo*. This tract contains in a short compass a perspicuous statement of all the arguments, both for and against the antiquity of the Hebrew letters: and the conclusion which the author deduces is, that not the *Hebrew*, but that the *Samaritan* was the ancient alphabet of the (p. 246) Jews. That the present Hebrew or Chaldee character was *not* used by the Jews before the Babylonish Captivity is an opinion, which is now almost universally received, and the truth of it seems no longer disputable. But it is still a question whether the Samaritan letters, *in the form in which we now find them in manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch*, were the letters used by the Jews before the Babylonish Captivity. Now as letters are continually liable to some trifling alteration, according to the taste or fancy of transcribers, and alterations, though at first insensible, will by frequent repetition, in the course of two or three thousand years, produce such changes, that the *modern* form becomes materially different from the *ancient* one, it is highly probable, if we argue from analogy, that the Samaritan letters, which are used in the manuscripts now extant, are in many respects different from those which were used by the Jews and Samaritans before the Babylonish Captivity. But *what* was the form of the letters then in use among them, or even by what *name* that alphabet should be called, are questions on which the learned are divided, and on which, for want of data, it is impossible perhaps to come to a decision. Many writers call this alphabet the *old Samaritan*: Professor Bauer in the *Critica Sacra* above-quoted calls it Phoenician: Eichhorn in his Introduction calls it (p. 247) Phoenician-Egyptian: Michaelis seems undetermined about the *name*, though he is equally of opinion that the ancient alphabet differed from the present Samaritan, as well as from the Hebrew. A detailed account of the authors, who by the aid of inscriptions and medals have endeavoured to trace the forms of the ancient, letters in question, of whom the principal are Bayer, Caylus, Buttner, and Dutens, would occasion a digression, which however interesting in itself, is not immediately connected with critical theology.

Of the Hebrew *points* the antiquity has been no less contested, than that of the Hebrew *letters*: and here again their advocates have considered their antiquity as so connected with the integrity of the text, that they have argued for the *divine* origin of the Hebrew points. The controversy between Cappellus and the younger Buxtorf on this subject was related in the eighth Lecture, where the works were quoted, which appeared on that occasion. The *Arcanum punctuationis revelatum*, first printed in 1624, was reprinted in *L. Cappelli Commentarii et notae criticae in Vetus Testamentum*, which were published at Amsterdam in 1689 by his son, who prefixed to it a clear and useful statement of the controversy. In the same work was published also the *Vindicace* mentioned in the eighth (p. 248) Lecture. The subject was so exhausted by the original combatants, that from this period the respective advocates, who were numerous on each side, and whom it would be tedious to enumerate, had only to repeat the arguments of their leaders. At length Albert Schultens, Professor of the Oriental languages at Leyden, in his *Institutiones ad fundamenta linguæ Hebrææ*, published at Leyden in 1737 and reprinted in 1756, proposed a *middle path* between the two extremes: and as Schultens was a man of great authority, it will not be improper to quote his words. In the second section, after a statement of the arguments, which had been advanced for and against the antiquity of the points, he says, "*Controversia simplicius proposita non ita difficulter componi potuisset, si sola veritas quaesita fuisset. Amputa quaestionis appendices, de hodiernis figuris et nominibus vocalium, de Schevatibus, de accentuum numero et munere multiplici: disquire dein quid verisimilius, adfuerintne hinc ab antiquissimis temporibus vocales, an non? Hoc ipsum quoque adhuc restringe, et disputa, an non ibi saltem vocalium notulae adjectæ a sacris scriptoribus, ubi summa necessitas id postulabat. Hoc negare non valde verecundum; ulterius quid ewigere imprudens et bonæ causæ noxium. His finibus si lis hæcce semet coerceat, concordia inter criticos et theologos sponte coibit: et puncta vocalia communi consensu justum illtim et naturalem locum (p. 249) obtinebunt, quem indoles linguæ Hebrææ, quem usus Orientis, inde a primaeva origine, iisdem inter Chaldaeos, Syros, Arabes assignavit.*"--- In 1769 Michaelis, who had formerly defended the antiquity of the present points, adopted in the second volume of his *Miscellaneous Works (Vermischte Schriften)* published in that year, the *middle path* proposed by

Schultens. He admitted on the one hand, that our *present* system of punctuation was invented and introduced by the Masorets: but he maintained on the other hand, that even in the *earliest ages* the Hebrews made at least occasional use of *some* vowel points.—In the thirty-sixth volume of the History of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres, published at Paris in 1775 is a very valuable Dissertation by Dupuy, (directed chiefly against the system of Mascleff and his followers) in which the same *medium* is observed as by Schultens and Michaelis.— In the eighteenth volume of Eichhorn's Repertorium is a dissertation by Trendelenburg, of which the object is to prove that the ancient Hebrews had *three* vowel marks. And Eichhorn in his Introduction to the Old Testament, § 62, says, " From the preceding remarks it appears, that we may draw the certain conclusion, that the ancient Hebrews had *vowel marks*, but not the *whole* number of those which are *now* in use, probably only *three*; that the ancient Hebrew authors (p. 250) provided their writings with vowel marks, not indeed throughout, but only *here and there*, in difficult *ambiguous* passages; and that our *present* system of punctuation was introduced in some *later* age, probably after Hebrew had ceased to be a living language." The question is very clearly stated by Eichhorn: but as these Lectures are not intended to convey long dissertations on any single subjects, it would be foreign to their purpose to translate more. The opinion of Schultens, Michaelis, and Eichhorn is now the common opinion of the Oriental scholars in Germany. We must except indeed Professor Tychsen, who has uniformly adhered to the system of Buxtorf. In our own country, Walton, Kennicott, Lowth, and many other distinguished Hebrew scholars have sided with Cappellus. Among the few, who in later times have defended the antiquity of the present points, may be mentioned Dr. James Robertson, Professor of the Oriental languages at Edinburgh, who prefixed to his *Claris Pentateuchi*, published at Edinburgh in 1770, a *Dissertatio de genuina punctorum vocalium Hebraicorum Antiquitate*³. (p. 251)

Though the integrity of the Hebrew text depends not on the decision of the questions, whether (p. 252) the points be coeval with the letters, or whether the letters themselves were the original letters of the Jews, yet a question of some importance to the Criticism of the Bible arose out of the controversy, as conducted by Cappellus and Buxtorf. This question is, whether the *Hebrew Pentateuch* or the *Samaritan Pentateuch* has the greater *critical authority*. Most writers, who have maintained the superior antiquity of the Samaritan to the Hebrew *letters*, have hence concluded that the *text* of the Samaritan Pentateuch is more ancient, and more free from corruption, than the Hebrew Pentateuch. On the other hand, most writers who defend the antiquity of the Hebrew *letters*, prefer at the same time the Hebrew to the Samaritan *text*. The principal advocates of the Samaritan Pentateuch are J. Morinus, in his *Exercitationes ecclesiasticae* (Paris 1631, 4to) and his *Opuscula Hebræo-Samaritana* (Paris, 1657, 12mo): Walton in the eleventh chapter of his *Prolegomena*; Houbigant, likewise in the *Prolegomena* to his Hebrew Bible; Kennicott, (p. 253) as well in his *Dissertatio generalis*, as in his *Second Dissertation on the State of the printed Hebrew Text*; and Dr. Henry Owen, in his *Dissertation on the comparative Excellence of the Hebrew and Samaritan Pentateuch*, which is annexed to his above-quoted

³ If our *present* Hebrew points are an invention of the Masorets, the question occurs, whether in learning Hebrew we may not discard them, and with Mascleff or Parkhurst make a pronunciation for ourselves, especially as the study of the language is thereby rendered much easier. To determine this (p. 251) question we must consider the *purpose*, for which they were introduced. All vowel *marks*, whether letters or points, are representatives of vowel *sounds*: and the sounds must have existed before the marks for them were invented. In most languages the vowel sounds are more numerous, than the marks which represent them: the French e for instance being pronounced in five different ways. If Hebrew therefore, like Arabic, had originally three vowel marks, the vowel sounds must have been more numerous than the vowel marks, which were used for them. While Hebrew was a living language, this paucity of vowel marks, or even the entire want of them, could be remedied by known usage. The Jews who returned from the Babylonish Captivity, returned with the language of Chaldæa, a language very nearly allied to the Hebrew, though somewhat different. Hence arose the custom of reading in the Synagogues in Judæa, first the Hebrew original, and then a Chaldee paraphrase. Now the continued custom of reading in the Synagogue from the Hebrew Scriptures must have contributed to preserve among the Jewish *Priests* the pronunciation, which had been in use, while Hebrew was a living language. And it is probable, that in the time of our Saviour the mode of reading Hebrew was not very different from the mode of reading it in the time of David and Solomon. After the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, and the dispersion of the Hebrew Jews, the ancient pronunciation might have been entirely lost, if some remedy had not been provided. As soon therefore as the Jewish school was established at Tiberias, it was a primary object of its learned members to *perpetuate* the Hebrew pronunciation: and this (p. 252) could only be done by additional vowel marks. If this account of their origin be true, it is advisable to *retain* them. The Synagogue Rolls are indeed still written without points: but then they are *read*, as if they were pointed throughout, every experienced Rabbi knowing from the very form of each word, in what manner it should be pointed and pronounced.

Brief Account of the Septuagint Version. The principal adversaries of the Samaritan Pentateuch are Hottinger, in his *Exercitationes Anti-Moriniance de Pentateucho Samaritano*, published at Ziirich in 1644, quarto; S. Morinus, in his above-quoted *Exercitationes de lingua primaeva*; F. J. Schwarz, Professor at Wittenberg, in his *Exercitationes historicocriticae in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum. Vitembergae, 1756, 4to*; and lastly Professor Tychsen, as well in the above-quoted *Tentamen*, as in his *Disputatio philologico-critica, de Pentateucho Ebrte OSamaritano, ab Ebrceo eoque Masoretico, descripto exemplari. Butzovii, 1765, 4to*. From the very title of this work it appears that Tychsen was resolved to degrade the Samaritan Pentateuch to the utmost. Hottinger indeed (to whom Walton replied, Prol. XI. 12.) had called the Samaritan Pentateuch *Apographum vitiosum ex Hebrceo-Autographo*: but Tychsen goes so far as to assert, that, it was derived from some *Masoretic* copy of the Hebrew Pentateuch, and not before the tenth century. But Tychsen's arguments were fully confuted by Professor Hassencamp of Rinteln, in a (p. 254) German work⁴ printed at Minden in 1775, octavo.-- After all, though the Samaritan Pentateuch has been rescued from the charges of its adversaries, it is no necessary consequence, that it deserves the preference, which is given to it by some of its friends. The Pentateuch in *Samaritan* letters, and the Pentateuch in *Hebrew* letters, emanate from the *same* source: they are *equally* derived from the autograph of Moses. The *difference* in the age between the oldest *Hebrew* and the oldest *Samaritan* manuscripts now extant (on whatever side the scale may preponderate) can bear but a small proportion to the *whole* period, which elapsed from the time of Moses: and during that period the manuscripts in *Samaritan* letters were subject at least to *similar*, though not the *same*, alterations, as the manuscripts in *Hebrew* letters. The *purity of the text* depends not on the *shape of the character*, in which it is expressed: the former may be preserved, though the latter be changed, or the former may be changed, though the latter be preserved. Even therefore if the letters *now* used in Samaritan manuscripts were *precisely the same* as those, which were used by Moses himself, we could neither conclude from this *con-* (p. 255) *servation of character to a conservation of text*, nor from the *change of character* in the Hebrew manuscripts to a *change in the text*. But if we may judge from inscriptions and medals, the *original* letters of the Pentateuch have undergone material changes, as well in the *Samaritan*, as in the *Hebrew* manuscripts. Upon the whole then the two Pentateuchs are more nearly equal for the purposes of *criticism*, than the advocates of either have commonly supposed: and wherever their readings are different, the *genuine* reading must be determined by *other* arguments than those, which are founded on a supposed intrinsic superiority of one to the other.

Connected with this subject is the question, which has been agitated, whether a copy of the *Samaritan*, or a copy of the *Hebrew* Pentateuch was used by the person or persons, who made what is called the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch. The decision of this question is of some importance in forming our judgment of readings, where the Hebrew and the Samaritan copies are at variance. For, if the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch was made from the *Samaritan* text, it does nothing more, where it agrees with the *Samaritan* in opposition to the Hebrew, than *repeat*, or *echo*, the evidence of its original; whereas in the places, in (p. 256) which it agrees with the *Hebrew* in opposition to the Samaritan, it affords presumptive evidence, that in *those* places the Samaritan text was *originally* the same as the *present Hebrew* text, and that the error lies in the *present Samaritan* text. Now that the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch was made from a *Samaritan* manuscript, is an opinion, which many writers have entertained. Even Hottinger was of that opinion, though he believed that the Samaritan itself was derived from the Hebrew. But no one has treated this subject so fully as Professor Hassencamp in his *Dissertatio philologicocritica de Pentateucho LXX. Inteipretum Grceco, non ex Hebrceo, sed Samaritano textu converso*, printed at Marburg in 1765, 4 to. Professor Tychsen of Rostock in the above-quoted *Tentamen* printed in 1772, attempted to support the opinion, that it was taken from the *Hebrew* text, and moreover from a manuscript, in which the *Hebrew text* (as in the second column of Origen's Hexapla) was expressed in *Greek letters*. This opinion however was very successfully combated by Hassencamp, in the second part of the German work, which has been quoted in a preceding note.

After this description of the several subjects, which are more or less connected with the criticism of the Hebrew Bible, we cannot better conclude than with a caution against *both* of the extremes, into which authors have fallen, with respect to the *integrity* of the Hebrew text. What we *ought* to understand by that expression was explained at the beginning of the preceding Lecture, where it was observed, that an ancient work may be properly said to have preserved its integrity, if it has descended to the present age in such a state as *upon the whole* the author gave it. In order therefore to defend the integrity of the Hebrew text, it is not necessary to maintain with Buxtorf, that there are *no* variations in the Hebrew manuscripts, a thing impossible in itself, and contradicted by fact; nor is it necessary for this purpose to contend, as Professor Tychsen has lately done in his

⁴ Its German title, which I add for the sake of those who understand the language, and who may wish to procure the work, is, " Der entdeckte wahre Ursprang der alten Bibel-Uebersetzungen."

Tentamen, that our Masoretic text is so perfect, as to require not the aid of a critical apparatus. The Hebrew Bible, like the Greek Testament, has been exposed to the variations, which unavoidably result from a multiplication of written copies: and even after the introduction of the *Masora*., it was impossible *wholly* to avoid them: nor can it be supposed that with all the religious care applied by the learned Jews of Tiberias, the text *originally established* by the Masora was *every where* free from error. Indeed the Jewish writers of the greatest distinction have themselves admitted that the Masoretic text is not infallible, as De Rossi has shewn by some remarkable quotations in the Prolegomena (§ 10.) to his *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti*. We must apply therefore in doubtful passages the same critical remedies, which are applied to all other ancient works. But among those critical remedies, we must be very cautious of introducing that desperate remedy, emendation from *conjecture*, which should never even be *attempted*, till *all other* remedies have failed. Nor must we be less cautious of concluding, that the Hebrew text is at any place faulty, *because* at that place some other text, or some ancient version, to which we choose *a priori* to give higher authority, has a different reading. Indeed if the Hebrew text were *so* faulty, as Morinus has made it in *theory*, and Houbigant in *practice*, it would be impossible, in *any* sense, to assert, that the integrity of the Hebrew Bible had been preserved. The truth, as usual, lies between the two extremes, of Buxtorf and Tychsen on the one hand, and of Morinus and Houbigant on the other. Among all the works on this subject, whether English or foreign, I know of none, in which this golden mean is so well preserved as in the following, of which I will subjoin the whole title, as it clearly expresses the design of the author. *Des Titres Primitifs de la Revelation, ou Considerations critiques sur la purete et l'integrite du texte original des livres saints de l'Ancien Testament; dans lesquelles on montre les avantages que la Religion (p. 259) et les Lettres peuvent retirer d'une nouvelle edition projettée de ce texte compare avec les manuscrits Hebreux, et les anciennes versions Grecques, Latines, et Orientales. Par le R. P. Gabriel Fabricy, de l'ordre des FF. Preoheurs, Docteur Theologien de Casanate, de l'Academie des Arcades. Rome, 1772, 2 tom. 8vo.* This work was published, while the collations were making for Dr. Kennicott, to whose then-intended edition the title refers, though it is not exactly descriptive of it, as Kennicott's edition (though Fabricy supposed it would) contains no quotations from the ancient versions.

Having thus described the first branch of Theology, or the *Criticism* of the Bible, I shall in the next Course describe the second branch, which relates to the *Interpretation* of the Bible.

Comments on this section from the Editor of theSamaritanUpdate.com

This reference is not located in *A Bibliography of the Samaritans, Third Edition, Revised, Expanded, and Annotated*, by Alan David Crown and Reinhard Pummer, ATLA Bibliography, No. 51, The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford. 2005