learning, and had a cool and ſound judgment, though it did not prevent him from thinking too highly of the Latin readings, and of the *Codex Alexandrinus,* with other Latinizing manuſcripts.

The imperfections of Bengel’s edition ariſe chiefly from his diffidence and caution. He did not venture to inſert into the text any reading which had not al­ready appeared in ſome printed edition, even though he believed it to be the genuine reading. In the book of Revelation indeed he took the liberty to inſert read­ings which had never been printed; becauſe few manuſcripts had been uſed in the printing of that book.

The celebrated edition of John James Wetſtein, which is the moſt important of all, and the moſt neceſſary to thoſe engaged in ſacred criticiſm, was publiſhed at Amſterdam in 1751 and 1752, in two volumes folio. No man will deny that Wetſtein’s *Prolegomena* diſcover profound erudition, critical penetration, and an intimate acquaintance with the Greek manuſcripts. It is a work which in many reſpects has given a new turn to ſacred criticifm, and no man engaged in that ſtudy can diſpenſe with it. Wherever Wetſtein has delivered his ſentiments reſpecting a Greek manuſcript, which he has done leſs frequently than Mill, and indeed leſs frequently than we could have wiſhed, he ſhows himſelf an experienced and ſagacious critic. He is likewiſe more concile than Mill in delivering his opinion, and does not ſupport it by producing ſo great a number of readings from the manuſcript in queſtion. This conciſeneſs is the conſequence of that warmth and haſte which were peculiar to Wetſtein’s character, and which have ſometimes given birth to miſtakes. The fire of his diſpoſition was likewiſe the cauſe of his advancing conjectures, in regard to the hiſtory of his manuſcripts, which exceed the bounds of probability. But the cri­tical rules which he has delivered are perfectly **juſt;** and in this reſpect there is a remarkable agreement between him and his eminent predeceſſors Mill and Bengel. In regard to the Latin verſion alone they appear to differ: in Mill and Bengel it has powerful, and per­haps partial, advocates; but in Wetſtein a ſevere and ſa­gacious judge, who ſometimes condemns it without a cauſe. The Greek manuſcripts which confirm the read­ings of the Vulgate, and which he ſuppoſed had been corrupted from it, he of courſe condemned with equal ſeverity: and ſome collections of various readings which had been made by Catholics, he made no ſcruple to pronounce a forgery, ſaying, “*Timeo Danaos, et dona ferentes."* But in conſequence of his antipathy to the Vulgate, his collection of various readings is leſs perfect than it might have been.

It has been aſked, 1. Whether he has quoted his manuſcripts either falſely or imperfectly, in order to eſtabliſh his own religious opinions? or, *2.* Whether his diligence and accuracy has been ſuch that we may at all times depend upon them? To the firſt of theſe queſtions there can be no other anſwer, than that Wetſtein, in his character of a critic, is perfectly honeſt. With reſpect to the ſecond, his diligence and accuracy, Mi­chaelis thinks there is leſs reaſon to pronounce him faultleſs. But Mr Marſh has examined the examples on which Michaelis founds his affertion, and declares that Michaelis is miſtaken in every one of them.

The diligence of Wetſtein can ſcarcely be queſtioned

by any who are acquainted with his hiſtory, He travelled into different countries, and examined with his own eyes a much greater number of manuſcripts than any of his predeceſſors. His collection of various read­ings amount to *above a million;* and he has not only produced a much greater quantity of matter than his predeceſſors, but has likewiſe corrected their miſtakes. The extracts from manuſcripts, verſions, and printed editions of the Greek Teſtament, which had been quoted by Mill, are generally quoted by Wetſtein. Whenever Wetſtein had no new extracts from the ma­nuſcripts quoted by Mill, or had no opportunity of ex­amining them himſelf, he copied literally from Mill; but wherever Mill has quoted from printed editions, as from the margin of Robert Stephens’s for inſtance, or from the London Polyglot, Wetſtein did not copy from Mill, but went to the original fource, as appears from his having corrected many miſtakes in Mill’s quo­tations.

In the opinion of Michaelis, there are many defects in the edition of Wetſtein, which require to be ſupplied, and many errors to be corrected. Yet ſtill it muſt be allowed to be a work of immenſe labour, and moſt valuable to thoſe engaged in ſacred criticiſm; and it is ſurpriſing, when we conſider the difficulties and la­bour which Wetſtein had to encounter, that his errors and imperfections are ſo few.

The propoſal of Michaelis, however, of a new collation of manuſcripts, in order to form a complete col­lection of various readings, is worthy the attention of the learned. In mentioning this propoſal, Michaelis turns a wiſhful eye towards Britain, the only country, he ſays, which poſſeſſes the will and the means to exe­cute the taſk. Should a reſolution, he adds, be form­ed in this iſland, ſo happily ſituated for promoting the purpoſes of general knowledge, to make the underta­king a public concern, to enter into a ſubſcription, and to employ men of abilities in collating manuſcripts both at home and abroad, they would be able to do more in ten years than could otherwiſe be done in a century. And could this nation direct its attention to any object more glorious or more uſeful than in aſcertaining the text of the ſacred Sciptures, and giving to poſterity an accurate edition?

As the ſenſe of Scripture, as well as all other books, is affected by the punctuation, it is of importance to determine whether the flops or points which we find in the ſacred books were uſed by the ſacred writers, or have been inſerted by modern tranſcribers.

We are told by Montfaucβn, in his *Palaeοgraphia Graea,* p. 31. that the perſon who firſt diſtinguiſhed the ſeveral parts of a period in Greek writing, by the introduction of a point, was Ariſtophanes of Byzan­tium, who lived under Ptolemæus Epiphanes, in the 145th Olympiad. But though pointe were not uſed in books before this period, they were employed in inſcriptions above 400 years before the birth of Chriſt. See *Mont. Pal. Grac.* p. 135.

Under the article Punctuation we mentioned, on authority which we reckoned unqueſtionable, that the ancient manuſcripts were written without any points. We have now, however, diſcovered, from Woide’s edi­tion of the *Codex Alexandrinus,* that points are uſed in that manuſcript, though omitted in the *fac simile* given