those of Tobit and of Judith, which are genuine, though not inspired ; to the latter all the rest of the apocryphal books, both of the Old Testament and the New, none of which are inspired, or can be shown to be genuine.

Horne's Introduction, vol. i., Appendix, p. 457 ; Rainold, *Censura Lihrorum Veteris Testamenti Apocryphorum,* 1611 ; Bretschneider, *De Libri Sapientia,* &c. 1804; Josephus, *Cont. Apionem,* i. 8 ; Hierony­mi, *Præfat.* in *libb. Salomonis, et in Judith et Tobiam*

Sect. VII.—*History of the Original Text of the Old Tes­tament Scriptures.*

The history of the Hebrew text may be divided into three great epochs. The *first* of these reaches from the comple­tion of the Alexandrian Greek version to the times of Ori­gen, Jerome, and the Talmud, b. c. 300—a. d**.** 500. Du­ring this period the use of the Greek version had very much superseded, even in Palestine, the original Hebrew ; but ample compensation for this has been rendered by the aid which the existence of this and of other versions has afford­ed the critic in settling the Hebrew text. Important ser­vice was rendered by Origen’s critical revision of the Greek, and Jerome’s revision of the Latin versions. Nor were the Jews behind the Christians in this respect, for we find from the Talmud evidence that already had various readings be­gun to be collected by them.

In the *Talmud, Hierosol. Tract. Thaanit.* fob lxviii., it is said of cer­tain various readings, that “ they have come down from the times when the temple was yet standing.” Capeili *Critica Sacra,* tom. i. p. 444-458 ; Waltoni *Prolegom.* viii. § 20-28 ; Kennicott, *Dissert. Genera­lis,* p. 275 ; Horne’s Introduction, vol. ii. p. 35, 36.

The *second* epoch reaches from the times of Jerome and the Talmud to that of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphthali, that is, from the sixth to the eleventh century. About the com­mencement of this period the Masorah, or collection of tra­ditionary observations, orthographical, critical, grammatical, and exegetical, which had been accumulating for upwards of three centuries among the Jewish rabbin, was made by a college of leaτned Jews at Tiberias in Palestine. To this mass of scholia additions were continually made, as well as corrections proposed on it, by the *Lords of the Masorah* (בעלי חמםורח), as they were called, until the time of Jacob Ben Ha-yim, by whom the whole was completed and print­ed along with the Hebrew text in the year 1526. The commencement of the eleventh century is memorable in the history of the Hebrew text, from the circumstance of two recensions having been issued by the heads of two celebrat­ed Jewish academies ; by Aaron Ben Asher, principal of the academy of Tiberias, and Jacob Ben Naphthali, principal of the academy of Babylon. These have given rise to the various readings denominated the occidental and the orien­tal respectively. By them also the last hand was put to the pointing of the Hebrew text.

Capelli *Crit*. *Sacra,* t. i. p. 439-443 ; Simon, *Histoire Critique,* ch. i.

p. 24—26 ; Kennicott, ii. p. 279 ; Buxtorf, *Tiberias,* 1610 ;

Marsh’s Lectures, lect viii. cd. 1828 ; Walton, *Prolegom.* viii. ; Horne, vol. ii. p. 39, 40.

The *third* epoch reaches from the beginning of the eleventh century to the middle of the eighteenth. About the year 1040 many learned Jews, banished from the cast, took refuge in Europe, and brought with them their Scriptures and their critical learning. Maimonides, Jarchi, Ebenezra, Kimchi, and others, rendered additional service as to the interpretation, so also to the criticism, of the sacred text. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries Todrosius, Me- nachem, and Sal. Norzi, collected various readings. In 1477 the first scriptural book in Hebrew, in 1488 the entire Hebrew Bible for the first time, was printed ; the latter at Soncino, the former at some place unknown. Of great importance is the so-called *Rabbinical Bible,* printed at •Venice in 1526, and edited by Ben Ha-yim. Among Chris­

tian editors, Sebastian Münster was the first who issued an edition of the Hebrew Bible, with various readings, Basil., 1535. The editions of Jablonski, Berlin, 1699, and of Van der Hooght, Amsterdam, 1705, are worthy of notice as critical editions. John Henry Michaelis published his edi­tion at Halle in 1720, for which he collated five manuscripts and nineteen editions. In 1753, at Paris, appeared the edi­tion of Charles Francis Houbigant, for which twelve manu­scripts were collated, but the value of which is greatly im­paired by the editor’s propensity to conjectural emendation, and by his attaching such undue importance to the read­ings of the Septuagint. The splendid work of Kennicott (Oxford, t. i. 1776, ii. 1780) presents the largest mass of va­rious readings yet collected ; but the want of scientific dis­crimination as to their relative value has impaired the use­fulness of the collection. The same may be said of the va­rious readings collected by De Rossi, Parma, 1784-1788.

Marsh’s Lectures, lect. ix. ; ∏orne, ii. p. 41, 42 ; Augusti, *Einleitung,* s. 85—92.

Sect. VIII.—*History of the Original Text of the New Tes­tament Scriptures.*

In regard to the *Greek* text of the New Testament, the first thing to be considered is the variety of opinion among critics respecting the different *recensions,* as they have been termed, or *classes* of documents containing the original text. Of these documents, some more, and others less, closely re­semble each other as respects the nature and selection of their readings, and not unfrequently traces of a common ori­gin in the older codices and versions arc apparent. This has led to the idea of arranging these into *classes,* or *fami­lies,* or *recensions,* an idea first started by Bengel and Semler ( I ), and which has been carried out by several more recent inquirers. Bengel concluded that there are two families of manuscripts, the African and Asiatic, of the former of which the Alexandrian manuscript is the sole representative (with which agree the Ethiopic, the Coptic, and the ancient Latin versions), whereas the latter is very numerous. After Bengel came Griesbach (2), who contended for a threefold recen­sion, the Western, the Alexandrian or Eastern, and the Constantinopolitan or Byzantine. Of these, the two former are the oldest, and are by him attributed to the same age. They differ, in that the Western text is more replete with Hebraisms, with explanatory additions, and with occasional substitutions of a perspicuous formula for one more difficult ; whilst the Eastern prefers those readings that are accommodated to the classic Greek, corrects phrases that are less pure, and is less deformed by errors of the transcriber, though particles and synonyms are occasionally omitted through haste. The Constantinopolitan has arisen from the mingling of the readings of the other two. It properly con­sists of *two* recensions ; a senior (fourth century), even more fond of pure Greek forms, and richer in glosses, than the Alexandrian itself; and a junior (fifth or sixth century), which appears to have been formed after a new collation of the senior with the Eastern and Alexandrian recensions, by the labours of some learned men of the Syrian Church. Griesbach defends his system with great learning and in­genuity ; but it is open, as Schott observes, to the following objections : 1*st,* His positions respecting the origin assigned to both recensions are destitute of a solid basis ; *idly,* Many reasons concur to prevent our admitting that any state of the text of the New Testament peculiar to the Western Church, such as could from its singular character be entitled to the name of a recension, existed (3) ; *3dly,* The features of the text followed by the very ancient Peschito version cannot well be accounted for on the principles of Griesbach ; and, in fine, all who seek accurately to arrange codices, versions, and extracts found in the fathers, according to different re­censions, labour under this difficulty, that none of those do-