1516. The next possessing any critical value were those of Robert Stephen,@@1 viz. that of 1546, 12mo, commonly call­ed, from the first words of the preface, the *“ O Mirificam”* edition, that of 1549, 12mo, and that of 1550, folio. Beza was the first to issue an edition of the New Testament with a copious critical apparatus ; and his edition many of the minor editions for several years followed. The beautiful editions of the Elzevirs, which conform partly to the text of Stephen, partly to that of Beza, became so famous that they formed what has been called the *textus receptus.* In 1707 the edition of Mill was published at Oxford, in which not only is there a larger collection of various readings furnish­ed, but also a more scientific discrimination of these aimed at, than in any preceding edition. His example was fol­lowed by Bengel in Germany and Wetstein in Holland, both of whom have rendered important service to the text of the New Testament. All these, however, have been outstripped in diligence, learning, and acuteness, by Gries­bach, who issued his first edition, which embraced only the historical books of the New Testament, at Halle, 1774—75. In the mean time, the researches of Matthæi, Alter, Birch, and others, had greatly enlarged the mass of materials for a critical revision of the New Testament, and of these Gries­bach eagerly and ably availed himself in preparing a criti­cal edition of the whole New Testament. This he pub­lished in two volumes large octavo, the former in 1799, and the latter in 1806, at Halle. Subsequent editors have chiefly followed the scheme of this recension, at the same time exercising their own judgment upon the readings it supplies ; but recently Professor Scholz of Bonn has issued a new recension, for which he has subjected most of the manuscripts already used to a new collation, and collated some not hitherto examined. It appeared in two vols. 4to, in 1830-36, at Leipzig. A beautiful and exceedingly use­ful edition of the New Testament has been recently issued in this country by Dr S. T. Bloomfield, formed upon a care­ful collation of all previous critical recensions ; the third edition, two vols. 8vo, appeared at London in 1839.

Marsh’s Lectures, lect. iii.-vii. ; Schott, *Isagoge,* pp. 631—642 ; Horne’s Introduction, vol. ii. part ii. pp. 11—35 ; Michaelis, Introduc­tion, by Marsh, vol. ii. p. 159 and 429 ; Ernesti's Principles of Inter­pretation, vol. ii. p. 47.

Sect. IX.—*Manuscripts of the Sacred Text.*

Hebrew manuscripts are of two classes, *the rolled* and *the square ;* the former prepared for the use of the syna­gogues, and written only on parchment ; the latter for pri­vate use, and written sometimes on parchment and some­times on paper. In all the ancient manuscripts the words are written continuously without any division, and in the square Chaldaic character. They are divided by De Rossi into three classes, viz. 1. *The more ancient,* or those writ­ten before the twelfth century ; 2. *The ancient,* or those of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries ; 3. *The more re­cent,* or those written at the end of the fourteenth or be­ginning of the fifteenth century. The number of manu­scripts collated by Dr Kennicott was about 630, and by De Rossi 479.

Kennicott, *Dissert. Generalis;* Tychsen, *Tentamen de variis Codd. IIeb. ΜSS.* 1772; Home, vol. ii. p. 76-90.

Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament were written first on Egyptian papyrus, and then, as this was found too subject to decay, on skins. Subsequent to the twelfth cen­tury, silk paper was used for this purpose, until the thir­teenth century, when common (linen) paper came into

use (1). For the first eight centuries the manuscripts were written in uncial letters, large, erect, and not united either by strokes or hooks. From the beginning of the ninth century the cursive letters were employed, which are smaller, more inclined, and united with strokes ; they have, moreover, the iota subscribed (2). At first all the words were written without any diacritical marks or separations ; but as this was found inconvenient, and productive of mis­takes, especially in the public reading of the New Testa­ment, a plan was introduced to remedy it by Euthalius, then a deacon at Alexandria, in the fifth century, which consisted in so arranging those words that make one sense, as that they should compose one stich (*στιχοv*) or line (3). To save room, subsequent transcribers, instead of arranging these in distinct lines, marked the conclusion of each by a colon or point; and thus by degrees arose a complete gram­matical punctuation, which is presented in manuscripts from the tenth century downwards, though it was not till the six­teenth century that it was subjected to fixed rules in the editions then printed. From a very early period the cus­tom prevailed of dividing the text into sections (*χεφαλαια*)*,* but until the time of Euthalius no uniform order was ob­served in this respect. About the middle of the third cen­tury, Ammonius of Alexandria, in preparing a Diatesseron or Harmony of the Evangelists, divided the text into a number of very short sections ; and these having been adopted with slight variations by Eusebius (4) (whence they are frequently denominated *χεφαλαια Ammoniano-Eusebiana),* they were in many manuscripts conjoined with the Euthalian divisions. In the sixth century, some finding use for a division of the text into larger portions, introduced the arrangement by *τιτλοι* or *breves ;* but in the course of time these two modes led to so much confusion, that in the thirteenth century Hugo de Santo Caro, a Spanish cardinal, introduced as a remedy the division into chapters and verses, which was afterwards perfected by Robert Stephen into that now in use. Besides these divisions, there was another for church purposes into *τεϑιχοπαι*, *ἀvαγvωσεις*, or

containing the sections of the New Testament appointed for lessons in the public service of the church on Sundays and festivals. The commencement of each of these was marked with an α (*ἀϑχη*), and the close with a (*τελος*) (5).

1. Montfaucon, *Palæographia Graca,* p. 15.

2. *Ibid.* pp. 151-177, 269, 33, 134.

3. Zacagni *Collectuneu Monument. Vet. Eccl. Græcæ,* 1698, tom. i. p. 403, &c. ; Eichhorn, *Einleit.,* bd iv. p. 164 ; Marsh’s Notes to Mi­chaelis, vol. i.

4. See Mill’s New Testament, p. 181.

5. Marsh’s Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 889 et seq. ; Horne's Introduction, vol. ii. p. 71 ; Schott, *Isagoge,* p. 577-584.

These historical facts are of service in determining the age of the New Testament codices. These are very numerous, but the most famous of them alone required to be enume­rated. Very few of them contain the whole of the New Testament. They are arranged as follows.

1. *Manuscripts executed before the stichometric mode of writing was prevalent,* viz. the Cod. Alexandrinus (A@@2), Vaticanus (B), Ephraemi (vel Cod. Regius 9, G), Dublinensis rescriptus (Z).

2. *Stichometric Manuscripts,* viz. Cod. Cantabrigiensis (vel Cod. Bezæ, D), Laudianus III. (E), Claromontanus (D, inter Cod. Paulinos), Boernerianus (G, inter Cod. Paulinos), Augiensis (F, inter Cod. Paulinos), Coislininus (H).

3. *Manuscripts written after the disuse of the stichometric method.* These are very numerous. The most valuable

@@@, This is commonly written *Stephens,* but the correctness of this may be questioned. The French *Etienne,* which was the vernacular name of this illustrious family, is equivalent to our *Stephen,* and the proper Latin form of Stephens would he *Stephanius,* and not *Stephanus.*

@@@8 These letters refer to the nomenclature of the manuscripts adopted by Griesbach and Wetstein.