cuments of the New Testament which are of great age ex­hibits any such pure and perfect recension (4).

1. Bengel, *Apparatus Criticus ad Novum Test.* p. 425, Tubingæ 1763 ; Ejusdem *Introductio in Crisin N. T.* § 26, &c., p. 385, Tubin­gæ, 1734 ; Semler, *Vorbereitungen zur Hermeneutik,* Halle, 1760— 1769.

2. Griesbach, *Opuscula Academica,* ed. Gabler, vol. i.

3. From the writings of the fathers of the second century, we learn that those various readings which are said to be peculiar to the west-era and to the eastern texts respectively, do not, as respects their *origin,* belong to different recensions. (See Eichhorn, *Einl.* bde. iv. p. 265 and 269, &c.) Nor is it probable that the doctors of the Western Church, who were but little skilled in Greek, should have thought of preparing a recension of the New Testament.

4. Schott, *Isagoge,* p. 562—565.

A different theory of recensions has been adopted by Hug. He thinks that the text which we find in those early codi­ces which Griesbach referred to the Western recension, in the oldest Latin versions, in the Sahidico-Coptic version, in the quotations of the fathers till the time of Origen, and in Origen himself, was the *χοιvὴ* *ἔχδοσις*, or common edition, conformed to no recension in particular, and containing various readings of different sorts and of different origins mingled together, especially such as serve to explain the text. At the same time those codices which were written in Syria and other parts of the east (the inhabitants of which understood better than most others the Hebræo-Greek dialect of the New Testament) preserved the primitive text more correctly ; and hence it happened that the oldest Syriac version, though upon the whole belonging to this common edition, not unfrequently dissents from the read­ings of the other documents of the same edition. About the middle of the third century, Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop, first set about correcting the errors of the recension of the common edition used in Egypt, purging out all in­terpolations and glosses, restoring words that had been omitted, but aiming too much at producing a text that should be remarkable for its Greek purity and elegance. Almost at the same time, Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, in Syria, revised the common edition as it appeared in the Peschito version, following chiefly the authority of this ver­sion. but at the same time comparing other codices found in Syria, and produced a text differing from that of He­sychius in this, that it showed less desire to amend the Greek of the New Testament. Besides these, a third re­cension was undertaken by Origen in Palestine, based upon the common edition used by the Christians there, which conformed in some respects to that of Hesychius, in others to that of Lucian, whilst frequently it differed from both, and which subsequently became the one commonly used in Palestine and the adjoining districts. Of these recensions none is preserved in any of those documents which we now possess, as the transcribers frequently compared their re­cension with the common edition and with other recensions. Hug’s theory rests so far on an historical basis, that it ap­pears certain that Hesychius and Lucian did undertake some such labour as he ascribes to them ; but that codi­ces of their recensions were either very numerous or very widely disseminated, cannot be shown. The labour attri­buted to Origen is more than doubtful.

Hug, *Einleitung,* bιl. i. s. 126 (Eng. Trans, vol. i. p. 134, &c.); Schott, *Isagoge,* p. 566 ; Horne, ii. p. 56

Matthæi thinks that no recensions of the text of the New Testament were anciently made, and he prefers dividing the documents from which the text is to be determined, into, 1*st, Codices textus perpetui,* in which there are neither scholia nor commentaries, and which excel all the others in the purity of the text they exhibit ; 2*d*, *Lectionaria,* which contain the lessons read in churches, and exhibit a text loss free from scholiary interpolation than the preceding ; 3*d*, *Codices mixti,* which contain scholia and interpretations partly on the margin, but chiefly interpolated. Matthæi

thought the Moscow manuscripts, which he had himself diligently collated, the best ; and this perhaps led him to a very unjust estimate of the worth and authority of many other documents of the text of the New Testament.

Schott, *Isagoge,* p. 570 ; Horne, ii. p. 50.

Scholz, the most recent editor of the Greek New Tes­tament, adopts neither the opinion of Griesbach nor that of Hug. He concludes that there are two classes of cri­tical witnesses for the text of the New Testament, the Alex­andrian and the Constantinopolitan ; to the former of which belong all the codices executed in Egypt and western Eu­rope, the most of the Coptic and Latin versions, the Ethi­opic version, and the quotations by ecclesiastical writers of these districts ; and to the latter all the codices written in Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and eastern Europe, the Phi- Ioxenian Syriac version, the Gothic, the Georgian, the Scla­vonian, the quotations by the fathers living in these regions, and all printed editions. To manuscripts of the latter class he attributes superior value, because of their greater har­mony, and of their having been more faithfully copied from original documents than those of the former, which often exhibit a text altered at the will of grammarians. A two­fold difficulty presses upon this theory of Scholz ; for, first, the Western text of the New Testament has a character considerably different from that of the Alexandrian ; and, secondly, the text divulged at Constantinople by order of Constantine and Constans was, as Scholz himself admits, collated with the Alexandrian text, so that the readings of both recensions were intermixed. It is, moreover, rather as­sumed than proved that that form of the text which, dur­ing the first three centuries, prevailed in Asia Minor and Greece, was the same which was afterwards divulged prin­cipally in the Constantinopolitan codices ; nor is it suffi­ciently clear that Alexandria was the primary seat of the arbitrary corruption **of** the New Testament text.

Scholz, *Pro,eg. ad editionem* *N*. *T.* vol. i. ; Schott, *Isagoge,* p. 570; Horne, ii. 58-66.

The theory of Eichhorn is that which perhaps approaches nearest the truth; He grants, that from a very early age, different readings, derived from various sources, existed, and were vastly augmented in the third century by va­rious efforts of an exegetical nature, so that as early as the second century there were two species of texts, the Asiatic and the African, but neither of them was deter­mined by any very certain critical laws. He denies that Origen was the author of a peculiar recension, but admits the services of Hesychius and Lucian in this respect, although he questions the possibility of ascertaining accu­rately the primitive character of either recension from ancient documents. There thus arose a threefold text of the New Testament, the African (Alexandrian), the Asiatic (Constantinopolitan), and a Mixed, which had its source from this, that many, notwithstanding the authority ac­quired by the recensions of Hesychius and Lucian in the churches of Africa and Asia, preferred following the au­thority of older codices. No change of a critical kind took place upon the text thus formed until editions of the New- Testament began to be printed. No opinion so fully ac­cords with what may be regarded as best ascertained as this of Eichhorn, though it is still doubtful whether the ef­forts of Hesychius and Lucian exerted a very wide or last­ing influence upon the form of the text of the New Testa­ment.

Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Ν. T.* bd. iv. s. 183, &c. ; Schott, *Isa­goge,* p. 572, from which work the above account has been principally taken ; Horne, ii. p. 57.

With the exception of some detached portions, the first printed editions of the New Testament were those of the Complutensian Polyglott, 1514, and of Erasmus, Basil.,