

The
Revision
Revised

A Refutation of Westcott and Hort's
False Greek Text and Theory



A Defense of the Authorized Version

Dean John William Burgon



John William Burgon (1813-1888)

The following is PREBENDARY SCRIVENER'S recently published estimate of the System on which DRs. WESTCOTT AND HORT have constructed their 'Revised Greek Text of the New Testament' (1881).—That System, the Chairman of the Revising Body (BISHOP ELLICOTT) has entirely adopted (see below, pp. 391 to 397), and made the basis of his Defence of THE REVISERS and their 'New Greek Text.'

- (1.) "There is little hope for the stability of their imposing structure, if *its foundations have been laid on the sandy ground of ingenious conjecture*. And, since barely the smallest vestige of historical evidence has ever been alleged in support of the views of these accomplished Editors, their teaching must either be received as intuitively true, or *dismissed from our consideration as precarious and even visionary.*"
- (2.) "DR. HORT'S System *is entirely destitute of historical foundation.*"
- (3.) "We are compelled to repeat as emphatically as ever our strong conviction that the Hypothesis to whose proof he has devoted so many laborious years, *is destitute not only of historical foundation, but of all probability, resulting from the internal goodness of the Text which its adoption would force upon us.*"
- (4.) "'We cannot doubt' (says DR. HORT) 'that S. Luke xxiii. 34 comes from an extraneous source.' [*Notes*, p. 68.]—*Nor can we, on our part, doubt,*" (rejoins DR. SCRIVENER,) "*that the System which entails such consequences is hopelessly self-condemned.*"

SCRIVENER'S 'Plain Introduction,' &c. [ed. 1883]:
pp. 531, 537, 542, 604.

TO THE
RIGHT HON. VISCOUNT CRANBROOK, G.C.S.I.,
&c., &c., &c.

MY DEAR LORD CRANBROOK,

Allow me the gratification of dedicating the present Volume to yourself; but for whom—(I reserve the explanation for another day)—it would never have been written.

This is not, (as you will perceive at a glance,) the Treatise which a few years ago I told you I had in hand; and which, but for the present hindrance, might by this time have been completed. It has however grown out of that other work in the manner explained at the beginning of my Preface. Moreover it contains not a few specimens of the argumentation of which the work in question, when at last it sees the light, will be discovered to be full.

My one object has been to defeat the mischievous attempt which was made in 1881 to thrust upon this Church and Realm a Revision of the Sacred Text, which—recommended though it be by eminent names—I am thoroughly convinced, and am able to prove, is untrustworthy from beginning to end.

The reason is plain. It has been constructed throughout on an utterly erroneous hypothesis. And I inscribe this Volume to you, my friend, as a conspicuous member of that body of faithful and learned Laity by whose deliberate verdict, when the whole of the evidence has been produced and the case has been fully argued out, I shall be quite willing that my contention may stand or fall.

The English (as well as the Greek) of the newly "Revised Version" is hopelessly at fault. It is to me simply unintelligible how a company of Scholars can have spent ten years in elaborating such a very unsatisfactory production. Their uncouth phraseology and their jerky sentences, their pedantic obscurity and their unidiomatic English, contrast painfully with "the happy turns of expression, the music of the cadences, the felicities of the rhythm" of our Authorized Version. The transition from one to the other, as the Bishop of Lincoln remarks, is like exchanging a well-built carriage for a vehicle without springs, in which you get jolted to death on a newly-mended and rarely-traversed road. But the "Revised Version" is inaccurate as well; exhibits defective scholarship, I mean, in countless places.

It is, however, the systematic depravation of the underlying Greek which does so grievously offend me: for this is nothing else but a poisoning of the River of Life at its sacred source. Our Revisers, (with the best and purest intentions, no doubt,) stand convicted of having deliberately rejected the words of

Inspiration in every page, and of having substituted for them fabricated Readings which the Church has long since refused to acknowledge, or else has rejected with abhorrence; and which only survive at this time in a little handful of documents of the most depraved type.

As Critics they have had abundant warning. Twelve years ago (1871) a volume appeared on 'the last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark,'—of which the declared object was to vindicate those Verses against certain critical objectors, and to establish them by an exhaustive argumentative process. Up to this hour, for a very obvious reason, no answer to that volume has been attempted. And yet, at the end of ten years (1881),—not only in the Revised English but also in the volume which professes to exhibit the underlying Greek, (which at least is indefensible,)—the Revisers are observed to separate off those Twelve precious Verses from their context, in token that they are no part of the genuine Gospel. Such a deliberate preference of 'mumpsimus' to 'sumpsimus' is by no means calculated to conciliate favour, or even to win respect. The Revisers have in fact been the dupes of an ingenious Theorist, concerning whose extraordinary views you are invited to read what Dr. Scrivener has recently put forth. The words of the last-named writer (who is facile princeps in Textual Criticism) will be found facing the beginning of the present Dedication.

If, therefore, any do complain that I have sometimes hit my opponents rather hard, I take leave to point out that "to every-

thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the sun": "a time to embrace, and a time to be far from embracing": a time for speaking smoothly, and a time for speaking sharply. And that when the words of Inspiration are seriously imperilled, as now they are, it is scarcely possible for one who is determined effectually to preserve the Deposit in its integrity, to hit either too straight or too hard. In handling certain recent utterances of Bishop Ellicott, I considered throughout that it was the 'Textual Critic,'—not the Successor of the Apostles,—with whom I had to do.

And thus I commend my Volume, the fruit of many years of incessant anxious toil, to your indulgence: requesting that you will receive it as a token of my sincere respect and admiration; and desiring to be remembered, my dear Lord Cranbrook, as

Your grateful and affectionate

Friend and Servant,

JOHN W. BURGON.

DEANERY, CHICHESTER,
ALL SAINTS' DAY. 1883.

P R E F A C E.

THE ensuing three Articles from the 'Quarterly Review,'—(wrung out of me by the publication [May 17th, 1881] of the 'Revision' of our 'Authorized Version of the New Testament,')—appear in their present form in compliance with an amount of continuous solicitation that they should be separately published, which it would have been alike unreasonable and ungracious to disregard. I was not prepared for it. It has caused me—as letter after letter has reached my hands—mixed feelings; has revived all my original disinclination and regret. For, gratified as I cannot but feel by the reception my labours have met with,—(and only the Author of my being knows what an amount of antecedent toil is represented by the ensuing pages,)—I yet deplore more heartily than I am able to express, the injustice done to the cause of Truth by handling the subject in this fragmentary way, and by exhibiting the evidence for what is most certainly true, in such a very incomplete form. A systematic Treatise is the indispensable condition for securing cordial assent to the view for which I mainly contend. The cogency of the argument lies entirely in the cumulative character of the proof. It requires to be demonstrated by induction from a large collection of particular instances, as well as by the complex exhibition of many converging lines of evidence, that the testimony of one small group of documents, or rather, of one particular manuscript,—(namely

the Vatican Codex B, which, for some unexplained reason, it is just now the fashion to regard with superstitious deference,)—is the reverse of trustworthy. Nothing in fact but a considerable Treatise will ever effectually break the yoke of that iron tyranny to which the excellent Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol and his colleagues have recently bowed their necks; and are now for imposing on all English-speaking men. In brief, if I were not, on the one hand, thoroughly convinced of the strength of my position,—(and I know it to be absolutely impregnable);—yet more, if on the other hand, I did not cherish entire confidence in the practical good sense and fairness of the English mind;—I could not have brought myself to come before the public in the unsystematic way which alone is possible in the pages of a Review. I must have waited, at all hazards, till I had finished ‘my Book.’

But then, delay would have been fatal. I saw plainly that unless a sharp blow was delivered immediately, the Citadel would be in the enemy’s hands. I knew also that it was just possible to condense into 60 or 70 closely-printed pages what must *logically* prove fatal to the ‘Revision.’ So I set to work; and during the long summer days of 1881 (June to September) the foremost of these three Articles was elaborated. When the October number of ‘the Quarterly’ appeared, I comforted myself with the secret consciousness that enough was by this time on record, even had my life been suddenly brought to a close, to secure the ultimate rejection of the ‘Revision’ of 1881. I knew that the ‘New Greek Text,’ (and therefore the ‘New English Version’),

had received its death-blow. It might for a few years drag out a maimed existence; eagerly defended by some,—timidly pleaded for by others. But such efforts could be of no avail. Its days were already numbered. The effect of more and yet more learned investigation,—of more elaborate and more extended inquiry,—*must* be to convince mankind more and yet more thoroughly that the principles on which it had been constructed were radically unsound. In the end, when partisanship had cooled down, and passion had evaporated, and prejudice had ceased to find an auditory, the 'Revision' of 1881 must come to be universally regarded as—what it most certainly is,—*the most astonishing, as well as the most calamitous literary blunder of the Age.*

I. I pointed out that 'the NEW GREEK TEXT,'—which, in defiance of their instructions,¹ the Revisionists of 'the Authorized English Version' had been so ill-advised as to spend ten years in elaborating,—was a wholly untrustworthy performance: was full of the gravest errors from beginning to end: had been constructed throughout on an entirely mistaken Theory. Availing myself of the published confession of one of the Revisionists,² I explained the nature of the calamity which had befallen the Revision. I traced the mischief home to its true authors,—Drs. Westcott and Hort; a copy of whose unpublished Text of the N. T. (the most vicious in existence) had been confidentially, and under pledges of the strictest secrecy, placed in the hands of every

¹ Any one who desires to see this charge established, is invited to read from page 399 to page 413 of what follows.

² Dr. Newth. See pp. 37-9.

member of the revising Body.¹ I called attention to the fact that, unacquainted with the difficult and delicate science of Textual Criticism, the Revisionists had, in an evil hour, surrendered themselves to Dr. Hort's guidance: had preferred his counsels to those of Prebendary Scrivener, (an infinitely more trustworthy guide): and that the work before the public was the piteous—but *inevitable*—result. All this I explained in the October number of the 'Quarterly Review' for 1881.²

II. In thus demonstrating the worthlessness of the 'New Greek Text' of the Revisionists, I considered that I had destroyed the key of their position. And so perforce I had: for if the underlying Greek Text be mistaken, what else but incorrect must the English Translation be? But on examining the so-called 'Revision of the Authorized Version,' I speedily made the further discovery that the Revised English would have been in itself intolerable, even had the Greek been let alone. In the first place, to my surprise and annoyance, it proved to be a *New Translation* (rather than a Revision of the Old) which had been attempted. Painfully apparent were the tokens which met me on every side that the Revisionists had been supremely eager not so much to correct none but "plain and clear errors,"—as to introduce as many changes into the English of the New Testament Scriptures as they conveniently could.³ A skittish impatience of the admirable work before them, and a strange inability

¹ See pp. 24-9: 97, &c.

² See below, pp. 1 to 110.

³ This will be found more fully explained from pp. 127 to 130: pp. 154 to 164: also pp. 400 to 403. See also the quotations on pp. 112 and 368.

to appreciate its manifold excellences :—a singular imagination on the part of the promiscuous Company which met in the Jerusalem Chamber that they were competent to improve the Authorized Version in every part, and an unaccountable forgetfulness that the fundamental condition under which the task of Revision had been by themselves undertaken, was that they should abstain from all but “*necessary*” changes :—*this* proved to be only part of the offence which the Revisionists had committed. It was found that they had erred through *defective Scholarship* to an extent, and with a frequency, which to me is simply inexplicable. I accordingly made it my business to demonstrate all this in a second Article which appeared in the next (the January) number of the ‘Quarterly Review,’ and was entitled ‘THE NEW ENGLISH TRANSLATION.’¹

III. Thereupon, a pretence was set up in many quarters, (*but only by the Revisionists and their friends,*) that all my labour hitherto had been thrown away, because I had omitted to disprove the principles on which this ‘New Greek Text’ is founded. I flattered myself indeed that quite enough had been said to make it logically certain that the underlying ‘Textual Theory’ *must be* worthless. But I was not suffered to cherish this conviction in quiet. It was again and again cast in my teeth that I had not yet grappled with Drs. Westcott and Hort’s ‘arguments.’ “Instead of condemning *their Text*, why do you not disprove *their Theory*?” It was tauntingly insinuated that I knew better than to cross swords

¹ See below, pp. 113 to 232.

with the two Cambridge Professors. This reduced me to the necessity of either leaving it to be inferred from my silence that I had found Drs. Westcott and Hort's 'arguments' unanswerable; or else of coming forward with their book in my hand, and demonstrating that in their solemn pages an attentive reader finds himself encountered by nothing but a series of unsupported assumptions: that their (so called) 'Theory' is in reality nothing else but a weak effort of the Imagination: that the tissue which these accomplished scholars have been thirty years in elaborating, proves on inspection to be as flimsy and as worthless as any spider's web.

I made it my business in consequence to expose, somewhat in detail, (in a third Article, which appeared in the 'Quarterly Review' for April 1882), the absolute absurdity, —(I use the word advisedly)—of 'WESTCOTT AND HORT'S NEW TEXTUAL THEORY;' ¹ and I now respectfully commend those 130 pages to the attention of candid and unprejudiced readers. It were idle to expect to convince any others. We have it on good authority (Dr. Westcott's) that "he who has long pondered over a train of Reasoning, *becomes unable to detect its weak points.*" ² A yet stranger phenomenon is, that those who have once committed themselves to an erroneous Theory, seem to be incapable of opening their eyes to the untrustworthiness of the fabric they have erected, even when it comes down in their sight, like a child's house built with playing-cards,—and presents to every eye but their own the appearance of a shapeless ruin.

¹ See below, pp. 235 to 366.

² *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. viii.

§ 1. Two full years have elapsed since the first of these Essays was published; and my Criticism—for the best of reasons—remains to this hour unanswered. The public has been assured indeed, (in the course of some hysterical remarks by Canon Farrar¹), that “the ‘Quarterly Reviewer’ can be refuted as fully as he desires as soon as any scholar has the leisure to answer him.” The ‘Quarterly Reviewer’ can afford to wait,—if the Revisers can. But they are reminded that it is no answer to one who has demolished their master’s ‘Theory,’ for the pupils to keep on reproducing fragments of it; and by their mistakes and exaggerations, to make both themselves and him, ridiculous.

¹ Reference is made to a vulgar effusion in the ‘*Contemporary Review*’ for March 1882: from which it chiefly appears that Canon (now Archdeacon) Farrar is unable to forgive S. Mark the Evangelist for having written the 16th verse of his concluding chapter. The Venerable writer is in consequence for ever denouncing those “*last Twelve Verses.*” In March 1882, (pretending to review my Articles in the ‘Quarterly,’) he says:—“In spite of Dean Burgon’s Essay on the subject, the minds of most scholars are *quite unalterably made up* on such questions as the authenticity of the last twelve verses of S. Mark.” [*Contemporary Review*, vol. xli. p. 365.] And in the ensuing October,—“If, among *positive results*, any one should set down such facts as that . . . Mark xvi. 9–20 . . . *formed no part of the original apostolic autograph* . . . He, I say, who should enumerate these points as being *beyond the reach of serious dispute* . . . would be expressing the views which are *regarded as indisputable* by the vast majority of such recent critics as have established any claim to serious attention.” [*Expositor*, p. 173.]

It may not be without use to the Venerable writer that he should be reminded that critical questions, instead of being disposed of by such language as the foregoing, are not even touched thereby. One is surprised to have to tell a “fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge,” so obvious a truth as that by such writing he does but effectually put himself out of court. By proclaiming that his mind is “*quite unalterably made up*” that the end of S. Mark’s Gospel is not authentic, he admits that he is impervious to argument and therefore incapable of understanding proof. It is a mere waste of time to reason with an unfortunate who announces that he is beyond the reach of conviction.

§ 2. Thus, a writer in the 'Church Quarterly' for January 1882, (whose knowledge of the subject is entirely derived from what Dr. Hort has taught him,)—being evidently much exercised by the first of my three Articles in the 'Quarterly Review,'—gravely informs the public that "it is useless to parade such an array of venerable witnesses," (meaning the enumerations of Fathers of the IIIrd, IVth, and Vth centuries which are given below, at pp. 42-4: 80-1: 84: 133: 212-3: 359-60: 421: 423: 486-90:)—"*for they have absolutely nothing to say which deserves a moment's hearing.*"¹—What a pity it is, (while he was about it), that the learned gentleman did not go on to explain that the moon is made of green cheese!

§ 3. Dr. Sanday,² in a kindred spirit, delivers it as his opinion, that "the one thing" I lack "is a grasp on the central condition of the problem:"—that I do "not seem to have the faintest glimmering of the principle of 'Genealogy:'"—that I am "all at sea:"—that my "heaviest batteries are discharged at random:"—and a great deal more to the same effect. The learned Professor is quite welcome to think such things of me, if he pleases. Οὐ φροντὶς Ἰπποκλείδη.

§ 4. At the end of a year, a Reviewer of quite a different calibre made his appearance in the January number (1883) of the 'Church Quarterly:' in return for whose not very

¹ No. xxviii., page 436. If any one cares to know what the teaching was which the writer in the 'Church Quarterly' was intending to reproduce, he is invited to read from p. 296 to p. 300 of the present volume.

² *Contemporary Review*, (Dec. 1881),—p. 985 seq.

encouraging estimate of my labours, I gladly record my conviction that if he will seriously apply his powerful and accurate mind to the department of Textual Criticism, he will probably produce a work which will help materially to establish the study in which he takes such an intelligent interest, on a scientific basis. But then, he is invited to accept the friendly assurance that the indispensable condition of success in this department is, that a man should give to the subject, (which is a very intricate one and abounds in unexplored problems), his undivided attention for an extended period. I trust there is nothing unreasonable in the suggestion that one who has not done this, should be very circumspect when he sits in judgment on a neighbour of his who, for very many years past, has given to Textual Criticism the whole of his time;—has freely sacrificed health, ease, relaxation, even necessary rest, to this one object;—has made it his one business to acquire such an independent mastery of the subject as shall qualify him to do battle successfully for the imperilled letter of God's Word. My friend however thinks differently. He says of me,—

“In his first Article there was something amusing in the simplicity with which ‘Lloyd's Greek Testament’ (which is only a convenient little Oxford edition of the ordinary kind) was put forth as the final standard of appeal. It recalled to our recollection Bentley's sarcasm upon the text of Stephanus, which ‘your learned Whitbyus’ takes for the sacred original in every syllable.” (P. 354.)

§ 5. On referring to the passage where my ‘simplicity’ has afforded amusement to a friend whose brilliant conversation is always a delight to *me*, I read as follows,—

“It is discovered that in the 111 (out of 320) pages of a copy of Lloyd’s Greek Testament, in which alone these five manuscripts are collectively available for comparison in the Gospels,—the serious deflections of A from the *Textus Receptus* amount in all to only 842 : whereas in C they amount to 1798 : in B, to 2370 : in X, to 3392 : in D, to 4697. The readings peculiar to A within the same limits are 133 : those peculiar to C are 170. But those of B amount to 197 : while X exhibits 443 : and the readings peculiar to D (within the same limits), are no fewer than 1829 We submit that these facts are not altogether calculated to inspire confidence in codices B X C D.”¹

§ 6. But how (let me ask) does it appear from this, that I have “put forth Lloyd’s Greek Testament as the *final standard of Appeal*”? True, that, in order to exhibit clearly their respective divergences, I have referred five famous codices (A B X C D)—certain of which are found to have turned the brain of Critics of the new school—to *one and the same familiar exhibition of the commonly received Text of the New Testament* : but by so doing I have not by any means assumed the *Textual purity* of that common standard. In other words I have not made it “*the final standard of Appeal*.” All Critics,—wherever found,—at all times, have collated with the commonly received Text : but only as the most convenient *standard of Comparison* ; not, surely, as the

¹ Q. R. (No. 304,) p. 313.—The passage referred to will be found below (at p. 14),—slightly modified, in order to protect myself against the risk of *future* misconception. My Reviewer refers to four other places. He will find that my only object in them all was to prove that codices A B X C D *yield divergent testimony* ; and therefore, so habitually *contradict* one another, as effectually to invalidate their own evidence throughout. This has never been *proved* before. It can *only* be proved, in fact, by one who has laboriously collated the codices in question, and submitted to the drudgery of exactly tabulating the result.

absolute *standard of Excellence*. The result of the experiment already referred to,—(and, I beg to say, it was an exceedingly laborious experiment,)—has been, to demonstrate that the five Manuscripts in question stand apart from one another in the following proportions:—

842 (A) : 1798 (C) : 2370 (B) : 3392 (N) : 4697 (D).

But would not the same result have been obtained if the 'five old uncials' had been *referred to any other common standard which can be named?* In the meantime, what else is the inevitable inference from this phenomenon but that four out of the five *must* be—while all the five *may* be—outrageously depraved documents? instead of being fit to be made our exclusive guides to the Truth of Scripture,—as Critics of the school of Tischendorf and Tregelles would have us believe that they are?

§ 7. I cited a book which is in the hands of every school-boy, (Lloyd's 'Greek Testament,') *only* in order to facilitate reference, and to make sure that my statements would be at once understood by the least learned person who could be supposed to have access to the 'Quarterly.' I presumed every scholar to be aware that Bp. Lloyd (1827) professes to reproduce Mill's text; and that Mill (1707) reproduces the text of Stephens;¹ and that Stephens (1550) exhibits with sufficient accuracy the Traditional text,—which is confessedly

¹ "Damus tibi in manus Novum Testamentum *idem profecto*, quod ad textum attinet, cum ed. Millianâ,"—are the well known opening words of the 'Monitum' prefixed to Lloyd's N. T.—And Mill, according to Scrivener, [*Introduction*, p. 399,] "only aims at reproducing Stephens' text of 1550, though in a few places he departs from it, whether by accident or design." Such places are found to amount in all to *twenty-nine*.

at least 1530 years old.¹ Now, if a tolerable approximation to the text of A.D. 350 may *not* be accepted as a *standard of Comparison*,—will the writer in the ‘Church Quarterly’ be so obliging as to inform us *which* exhibition of the sacred Text *may* ?

§ 8. A pamphlet by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol,² which appeared in April 1882, remains to be considered. Written expressly in defence of the Revisers and their New Greek Text, this composition displays a slenderness of acquaintance with the subject now under discussion, for which I was little prepared. Inasmuch however as it is the production of the Chairman of the Revisionist body, and professes to be a reply to my first two Articles, I have bestowed upon it an elaborate and particular rejoinder extending to an hundred-and-fifty pages.³ I shall in consequence be very brief concerning it in this place.

§ 9. The respected writer does nothing else but reproduce Westcott and Hort’s theory *in Westcott and Hort’s words*. He contributes nothing of his own. The singular infelicity which attended his complaint that the ‘Quarterly Reviewer’ “censures their [Westcott and Hort’s] Text,” but, “has not attempted a *serious examination of the arguments which they allege in its support*,” I have sufficiently dwelt upon elsewhere.⁴ The rest of the Bishop’s contention may be summed

¹ See below, pp. 257–8 : also p. 390.

² *The Revisers and the Greek Text of the New Testament, &c.*—Macmillan, pp. 79.

³ See below, pp. 369 to 520.

⁴ Pages 371–2.

up in two propositions :—The first, (I.) That if the Revisionists are wrong in their ‘New Greek Text,’ then (not only Westcott and Hort, but) Lachmann, Tischendorf and Tregelles must be wrong also,—a statement which I hold to be incontrovertible.—The Bishop’s other position is also undeniable : viz. (II.) That in order to pass an equitable judgment on ancient documents, they are to be carefully studied, closely compared, and tested by a more scientific process than rough comparison with the *Textus Receptus*.¹ . . . Thus, on both heads, I find myself entirely at one with Bp. Ellicott.

§ 10. And yet,—as the last 150 pages of the present volume show,—I have the misfortune to be at issue with the learned writer on almost every particular which he proposes for discussion. Thus,

§ 11. At page 64 of his pamphlet, he fastens resolutely upon the famous problem whether ‘GOD’ (Θεός), or ‘who’ (ὅς), is to be read in 1 Timothy iii. 16. I had upheld the former reading in eight pages. He contends for the latter, with something like acrimony, in twelve.² I have been at the pains, in consequence, to write a ‘DISSERTATION’ of seventy-six pages on this important subject,³—the preparation of which (may I be allowed to record the circumstance in passing?) occupied me closely for six months,⁴ and taxed me severely. Thus, the only point which Bishop Ellicott has condescended to discuss argumentatively with me, will be found to enjoy full half of my letter to him in reply.

¹ *Pamphlet*, pp. 77 : 39, 40, 41.

² See below, p. 425.

³ Pages 424–501.

⁴ From January till June 1883.

The 'Dissertation' referred to, I submit with humble confidence to the judgment of educated Englishmen. It requires no learning to understand the case. And I have particularly to request that those who will be at the pains to look into this question, will remember,—(1) That the place of Scripture discussed (viz. 1 Tim. iii. 16) was deliberately selected for a trial of strength by the Bishop: (I should not have chosen it myself):—(2) That on the issue of the contention which he has thus himself invited, we have respectively staked our critical reputation. The discussion exhibits very fairly our two methods,—his and mine; and "is of great importance as an example," "illustrating in a striking manner" our respective positions,—as the Bishop himself has been careful to remind his readers.¹

§ 12. One merely desirous of taking a general survey of this question, is invited to read from page 485 to 496 of the present volume. To understand the case thoroughly, he must submit to the labour of beginning at p. 424 and reading down to p. 501.

§ 13. A thoughtful person who has been at the pains to do this, will be apt on laying down the book to ask,—“But is it not very remarkable that so many as five of the ancient Versions should favour the reading ‘which,’ (*μυστήριον ὃ ἐφανερώθη*), instead of ‘GOD’ (*Θεός*)”?—“Yes, it is very remarkable,” I answer. “For though the Old Latin and the two Egyptian Versions are constantly observed to conspire

¹ *Pamphlet*, p. 76.

Westcott & Hort's Greek Text And Theory Refuted

Summarized From
Dean Burgon's

Revision Revised

By Rev. D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.

President of THE DEAN BURGON SOCIETY, and
Director of THE BIBLE FOR TODAY, INCORPORATED

900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, NJ 08108

Phone: 856-854-4452; FAX: 856-854-2464;

Orders: 1-800-JOHN 10:9; E-Mail: BFT@BibleForToday.org

I INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

A. The Purpose of This Booklet. As the title indicates, it is the purpose and intention of this booklet to deal with the false and erroneous Greek New Testament Greek text and theory promulgated by what Dean Burgon refers to as "two irresponsible scholars of the University of Cambridge." These "irresponsible scholars" are none other than Bishop Brooke Foss Westcott and Professor Fenton John Anthony Hort. Their "invention" of the new Revised Greek Text that surfaced in 1881. It is strange indeed that very few people saw as clearly as Dean John William Burgon, their fellow Anglican clergyman, that Westcott and Hort were indeed "irresponsible scholars."

Instead, there has been, from that day to this, a stampede of pastors, teachers, "scholars," lay people, students and others who have followed their false lead into serious error. From the quotations taken from Dean Burgon's *Revision Revised*, it is hoped that the reader will turn from the errors of Westcott and Hort and enter into the truth and acceptance of the Traditional Greek text. It is also hoped that the

it is hoped that the reader will turn from the errors of Westcott and Hort and enter into the truth and acceptance of the Traditional Greek text. It is also hoped that the reader will purchase and read *The Revision Revised* in its entirety. It is available as B.F.T. #611 for a GIFT of \$25.00 + \$3.00 for postage and handling. It is the new hardback edition published by the Dean Burgon Society.

B. The Relationship Between the Westcott and Hort Greek Text and the Modern So-Called "Eclectic" or "Critical" Text. Many of those who despise the Textus Receptus today and are powerful advocates of the false Revised Greek texts of Nestle-Aland or the United Bible Society have attempted to distance themselves from the Westcott and Hort Greek Text of 1881. In reality, with some minor changes, they are virtually identical. This fact is what makes this present booklet and the entire *Revision Revised* so powerful and so necessary. Here are some quotes from various writers about modern New Testament Greek texts and theories compared with the Greek text and theories of Westcott and Hort, showing the similarity between the two in both areas.

1. Seven Testimonies By Writers from 1914 through 1990 Stating the Similarity between the Westcott and Hort Text and Theory and that of the Current Greek Texts.

a. 1914--The Testimony of Herman Hoskier.

"The text printed by **Westcott and Hort** has been accepted as 'the true text,' and grammars, works on the synoptic problem, works on higher criticism, and others have been grounded on this text." [Herman C. Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies--a Study and an Indictment*, (1914), Vol I, p. 468]

b. 1964--The Testimony of J. H. Greenlee.

"The textual theories of **W-H [Westcott & Hort]** underlies virtually all subsequent work in NT textual criticism." [J. H. Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, (1964), p. 78]

c. 1979--The Testimony of D. A. Carson.

"The theories of **Westcott and Hort** . . . [are] almost universally accepted today. . . . Subsequent textual critical work [since 1881] accepted the theories of **Westcott and Hort**. The vast majority of evangelical scholars hold that the basic textual theories of **Westcott and Hort** were right and the church stands greatly in their debt." [D. A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate*, (1979), p. 75]

d. 1980--The Testimony of Wilbur N. Pickering.

"The two most popular manual editions of the text today, Nestles-Aland and U.B.S. (United Bible Society) really vary little from the **W-H [Westcott & Hort] text**." [Dr. Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, (1980), pp. 42]

e. 1987--The Testimony of John R. Kohlenberger.

"**Westcott and Hort** . . . all subsequent versions from the Revised Version (1881) to those of the present . . . have adopted their basic

approach . . . [and] accepted the **Westcott and Hort** [Greek] text." [John R. Kohlenberger, *Words About the Word*, (1987) p. 42]

f. **1990—The Testimony of Philip W. Comfort.**

"But textual critics have not been able to advance beyond **Hort** in formalizing a **theory** . . . this has troubled certain textual scholars." [Philip W. Comfort, *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*, (1990), p. 21]

g. **1990—The Testimony of Bruce Metzger.** In 1990, Dr. Kirk D. DiVietro, a Baptist Pastor who was then in New Jersey, wrote to Dr. Bruce Metzger about how he and the other members of the Nestle-Aland and United Bible Societies Committee began their work on their New Testament Greek Texts. Dr. Metzger replied to him as follows:

"We took as our base at the beginning the **text of Westcott and Hort** (1881) and introduced changes as seemed necessary on the basis of MSS evidence."

This documentation is found in Metzger's own handwriting in **B.F.T. #2490-P, p. 272** in *The Dean Burgon Society (1978--1994) Messages From the 16th Annual Meeting, August, 1994.*

2. The Conclusion and Importance to be Drawn from these Seven Testimonies. Have you ever wondered just **WHY** the basic Greek text of Westcott and Hort dated in 1881 is virtually identical with the basic Greek text of the present critical editions? The simple reason is that they are derived from the same basic, corrupt Greek manuscripts, namely "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) and a few others that followed them.

Do you remember the axiom we were taught in high school plane geometry class: "Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other"? This applies in this case as well. The conclusion drawn from this is that when we attack the text and theory of Westcott and Hort, we are at the same time attacking the text and theory behind the Nestle-Aland Greek text, the United Bible Society text, and others that go along with them. What is said against Westcott and Hort's text in these quotes can also be said against the texts of Nestle-Aland and the United Bible Society!

C. The History of Burgon's *Revision Revised*. *The Revision Revised*, by Dean John William Burgon, was originally published in 1883. In 1973, I read a condensed version of it in *True or False?* edited by Dr. David Otis Fuller. The first complete and unedited copy I read was the Conservative Classics edition which was published in Paradise, Pennsylvania. This edition has long since gone out of print. THE BIBLE FOR TODAY, INCORPORATED, has been publishing a xerox copy of this book for many years in order to make it available for those who wanted to read it. Jay Green published portions of Dean Burgon's books in his book *Unholy Hands on God's Holy Word*. Since Dean Burgon's various books do not have their original page numbers, and are not organized in their original order, it is difficult to see if every word has been included.

D. The New Dean Burgon Society Hardback Edition. In view of the continued need for *The Revision Revised*, the Executive Committee of the Dean Burgon Society voted to make hardback copies (with the original page numbers) again available for the many who want to read it. An important fact to remember about *The Revision Revised* is that it was still unanswered even after two full years after it was published. It is still unanswered to this day!

E. The Method Used in this Booklet. Though *The Revision Revised* has almost 600 pages, in this brief booklet, I will only allude to about fifty quotations that summarize the argument of the book. It is important that we see why Dean Burgon's book, *The Revision Revised*, is such a valuable tool for people to read and understand. It is hoped that these fifty quotations will whet the appetite for this solid documentation so that the reader might be anxious to read every page of the book itself!!

F. Outline of the book. *The Revision Revised* consists of three major ARTICLES. Each of the ARTICLES appeared first in a periodical in England called *The Quarterly Review*. In **ARTICLE I** Dean Burgon evaluated the new Greek text of Westcott and Hort (pages 1-110). In **ARTICLE II** he enumerated the defects of the English Revised Version (ERV) and the superiority of the King James Bible (pages 111-232). In **ARTICLE III** Dean Burgon refuted Westcott and Hort's new textual theory and its serious defects (pp. 233-366). These three ARTICLES are followed by a LETTER TO BISHOP ELLICOTT in reply to his pamphlet, various APPENDICES and the INDEX (pages 367-549).

G. Background. In 1995, at the DEAN BURGON SOCIETY, I spoke about *Dean Burgon's CONFIDENCE in the King James Bible*. Quotations were taken from **ARTICLE II** of *The Revision Revised* in which the English Revised Version (ERV) and the King James Bible (AV) were compared. The Authorized (King James) Version was found by Dean Burgon to be far superior in every way to any other version of his day. By extension, similar arguments might be made against the false versions of our own day. This is available in a printed booklet form as **B.F.T. #2591 (36 pages)** for a GIFT of \$3.00 + \$2.00 postage and handling.

H. The Refutation of Westcott and Hort's Greek Text and Theory. At this time, I would like to summarize some of the highlights, main arguments, and quotations from Dean Burgon's PREFACE, from his **ARTICLE I**, and from his **ARTICLE III** as found in his book, *The Revision Revised*. As mentioned before, **ARTICLE I** dealt with Westcott and Hort's false New Testament Greek text (pages 1-110). **ARTICLE III** condemned in strong, yet clear language, Westcott and Hort's false theory behind their New Testament Greek text (pages 233-366).

II

Quotations From Dean Burgon's PREFACE--Setting the Stage (pages iv-xxxii)

A. Dr. Frederick Scrivener Backed Dean Burgon's Attack on Westcott and Hort's New Testament Greek Text. Dr. Frederick H. A. Scrivener was an Anglican clergyman who was a contemporary of both Westcott and Hort and Dean Burgon. Dr. Scrivener was one of the greatest and most exacting scholars of his day in the field of textual criticism. He was quoted by Dean Burgon in his PREFACE.

1. Westcott and Hort's Greek Text Was Based on "Ingenious Conjecture." Dr. Scrivener wrote:

"There is little hope for the stability of their [that is, **Westcott & Hort's**] imposing structure, if its foundations have been laid on the sandy ground of ingenious conjecture. And, since barely the smallest vestige of historical evidence has ever been alleged in support of the views of these accomplished editors, their teaching must either be received as intuitively true, or dismissed from our consideration as precarious and even visionary." [Dr. F. H. A. Scrivener's *Plain Introduction*, 1883, p. 531, quoted by Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. iv].

2. Dr. Hort's Greek Textual System Was "Destitute of Historical Foundation." Dr. Scrivener again wrote:

"Dr. Hort's System is entirely destitute of historical foundation. . . We are compelled to repeat as emphatically as ever our strong conviction that the Hypothesis to whose proof he has devoted so many laborious years, is destitute not only of historical foundation, but of all probability, revealing from the internal goodness of the Text which its adoption would force upon us." [Dr. F. H. A. Scrivener's *Plain Introduction*, 1883, pp. 537, 542, quoted by Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. iv].

B. Dean Burgon's Sage Comments of an Introductory Nature.

1. Dean Burgon's One Object in *The Revision Revised*. He wrote:

"My one object has been to defeat the mischievous attempt which was made in 1881 to thrust upon this Church [**the Anglican Church**] and Realm [**London and the whole British Commonwealth**] a Revision of the Sacred Text, which--recommended though it be by eminent names--I am thoroughly convinced, and am able to prove, is untrustworthy from

beginning to end." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. v].

2. "Poisoning the River of Life." Dean Burgon wrote:

"It is, however, the systematic depravation of the underlying Greek which does so grievously offend me: for this is nothing else but a poisoning of the River of Life at its sacred source. Our Revisers (with the best and purest intentions, no doubt,) stand convicted of having deliberately rejected the words of Inspiration in every page, and of having substituted for them fabricated Readings which the Church has long since refused to acknowledge, or else has rejected with abhorrence, and which only survive at this time in a little handful of documents of the most depraved type." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. vi-vii].

He is referring to "B" and "Aleph," the Vatican and Sinai manuscripts.

3. A Time for Hitting His Opponents "Hard." Dean Burgon was often charged with hitting his opponents "rather hard." This was his response:

"If, therefore, any do complain that I have sometimes hit my opponents rather hard, I take leave to point out that `to everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the sun'; a time to embrace, and a time to be far from embracing; a time for speaking smoothly, and a time for speaking sharply. And that when the Words of Inspiration are seriously imperilled, as now they are, it is scarcely possible for one who is determined effectually to preserve the Deposit in its integrity, to hit either too straight or too hard." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. vii-viii].

4. This book Was Unanswered After Two Years while Dean Burgon Was Still Alive, And Is Still Unanswered. Dean Burgon wrote:

"Two full years have elapsed since the first of these Essays was published; and my Criticism--for the best of reasons--remains to this hour unanswered. The public has been assured indeed, (in the course of some hysterical remarks by Canon Farrar), that `the "Quarterly Reviewer" can be refuted as fully as he desires as soon as any scholar has the leisure to answer him.' The `Quarterly Reviewer' can afford to wait,--if the Revisers can. But they are reminded that it is no answer to one who has demolished their master's `Theory,' for the pupils to keep on reproducing fragments of it; and by their mistakes and exaggerations, to make both themselves and him, ridiculous." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. xv].

5. Inventing Facts and "Oracular Decrees." Dean Burgon wrote:

"In this department of sacred Science, men have been going on too long inventing their facts, and delivering themselves of oracular decrees, on the sole responsibility of their own inner consciousness. There is great convenience in such a method certainly,--a charming simplicity which is in a high degree attractive to flesh and blood. It dispenses with proof. It furnishes no evidence. [that is, Westcott and Hort's text and theory] It asserts when it ought to argue. It reiterates when it is called upon to

explain. 'I am sir Oracle.' . . . This,—which I venture to style the *unscientific* method,—reached its culminating point when Professors Westcott and Hort recently put forth their Recension of the Greek Text."

"Their work is indeed quite a psychological curiosity. Incomprehensible to me is it how two able men of disciplined understandings can have seriously put forth the volume which they call 'INTRODUCTION--APPENDIX.' It is the very *Reductio ad absurdum* of the uncritical method of the last fifty years. And it is especially in opposition to this new method of theirs that I so strenuously insist that *the consentient voice of Catholic Antiquity* is to be diligently inquired after and submissively listened to; for that *this*, in the end, will prove our *only* safe guide." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. xxv-xxvi].

6. "Catholic Antiquity" Defined as Universal Antiquity. Dean Burgon defined what he meant by "Catholic antiquity." He did not mean "Roman Catholic antiquity," but "universal antiquity." He wrote:

"The method I persistently advocate in every case of a supposed doubtful Reading. (I say it for the last time, and request that I may be no more misrepresented.) is, that *an appeal shall be unreservedly made to Catholic Antiquity*; and that the combined verdict of Manuscripts, Versions, Fathers, shall be regarded as decisive." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. xxvii].

That is what Dean Burgon appeals to, Westcott and Hort do not.

7. Dean Burgon Longed to Teach the Bible. Dean Burgon would rather engage in Bible interpretation than needing to battle for the Words of God. He wrote:

"But I more than long,—I fairly *ache* to have done with Controversy, and to be free to devote myself to the work of Interpretation. My apology for bestowing so large a portion of my time on Textual Criticism, is David's when he was reproached by his brethren for appearing on the field of battle,—'Is there not a cause?'" [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. xxix].

Many of us would love to be able to "have done with controversy," but the battle for the Words of God is there. I think we chose a good name for our society—The Dean Burgon Society. As Dean Burgon did, we certainly have a cause, don't we!

8. Westcott and Hort as "Irresponsible Scholars." Dean Burgon characterized Westcott and Hort as two "irresponsible scholars." He wrote:

"But instead of all this, a Revision of the *English Authorised Version* having been sanctioned by the Convocation of the Southern Province in 1871, the opportunity was eagerly snatched at by two irresponsible scholars of the University of Cambridge [**He is talking about Westcott and Hort**] for obtaining the general sanction of the Revising body, and thus indirectly of Convocation, for a private venture of their own,—their own privately devised Revision of the Greek Text. On that Greek Text of theirs, (which

I hold to be the most depraved which has ever appeared in print), with some slight modifications, our Authorised English Version has been silently revised: silently, I say, for in the margin of the English no record is preserved of the underlying Textual changes which have been introduced by the Revisionists." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. xxx]. Though Westcott and Hort's Greek text is "*the most depraved which has ever appeared in print*," this is virtually the same text used by the new versions and perversions of today.

9. Why Dean Burgon Descended into "the Arena of Controversy."

Dean Burgon wrote:

"If all this does not constitute a valid reason for descending into the arena of controversy, it would in my judgment be impossible to indicate an occasion when the Christian soldier *is* called upon to do so:--the rather because certain of these who, from their rank and station in the Church, ought to be the champions of the Truth, are at this time found to be among its most vigorous assailants." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. xxxi-xxxii].

Notice what he said about some of the preachers of his day. We have this today do we not? Some claim to be "champions," and "Fundamentalists," yet they are assailants of the truth. When the Words of God are at stake, we must, at times, contend with even our own Christian brethren. If our brethren are wrong on the Words of God, and don't want to preserve the Words of our Lord Jesus Christ, then we must stand up as David did and ask: "Is there not a cause?" We of course should also expose those who are in error who are not "brethren." In so doing, we will no doubt get into trouble from both of these groups.

III

ARTICLE I: THE NEW GREEK TEXT-- Refuted by Dean John William Burgon (pages 1-110)

A. The Importance of Dean Burgon's ARTICLE I on THE NEW GREEK TEXT. In Dean Burgon's ARTICLE I on THE NEW GREEK TEXT, he totally destroyed the erroneous New Testament Greek Text that was foisted upon an unsuspecting people in 1881 by Westcott and Hort. Sad to say, this false Greek text was, in the main, the basis for the English Revised Version (ERV). I have cited above, in Section I (pages 2-3), seven critical scholars in the 20th century (from 1914 to 1990) who have proclaimed that this false Greek text is STILL the primary basis for the modern Greek texts of Nestle-Aland and the United Bible Society! When Dean Burgon destroyed Westcott and Hort's Greek text, he also destroyed the present Greek texts that form the basis of the modern New Testament versions and perversions. These Westcott and Hort-type Greek texts are used, not only in the apostate schools, colleges, and seminaries, and the New Evangelical schools, colleges, and seminaries, but, sadly, also in entirely too many so-called "Fundamentalist" schools, colleges and seminaries!

I would urge you to pay close attention to the quotations from this section of Dean Burgon's masterful book, *The Revision Revised*.

B. Important Quotations from Dean Burgon's ARTICLE I: THE NEW GREEK TEXT (pages 1-110)

1. God's Threefold Means of Preservation of His Written Words.

a. God's Preservation Means #1: MANUSCRIPT COPIES. Dean Burgon wrote of the manuscript COPIES:

"(1) The provision, then, which the Divine Author of Scripture is found to have made for the preservation of His written Word, is of a peculiarly varied and highly complex description, First--By causing that a vast multiplication of Copies should be required all down the ages,--beginning at the earliest period, and continuing in an ever-increasing ratio until the actual invention of Printing,--He provided the most effectual security imaginable against fraud. True, that millions of the copies so produced have long since perished; but it is nevertheless a plain fact that there survive of the Gospels alone upwards of one thousand copies in the present day." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. 8-9].

b. God's Preservation Means #2: ANCIENT NEW TESTAMENT VERSIONS. On the subject of the VERSIONS, Dean Burgon wrote:

"(2) Next, VERSIONS. The necessity of translating the Scriptures into divers languages for the use of different branches of the early Church, procured that many an authentic record has been preserved for the New Testament as it existed in the first few centuries of the Christian era. Thus, the Peschito Syriac and the Old Latin version are believed to have been executed in the IInd century [**Early versions show the text that the translators had in their hands and were using.**] . . . The two Egyptian translations are referred to the IIIrd and IVth. The Vulgate (or revised Latin) and the Gothic are also claimed for the IVth; the Armenian and possibly the Aethiopic, belong to the Vth." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 9].

c. God's Preservation Means #3: Quotations From CHURCH FATHERS. Here's what Dean Burgon wrote on the value of "patristic" quotations, or references to the Bible by the Church Fathers:

"(3) Lastly, the requirements of assailants and apologists alike, the business of Commentators, the needs of controversialists and teachers in every age, have resulted in a vast accumulation of additional evidence, of which it is scarcely possible to over-estimate the importance. For in this way it has come to pass that every famous Doctor of the Church in turn has quoted more or less largely from the sacred writings, and thus has borne testimony to the contents of the codices with which he was individually familiar. **PATRISTIC CITATIONS.**" [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 9]

These "Church Fathers" were leaders in the early churches who either quoted the New Testament directly, or made references to certain verses. What text did they have in their hands when they referred to these verses? This evidence is very important. Dean Burgon made an index of over 86,000 quotations from these Church Fathers showing the text of Scripture they used. This is a third mighty safeguard of the integrity of the deposit of the Words of God.

2. The Value of "Lectionaries." Dean Burgon wrote:

"In truth, the security which the Text of the New Testament enjoys is altogether unique and extraordinary. To specify the single consideration, which has never yet attracted nearly the amount of attention it deserves. Lectionaries abound which establish the Text which has been publicly read in the churches of the East, from *at least* A.D. 400 until the time of the invention of printing." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 11]

"Lectionaries" were portions of the New Testament that were read on certain feast days such as Christmas, Easter, and so on. We have at least 2,143 of these Greek Lectionaries preserved for us today. This evidence is very important.

3. The Blind Superstitious Reverence for "B," "Aleph," and Others. Dean Burgon wrote:

"Singular to relate, the first, second, fourth and fifth of these codices (B, Aleph, C, D) but especially B and Aleph have within the last twenty years established a tyrannical ascendancy over the imagination of the Critics which can only be fitly spoken of as a blind superstition. It matters nothing that all four ["B", "Aleph", "C", and "D"] are discovered on careful scrutiny to differ essentially, not only from ninety-nine out of a hundred of the whole body of extant MSS, besides, but even *from one another*." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. 11-12].

Yet these same manuscripts, by "blind superstition" are used as the very foundations of the versions and perversions of our day. Even the ones that Bible-believing Christians are using such as: the New International Version, the New American Standard Version, the New King James Version in the footnotes, the New Berkeley, and others.

4. The Similarities Between "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) Manuscripts. Dean Burgon wrote:

"Between the first two (B and Aleph) there subsists an amount of sinister resemblance, which proves that they must have been derived at no very remote period from the same corrupt original. . . . It is in fact *easier to find two consecutive verses in which these two MSS differ the one from the other, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree*." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 12]

5. The Unreliability of "Aleph" the Sinai Manuscript. Dean Burgon wrote:

"Next to "D," the most untrustworthy codex is Aleph, which bears on its front a memorable note of the evil repute under which it has always laboured:--viz. it is found that at least ten revisers between the IVth and the XIIth centuries busied themselves with the task of correcting its many and extraordinary perversions of the truth of Scripture." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 13].

6. The Depravity of Manuscripts "Aleph," "B," and "D." Dean Burgon wrote:

"We venture to assure him, without a particle of hesitation, that "Aleph," "B," "D" are *three of the most scandalously corrupt copies extant:--exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anywhere to be met with:--have become, by whatever process (for their history is wholly unknown), the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings ancient blunders, and intentional perversions of Truth,--which are discoverable in any known copies of the Word of God*." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 16].

Dean Burgon knew what these old ancient Uncials were. They were depraved, and mutilated. Yet these are respected, revered, and put on a pedestal today.

7. The Worst Corruptions of the New Testament Came Within the First 100 Years After They Were Made. Dean Burgon wrote:

"It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound,' writes the most learned of the Revisionist body [that is, **Dr. Frederick H. A. Scrivener**], 'that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed: that Irenaeus (A.D. 150), and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephens thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Textus Receptus.'" [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 30].

What he is saying is that the corruptions in the Greek texts at the time of Irenaeus, the African Church, the Western Church, and the early days of "B", and "Alep" were far worse than and inferior to the texts used to develop the Textus Receptus.

8. Dean Burgon Defended the Traditional Greek Text Against the False Westcott and Hort Type of Text in the Following Thirty Passages. Though Dean Burgon defended the traditional text throughout the book, here is a section which takes examples one after another in rapid succession. Without comment, these thirty passages are listed here with the pages in *The Revision Revised* where they are taken up in detail:

1. Mark 2:1-12 (pp. 30-34)
2. Luke 11:2-4 (pp. 34-36)
3. Mark 16:9-20 (pp. 36-40)
4. Luke 2:14 (pp. 41-51)
5. Acts 27:37 (pp. 51-53)
6. Acts 18:7 (pp. 53-54)
7. Matthew 11:23 & Luke 10:15 (pp. 54-56)
8. Mark 11:3 (pp. 56-58)
9. Mark 11:8 (pp. 58-61)
10. Luke 23:45 (pp. 61-66)
11. Mark 6:20 (pp. 66-70)
12. Mark 9:24 (pp. 70-71)
13. Matthew 14:30 (p. 71)
14. Mark 15:39 (pp. 71-72)
15. Luke 23:42 (p. 72)
16. John 14:4 (pp. 72-73)
17. Luke 6:1 (pp. 73-75)
18. Luke 22:19-20--32 words (pp. 75-79)
19. Luke 22:43-44--26 words (pp. 79-83)
20. Luke 23:34--12 words (pp. 82-85)
21. Luke 23:38--7 words (pp. 85-88)
22. Luke 24:1,3,6,9,12--37 words (pp. 88-90)
23. Luke 24:40,42,51-53--23 words (pp. 90-91)
24. Matthew 27:21 (pp. 91-92)
25. Matthew 28:11 (pp. 92-93)

26. Luke 9:55-56 (p. 93)
27. Luke 24:41 (p. 93)
28. Luke 6:1 (pp. 93-98)
29. 1 Timothy 3:16 ("God was manifest in the flesh") (pp. 98-106, and pp. 424- 491)
30. 2 Peter 2:22 (p. 106)

9. Dean Burgon's Conclusion About the False Type of Greek Text Adopted by Westcott and Hort. Dean Burgon wrote:

"It has been the ruin of the present undertaking--as far as the Sacred Text is concerned--that the majority of the Revisionist body have been misled throughout by the oracular decrees and impetuous advocacy of Drs. Westcott and Hort, who, with the purest intentions and most laudable industry, have constructed a Text demonstrably more remote from the Evangelic verity than any which has ever yet seen the light." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 110].

Did Dean Burgon name names? Yes, he did. He names Westcott and Hort. Did he name names within his own denominational framework? Yes, he did. Both of these men were Anglicans, that is, members of the clergy of the Church of England. Dean Burgon was a fundamental, conservative Anglican. Westcott and Hort, on the other hand, were apostate and heretical unbelievers. This is shown in both of my booklets: *The Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort* [B.F.T. #595 for a GIFT of \$3.00], and *Bishop Westcott's Clever Denial of the Bodily Resurrection of Christ* [B.F.T. #1131 for a GIFT of \$4.00]. The latter booklet shows clearly that Westcott denied the bodily resurrection of Christ.

Westcott and Hort have to be named and exposed, not only in textual matters, but also in doctrinal matters. Dr. Stewart Custer of Bob Jones University, in his booklet, *The Truth About the King James Controversy*, on page 26, stated of Westcott and Hort: ". . . these men have written in their mature years book after book defending the **CONSERVATIVE** interpretation of Scripture. . . ." *The Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort* shows clearly that these men have written books that do **NOT** defend "the **CONSERVATIVE** interpretation of Scripture." There are about 125 quotations from five of their books to prove this point.

Using the term, "**conservative**," to refer to such a man as Westcott who clearly denied the bodily resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, would require a complete redefinition of what is meant by the word, "**conservative**." I don't want any part of that kind of "**conservativism**," do you? Dean Burgon named names politely and gently. We can be gentlemen and, where appropriate, still name names in the same manner.

IV

**ARTICLE III--WESTCOTT & HORT'S
NEW TEXTUAL THEORY--
Refuted by Dean Burgon (pages 233-366)**

A. The Importance of Dean Burgon's ARTICLE III Which Refuted Westcott and Hort's NEW TEXTUAL THEORY. In 1881, Westcott and Hort and the other members of the translation committee of the English Revised Version (ERV) published their very inferior work. At about the same time Westcott and Hort published an *Introduction to the Greek New Testament*. This amazingly misleading book has been answered fully by Dean Burgon in his ARTICLE III. The BIBLE FOR TODAY has re-printed this *Introduction* for those who wish to see their false theory for themselves. It is BFT #1303 (540 pp.) which is available for a gift of \$25.00.

This false THEORY behind the false Revised Greek text is as important as the Greek text itself. Not only is the same basic false Greek text in use today by the various versions and perversions, but also the same basic false THEORY supporting this text is in use today by the same versions and perversions!!

B. Important Quotations from Dean Burgon's ARTICLE III: WESTCOTT AND HORT'S NEW TEXTUAL THEORY (pages 233-366).

1. Dean Burgon's Massive Evidence in Favor of the Reading "GOD Was Manifest in the Flesh" in 1 Timothy 3:16. Dean Burgon shows strong and irrefutable proof for the correctness of "GOD WAS MANIFEST IN THE FLESH."

Evidence for THEOS ("God")	
N.T. Greek Manuscripts	
(Lectionaries & Copies) =	289
Ancient N.T. Versions =	3
Greek Church Fathers =	c. 20

There is an abundance of evidence for this reading as contained in the King James Bible. *Theos* or "God" is without any doubt the original and proper reading.

	PAGE
Unwarrantable change in Acts xxvi. 28, 29	151
(f.) Mechanical uniformity of rendering, a grievous mistake ..	152
(g.) Vicious system of rendering the Greek Tenses and representing the Greek Article	154
Specimens of infelicitous and unidiomatic rendering	155
Pedantry of the Revisers in respect of the Greek AORIST ..	157
and of THE TENSES generally	161
The Greek ARTICLE misunderstood by the Revisers	164
PRONOUNS and PARTICLES tastelessly and inaccurately rendered	165
Unidiomatic rendering of PREPOSITIONS	170
A specimen (2 S. Peter i. 5-7)	171
Violated proprieties of the English language	172
(h.) The MARGIN of the Revision is encumbered with Textual Errors	175
Take two specimen blunders:	176
also, some sorry alternative Renderings:—some useless marginal glosses	178
some erroneous 'Explanatory Notes'	180
some foolish mistakes resulting from slender acquaintance with Hellenistic Greek	182
Specimens of 'Marginal Notes' desiderated	184
Absurd note on S. Mark xiv. 3	185
Marginal inconsistency in respect of proper Names	186
(i.) Mistaken principle of Translation	187
Theory of the Translators of 1611	188
The work of 1881 inferior to that of 1611	190
(j.) The same word must sometimes be diversely rendered:—as <i>αἱρέσις</i> <i>ἀφιέναι, παιδίσκη</i> . And certain renderings:—	193
as 'Sepulchre,' 'Doctrine,' 'Vials,' 'Charity,' 'Miracles' ..	197
and 'HOLY GHOST'—may, on no account, be interfered with	204
'Epileptic' (S. Matth. xvii. 15), a sorry gloss, not a translation	205
(k.) 'Everlasting' unfairly excluded as the rendering of <i>αἰώνος</i> ..	206
'Inspiration':—(Bp. Middleton <i>versus</i> Bp. Ellicott)	208
Discreditable handling of S. Mark xiii. 32	209
Socinian gloss on Romans ix. 5, patronized by the Revisers ..	210
(l.) 'The Evil One' improperly introduced into 'the LORD'S Prayer'	214
Other changes for the worse in the Revision of 1881	217
The Revisers prefer 'mumpsimus' to 'sumpsimus':—	218
and have corrupted the text of S. John x. 14	220
(m.) The Authorized Version is better than the Revision	221
Sir Edmund Beckett.—Novel Phraseology	222
(n.) Where are our 'Headings' and our 'Marginal References?' ..	223
The 'New English Version' characterized	225
The Book has been made unreadable	226
(o.) Case of 'the Revision' hopeless	227

	PAGE
Certain of the Revisers at least are free from blame	228
Consolation	232
ARTICLE III.—WESTCOTT AND HORT'S NEW TEXTUAL THEORY.	
(a.) The general disappointment occasioned by 'the Revision' ..	235
having been proclaimed by the Reviewer in Oct. 1881 ..	237
he found himself taunted with not having grappled with	
Drs. Westcott and Hort's 'New Textual Theory' ..	240
that omission he proposes to repair effectually now ..	241
(b.) He begins by rehearsing the method of their predecessors:— ..	242
(Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf): and pointing out	
what had been the underlying fallacy of them all ..	243
The Edition of Drs. Westcott and Hort, unlike the rest,	
proves to be destitute of Critical apparatus ..	245
which makes its oracular tone peculiarly unbecoming ..	247
(c.) Dr. Hort takes no account of gross Textual errors which have	
been the result of <i>Design</i>	248
and which prevail in his favourite Codices B and D ..	249
His account of his own Edition inspires distrust and dismay ..	250
for he claims that Readings [by himself] " <i>strongly pre-</i>	
ferred" shall be accepted as the Truth of Scripture ..	252
thereby setting up <i>himself</i> as the supreme authority ..	253
(d.) He vaunts the ' <i>factor of Genealogy</i> ' (a term to be explained	
further on) as the great instrument of Textual progress ..	254
and identifies the Traditional Greek Text with the	
dominant ' <i>Syrian Text</i> ' of A.D. 350-400	257
(e.) His ' <i>Theory of Conflation</i> ' critically examined	258
and ascertained to be visionary	264
On it, nevertheless, Dr. Hort proceeds to build	265
frequently asserting (never proving) that ' <i>Syrian readings</i> '	
are posterior to all other	266
and that ' <i>Præ-Syrian</i> ' readings must be Apostolic ..	268
The ' <i>Traditional Greek Text</i> ,' Dr. Hort chooses to call ' <i>Syrian</i> '	269
and readings peculiar to B and N, he arbitrarily design-	
ates ' <i>Præ-Syrian</i> ' and ' <i>Neutral</i> '	271
By an effort of the Imagination, he assumes (α) that the	
' <i>Syrian</i> ' Text was the result of a deliberate and autho-	
ritative <i>Recension</i> ,—	272
of which he invents (1) the Occasion (2) the History, and	
(3) the Date (namely, between A.D. 250 and A.D. 350) ..	273
He further assumes (β) that the Syriac Version underwent	
a similar fantastic process of <i>Recension</i> at the same time	275
Dr. Hort's fabulous account of the origin of the Traditional	
Greek Text	278

	PAGE
which recoils inconveniently on himself	284
For (by the hypothesis) <i>that</i> Text was the direct product of the collective wisdom of the Church in her best days	286
Dr. Hort's estimate of the result of the (imaginary) labours of the Church A.D. 250—A.D. 350: which (he says)— ..	289
resulted in a fabricated Text which, in some unexplained way instantly established itself all over the world ..	290
and—(unrecorded by a single writer of Antiquity)— ..	293
became the direct lineal Ancestor of every copy of the N. T. in existence	297
insinuating itself into the writings of all the Greek Fathers and thus establishing the importance of the ' <i>factor of</i> <i>Genealogy</i> ' [vaunted at p. 254]	299
(f.) The one object of all this wild writing shown to be the glorifi- cation of 'Codices B and N'—	300
for the lost original of which two Codices, 'general immu- nity from substantive error' is claimed by Dr. Hort ..	304
(g.) The Reviewer remonstrates with the Professor	305
who insists that the readings of 'codex B' have the ' <i>ring</i> of genuineness'	306
but is reminded that his own 'inner consciousness' is an unsafe guide in this respect	308
Moreover, his proposed test is proved to be inapplicable ..	310
(h.) Dr. Hort is for shutting us up for ever within 'Codices B and N' but we decline to submit to the proposed bondage ..	313
for the bad character of those two Codices is <i>a fact</i> ..	315
their very preservation being probably attributable solely to the patent foulness of the Text they exhibit ..	319
(i.) And thus we part company from our learned, and accomplished but certainly most incompetent and mistaken Guide ..	320
(j.) DIALOGUE of the Reviewer with a SUPPOSED OBJECTOR, in proof that the most ancient document accessible is not of <i>necessity</i> the purest also	321
Fragment of the ' <i>Medea</i> ' written B.C. 200	321
Caius (A.D. 175) on heretical deprivations of the Text ..	323
Case of the Codices 'B N C'	325
Visit to the library of Clemens Alexandrinus (A.D. 183) ..	326
(k.) DIALOGUE of the Reviewer with a FRIENDLY CRITIC,—who remonstrates with him on the (supposed) dangerous tendency of the foregoing remarks	328
The Reviewer in reply, explains what is meant by appealing to 'Antiquity'	329
Endeavours to account for the deformity occasionally exhibited by certain of the earliest documents	334

	PAGE
and describes his own humble method of procedure when he would himself ascertain the Truth of Scripture ..	336
(l.) God hath made ample provision for the security of His own written Word	338
(m.) The only trustworthy method of Textual Criticism explained ..	339
<i>That must be held to be the true Text which enjoys the fullest and most varied attestation</i>	340
Whereas Dr. Hort's 'Theory,' (founded on the hypothesis that Codex B is almost immaculate), suggests the image of a pyramid balanced on its apex	342
And the Revisers by adopting his preposterous method, have done their best to make the Church of England as well as themselves, ridiculous	344
(n.) The case of the Codex Alexandrinus (A) stated	345
1 S. John v. 18 discussed by the Reviewer	347
and proposed as a specimen of his own 'innocent ignorance'	349
(o.) The Nemesis of Superstition and Idolatry	350
Dr. Hort on 'Conjectural Emendation:—2 Tim. i. 13 ..	351
S. John vi. 4:—Acts xx. 28	353
'Conjectural Emendation' can be allowed <i>no</i> place ..	354
2 S. Peter iii. 10 vindicated against Dr. Hort	356
also <i>εἰκῆ</i> ('without a cause') in S. Matthew v. 22 ..	358
(p.) Westcott and Hort's method of dealing with the Inspired Text shown to be wholly indefensible	362
(q.) The subject of 'TEXTUAL CRITICISM' may no longer sleep ..	364
But the great underlying problem will have now to be fairly threshed out: and,—'GOD DEFEND THE RIGHT!'	365
LETTER TO THE RIGHT REV. C. J. ELICOTT, D.D., BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL, IN REPLY TO HIS PAMPHLET IN DEFENCE OF THE REVISERS, AND THEIR NEW GREEK TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.	
(a.) Bishop Ellicott's reply to our first two Articles	369
scarcely deserves serious attention	370
and was anticipated by our own third Article	371
The unfairness of his procedure pointed out	372
and a question proposed to him in passing	374
<i>He</i> appeals to ' <i>Modern Opinion</i> ': <i>we</i> , to ' <i>Ancient Authority</i> ' ..	375
The Bishop in May 1870, and in May 1882	378
His estimate of 'the fabric of Modern Textual Criticism' ..	379
proved to be incorrect, by an appeal to historical facts ..	380
He confuses the standard of <i>Comparison</i> with the standard of <i>Excellence</i>	383
and misrepresents the Reviewer in consequence	387
But why does he prejudice the question	388

	PAGE
by pouring contempt on the 'first edition of Erasmus?' ..	389
since he admits that the Traditional Text (which is <i>not</i> the 'first edition of Erasmus') is at least 1550 years old	390
And since he has nothing to urge against it	391
except Dr. Hort's fantastic hypothesis	394
(b.) Nothing (says the Bishop) can be more unjust on the part of the Reviewer than to suggest that the Revisers <i>exceeded their</i> <i>Instructions</i>	399
But the Reviewer demonstrates that, both in respect of the 'New English Version'	400
and in respect of the 'New Greek Text,' the Revisers have outrageously exceeded their Instructions	403
not even suffering a trace to survive in their Margin of the mischief they have effected in the Text	407
e.g. at S. John iv. 15:—S. Mark vi. 11:—S. Matth. v. 44	407
On the other hand, they encumber their Margin with the readings they deliberately reject	411
and omit the 'Headings,' and the 'Marginal References' ..	412
(c.) Suggested Allocution,—Bp. Ellicott to Drs. Westcott and Hort	413
(d.) Examination of the 16 Places in which the Bishop proposes to defend his 'New Greek Text'	415
Viz. S. Matth. i. 25:—xvii. 21:—xviii. 11:—S. Mark vi. 20:—xi. 3:—xi. 8:—xvi. 9-20:—S. Luke ix. 55, 6:— x. 15:—xi. 2-4:—xxiii. 38:—xxiii. 45:—S. John xiv. 4:—Acts xviii. 7:—1 Tim. iii. 16	417
(e.) Three of these Readings singled out for special laborious study, viz. (α) S. LUKE ii. 14:—(β) S. MARK xvi. 9-20	420
(for it is the Reviewer,—not the Bishop,—who makes, and insists on making, his appeal to Catholic Antiquity)	423
(f.) Lastly (γ) 1 TIMOTHY iii. 16.—	
A Dissertation follows, in proof that " GOD WAS MANI- FESTED IN THE FLESH " is the correct Reading.	
Preliminary remarks in explanation	424
Evidence in favour of <i>μυστήριον ὄς</i> , as stated by Bp. Ellicott ..	429
shown to be in every respect mistaken	430
[1] Testimony of the COPIES to 1 Timothy iii. 16. Of Cod. A ..	431
next, of Cod. c	437
next, of Codd. F and G. of S. Paul	438
next, of the Cursive Copies,—'Paul 17,' '73' and '181' ..	443
[2] Testimony of the VERSIONS concerning 1 Tim. iii. 16. The old Latin,—	448
the Vulgate,—the Peschito,—the Harkleian,—the Egypt- tian,—the Gothic,—the Ethiopic,—the Armenian,—the Arabic version	449

	PAGE
Up to this point, the sanction obtained for <i>μυστήριον · ὄς</i> is wondrous slender	454
[3] Testimony of the FATHERS concerning 1 Tim. iii. 16 ..	455
Gregory of Nyssa,—Didymus,—Theodoret	456
Chrysostom,—Gregory of Nazianzus,—the title “ <i>Περὶ θείας σαρκώσεως</i> ”	457
Severus of Antioch,—Diodorus of Tarsus	458
(Bp. Ellicott as a Controversialist.) The case of Euthalius ps.-Dionysius Alexandrinus	459
Ignatius,—Barnabas,—Hippolytus,—Gregory Thaumaturgus,—the Apostolical Constitutions,—Basil	462
Cyril of Alexandria	464
The argument <i>e silentio</i> considered	469
The story about Macedonius examined, and disposed of ..	470
Anonymus,—Epiphanius (A.D. 787),—Theodorus Studita, —Scholiasts, —Œcumenius,—Theophylact,—Euthymius, —Ecclesiastical Tradition,—the ‘Apostolus’	475
(I.) Sum of the evidence in favour of <i>μυστήριον · ὄ</i> in 1 Tim. iii. 16, shown to be insufficient.—Theodore of Mopsuestia ..	479
(II.) Sum of the evidence in favour of <i>μυστήριον · ὄς</i> in 1 Tim. iii. 16, shown to be vastly inferior to the preceding	482
Bp. Ellicott is reminded that <i>not</i> ‘Modern Opinion,’ but ‘Ancient Authority’ (i.e. <i>Fact</i> not <i>Fiction</i>) is to settle this, and every other Textual question	483
(III.) Sum of the evidence in favour of <i>Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη</i> in 1 Tim. iii. 16, shown to be overwhelming and decisive	485
Testimony of 20 Fathers, 3 Versions, 4 Uncial Codices	487
and 252 (out of 254) cursive Copies—[or rather, 260 out of 262, for see the POSTSCRIPT at page 528]	491
also of 33 Lectionaries—[or rather, of 36]	495
Internal evidence for reading <i>Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη</i> in 1 Tim. iii. 16, shown to be the strongest possible	497
Close of the D <i>D</i> <i>is</i> <i>s</i> <i>e</i> <i>r</i> <i>t</i> <i>a</i> <i>t</i> <i>i</i> <i>o</i> <i>n</i> (which began at p. 424)	501
(g.) Composition of the Revising Body a breach of Church Order ..	501
An Unitarian Reviser intolerable	503
The ‘Westminster Abbey scandal’ (22nd June 1870)	507
(h.) Forecast of the probable Future of the Revision of 1881 ..	508
which differs essentially from that of 1611	509
Mutilation of S. Mark x. 21 : S. Luke ix. 54–6 : xxii. 64 : xxiii. 38 : xxiv. 42	510
(i.) Review of the entire subject, and of our respective positions ..	514
The nature of the present contention explained	516
Parting counsels.—Three convenient <i>Test places</i> indicated ..	519
The subject dismissed	520

ARTICLE I.

THE NEW GREEK TEXT.

SAMPLE PAGES

“One question in connexion with the Authorized Version I have purposely neglected. It seemed useless to discuss its REVISION. *The Revision of the original Texts must precede the Revision of the Translation: and the time for this, even in the New Testament, has not yet fully come.*”—DR. WESTCOTT.¹

“It is my honest conviction that for any authoritative REVISION, we are not yet mature; *either in Biblical learning or Hellenistic scholarship.* There is good scholarship in this country, . . . but *it has certainly not yet been sufficiently directed to the study of the New Testament . . . to render any national attempt at REVISION either hopeful or lastingly profitable.*”—BISHOP ELLICOTT.²

“I am persuaded that a REVISION ought to come: I am convinced that it will come. Not however, I would trust, as yet; for *we are not as yet in any respect prepared for it. The Greek and the English which should enable us to bring this to a successful end, might, it is feared, be wanting alike.*”—ARCHBISHOP TRENCH.³

¹ Preface to *History of the English Bible* (p. ix.),—1863.

² Preface to *Pastoral Epistles* (p. xiv.),—1861.

³ *The Authorized Version of the N. T.* (p. 3),—1858.

THE

REVISION REVISED.

ARTICLE I.—THE NEW GREEK TEXT.

“It is happened unto them according to the true proverb, *Κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα* · and, *Ἦς λουσαμένη εἰς κύλισμα βορβόρου.*”
—2 PETER ii. 22.

“Little children,—Keep yourselves from idols.”—1 JOHN v. 21.

AT a period of extraordinary intellectual activity like the present, it can occasion no surprise—although it may reasonably create anxiety—if the most sacred and cherished of our Institutions are constrained each in turn to submit to the ordeal of hostile scrutiny; sometimes even to bear the brunt of actual attack. When however at last the very citadel of revealed Truth is observed to have been reached, and to be undergoing systematic assault and battery, lookers-on may be excused if they show themselves more than usually solicitous, ‘ne quid detrimenti Civitas DEI capiat.’ A Revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament,¹ purporting to have been executed by authority of the Convocation of the Southern Province, and declaring itself the exclusive property of our two ancient Universities, has recently (17th May, 1881) appeared; of which the essential feature proves to be, that it is founded on *an*

¹ *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST translated out of the Greek: being the Version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient Authorities, and Revised A.D. 1881.* Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 1881.

*entirely New Recension of the Greek Text.*¹ A claim is at the same time set up on behalf of the last-named production that it exhibits a closer approximation to the inspired Autographs than the world has hitherto seen. Not unreasonable therefore is the expectation entertained by its Authors that the 'New English Version' founded on this 'New Greek Text' is destined to supersede the 'Authorized Version' of 1611. *Quæ cum ita sint*, it is clearly high time that every faithful man among us should bestir himself: and in particular that such as have made Greek Textual Criticism in any degree their study should address themselves to the investigation of the claims of this, the latest product of the combined Biblical learning of the Church and of the sects.

For it must be plain to all, that the issue which has been thus at last raised, is of the most serious character. The Authors of this new Revision of the Greek have either entitled themselves to the Church's profound reverence and abiding gratitude; or else they have laid themselves open to her gravest censure, and must experience at her hands nothing short of stern and well-merited rebuke. No middle course presents itself; since assuredly *to construct a new Greek Text* formed no part of the Instructions which the Revisionists received at the hands of the Convocation of the Southern Province. Rather were they warned against venturing on such an experiment; the fundamental principle of the entire undertaking having been declared at the outset to be—That

¹ *The New Testament in the Original Greek, according to the Text followed in the Authorized Version, together with the Variations adopted in the Revised Version.* Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, by F. H. A. Scrivener, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Prebendary of Exeter and Vicar of Hendon. Cambridge, 1881.

'H KΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. *The Greek Testament, with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version.* [Edited by the Ven. Archdeacon Palmer, D.D.] Oxford, 1881.

'a Revision of *the Authorized Version*' is desirable; and the terms of the original Resolution of Feb. 10th, 1870, being, that the removal of 'PLAIN AND CLEAR ERRORS' was alone contemplated,—'whether in the Greek Text originally adopted by the Translators, or in the Translation made from the same.' Such were in fact *the limits formally imposed by Convocation*, (10th Feb. and 3rd, 5th May, 1870,) *on the work of Revision*. Only NECESSARY changes were to be made. The first Rule of the Committee (25th May) was similar in character: viz.—'To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the *Authorized Version*, consistently with faithfulness.'

But further, we were reconciled to the prospect of a Revised Greek Text, by noting that a limit was prescribed to the amount of licence which could by possibility result, by the insertion of a proviso, which however is now discovered to have been entirely disregarded by the Revisionists. The condition was enjoined upon them that whenever '*decidedly preponderating evidence*' constrained their adoption of some change in 'the Text from which the *Authorized Version* was made,' *they should indicate such alteration in the margin*. Will it be believed that, this notwithstanding, *not one* of the many alterations which have been introduced into the original Text is so commemorated? On the contrary: singular to relate, the Margin is disfigured throughout with ominous hints that, had 'Some ancient authorities,' 'Many ancient authorities,' 'Many very ancient authorities,' been attended to, a vast many more changes might, could, would, or should have been introduced into the Greek Text than have been actually adopted. And yet, this is precisely the kind of record which we ought to have been spared:—

(1) First,—Because it was plainly external to the province of the Revisionists to introduce any such details into their margin *at all*: their very function being, on the contrary, to

investigate Textual questions in conclave, and to present the ordinary Reader with *the result* of their deliberations. Their business was to correct "*plain and clear errors*;" not, certainly, to invent a fresh crop of unheard-of doubts and difficulties. This first.—Now,

(2) That a diversity of opinion would sometimes be found to exist in the revising body was to have been expected, but when once two-thirds of their number had finally "settled" any question, it is plainly unreasonable that the discomfited minority should claim the privilege of evermore parading their grievance before the public; and in effect should be allowed to represent *that* as a corporate doubt, which was in reality the result of individual idiosyncrasy. It is not reasonable that the echoes of a forgotten strife should be thus prolonged for ever; least of all in the margin of 'the Gospel of peace.'

(3) In fact, the privilege of figuring in the margin of the N. T., (instead of standing in the Text,) is even attended by a fatal result: for, (as Bp. Ellicott remarks,) 'the judgment commonly entertained in reference to our present margin,' (*i.e.* the margin of the A. V.) is, that *its contents are 'exegetically or critically superior to the Text.'*¹ It will certainly be long before this popular estimate is unconditionally abandoned. But,

(4) Especially do we deprecate the introduction into the margin of all this strange lore, because we insist on behalf of unlearned persons that they ought not to be molested with information which cannot, by possibility, be of the slightest service to them: with vague statements about "ancient authorities,"—of the importance, or unimportance, of which they know absolutely nothing, nor indeed ever can know. Unlearned readers on taking the Revision into their hands, (*i.e.* at least 999 readers out of 1000,) will *never* be

¹ *On Revision*,—pp. 215-6.

aware whether these (so-called) 'Various Readings' are to be scornfully scouted, as nothing else but ancient perversions of the Truth; or else are to be lovingly cherished, as 'alternative' [see the Revisers' *Preface* (iii. 1.)] exhibitions of the inspired Verity,—to their own abiding perplexity and infinite distress.

Undeniable at all events it is, that the effect which these ever-recurring announcements produce on the devout reader of Scripture is the reverse of edifying: is never helpful: is always bewildering. A man of ordinary acuteness can but exclaim,—'Yes, very likely. But *what of it?* My eye happens to alight on "Bethesda" (in S. John v. 2); against which I find in the margin,—"Some ancient authorities read *Bethsaida*, others *Bethzatha*." Am I then to understand that in the judgment of the Revisionists it is uncertain *which* of those three names is right?' . . . Not so the expert, who is overheard to moralize concerning the phenomena of the case after a less ceremonious fashion:—" *Bethsaida* " ! Yes, the old Latin ¹ and the Vulgate, ² countenanced by *one* manuscript of bad character, so reads. " *Bethzatha* " ! Yes, the blunder is found in *two* manuscripts, both of bad character. Why do you not go on to tell us that *another* manuscript exhibits " *Belzetha* " ?—another (supported by Eusebius ³ and [in one place] by Cyril ⁴), " *Bezatha* " ? Nay, why not say plainly that there are found to exist *upwards of thirty* blundering representations of this same word; but that " *Bethesda* "—(the reading of sixteen uncials and the whole body of the cursives, besides the Peschito and Cureton's Syriac, the Armenian, Georgian and Slavonic Versions,—Didymus, ⁵ Chrysostom, ⁶ and Cyril ⁷),—is the only reasonable way of exhibiting it? To

¹ Tertullian, *bis*.

² Hieron. *Opp.* ii. 177 c (see the note).

³ Apud Hieron. iii. 121.

⁴ iv. 617 c (ed. Pusey).

⁵ P. 272.

⁶ i. 548 c; viii. 207 a.

⁷ iv. 205.

speak plainly, *Why encumber your margin with such a note at all?* . . . But we are moving forward too fast.

It can never be any question among scholars, that a fatal error was committed when a body of Divines, appointed to revise the *Authorized English Version* of the New Testament Scriptures, addressed themselves to the solution of an entirely different and far more intricate problem, namely *the re-construction of the Greek Text*. We are content to pass over much that is distressing in the antecedent history of their enterprise. We forbear at this time of day to investigate, by an appeal to documents and dates, certain proceedings in and out of Convocation, on which it is known that the gravest diversity of sentiment still prevails among Churchmen.¹ This we do, not by any means as ourselves 'halting between two opinions,' but only as sincerely desirous that the work before us may stand or fall, judged by its own intrinsic merits. Whether or no Convocation,—when it 'nominated certain of its own members to undertake the work of Revision,' and authorized them 'to refer when they considered it desirable to Divines, Scholars, and Literary men, at home or abroad, *for their opinion*;'—whether Convocation intended thereby to sanction the actual *co-optation* into the Company appointed by themselves, of members of the Presbyterian, the Wesleyan, the Baptist, the Congregationalist, the Socinian body; *this* we venture to think may fairly be doubted.—Whether again Convocation can have foreseen that of the ninety-nine Scholars in all who have taken part in this work of Revision, only forty-nine would be Churchmen, while the remaining fifty would belong to the sects:²—*this* also we

¹ A reference to the *Journal of Convocation*, for a twelvemonth after the proposal for a Revision of the Authorized Version was seriously entertained, will reveal more than it would be convenient in this place even to allude to.

² We derive our information from the learned Congregationalist, Dr. Newth,—*Lectures on Bible Revision* (1881), p. 116.

venture to think may be reasonably called in question.—Whether lastly, the Canterbury Convocation, had it been appealed to with reference to 'the Westminster-Abbey scandal' (June 22nd, 1870), would not have cleared itself of the suspicion of complicity, by an unequivocal resolution,—we entertain no manner of doubt.—But we decline to enter upon these, or any other like matters. Our business is exclusively with *the result* at which the Revisionists of the New Testament have arrived: and it is to this that we now address ourselves; with the mere avowal of our grave anxiety at the spectacle of an assembly of scholars, appointed to revise *an English Translation*, finding themselves called upon, as every fresh difficulty emerged, to develop the skill requisite for *critically revising the original Greek Text*. What else is implied by the very endeavour, but a singular expectation that experts in one Science may, at a moment's notice, show themselves proficient in another,—and *that* one of the most difficult and delicate imaginable?

Enough has been said to make it plain why, in the ensuing pages, we propose to pursue a different course from that which has been adopted by Reviewers generally, since the memorable day (May 17th, 1881) when the work of the Revisionists was for the first time submitted to public scrutiny. The one point which, with rare exceptions, has ever since monopolized attention, has been the merits or demerits of *their English rendering* of certain Greek words and expressions. But there is clearly a question of prior interest and infinitely greater importance, which has to be settled first: namely, the merits or demerits of *the changes which the same Scholars have taken upon themselves to introduce into the Greek Text*. Until it has been ascertained that the result of their labours exhibits a decided improvement upon what before was read, it is clearly a mere waste of time to enquire into the merits of their work as *Revisers of a*

Translation. But in fact it has to be proved that the Revisionists have restricted themselves to the removal of “plain and clear *errors*” from the commonly received Text. We are distressed to discover that, on the contrary, they have done something quite different. The treatment which the N. T. has experienced at the hands of the Revisionists recalls the fate of some ancient edifice which confessedly required to be painted, papered, scoured,—with a minimum of masons’ and carpenters’ work,—in order to be inhabited with comfort for the next hundred years : but those entrusted with the job were so ill-advised as to persuade themselves that it required to be to a great extent rebuilt. Accordingly, in an evil hour they set about removing foundations, and did so much structural mischief that in the end it became necessary to proceed against them for damages.

Without the remotest intention of imposing views of our own on the general Reader, but only to enable him to give his intelligent assent to much that is to follow, we find ourselves constrained in the first instance,—before conducting him over any part of the domain which the Revisionists have ventured uninvited to occupy,—to premise a few ordinary facts which lie on the threshold of the science of Textual Criticism. Until these have been clearly apprehended, no progress whatever is possible.

(1) The provision, then, which the Divine Author of Scripture is found to have made for the preservation in its integrity of His written Word, is of a peculiarly varied and highly complex description. First,—By causing that a vast multiplication of COPIES should be required all down the ages, —beginning at the earliest period, and continuing in an ever-increasing ratio until the actual invention of Printing,—He provided the most effectual security imaginable against fraud. True, that millions of the copies so produced have long since

perished: but it is nevertheless a plain fact that there survive of the Gospels alone upwards of one thousand copies to the present day.

(2) Next, VERSIONS. The necessity of translating the Scriptures into divers languages for the use of different branches of the early Church, procured that many an authentic record has been preserved of the New Testament as it existed in the first few centuries of the Christian era. Thus, the Peschito Syriac and the old Latin version are believed to have been executed in the IInd century. "It is no stretch of imagination" (wrote Bp. Ellicott in 1870,) "to suppose that portions of the Peschito might have been in the hands of S. John, or that the Old Latin represented the current views of the Roman Christians of the IInd century."¹ The two Egyptian translations are referred to the IIIrd and IVth. The Vulgate (or revised Latin) and the Gothic are also claimed for the IVth: the Armenian, and possibly the Æthiopic, belong to the Vth.

(3) Lastly, the requirements of assailants and apologists alike, the business of Commentators, the needs of controversialists and teachers in every age, have resulted in a vast accumulation of additional evidence, of which it is scarcely possible to over-estimate the importance. For in this way it has come to pass that every famous Doctor of the Church in turn has quoted more or less largely from the sacred writings, and thus has borne testimony to the contents of the codices with which he was individually familiar. PATRISTIC CITATIONS accordingly are a third mighty safeguard of the integrity of the deposit.

To weigh these three instruments of Criticism—COPIES, VERSIONS, FATHERS—one against another, is obviously im-

¹ *On Revision*, pp. 26-7.

possible on the present occasion. Such a discussion would grow at once into a treatise.¹ Certain explanatory details, together with a few words of caution, are as much as may be attempted.

I. And, first of all, the reader has need to be apprised (with reference to the first-named class of evidence) that most of our extant COPIES of the N. T. Scriptures are comparatively of recent date, ranging from the Xth to the XIVth century of our era. That these are in every instance copies of yet older manuscripts, is self-evident; and that in the main they represent faithfully the sacred autographs themselves, no reasonable person doubts.² Still, it is undeniable that

¹ Dr. Scrivener's *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 2nd edition, 1874 (pp. 607), may be confidently recommended to any one who desires to master the outlines of Textual Criticism under the guidance of a judicious, impartial, and thoroughly competent guide. A new and revised edition of this excellent treatise will appear shortly.

² Studious readers are invited to enquire for Dr. Scrivener's *Full and exact Collation of about Twenty Greek Manuscripts of the Holy Gospels (hitherto unexamined), deposited in the British Museum, the Archbishopal Library at Lambeth, &c., with a Critical Introduction.* (Pp. lxxiv. and 178.) 1853. The introductory matter deserves very attentive perusal.—With equal confidence we beg to recommend his *Exact Transcript of the Codex Augiensis, a Græco-Latin Manuscript of S. Paul's Epistles, deposited in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge; to which is added a full Collation of Fifty Manuscripts, containing various portions of the Greek New Testament, in the Libraries of Cambridge, Parham, Leicester, Oxford, Lambeth, the British Museum, &c. With a Critical Introduction* (which must also be carefully studied). (Pp. lxxx. and 563.) 1859.—Learned readers can scarcely require to be told of the same learned scholar's *Novum Testamentum Textus Stephani, A.D. 1550. Accedunt varix Lectiones Editionum Bezae, Elzeviri, Lachmanni, Tischendorfii, Tregellesii.* Curante F. H. A. Scrivener, A.M., D.C.L., LL.D. [1860.] Editio auctior et emendatior. 1877.—Those who merely wish for a short popular Introduction to the subject may be grateful to be told of Dr. Scrivener's *Six Lectures on the Text of the N. T. and the Ancient MSS. which contain it, chiefly addressed to those who do not read Greek.* 1875.

they *are* thus separated by about a thousand years from their inspired archetypes. Readers are reminded, in passing, that the little handful of copies on which we rely for the texts of Herodotus and Thucydides, of Æschylus and Sophocles, are removed from *their* originals by full 500 years more: and that, instead of a thousand, or half a thousand copies, we are dependent for the text of certain of these authors on as many copies as may be counted on the fingers of one hand. In truth, the security which the Text of the New Testament enjoys is altogether unique and extraordinary. To specify one single consideration, which has never yet attracted nearly the amount of attention it deserves,—‘Lectonaries’ abound, which establish the Text which has been publicly read in the churches of the East, from *at least* A.D. 400 until the time of the invention of printing.

But here an important consideration claims special attention. We allude to the result of increased acquaintance with certain of the oldest extant codices of the N. T. Two of these,—viz. a copy in the Vatican technically indicated by the letter B, and the recently-discovered Sinaitic codex, styled after the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet \aleph ,—are thought to belong to the IVth century. Two are assigned to the Vth, viz. the Alexandrian (A) in the British Museum, and the rescript codex preserved at Paris, designated C. One is probably of the VIth, viz. the codex Bezae (D) preserved at Cambridge. Singular to relate, the first, second, fourth, and fifth of these codices (B \aleph C D), but especially B and \aleph , have within the last twenty years established a tyrannical ascendancy over the imagination of the Critics, which can only be fitly spoken of as a blind superstition. It matters nothing that all four are discovered on careful scrutiny to differ essentially, not only from ninety-nine out of a hundred of

the whole body of extant MSS. besides, but even *from one another*. This last circumstance, obviously fatal to their corporate pretensions, is unaccountably overlooked. And yet it admits of only one satisfactory explanation: viz. that *in different degrees* they all five exhibit a fabricated text. Between the first two (B and Ξ) there subsists an amount of sinister resemblance, which proves that they must have been derived at no very remote period from the same corrupt original. Tischendorf insists that they were partly written by the same scribe. Yet do they stand asunder in every page; as well as differ widely from the commonly received Text, with which they have been carefully collated. On being referred to this standard, in the Gospels alone, B is found to omit at least 2877 words: to add, 536: to substitute, 935: to transpose, 2098: to modify, 1132 (in all 7578):—the corresponding figures for Ξ being severally 3455, 839, 1114, 2299, 1265 (in all 8972). And be it remembered that the omissions, additions, substitutions, transpositions, and modifications, *are by no means the same* in both. It is in fact *easier to find two consecutive verses in which these two MSS. differ the one from the other, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree*.

But by far the most depraved text is that exhibited by codex D. 'No known manuscript contains so many bold and extensive interpolations. Its variations from the sacred Text are beyond all other example.'¹ This, however, is not the result of its being the most recent of the five, but (singular to relate) is due to quite an opposite cause. It is thought (not without reason) to exhibit a IIInd-century text. 'When we turn to the Acts of the

¹ Scrivener's *Plain Introduction*,—p. 118.