

The Development of the Printed Greek New Testament:  
A Survey of Textual Critics from Erasmus to Westcott and Hort

Church History 512  
Dr. Hal McNeill

February 28, 2001  
Don Burke

## Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction .....	1
From Erasmus to the Textus Receptus.....	1
Desiderius Erasmus (ca. 1466 – 1536) .....	1
Cardinal Ximenes (1436 – 1517).....	3
Robertus Stephanus (1503 – 59).....	3
Theodore Beza (1519 – 1605).....	3
Bonaventure Elzevir and Abraham Elzevir (unknown).....	4
Work Subsequent to the Textus Receptus .....	5
Bryan Walton (1601 - 61) .....	5
John Fell (1625 – 86).....	5
John Mill (1645 - 1707).....	5
Edward Wells (1667 – 1727) .....	5
Richard Bentley (1662 - 1742).....	6
Daniel Mace (unknown).....	6
Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687 - 1752).....	6
Johann Jakob Wettstein (1693 – 1754).....	6
Johann Salomo Semler (1725 – 1791).....	7
Isaiah Thomas Jr. (1749 – 1831).....	7
Johann Jakob Griesbach (1745 – 1812).....	7
Johann Leonhard Hug (1765 – 1846).....	7
Johannes Martin Augustinus Scholz (1794 – 1852) .....	7
Karl Lachmann (1793 – 1851) .....	8
Samuel Tregelles (1805 – 98) .....	8
Constantin Tischendorf (1815 – 1874) .....	8
Brooke Foss Westcott (1825 - 1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828 - 1892).....	9
Conclusion .....	10

## The Development of the Printed Greek New Testament: A Survey of Textual Critics from Erasmus to Westcott and Hort

The fifteenth-century invention of the printing press by Johannes Gutenberg advanced man's ability to spread knowledge to a level unlike the world had ever known. The first major product from Gutenberg's press was a copy of the Bible – specifically the Latin Vulgate – which was published in 1456. By 1500 Western Europe saw Bibles printed in the principal languages of most of its countries.

The twenty-first century Bible student may be surprised to find that the Greek text was not included in that list. After all, Greek is the language for the New Testament (NT) scholar is it not?

While Greek would in time certainly claim its share of the printed page, it had a slow beginning. It was not until 1516 that the first printed Greek text was available for purchase. This delay centered around two main issues: The nature of the Greek language itself, and the reverence the scholarly community held toward the Latin Vulgate.

The Greek language is built upon twenty-four letters. However, many of those letters take varying forms depending on their position in the word and the letters next to them in the word. Thus this language of twenty-four letters required a printer to have access to 200 different characters. To produce and work with this many characters in the quantities necessary for printing a major work was quite costly and laborious.

The veneration of Jerome's Latin Vulgate – the standard for the fifteenth-century theologian – proved to be an even greater obstacle. Scholarship of the period gave little attention to the Greek text<sup>1</sup>, likely due to both the scarcity of Greek texts and the high regard for the Vulgate. The many translations into the vernacular of the day were seen as no threat. However, the mass production and distribution of a Greek text, which was based upon older and more reliable texts than the Vulgate, could jeopardize the authority and status of that revered standard.

These issues notwithstanding, the world was to see the publication of the first Greek NT sixty years after the Vulgate was first produced by Gutenberg.

### From Erasmus to the Textus Receptus

#### Desiderius Erasmus (ca. 1466 – 1536)

The first Greek NT to be published (1516) was the hurried work of the Dutch scholar Desiderius Erasmus. Erasmus was persuaded to undertake this project by Froben who was a publisher of Basel, Switzerland. Froben was apparently driven by a desire to be the first to publish the Greek New Testament.

Erasmus' NT was not the first Greek NT to be printed (see Ximenes below), and it was only through some maneuvering that Erasmus was able to get his NT on the market first. Such books as these required papal approval before they could be sold. Dedicating his NT to the pope no doubt helped Erasmus succeed in obtaining that permission before Ximenes.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Harold Greenlee, Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), p. 69.

Erasmus published four other editions of his NT in the following twenty years. For these Erasmus consulted few additional manuscripts and apparently made no significant changes to the text. These texts were the source for Luther's German translation and the first English NT (Tyndale, 1525).

Erasmus' NT was not without some significant shortcomings. The first edition was so rushed that Erasmus himself described the work as "precipitated rather than edited"<sup>2</sup> The hasty printing of the 1,000 copies, which was completed in less than five months, contained so many typographical errors that F. H. A. Scrivener would later state, "[I]t is in that respect the most faulty book I know."<sup>3</sup>

From the perspective of a twenty-first century textual critic Erasmus' NT had other major problems as well. First, the text was based on very few manuscripts. Erasmus originally used no more than six Greek manuscripts – and possibly as few as four – and none of these were complete. Only one contained the book of Revelation, and Greenlee describes it as "mutilated."<sup>4</sup> Where the wording was missing or unsure, Erasmus resorted to translating from the Latin Bible back into the Greek. Thus Erasmus introduced into the Greek text that which has never been found in a Greek manuscript, but which nevertheless was and is still accepted in many of the texts and translations spawned from his works.

Another textual difficulty with Erasmus' NT was that all the manuscripts were late-date documents, the earliest being from the early twelfth century. Of those he used, only one was non-Byzantine and had any antiquity,<sup>5</sup> but apparently Erasmus preferred the rendering of the more recent ones. Textual and other difficulties notwithstanding, Erasmus' work was a giant beginning step for the development of the Greek NT.

Many people of that day found this innovation of Erasmus quite objectionable for other reasons. As mentioned earlier the Latin Vulgate had become revered almost to the point of worship, and this new work threatened to bring its integrity into question. One such challenge to the Vulgate's reading brought particular criticism. Erasmus omitted the "heavenly witnesses" passage, the *comma Johanneum*, of I John 5:7-8 in his NT. Erasmus rightfully defended its omission based upon its absence from any of the Greek texts that he consulted. After continued attacks Erasmus stated that if the passage was found in any Greek manuscript, he would include it in his next edition. Stuncia, one of his critics and an editor of Ximenes' *Complutensia Polyglot* (see below), finally produced such a text (now called Codex Montfortianus), although its authenticity was highly questionable.<sup>6</sup> Erasmus, being true to his word, added the passage in the third edition of his NT, footnoting his doubts about the legitimacy of the text. It was this third edition, the *comma Johanneum* error notwithstanding, that would become the basis for many future works.

In 1527 Erasmus produced a definitive edition of his NT (with the *comma Johanneum* once again omitted). This work was composed of a Greek text

---

<sup>2</sup> Bruce Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (New York: Oxford, 1992), p. 99.

<sup>3</sup> F. H. A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, II, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (London: n.p., 1894), p.185, as quoted by Metzger, p. 99.

<sup>4</sup> Greenlee, p. 70.

<sup>5</sup> Greenlee, p. 70.

<sup>6</sup> Metzger asserts that the copy was specifically made for this occasion (Metzger, p. 101).

accompanied by the Latin Vulgate and Erasmus' own Latin version. In preparation for this edition Erasmus wisely consulted the generally superior text of the recently released work by Ximenes, which prompted about ninety changes in his text. Eight years later a fifth and final edition was produced which omitted the Vulgate but left the Greek text virtually unchanged.

#### Cardinal Ximenes (1436 – 1517)

Erasmus' Greek NT was the first to be published, but Ximenes holds the distinction of producing the first to be printed. Ximenes (Francisco Jemines de Cisneros) was the archbishop of Toledo, Spain. As archbishop he played an active part in the Spanish Inquisition, causing the death of at least 2,500 martyrs during that time.

Ximenes' NT was actually printed in 1514 – two years prior to Erasmus' – but it was 1520 before he received the pope's approval. During that time the OT volumes were printed (1517), but this complete Bible, known as the *Complutensian Polyglot*, was not released to the public until 1522. This work was composed of texts in Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin (the Vulgate). The Greek manuscripts used for the NT portion of this work have not been exactly ascertained, but apparently were loaned to Ximenes from the Apostolic Library by the pope.

Ximenes' Greek text was superior to that of Erasmus. However, due to the inconvenience and cost of a work of this size, plus the delays in receiving papal approval, this work never attained the level of circulation that Erasmus' achieved.

#### Robertus Stephanus (1503 – 59)

Robert Estienne, better known by his Latin name Stephanus, was a printer and publisher in Paris. Stephanus contributed four editions of the Greek NT (1546 – 1551). His work was largely built upon the works of Erasmus and Ximenes' *Complutensian*, but he also consulted approximately fifteen additional manuscripts during his work.

Stephanus' made significant contributions to Greek text development. His third edition (1550), which was to become the standard Greek NT for England<sup>7</sup>, was the first Greek NT to include a type of critical apparatus. The fourth edition published the following year introduced verse numeration, which is still used today.

#### Theodore Beza (1519 – 1605)

Beza produced nine editions of the Greek NT around the later half of the sixteenth century (1565-1604). A tenth edition was published posthumously in 1611. Based upon the texts of Erasmus and Stephanus, his NT offered few changes from these standard works. The translators of the Authorized Version (1611) made extensive use of the 1588 – 9 and 1598 editions.

Although these NT's provided little advancement in the Greek text, Beza did ultimately provide a substantial contribution in the later development of the text. In 1581 he presented to the University of Cambridge the Codex Bezae (Codex D), a small manuscript containing the Gospels and Acts plus a small portion of 3 John in Greek and Latin. Due to the uniqueness of the readings in this manuscript Beza and his contemporaries felt it of questionable quality, so it likely had little bearing on his NT

---

<sup>7</sup> F. F. Bruce, The Books and the Parchments, (Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell, 1984), p. 177.

works. However, in more recent years this codex has attained a much higher level of respect among textual scholars.

Beza's scholasticism proved very beneficial in promoting the use and development of the Greek text. This rector of the Genevian Academy is probably best known as the successor to Calvin in the reformation movement centered in Switzerland. In this position of combined scholar and leader Beza was able to influence countless people of his own time and many leaders of the following generation. Such men as James Arminius (1560 – 1609) sat under Beza's instructions.

### Bonaventure Elzevir (1583 – 1652) and Abraham Elzevir (1592 – 1652)

Beginning in 1624 Bonaventure Elzevir and his nephew Abraham<sup>8</sup> produced seven editions of the Greek NT. The works of these two Dutch printers were largely based upon the texts from Stephanus and Beza, both texts tracing their lineage back to Erasmus. Because of the neat printing and convenient size these NT's became quite popular.

The introduction of the second edition (1633) made the bold claim that "even the most minute mistakes (*vel minutissimae mendae*) had been corrected."<sup>9</sup> The authors then added *Textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus* ("Therefore thou hast the text now received by all, in which we give nothing altered or corrupted").<sup>10</sup> From these bold introductory remarks we get the term *Textus Receptus* (i.e., the "Received Text").

Such brashness notwithstanding, the Elzevirs' statement proved to be a foreshadowing of the reception this text would receive for generations. Because of this popularity the TR would be the basis for many generations of other texts and translations.

But one has to wonder at the tenacity of the TR, especially in light of the quality of the manuscripts which undergird it. Finegan addresses this when he writes, [I]t is evident that the *Textus Receptus*, in spite of the impressive name it attained, rested actually upon relatively few, relatively late, and relatively poor manuscripts, namely, upon those known to Ximenes, Erasmus, Stephen, and Beza, of which in fact the best . . . were the least used. Nevertheless the *Textus Receptus* was indeed 'received,' and accepted as the standard for the next two hundred years.<sup>11</sup>

Metzger largely concurs by stating the TR . . .

. . . essentially reproduced [Erasmus'] debased form of the Greek Testament. Having secured an undeserved pre-eminence . . . the *Textus Receptus* of the New Testament resisted for 400 years all scholarly efforts to displace it in favor of an earlier and more accurate text.<sup>12</sup>

He later adds . . .

---

<sup>8</sup> Metzger states that many, including himself in earlier chapters of the same book, wrongly label the Elzevirs as brothers. (Metzger, p. 283).

<sup>9</sup> Jack Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), p. 58.

<sup>10</sup> Finegan, p. 59.

<sup>11</sup> Finegan, p. 59.

<sup>12</sup> Metzger, p. 103.

[the TR's] textual basis is essentially a handful of late and haphazardly collected minuscule manuscripts, and in a dozen passages its reading is supported by no known Greek witness.<sup>13</sup>

### Work Subsequent to the Textus Receptus

While theologians at large became enamored with the TR, some scholars became increasingly convinced that textual criticism had yet to produce the Greek text that best matched the autographs. Those scholars were not motivated by a concern for content, but of technical exactness. "The T.R. is not a 'bad' or misleading text, either theologically or practically. Technically, however, it is far from the original text."<sup>14</sup>

#### Bryan Walton (1601 - 61)

Walton, later Bishop of Chester, issued the London Polyglot in 1657. This work was composed of Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, Persian, Greek, and Latin. Stephanus' third edition comprised the NT text.

Walton's contribution to the development of the Greek text was more notable in his systemization of the collection of variant readings. Stephanus' 1550 edition included a somewhat disorganized critical apparatus, but Walton significantly improved it.

#### John Fell (1625 – 86)

This Dean of Christ Church anonymously issued a Greek NT based upon the Elzevir 1633 edition. This text included a critical apparatus, but lacked the detail necessary to make it of lasting benefit.

#### John Mill (1645 - 1707)

In 1707 Mill printed a Greek NT which followed Stephanus' text with no intended variations. The critical apparatus included the variants from seventy-eight manuscripts. Mill was the first to note the number of total variant readings, a figure he calculated to be near 30,000.

Mill died just two weeks after the printing of his NT and was thus spared the pain of seeing the brutal reception given to his work. His critics violently attacked it for the few deviations that had been made from the venerated TR, and for the tremendous number of variant readings Mill noted.

#### Edward Wells (1667 – 1727)

Wells, a mathematician and theological writer, published a Greek NT that was largely ignored during his own time. This Oxford-published work deviated from the Elzevir text 210 times, opting for more critically accurate readings. For this Metzger notes Wells to be "the first to edit a complete New Testament which [was willing to abandon a particular reading of] . . . the Textus Receptus in favour of readings from the more ancient manuscripts."<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Metzger, p. 106.

<sup>14</sup> Greenlee, p. 72.

<sup>15</sup> Metzger, p. 109.

### Richard Bentley (1662 - 1742)

Bentley was Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and stood in defense of Mill and his work. Bentley proposed that a new Greek NT be published, but not patterned after the TR. Instead, Bentley suggested, the work should be based on Greek manuscripts critically deemed to be the nearest to the original autographs. Unfortunately he was not to see his suggestion come to fruition.

### Daniel Mace (unknown)

"An almost forgotten pioneer in New Testament Criticism"<sup>16</sup> is a description made of this Presbyterian minister at Newbury. Mace anonymously published *The New Testament in Greek and English* (1729). Due to the colloquial flair in the English portion the whole work received either yawns or violent attacks from his contemporaries. Mace's work brought no great strides in the development of the Greek text itself, but the very presence of such a homespun text probably served to shake the stronghold of the TR, if only a small bit.

### Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687 - 1752)

Bengel published a new Greek NT in 1734. However, this Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, took somewhat of a coward's approach in doing so. Bengel included preferred variants from the TR in his text only if those variants had already been published elsewhere. Other preferred readings he relegated to the footnotes.

The greatest contribution Bengel made was in the grouping of the various manuscripts. He divided the available manuscripts into two text types: Asiatic (mostly from Constantinople; more numerous; inferior) and African (fewer, but older and superior). Bengel is also credited with formulating the canon of *proclivi scriptioni praestat ardua*, i.e., "the difficult is to be preferred to the easy reading."<sup>17</sup> For these notable achievements Bengel was given the title of "the father of modern textual criticism."<sup>18</sup>

### Johann Jakob Wettstein (1693 – 1754)

A new edition of the Greek NT was published by Wettstein in 1751-52. In this two-volume work requiring forty years in preparation, Wettstein used the TR as his text, opting to place his preferred reading in the critical apparatus. To his discredit this scholar of Amsterdam defended the later manuscripts, claiming that the earlier ones had been corrupted by the Latin.<sup>19</sup>

Although the text of Wettstein's NT was of no particular note, in this edition he did introduce and standardize the system of citing uncial manuscripts by capital Latin letters and minuscules by Arabic numbers.<sup>20</sup> His system is still in wide use today. Wettstein is also credited with the collation or re-collation of about 100 manuscripts.

---

<sup>16</sup> H. McLachlan, "An Almost Forgotten Pioneer in New Testament Criticism," *Hibbert Journal*, xxxvii (1938-9), pp. 617-25, as given by Metzger, p. 112.

<sup>17</sup> Finegan, p. 61.

<sup>18</sup> Greenlee, p. 73.

<sup>19</sup> Greenlee, pp. 73-74.

<sup>20</sup> So Metzger (p. 114) and Greenlee (p. 73). Finegan (p. 59) attributes at least the use of capital letters for uncials to Walton.

### Johann Salomo Semler (1725 – 1791)

Like Bentley before him, Semler, the Professor of Theology at Halle, did not publish a Greek NT. He did, however, make a significant contribution to its development by enlarging the text-type classifications of Bengel. Semler categorized texts into three main classifications: Alexandrian (versions used in Egypt), Western (Latin versions) and Eastern or Oriental (used at Antioch and Constantinople).

### Isaiah Thomas, Jr. (1749 – 1831)

A printer who began his apprenticeship at the age of six, Thomas is credited with printing the first Greek New Testament in America. Thomas claimed to use the TR from John Mill's edition exclusively. However, elements of Beza's and Elzevirs' works can be noted throughout the text.

### Johann Jakob Griesbach (1745 – 1812)

Griesbach was a student under Semler, and later became the Professor of NT at Jena. Three new editions dating from 1774 to 1806 were published under his direction.

In the course of his studies and travels Griesbach collated a large number of manuscripts. From his work he proposed that there are three families of manuscripts in the Gospels: Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine (also called Constantinopolitan). According to Griesbach the Pauline Epistles were only found among the Alexandrian and Western families.

Griesbach also stated no less than fifteen canons to guide in his study of the manuscripts. These canons included:

1. No reading can be considered preferable unless supported by at least some ancient witnesses;
2. All criticism must depend upon study of recensions or classes of documents, not just of individual manuscripts;
3. The shorter reading is to be preferred to the longer; and
4. [following Bengel's work] The more difficult reading is to be preferred to the easier.<sup>21</sup>

### Johann Leonhard Hug (1765 – 1846)

Hug was a Roman Catholic Professor of New Testament at Freiburg. He did not produce a Greek NT, but offered a protracted theory on the early corruption of the Greek NT, and the efforts by the church fathers to correct it. Although he is mentioned in a number of works on the history of textual criticism, the lasting contribution from his work is unclear.

### Johannes Martin Augustinus Scholz (1794 – 1852)

A pupil of Hug, Scholz greatly aided the development of the Greek NT by his extensive travels through Europe to catalogue Greek manuscripts. His findings included many works that were previously unknown to the scholastic world. His listing of manuscripts would point many future scholars to valuable sources for research. In his later years he retracted his early statements on his preferences for the Byzantine over the Alexandrian readings.

---

<sup>21</sup> Finegan, p. 62.

### Karl Lachmann (1793 – 1851)

With acknowledgement to Richard Bentley's proposal a century earlier, Lachmann published a Greek NT (Berlin, 1831) with the modest hope of presenting the oldest attainable text (ca. fourth century). Lachmann based this text on the few early uncials available to him, showing no interest in the minuscules or TR. The work was weakened by his disregard for the benefit of grouping texts into families.

In making a complete break with the TR Lachmann's text can boast of being the first critical text,<sup>22</sup> but that was not without its cost. Being a classicist and not a theologian, he may not have realized that breaking from the TR was reason enough for a scathing attack on this new work. The criticism was greatly intensified by Lachmann's failure to include the procedure he used for determining his preferred readings. This omission was corrected in his second edition.

### Samuel Tregelles (1805 – 98)

Tregelles was an Englishman belonging to the group of earnest Bible students known as the Plymouth Brethren. His critical edition of the Greek NT was published in 1857 – 72. He also did much work in collating and describing NT manuscripts.

### Constantin Tischendorf (1815 – 1874)

Tischendorf, Professor of New Testament at Leipzig, followed the example of Scholz and made numerous tours of Europe and the Middle East to discover and edit NT manuscripts. In 1845 he published the first full edition of the palimpsest<sup>23</sup> Codex Ephraem (Codex C). He also read and published Codex Claromontanus (Paris, 1852), and Codex Vaticanus (1867). In all Tischendorf published the text of 21 uncial mss. and collated or copied the text of more than 20 others.<sup>24</sup>

Tischendorf's greatest discovery was Codex Sinaiticus ( Ⲁ ), one of the most famous of all manuscripts. He found this treasure in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai. Tischendorf's designation of this codex as aleph (the first Hebrew letter, which would obviously precede the Latin designations used for previous codexes), and the heavy influence this manuscript had on his subsequent Greek NT both attest to the high importance he placed on this document.

Eight editions of the Greek NT (1841 – 72) are credited to Tischendorf. His work may have been weakened by his disregard for grouping of texts into families. "He had no confidence in the accuracy of grouping, and he relied on the internal evidence of readings for the reconstruction of his text."<sup>25</sup> Also, Tischendorf's newly discovered Codex Sinaiticus may have overly influenced his eighth edition of the Greek NT, as evidenced by an estimated 3,500 changes in the text from his seventh edition.<sup>26</sup> These flaws notwithstanding, his NT "contains a critical apparatus which has never been

---

<sup>22</sup> Greenlee, p. 75.

<sup>23</sup> A palimpsest is a manuscript which was written on once and subsequently had the letters scraped off in order to be used a second time. Codex C was composed of twelfth-century extra-biblical writings of Ephraem of Syria over a fifth-century copy of the scriptures.

<sup>24</sup> Greenlee, p. 76.

<sup>25</sup> Ernest Colwell, Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament, (Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1969), p. 5.

<sup>26</sup> Finegan, p. 64.

equalled in comprehensiveness of citation of the Greek mss., versions, and patristic evidence."<sup>27</sup>

Tischendorf stated a number of canons which directed his own textual research. The following is a summary of his canons of criticism:

1. The text is to be sought from the most ancient evidence, meaning especially the oldest Greek manuscripts.
2. A reading peculiar to a single document is to be considered suspect.
3. An obvious scribal error is to be rejected even though well supported in the manuscripts.
4. In parallel passages the tendency of copyists would be to make the readings agree, and therefore, in such passages, testimonies are to be preferred which are not in precise accordance.
5. That reading is to be preferred which could have given occasion to the others, or which appears to comprise the elements of the other.
6. That reading is to be preferred which accords with NT Greek or with the style of the individual writer.<sup>28</sup>

#### Brooke Foss Westcott (1825 - 1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828 - 1892)

Building on the foundational work of those already named, two Professors of Divinity at Cambridge University brought the development of Greek NT to a new plateau. After twenty-eight years of joint labor, in 1881 – 82 Westcott and Hort published their Greek NT under the title of The New Testament in the Original Greek. This two-volume work containing no critical apparatus became one of the standards of the Greek NT.

In their textual criticism these men, unlike Tischendorf, put heavy emphasis upon the text-type grouping for manuscripts. Westcott and Hort recognized four text types: Neutral, Alexandrian, Western, and Syrian.<sup>29</sup>

Crucial elements of Westcott and Hort's methodology included three rules of internal evidence. In brief those are:

1. Internal Evidence of Readings – The textual critic asks two questions: "What is an author likely to have written," and "What are copyists likely to have made him seem to write."
2. Internal Evidence of Documents – Here the critic takes into consideration the normal accuracy of a manuscript. Thus a document that is normally correct will be given more weight than a document that is noted for errors.
3. Internal Evidence of Groups – This is the previous rule applied to text groups. Thus a manuscript belonging to a group that is known to be normally accurate is given more weight than a text from a group known to have frequent errors.<sup>30</sup>

The efforts of these British scholars provided a newfound freedom for the textual critic. "With the work of Westcott and Hort the T.R. was at last vanquished. In the future, whatever form an editor's text might take, he would be free to construct it with

---

<sup>27</sup> Greenlee, p. 76.

<sup>28</sup> Finegan, p. 63.

<sup>29</sup> For a fuller discussion of these groupings see Metzger, pp. 131ff.

<sup>30</sup> Metzger, pp. 129 – 131.

reference to the principles of textual criticism without being under the domination of the Textus Receptus.”<sup>31</sup>

It would be difficult to overstate the impact that these Westcott and Hott had on the development of the Greek NT. “They presented what is doubtless the oldest and purest text that could be attained with the means of information available in their day.”<sup>32</sup> Greenlee states, “All things considered, the influence of W-H upon all subsequent work in the history of the text has never been equalled.”<sup>33</sup> He adds, “The textual theory of W-H underlie virtually all subsequent work in N.T. textual criticism.”<sup>34</sup>

### Conclusion

The progress of textual criticism in the first four hundred years of this discipline is nothing short of phenomenal. From the meager beginnings of Erasmus the critics have searched out, amassed and scrutinized thousands of fragments, manuscripts and other discoveries necessary to determine with reasonable certainty the accuracy of the Greek text to within a few decades of the original autographs.

The work of Westcott and Hort was certainly a milestone for the development of the Greek NT. However the work did not stop there, nor has it stopped even a century later. As long as there are new discoveries of ancient texts, the efforts of the textual critic to duplicate the original works of those who penned God’s Holy Word will not be completed. Yet no matter what developments the future may hold for the Greek NT, they will only be possible because of the foundational work of Erasmus and the critics that followed him.

---

<sup>31</sup> Greenlee, p. 77.

<sup>32</sup> Metzger, p 137.

<sup>33</sup> Greenlee, p. 77.

<sup>34</sup> Greenlee, p. 78.

## Bibliography

- Bruce, F. F. The Books and the Parchments. Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell, 1984
- Cairnes, Earle E. Christianity Through the Centuries. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Colwell, Ernest. Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1969.
- Finegan, Jack. Encountering New Testament Manuscripts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- The Greek New Testament. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stuttgart, West Germany: United Bible Societies, 1968.
- Greenlee, J. Harold. Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Lightfoot, Neil R. How We Got the Bible, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988.
- McLachlan, H. "An Almost Forgotten Pioneer in New Testament Criticism." Hibbert Journal, xxxvii (1938-9), as quoted by Metzger, p. 112.
- McManners, John, ed. The Oxford History of Christianity. Oxford: Oxford, 1993.
- Metzger, Bruce M. The Text of the New Testament. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Oxford, 1992.
- Scrivener, F. H. A. A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, II. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. London: n.p., 1894, as quoted in Metzger, pp. 99.