

**THE WORDS OF INSPIRATION:
JOHN WILLIAM BURGON AND THE TRADITIONAL TEXT
OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
Douglas W Taylor**

The following article won first prize in the second Martyn Lloyd-Jones Essay competition and first appeared in the Spring 1992 issue (No.88) of the The Evangelical Library Bulletin. It is here reproduced by courtesy of the Author.

Introduction

Beginning a little over a century ago with the publication of the Revised Version, a long-running debate has taken place in the churches of the English-speaking world over the merits of Bible versions.¹ The Revised Version of the New Testament marked a new departure in the history of the English Bible, not only as the first serious attempt to supersede the Authorized Version of 1611, but also as the first attempt to replace the Greek text of the Reformation translations with another, having a much narrower manuscript base. The Revised Version did not replace the Authorized Version, but the new Greek text enjoyed greater success. Texts very like it have been the basis of almost all the translations published in the present century.²

As the new versions began to gain greater currency in the churches, disquiet began to be felt on the part of some, not only about their quality as translations, but also regarding the soundness of the underlying text.³ Investigations of the background of this text led to the rediscovery of the fact that the period of the Revised Version's appearance had also witnessed some very learned and elaborate objections to the new Greek Text. One name was particularly prominent in this movement of opposition: that of J W Burgon (1813-88). An understanding of Burgon's views and their basis should contribute to an informed view of the current ferment over Bible versions. His writings also give an insight into a period in which the foundations of the faith were under severe attack. To the man, his writings, and the basis of his views, we now turn.

Burgon's Life and Writings

John William Burgon was born on August 21st, 1813, at

Smyrna, site of one of the churches of Asia (Revelation 2:8-11). His father was a London merchant with business interests in Smyrna and his mother was a daughter of the Austrian Consul in the city. It seems likely⁴ that it was from his mother that Burgon inherited the warm and enthusiastic temperament which appears in his controversial writings. As he grew up the intention he had formed of entering the ministry of the Church of England seemed to be frustrated by the feeling that it was his duty to enter his father's business, which was then in some difficulty. This service in his father's counting house was terminated in 1841 when the firm was forced to suspend payments and he was free to follow his inclination to enter the ministry. Friends helped him to enter Worcester College, Oxford, in 1842.

He graduated BA in 1845 and in the same year won the Newdigate prize with a lively poem entitled "Petra" on the rediscovered Nabatean city of that name. The poem contained the well-known descriptive line: "A rose-red city, half as old as time." Whether historically accurate or not, this at least showed his unquestioning acceptance of biblical chronology!

Burgon was elected a Fellow of Oriel College in 1846, graduated MA in 1848 and served several Berkshire parishes until 1863. In 1854 he published *A Plain Commentary on the Four Holy Gospels*, "a minute and reverent study of the sacred text."⁵ The motto-text printed on the title page was Jeremiah 6:16, an indication of his outlook. In 1860 the Church of England was convulsed in controversy over the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, a work in which the foundations of the faith were assailed by a number of clergymen and academics. Burgon preached a series of sermons that year, later published under the title *Inspiration and interpretation*, in which he refuted the sceptical principles of the writers of *Essays and Reviews*, setting forth in the clearest terms the doctrines of the verbal inspiration, infallibility and absolute authority of the Scriptures. Earlier in the same year Burgon spent some months in Rome as Chaplain to the English congregation in that city. His reflections on what he saw there formed the basis of *Letters from Rome to Friends in England*, published in 1862, in which his pungent views on Roman Catholicism find expression. We shall turn to his position regarding both Romanism and Rationalism below.

In 1863 Burgon was appointed Vicar of St Mary's, Oxford, and in 1867, Professor of Divinity at Gresham College, in the University of London. At the same time he graduated BD,

choosing for his required "Theological Exercises" *A Vindication of the Genuineness of the last Twelve Verses of St Mark's Gospel*, a foretaste of his major work on the subject, published in 1871. From 1876 until his death on August 4th, 1888, Burgon was Dean of Chichester. The publication of the revised Version of the New Testament in 1881 called forth from his pen a series of three articles published in the *Quarterly Review* dealing in turn with the Greek text underlying the new version, the English rendering and the textual theory on which the new Greek text was based. An expanded version of the articles, together with a lengthy reply to the comments of Bishop Ellicott, the Chairman of the Revisers, was later published as *The Revision Revised*.

Burgon's long-cherished desire to publish a systematic treatise on the text of the New Testament and the principles on which it is to be established was prevented by his death in 1888, but after his death his friend and collaborator, Edward Millar, used Burgon's materials to publish two volumes indicating at least the broad outlines of what the intended work would have contained, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* and *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text*.

Burgon's biographer lists over fifty published works on a wide variety of subjects, besides numerous articles contributed to periodicals.⁶ We have only sketched an outline of his life and the most prominent of his writings. The interested reader is referred to the bibliography for further details. We now attempt a brief account of Burgon's views on the inspiration and preservation of the Scriptures.

Burgon's Doctrine of Scriptural Authority

After Burgon's death a contemporary wrote:

"From first to last, all my reminiscences of Dean Burgon are bound up with the Bible, treated as few teachers of divinity now appear to regard it, as God's Word written: 'absolute, faultless, unerring, supreme.'"⁷

Another contemporary, R G Livingstone, commented as follows on Burgon's manner in leading a Bible study:

"We could not but notice the profound reverence with which he regarded the Bible as being from first to last, through every part of it, the Word of God - the unspeakable importance which he attached to everything which it contained. A name, a word, a date was of importance and interest to him because he found it there."⁸

Burgon concludes a sermon on 2 Timothy 3:16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God," in this way:

"... this day's sermon has had for its object to remind you, that the Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the Throne! Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it (where are we to stop?) every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High! - Pasa graphe theopneustos (All scripture divinely inspired). 'Well spake the HOLY GHOST, by the mouth of the many blessed men who wrote it. The Bible is none other than the Word of God: not some part of it more, some part of it less; but all alike the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the Throne, absolute, faultless, unerring, supreme.'"⁹

This high view of Scripture determined his approach to the textual criticism of the New Testament. Hear him again earlier in the same sermon as he deals with an imaginary objector to verbal inspiration:

"But if I am asked whether I believe the words of the Bible to be inspired, I answer, To be sure I do, every one of them: and every syllable likewise. Do not you?... or perhaps you enjoy a special tradition on this subject, and hold that Inspiration is a general, vague kind of thing, here more, there less... O Sir, but this 'general, vague kind of thing' will not suffice to anchor the fainting soul upon, in the day of trouble and in the hour of death! 'Here more, there less' will not satisfy a parched and weary spirit, athirst for the water of life, and craving the shadow of the great Rock. What security can you offer me that the promise which has sustained me so long occurs in the 'more' and not in the 'less'? How am I to know that your Bible is my Bible: in other words, what proof is there that either of us possesses the Word of God, the authentic utterance of God's Holy Spirit, at all?... No Sirs! The Bible (be persuaded) is the very utterance of the Eternal; as much God's Word as if high Heaven were open and we heard God speaking to us with human voice. Every book of it is inspired alike and is inspired entirely. Inspiration is not a difference of degree, but of kind. The Apocryphal books are not one atom more inspired than Bacon's Essays. But the Bible, from the Alpha to the Omega of it, is filled to overflowing with the Holy Spirit of God..."¹⁰

Since the Scripture is so entirely God's Word, Burgon regarded the supposed liberality of some who doubted it as bogus:

"Learn to abhor that spurious liberality which is liberal only with what is not its own... I allude to that sham liberality which under pretence of extending the common standing ground of Christian men, is in reality attenuating it until it proves incapable of bearing the weight of a single soul. There is room on the Rock for all, but it is only on the Rock that we are safe."¹¹

Yet Burgon saw the Word of God as being in danger, not only from those who denied or limited its inspiration, but also from those who, confessing the Scriptures to be inspired, treated the inspired words carelessly, allowing the precious deposit to be eroded by unsound methods of criticism. He saw clearly that the inspired words must have been preserved by their Author, yet

doubts were raised about the text. He was led to devote time to textual criticism, so as to "acquire such an independent mastery of the subject as [should] qualify him to do battle successfully for the imperilled letter of GOD's Word."¹² He was determined to defend, not only inspiration itself, but "the words of inspiration," since an infallible Bible, not infallibly preserved, did not answer to his conception of the nature of Scripture.¹³

Burgon's View of the Text of Scripture

Burgon's starting point in textual criticism was the divine inspiration and consequent infallible authority of all of the Word of God. Belief in this determined his whole approach:

"That which distinguishes Sacred Science from every other science which can be named is that it is Divine, and has to do with a book which is inspired."¹⁴

This being so, he held that the critic is not free to apply to the Scriptures criteria which may be applicable to other writings. In this he differed markedly from many scholars at the time and since who have believed it to be legitimate, and even necessary, to treat the Scriptures as they would treat any other book. F J A Hort, the editor mainly responsible for the text followed by the translators of the Revised Version (1881), wrote:

"For ourselves, we dare not introduce considerations which could not reasonably be applied to other ancient texts, supposing them to have documentary attestation of equal amount, variety, and antiquity."¹⁵

Burgon disallowed this supposedly neutral approach. In his view it neglected the most vital factor of all. If these were indeed "the words of inspiration," "the crowning masterpiece of [God's] creative skill,"¹⁶ two things inescapably followed: the written Word would be, like the Incarnate Word, the object of the malice of the devil; but it would also be the object of divine preservation and providential care. According to Burgon, both influences had been operative. This was particularly so in the earliest times:

"Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next directed his subtle malice against the Word written. Hence, as I think, hence the extraordinary fate which befell certain early transcripts of the Gospel ... Profane literature has never known anything approaching to it, can show nothing at all like it."¹⁷

In this early period, the Scriptures suffered at the hands of heretics, of orthodox defenders of the truth, and of self-appointed critics of the text.¹⁸ Nevertheless, the good providence of God secured the preservation of His Word and the multiplication of sound copies in increasing numbers as the centuries passed. Thus it came to pass, according to Burgon, that the true text came to

predominate among the copies, while the faulty copies were recognised for what they were and neglected. We have, therefore, to be on our guard against readings present, or omissions made, in only a few copies, however old they may be. God gave His Word to be used and to be known. It is inherently less likely that the truth of His Word should be represented in only a few copies, even if these are very ancient. The only reasonable assumption is therefore that the text preserved in the main body of the copies is the true text which God would have us use. The burden of proof clearly lies with those who wish to deny this. Burgon called for the fullest possible consideration of all the evidence, not just that thought to be earliest. All the later manuscripts represented ancestors much older than themselves. Such is, in barest outline, the view of the text urged by Burgon. The scholarship and ability with which he elaborated his position is best appreciated by reference to his writings.

The issue came to a head with the publication of the Revised Version. It became clear that the Revisers had remodelled the text of the Reformation versions on the basis of a tiny handful of ancient documents, not known to be more reliable. Indeed, Burgon showed that these documents, far from presenting a uniform text, were constantly at odds among themselves.¹⁹ He also replied to the textual theory put forward to justify acceptance of the new text. However, the tide, for the time being, was running strongly in favour of the new views. Burgon's strenuous efforts seemed largely unavailing. He was confident, however, that time would vindicate the position he contended for:

"Three and a half years ago," wrote H C Hoskier in 1890, I was in in Dean Burgon's study at Chichester. It was midnight, dark and cold without; he had just extinguished the lights, and it was dark, and getting cold within. We mounted the stairs to retire to rest, and his last words of the night have often rung in my ears since: 'As surely as it is dark now, and as certainly as the sun will rise tomorrow morning, so surely will the traditional text be vindicated and the views I have striven to express be accepted. I may not live to see it. Most likely I shall not. But it will come.'²⁰

Is Burgon a Trustworthy Guide?

Some have sought to weaken the case Burgon made for the superiority of the traditional text of the New Testament by representing him as unworthy of serious attention on one of two grounds. Either he is portrayed as an arch-conservative, opposed to all progress, "famous for his support of a long series of lost causes,"²¹ or he is decried as an Anglo-Catholic and his defence

of the traditional text said to be a reflection of his alleged belief in the infallibility of the church.²² Because these views contain misconceptions which tend to hinder a fair examination of the position contended for by Burgon it seems worthwhile to spend some time defending him from some of the assumptions of his critics.

No one can deny the strong conservative habit of mind shown by Burgon, nor would one wish to defend all his views. But it is clear that in his contending for the inspiration of the Scriptures and against theological liberalism he was far from supporting a lost cause. On the contrary, his very conservatism gave him an independence of viewpoint from which to discern the shallowness of "liberal" thought. It is to be feared that some who criticise Burgon on this score regard evangelical Christianity as a "lost cause." The same innate conservatism also saved him from the shallow assumption made by many that the text of the Scriptures is a neutral area which can be safely left to unbelieving scholars to settle. This could prove to be a very dangerous assumption, with far reaching implications for the church in the present day.

To describe Burgon as an Anglo-Catholic, in the usual sense of the term, raises another needless prejudice against the general reliability of his views. It is true that he had an unduly high estimate of the supposed soundness of the church of the early centuries (before the rise of Roman Catholicism) and expressed views on the church and the sacraments indefensible on the basis of Scripture. He also had a poor opinion of the Anglican evangelical party of the time, and regarded nonconformity as a rebellion against legitimate authority. How such views as these could coexist with his high and reverent regard for the Scriptures may be difficult for us to understand but Burgon is not the only figure in church history who seems to embody inconsistencies! None of this should be allowed to obscure his emphatic opposition to both Romanism and Ritualism.

Although he was one of the successors of J H Newman at St Mary's, Oxford,²³ he used that pulpit to express the strong views of scriptural authority which we have already considered and had no sympathy with Newman's defection to Rome. He opposed Ritualism vigorously. He remonstrates with a leader of the Ritualistic party, Canon Gregory, as follows:

"You used to be no Ritualist, no Romaniser, no novelty-monger, no leader of a lawless faction... What has happened that of late years you have made yourself so conspicuous in the camp of the seditious and insubordinate and lawless... who are visibly

multiplying our unhappy divisions?... O my soul, come not thou into their secret!"²⁴

In his *Letters from Rome to Friends in England* he recounts his first-hand impressions of the effects of Romanism and strongly repudiates the papal claims. He finds the root error of Rome in the systematic neglect of Scripture:

"The fatal principle which lies at the root of all Romish practice is a general disregard for Truth... Out of the neglect of the Bible has sprung, as a necessary consequence, general corruption of faith and practice." As to Mariolatry: "It is the great sin of modern Romanism that the Blessed Virgin is put in the place of God... She herself needed a Saviour!" The blasphemy of Mary-worship was "blatant and horrible." In general, "the theory of Romanism addresses itself successfully to every dominant instinct of man's corrupt nature." He repudiates wholesale the claims of the papacy to primacy and describes the Romish ritual as "weak, unscriptural, unsound, worthless." "I deprecate with all my heart any attempt to naturalise among ourselves any part of their gross and sensuous system... We are better without any of their ways."²⁵

In another letter to one who has "apostatized to Rome" he speaks against transubstantiation, the invocation of the saints, purgatory, prayers for the dead and the adoration of relics, defending the 39 Articles and the Prayer Book and insisting that "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England" (Article XXXVII).²⁶

Enough has been said to show that Burgon's "Anglo-Catholicism bears a strong resemblance to Protestantism. In fact, his views are hard to categorize rigorously. It is perhaps best to say that he was a convinced Anglican with "high church" sympathies but loyal to the Reformation and the Reformed character of the Church of England. Above all he loved the Word of God and sought to defend it against all attacks, either on its doctrines or on the words in which they are expressed. His views certainly cannot be dismissed on the grounds that they point away from the Reformation and towards Rome. It is also difficult to sustain the idea that he based his view of the text on the infallibility of the church. The outspoken way in which he addressed the alleged "successors of the Apostles"²⁷ shows that he regarded the bishops at least as all too fallible

Where are the "Words of Inspiration"?

Every believer in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures must surely agree with Burgon that none of the words given by inspiration of God has been lost.²⁸ To suggest otherwise would be to impugn either the wisdom of God in giving the words in the

first place or His ability to preserve them after they were given. If any of the inspired words were not needed, why were they given? If they were needed, could not God preserve them? But the work of Burgon prompts us to ask: Where are the "words of inspiration"? Burgon's answer was clear: they are to be found in the traditional text, handed down from the time of the Apostles, copied and multiplied through the intervening centuries until its representatives vastly outnumbered the defective copies, published for the first time (by Erasmus) just before the Reformation, translated in the great Reformation versions (such as Luther's and Tyndale's) and represented in English in the Authorized Version. Where the standard text of the Reformation period, often called the Received Text (*Textus Receptus*), diverged from the text of the majority of the manuscripts, the variations were to be examined in the light of all the available evidence and, where necessary, corrected. If the evidence was inconclusive the received reading should be allowed to stand.²⁹

The other main answer given today by those who believe in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures is called eclecticism.³⁰ The original wording is said to be present somewhere among the manuscripts but it requires to be picked out and pieced together according to certain principles. Some of these are admitted to be subjective in nature.³¹ Critics employing them can and do come to differing conclusions. However, in practice most scholars seem to be agreed that a few of the oldest manuscripts, despite their constant differences among themselves, are "more reliable" than the vast majority of the copies. In fact, we are told that "while conservative and liberal scholars disagree on so many subjects of biblical concern, they find large agreement as to the original text of the New Testament."³² Should we find this reassuring?

It is easy to underrate the importance of the continuing controversy between these opposing views. It is often said, for example, that there is no doubt about 95 per cent of the text.³³ This seems impressive, till we remember that five per cent of the Greek New Testament is more than seven thousand words.³⁴ If we believe that every inspired word matters we will continue to be concerned about the unresolved five per cent. Again, it is often said that no question of doctrine is at stake. This is misleading. The evidence for some doctrines is seriously weakened if the eclectic texts are accepted.³⁵ Moreover a further fundamental doctrine is at stake: that of the preservation of the text of the Scriptures. If we have to resort to an eclectic approach can we

still say that the Scriptures have been, by God's "singular care and providence kept pure in all ages,"³⁶ in the sense in which our fathers in the faith understood this statement?

From the viewpoint of historic Christianity eclecticism is open to some serious objections, which we can only sketch here. In the first place, it introduces a subjective element into what should be an objective, historically-based study. In doing so it ignores the fact of the dominance of the traditional text in the course of history, or tries to explain this fact away as an historical accident. Then also, eclecticism is based on the hypothesis that the church has been without a truly accurate text of the New Testament throughout the greater part of its history and has been guilty of using a text which adds to the Word of God,³⁷ the true text having already been lost by the 4th century, not to be rediscovered until the mid-19th century. This implies that the text given to the church at the time of the Reformation was seriously defective in thousands of places, and that the Reformers and Puritans and their successors wielded a faulty instrument and often expounded as Scripture words which are actually (by the eclectic hypothesis) non-inspired.³⁸ This eclectic view of the text parts company with John Owen³⁹ and, arguably, with the Westminster Divines and the framers of the Baptist Confession of 1689⁴⁰ as to the preservation and purity of the text then current. Perhaps most seriously of all, eclecticism undermines confidence in many of what countless generations have regarded as the "words of inspiration" themselves, assuring us the "most reliable" manuscripts lack them,⁴¹ whereas the alleged "reliability" of these manuscripts is neither proved nor provable.

It is obviously important for the church to know what is and what is not genuine Scripture. Doubts about this are bound to have serious repercussions both for individuals and for churches. Besides this, in an age of disintegration and rootlessness, it is important for the church to realise its own continuity and history and not to break its historic links with those who have gone before, nor to capitulate to those who wish to undermine confidence in the "old paths" and the "ancient landmarks." For these reasons, the testimony of John William Burgon to the traditional text of the New Testament should not be ignored. His witness, if heeded, would strengthen our confidence that God has preserved his own Word and always will, and that any departure from the well-tried foundations on which our fathers in the faith relied is premature and unnecessary. He would remind us that, in spite of all the

confusion of the present scene, "the word of our God shall stand for ever" (Isaiah 40:8).

Notes

1. For the more recent stages see, for example, the works by Carson, Hills, Letis, Martin, Sheehan and Van Bruggen in the Bibliography.
2. The only exceptions have been the *New King James Version*, Jay Green's *King James II Bible* and *Young's Literal Translation*.
3. Hills: *The King James Version Defended*, first published in 1956, was a pioneering work in this connection.
4. Hills: "The Magnificent Burgon," in Fuller: *Which Bible?* page 87.
5. Ollard, S & Crosse, G: *A Dictionary of English Church History*, 1912.
6. Goulburn: *Life of Dean Burgon*, Vol 2, pages 417 and 418.
7. "CHW" (probably Charles H Walker, DD) in the *Record* newspaper, 17th August, 1888.
8. Quoted in Goulburn, Vol 2, page 104.
9. Preached in Oxford, 25th November, 1860. (*Inspiration and Interpretation*, page 86.)
10. *Ibid*, pages 72 and 73.
11. *Ibid*, page 47.
12. *The Revision Revised*, xvii.
13. Compare John Owen's words ("Integrity and Purity of the Hebrew and Greek Text of the Scripture," *Works*, XVI, page 350): "But what, I pray, will it advantage us that God did so once deliver his word, if we are not assured also that the word so delivered hath been, by his special care and providence, preserved entire and uncorrupt unto us...?"
14. *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, page 9.
15. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Vol 2, Introduction and Appendix, 1881, page 277.
16. *The Revision Revised*, page 338.
17. *Ibid*, page 334.
18. *Ibid*, pages 334-336.
19. *Ibid*, pages 11-17.
20. Quoted in Fuller: *Which Bible*, page 153.
21. Cross F L (Ed): *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2nd edition 1974, article Burgon, repeating what is said in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1st Supplement, 1901.
22. Macleod, D: "Fundamentalism and Textual Criticism," *Free Church of Scotland Monthly Record*, January 1980, pages 3 and 4.
23. *Ibid*, page 3.
24. Quoted in *English Churchman*, 21st April, 1921.
25. *Letters from Rome to Friends in England*, pages 100-118.
26. *Ibid*, pages 305ff.
27. *The Revision Revised*, pages 369-520.
28. The Critics whose text was followed in the Revised Version, B F Westcott and F J A Hort, believed that the original words were, in places, lost from all the manuscripts (Introduction, page 71). So do the more extreme adherents of the eclectic position today.
29. *The Revision Revised*, pages 20 and 21.
30. Sheehan: *Which Version Now?* pages 12-16; Barker: *The Making of a Contemporary Translation*, 1987, pages 68-74; Pickering: *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, pages 21-30.
31. Sheehan: *Which Version Now?* page 15.
32. Barker: *op cit*, page 49.

33. Barker: op cit, page 73; J K Elliott: "Checking the Bible's Roots," article in *The Times*, 10th October, 1987. The figure of 3 per cent disagreement given by Sheehan is almost certainly too low.
34. The Received Text word-count is approximately 140,550.
35. For example, the reading "only begotten God" in John 1:18 (translated literally by the NASB, but misleadingly by the NIV) weakens the testimony to the orthodox doctrine that Christ is not begotten as God, but only as Son.
36. *Westminster Confession*, I:viii.
37. E H Palmer in Barker: op cit, pages 196-198. The attack is aimed at the King James Version, but the alleged fault is a feature of the dominant textual tradition through the centuries.
38. For example, Matthew Poole and Matthew Henry expound, without hesitation, many versions and portions rejected by the eclectic texts. Some of the proof-texts in the Westminster Confession must also be rejected if the eclectic texts are accepted.
39. *Works*, XVI, pages 300-302, 349, 350, 362-367.
40. *Westminster Confession*, I:viii: the Independents and Baptists concurred with this statement.
41. See, for example, the notes in the NIV against Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11.

Bibliography

- Barker, K (Ed): *The Making of a Contemporary Translation*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1987.
- Burgon, J W: *Inspiration and Interpretation*, seven sermons preached before the University of Oxford, London, Marshall Brothers, 1905.
- - *Letters from Rome to Friends in England*, London, J Murray, 1862.
- - *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, edited by E Miller, London, G Bell & Sons, 1896.
- - *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to S Mark*, Ann Arbor, Sovereign Grace Book Club, 1959.
- - *The Revision Revised*, fourth printing, Fort Worth, A G Hobbs Publications, 1983.
- - *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established*, edited by E Miller, London, G Bell & Sons, 1896.
- Carson, D A: *The King James Version Debate*, Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1979.
- Dabney, R L: "The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek and "The Revised Version of the New Testament" in *Discussions: Evangelical and Theological*, Vol 1, London, Banner of Truth 1967.
- Fuller, D O (Ed): *True or False? The Westcott-Hort Textual Theory Examined*, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1973.
- - *Which Bible?* Grand Rapids International Publications, 1872.
- Goulburn, E M: *Life of Dean Burgon*, 2 Vols, London, J Murray, 1892.
- Hills, E F: *The King James Version Defended*, Des Moines, Christian Research Press, 4th edition, 1984.
- Letis, T P: *The Majority Text: Essays and Reviews in the Continuing Debate*, Grand Rapids, Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1987.
- Martin, R P: *Accuracy of Translation and the New International Version*, Edinburgh, Banner of Truth Trust, 1989.
- Owen, J: "Of the Divine Original of the Scriptures" and "Integrity and Purity of the Hebrew and Greek Text" in *Works*, Vol XVI, London, Banner of Truth Trust, 1968.
- Pickering, W N: *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, 2nd edition, Nashville, Thomas Nelson, 1980.
- Sheehan, R J: *Which Version Now?* Haywards Heath, Carey Publications
- Van Bruggen: *The Future of the Bible*, Nashville, Thomas Nelson, 1978.

**ADDENDUM: WRITINGS OF JOHN WILLIAM BURGON –
Chronological list from 1891 edition of Schaff–Herzog
Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge. [Compiled by H L
Williams]**

- Memoire sur les vases Panathaiques par le Chev. Brönsted.* (translated), London, 1833.
- The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Gresham*, 2 vols, 1839.
- Petra, a Poem*, 1846.
- Some Remarks on Art* (Edited with Rev H J Rose), 1846.
- Fifty Cottage Prints*, 1851.
- Thirty-six Cottage Wall Prints*, 1853.
- The Pictorial Bible*, 1854.
- Oxford Reformers*, 1854.
- The History of Our Lord: A Plain Commentary on the Four Holy Gospels* (with 72 engravings), 8 vols, 1855. Reprinted in Philadelphia in 2 vols in 1856 and 1868, and republished in a new edition in 4 vols in 1877.
- Ninety Short Sermons, for Family Reading*, 2 vols, 1855.
- Historical Notices of the Colleges of Oxford*, 1857.
- One Soweth, and Another Reapeth* (Ordination Sermon), 1859.
- Portrait of a Christian Gentleman: A Memoir of P F Tyler Esq*, 1859.
- Inspiration and Interpretation* (Answer to Essays and Reviews), 1861.
- Letters from Rome to Friends in England*, 1862.
- A Treatise on the Pastoral Office*, 1864.
- Zacchaeus*. 1864.
- Work of the Christian Builder tried by Fire*, 1865.
- Ninety-one Short Sermons*, 2nd series, 2 vols, 1867.
- The Lambeth Conference and the Encyclical*, 1867.
- Plea for a Fifth School*, 1868.
- Disestablishment: The Nation's Formal Rejection of God and Denial of the Faith*, 1868.
- England and Rome: Three Letters to a Pervert*, 1869.
- The Roman Council*, 1869.
- First and Second Protest against Dr Temple's Consecration*, 1869.
- Protests of the Bishops*, 1870.
- Dr Temple's Explanation Examined*, 1870.
- The Last 12 Verses of the Gospel according to St Mark, vindicated against Recent Critical Objectors and established*, 1871.
- The Review of a Year*, 1871.
- Woman's Place*, 1871.
- An Unitarian Reviser of our Authorized Version, Intolerable*, 1872.
- The New Lectionary*, 1872.
- The Athanasian Creed to be retained in its Integrity, and why*, 1872.
- The Oxford Diocesan Conference, and Romanizing within the Church of England* (2 sermons), 1st to 3rd editions, 1873.
- A Plea for the Study of Divinity in Oxford*, 1875.
- Home Missions and Sensational Religion: also Humility Ad Clerum*, 1876.
- The New Lectionary Examined, with reasons for its Amendment* (jointly with the Bishop of Lincoln and Dean Goulbourn), 1877.
- Nehemiah, a Pattern for Builders*, 1878.
- The Servants of Scripture*, 1878.
- The Disestablishment of Religion in Oxford, the Betrayal of a Sacred Trust: Words of Warning to the University*, 1880.
- Prophecy not "Forecast," but (in the words of Bishop Butler) "The History of Events before they come to pass,"* 1880.

Divergent Ritual Practice, 1881.

Canon Robert Gregory, *A Letter of Friendly Remonstrance*, 1st and 2nd editions, 1881.

The Revision Revised: Three Articles from the Quarterly Review, with a Reply to Bishop Ellicott's Pamphlet, and a Vindication of the Traditional Reading of 1 Timothy 3 v16, 1883.

To Educate Young Women like Young Men, and with Young Men, a Thing Inexpedient and Immodest, 1884.

Poems (1840-78), 1885.

Lives of Twelve Good Men, London, 1888.

Posthumous Writings, edited by his understudy, Edward Miller

The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established, London, George Bell and Sons, 1896.

The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, London, George Bell and Sons, 1896.

SUFFICIENCY AND INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

(Continued from page 2)

Greek Scriptures. This is so much the case that the English of the KJV is not really the English of the 17th Century, as is sometimes charged, but "Biblical English," the result of the efforts of the translators to be as faithful as possible to the original Greek and Hebrew. The italics that the KJV uses for all words not found in the original Greek or Hebrew are another example of these efforts to obtain an accurate translation.

Nor is it true that modern versions are based on better manuscripts, ones that the translators of the KJV knew nothing about. They knew of other manuscripts, though they did not have all of those that have been discovered today. What is more, these other manuscripts, though some of them are very old, are also very corrupt, having thousands of unique changes and omissions. Most manuscripts (80-90%), by the providence of God, support the so-called "Received Text," the text on which the KJV is based.

The need for a good, faithful and accurate translation like the KJV is expressed in the words of the translators themselves: "Translation is it that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtaine, that we may looke into the most Holy place; that remooveth the cover of the well, that we may come by the water..." Let us, then, be faithful to the Word of God, as God in His providence and grace has given it to us and be satisfied with nothing less than the Word of God.