

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



The Text of the Gospels *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*. By the late Dean Burgon and the Rev. E. Miller. Published by George Bell and Sons. 10s. 6d. net.

K. Lake

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 08 / November 1896, pp 395 - 397

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204903, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204903

How to cite this article:

K. Lake (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 395-397 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204903

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

serious shortcoming. On p. 60 we read: 'Servius says that the ancient custom was to bury the dead in the house. Until the XII. Tables, the Romans were at any rate buried in the courtyard of the house, and down to late times, children who died before the fortieth day were laid in a niche in the wall, covered by a projecting roof or eaves.' Where did Mr. Granger find evidence for the first of these astonishing statements? He gives no reference, and of course the fragment of the Tables which he has in his mind simply says that dead persons were not to be buried or burnt within the city. The evidence of Roman and Italian archaeology is overwhelming on this question: if there is one thing of which we may be certain, it is that even in the most remote periods the dead were deposited in cemeteries outside the cities. Recent excavations have proved that the most primitive hill-communities in the near neighbourhood of Rome, which probably had come to an end even before the traditional date of Rome's foundation, had already given up the savage custom of burial in or close to the house. If Mr. Granger had not at hand the last volume of the *Monumenti Antichi*, he might at least have satisfied himself on this point by referring to Marquardt's excellent account of Roman burial customs. But this is not all. For the second of his statements, about the burial of babes under forty days old, he refers us to Lewis and Short's *Lexicon s.v. suggrundarium*. There is but one citation to be found there, and that one is from Fulgentius, a writer of the sixth century A.D., famous for his habit of inventing quotations where he could not find them to his hand. And even Fulgentius does not say what Mr. Granger does—that the children were deposited in niches in the

house-wall—nor as yet can I find any other evidence for the assertion.

From statements such as this I am forced to draw the conclusion that Mr. Granger is not to be trusted as an authority on Roman antiquities. I must add, that whenever he touches on a really difficult subject, such as the Lupercalia, or Hercules, or the Indigitamenta, his want of a better equipment produces a feeling of discomfort in the mind of a reader who has once become acquainted with the difficulties they present. Mr. Granger writes with a light heart of them, and has suggestions and parallels to draw in each case: but these seldom carry weight, for they are not the result of a thorough and independent examination, such as we find in Robertson Smith's admirable *Religion of the Semites*.

Still, when all is said, the book is clever, interesting, and sometimes suggestive. If the student of Roman antiquity will carefully test it at all doubtful points, and take nothing in it for granted, he may incidentally learn a great deal. And if its writer will devote a few years to a patient study of Roman religious ideas and practice, his wide reading in folklore and mythology, and his obvious brightness of mind and interest in his subject will no doubt enable him to produce something which shall be really worthy to survive. New facts and new theories are now constantly contributing to throw light upon the religious life of the Greeks and Romans: folklore and archaeology are alike helping us forward. But the first and most essential step for any one who would contribute to the process, is to make himself thoroughly acquainted with all that Greeks or Romans have themselves to tell us.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS.

The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels.
By the late DEAN BURGON and the Rev.
E. MILLER. Published by George Bell
and Sons. 10s. 6d. net.

In this volume Mr. Miller has used his own and Dean Burgon's researches to support the view that the traditional text of the New Testament is the oldest and best.

It must be recognized that the logical

basis of the book is a belief that a true statement of the doctrine of inspiration would support the traditional text to the exclusion of all others, but this fact is not obtruded; and even those who do not agree with the authors either in their doctrinal or critical position, are bound to admit that a sincere attempt is made to answer critical questions by critical methods.

The authors point out that the oldest

evidence which we possess for the text is not the direct evidence of the MSS. but the indirect evidence of Patristic quotations. They therefore begin with an examination of the text of the early Fathers and endeavour to show that it supports the traditional view. We are given a full analysis of the Pre-Chrysostomic writers and the results which Mr. Miller has reached. But as considerations of space prevented the quotations being given in full, we are reduced for purposes of criticism to thirty passages which Mr. Miller has selected as representative and given with a full statement of the Patristic evidence on either side in each case. But the followers of Drs. Westcott and Hort fail to be convinced by this part of the book, because the selected passages are with few exceptions representative of the traditional text only in so far as that text embodies a western element, and all critics are prepared to admit that the western text was habitually used by a majority of the Pre-Chrysostomic Fathers. There are probably not more than three passages in Mr. Miller's list which are 'distinctively Syrian' and it is noticeable that in these cases the Patristic evidence is markedly weak. For instance, in Mt. xxviii. 2 the traditional text as supported by the mass of late MSS. against $\aleph B D$ latt Origen reads ἀπὸ τῆς θυρᾶς after ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον, but all the Patristic evidence which Mr. Miller can adduce in favour of this addition is that of Eusebius and Gregory of Nyssa, with the support of the Gospel of Nicodemus, Acta Philippi, Apocryphal Acta Apostolorum, and perhaps Acta Pilati and the gospel of St. Peter.

Surely this is insufficient to set aside the probability that the later MSS. owe their reading to harmonizing with the parallel passage in St. Mark?

It is also noticeable that Mr. Miller seems to have taken a wide view of the extent of the field in which it is possible to find Patristic evidence for the text of the canonical gospels, and is also somewhat prone to set down passages as quotations from one source which might be referred equally well to another. For instance, it is doubtful, at least, whether it is legitimate to quote the gospel of St. Peter and the other extra-canonical writings mentioned above as evidence for the text of St. Matthew, although we may recognize the testimony so far as it concerns the historicity of the events narrated.

And it is scarcely wise to quote as authorities for one canonical gospel rather

than another, or perhaps for any canonical gospel at all, books like the $\Delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta$ of which it is impossible at present to say with certainty from what source they are quoting.

It is also probably true that Mr. Miller has occasionally allowed himself to forget that the text of his authorities themselves is often corrupt. For he quotes the epistle of St. Barnabas in support of the addition $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\nu$ in Mt. ix. 13 though this is not found in either Lightfoot's or Gebhardt and Harnack's editions of St. Barnabas, but only in Migne and other unrevised texts. This is perhaps due to the fact that textual criticisms of the New Testament and of the Fathers are so closely connected that the view taken of one must influence the opinion formed of the other. Similarly the other tendencies noted in Mr. Miller's treatment of Patristic evidence are probably due to an ultraconservative position with regard to the synoptic and kindred questions. Although the higher criticism of documents postulates a fairly correct text, yet inasmuch as the higher criticism is logically anterior to textual criticism, it necessarily follows that the results of the two react on each other. Mr. Miller reduces written documents preceding the canonical gospels, if one may judge from the remarks he has let fall in this book, to the smallest possible number and significance. Most other critics are inclined to believe that the first and second century church possessed documents not now extant which perhaps formed the basis of the canonical gospels. The result is that they are inclined to class some of the curious phenomena of the earliest Patristic quotations as bearing on the problems of higher criticism, while Mr. Miller presses them into the service of the textualist.

In view of these facts we cannot accept Mr. Miller's statement that judging from Patristic evidence the traditional text was predominant in Pre-Chrysostomic times, and it is somewhat strange to read 'Let any one who disputes this conclusion make out for the western text...a case which can equal that which has now been placed before the reader' seeing that it is the western text and no other which Mr. Miller's evidence supports.

After dealing with the evidence of the Fathers Mr. Miller proceeds to discuss the Syriac and Latin versions. It is perhaps unnecessary to say more of his treatment of the former than that he still maintains the position which is taken up in his edition of Scrivener's Introduction. That is, he considers the Peshitto to be the oldest

version in Syriac and regards the Curetonian and Sinaitic as corruptions of it. Such a view can be dealt with at first hand only by Syriac scholars, but the evidence of experts seems to be against Mr. Miller.

The treatment of the Latin versions is more important. Mr. Miller sets forth a most interesting analysis of the testimony of the various codices, both as regards readings and renderings, in order to show that there are many Latin versions and not one only. There is considerable weight in his argument: multiplicity of rendering *primâ facie* suggests multiplicity of versions, but on the other hand he has perhaps not allowed sufficiently for the effect of mixture and for the probability that scribes who knew Greek would be apt to emend the rendering of difficult places. Possibly Mr. Miller has not done more than emphasize the distinction between the African and European Latin, using the words in a textual and not necessarily geographical sense.

Mr. Miller goes on to elaborate a theory:—The 'Itala' of Augustine was the oldest and best version, the other versions were those used in the less cultured and critical parts of the empire, and judging the Itala from St. Augustine's use of it, it supported the traditional text rather than the Neologian. The last part of the argument is indisputable, but a flood of light has been thrown on the first clauses by Mr. Burkitt's monograph on 'The Itala and old Latin' which shows reason for believing that the 'Itala' of Augustine is the Vulgate. Nothing could be more damaging to Mr. Miller's position. His argument in reply to those who say that the traditional text is a recension has always been that there is no proof of it. Yet in the present case we find him selecting the Itala as the oldest Latin version and pointing to it as supporting the traditional text, whereas, if Mr. Burkitt be right, the Itala is after all a recension, the date and authorship of which is well known. This is of course not demonstrative proof against Mr. Miller's position, but it is certainly damaging.

Mr. Miller sets forth a complete theory of the history of the text in opposition to the well known one of Westcott and Hort, which must be noticed. He admits a certain type of Alexandrian corruption and another of Syrio-Low-Latin and considers that these together with the traditional text were worked over by Origen and his school at

Caesarea, with the result that they produced the type of text preserved in **SB**.

Mr. Miller supports this theory by an attempt to show, (1) that **SB** are connected with the Library at Caesarea, (2) that a sceptical spirit can be traced in **SB**. As to (1). It is scarcely proved that **SB** come from Caesarea, but reason is certainly shown for believing that Origen and Pamphilus used MSS. of a similar character. This is deducible from the colophon in **S** at the end of the book of Esther to the effect that the MS. was compared with a copy corrected by Pamphilus and found similar to it. But it must be remembered that this only shows that Pamphilus and Origen used MSS. of this type not that they manufactured them, and that it is universally acknowledged that **S** has a composite text, consisting of Western and Alexandrian as well as 'Neutral' elements. So then, all that follows from Mr. Miller's argument is that if we grant its conclusiveness we have in the critical school of Caesarea an historic cause for the compositeness of the text of **S**. It still remains for him to show that the non-Western, non-Alexandrian, non-Neutral part of the traditional text was one of the elements thus compounded.

(2) Mr. Miller's second point cannot be received favourably. It introduces some of the most difficult points of dogma into a purely critical question, and to say that 'omission is in itself sceptical,' which is the logical basis of this section, is as much a begging of the question as it would be to say that doctrinal additions are signs of little faith in the sufficiency of Scripture.

Mr. Miller promises us another volume dealing with 'causes of corruption.' This is sure to be an interesting book, but is it vain to hope that Mr. Miller will some-day publish the exact text which he considers 'Traditional'? At present clear criticism is difficult because we do not know accurately what is the text which Mr. Miller supports. Judging from some of the samples, one is almost inclined to think that the 'Traditional' text may prove to be a modified Western text, and this of course would raise the difficult question of why the Western text is to be regarded as a corruption, seeing that it can be traced back in the earliest quotations which we possess.

K. LAKE.