

THE REVISED VERSION

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING ARTICLE WAS PUBLISHED IN THE OCTOBER 1896 ISSUE OF *THE COVENANT PEOPLE*. A CENTURY LATER, AND AFTER EXTENSIVE STUDY OF THE TOPIC OF VARIOUS MODERN BIBLE VERSIONS, JAMES BRUGGEMAN PRODUCED A SERIES OF 20 AUDIO LECTURES ENTITLED "[WHICH BIBLE? WHICH VERSION?](#)"

AN enquiry in the August issue has been shewn to me, which was not rightly answered. My examination of the R. V. of New T. extended over June, July, August, and September, of Vol. I *Messenger* (1886). The R. V. of Old T. was considered in November and December of that year, and continued over several months of Vol. 2 (1887). Those volumes are out of print. An account was given of the nature of the materials we possess for verification of the Sacred Text; and of the technical methods of textual criticism; with facsimile examples of uncial and cursive Greek Texts.

The Revised Old Testament was adjudged to be in some respects an improvement, but in many cases inferior to the Authorized Version. The Revised New Testament was condemned as a willful, shameless perversion of the Word, a deliberate systematic attempt to expunge the Godhood of Our Lord Jesus, the Christ of God, and thus to render futile the Faith of the Church, on whose bread and salt the faithless majority of the Revisers were subsisting. In this I followed the argument of the late beloved Dr. Burgon, Dean of Chichester, whose famous treatise left the new version without a shred of credit; and of the late Canon Cook, of Exeter, whose book on the version of the Synoptic Gospels demonstrated that the Revisers' vaunted "ancient authorities" (to wit, the Sinai and Vatican codices) are both bad contemporary copies of the same corrupted recension. The notorious instances of the gross corruption of I Tim. iii.

16, and the amazing margin at Rom. ix. 5, are of themselves sufficient, without more ado, to condemn the version. The animus which governed the whole procedure was, indeed, so obvious, that it was with utmost difficulty that a mere formal vote of thanks to the Revisers was forced thro' the Convocation of Canterbury, which gave them their commission.

There are two sets of people who use this miserable pretence of a Version—they who are called "Higher Critics; and an uneducated mass who are wholly ignorant of the nature and magnitude of the questions at issue."

C.M.

In Vinculis Sanctae Crucis. 9th Sep., 1896.