

Biblical Criticism, the Westcott and Hort's Resonance: Challenges to Post Modernism in New Testament Studies

Author:

Omaka Kalu Ngele 

Affiliation:

Department of Religion and Cultural Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Corresponding author:

Omaka K. Ngele
omaka.ngele@unn.edu.ng

Dates:

Received: 18 February. 2022
Accepted: 26 May. 2022
Published: 11 July. 2022

Disclaimer:

All opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position of the editors of Nsukka Journal of Religion and Cultural Studies (NJRCS) or the Department at large.

Competing interests

The author declare that he/she has no financial or personal relationships that may have inappropriately influenced him/her in writing this article.

Copyright:

© 2022. Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license



Abstract

Mirages of contours had characterised biblical scholarship on the texts of the New Testament in modern time across the globe. This has led assailants, in the form of cynics who, out of sheer ignorance, to question the inerrancy as well as the authority of the text of the scriptures of the New Testament. Whatever happened to the texts of the scriptures, and to what extent had certain biblical scholars delved in to resolving the puzzle, had become a case in point to ponder across the strata of academic enquiry. This paper investigates these quests with special emphasis on two astute New Testament scholars like Westcott and Hort, probing into their resonance in biblical as well as textual criticism in New Testament Scholarship. The study, driven by socio-historical antecedents surrounding West-Hort's Text of Greek New Testament their contribution in biblical scholarship, examined and presented the positional truth behind what biblical scholars do. The study deciphers that i) biblical scholarship is beyond what is assumed by lay readers of the New Testament; ii) that approaches to biblical scholarship is scientific with the employment of textual/ critical apparatus unlike the natural, behavioural, social and physical sciences. iii) that the New Testament as a core branch of biblical studies is a very interesting field in religious studies, as well as biblical scholarship meant for great minds; and iv) that Westcott and Hort in their ingenuity had not done it all given emerging postmodern challenges. This piece of treatise would definitely sound as an apogee for critical resonance to students of New Testament as well as biblical studies as a discipline.

Key Words: Biblical, Criticism, Westcott, Hort, Resonance, Challenges, Post Modernism, New Testament Studies

Introduction

The text of the New Testament presents a raw view of a text that had passed through a crucible in structure, arrangements and documentation by human vehicles in the divine tapestry of God. Although God Almighty, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, made the scriptures come to humankind through human instruments which remained the vehicle through whom they were transmitted. This gave room for editorial tendentious stages which New Testament scholar like Ituma (2016:40) termed 'transcriptional tendencies' which the Bible had passed through over two millennia of its existence. This began as oral tradition for 30 years of oral history. This was confirmed by Chinwokwu (2015:33). However, there are alleged discrepancies in the Bible with no exemption to the NT. Therefore, since there are no extant autograph copies of books of the Bible, its text must be established by the process known as textual criticism, an aspect of biblical criticism.

Naturally, students of biblical studies nay New Testament in particular are faced with challenges of critical studies of New Testament texts in view of fundamental scribal tendencies and transcriptional probabilities in the original Greek Bible texts in the course of their studies in the tertiary institutions and theological Seminaries. These puzzles often come as a surprise owing to the fact Biblical Studies is beyond theological nuances which preachers or Sunday school teachers do daily or weekly in the pulpit. It snowballs into scientific, analytical, modern and socio-scientific, socio-historical and sociological cum historical critical study of the texts of the scriptures. These constitute a modern, scientific and analytical methodology employed by biblical scholars as well as students of New Testament in engaging in their advanced New Testament studies especially in their thesis writing. Oftentimes, students who have hitherto had their minds made up on the fallacy and fantasy that by being admitted into the Department of Religion, he or she is into Bible study class as in it is done in the churches. This constitutes an error of sweeping generalisation.

This study takes a closer peep into resonance of Brooke Foss Westcott, (1825-1901), Regius Professor at Cambridge University, who worked with Fenton Anthony Hort (1828-1892) Cambridge Professor of Divinity to deliver a new critical edition of the Greek New Testament (Westcott & Hort 1985:583). These legends of biblical criticism, who delved into critical study of the New Testament Greek texts, hence gave the contemporary Christian church their Greek Text which Hort boasted that it will be of 'better stock' than the *texts receptus* or "received text" (i.e., the Byzantine text). The study, driven by socio-historical antecedents, investigates West-Hort's Text of Greek New Testament and their contribution in biblical scholarship. It critically nuanced and assessed the good works of these eminent Biblical scholars. The import of the study is to sensitise students on the beauty of Biblical Scholarship with special emphasis on the study of the New Testament from the inquisitive lenses Westcott and Hort. This will enable students light their candle lights in theirs and find pathway to academic excellence. This is with the view that this paper is expected to be at the vanguard of demythologising New Testament studies.

What then is Biblical Criticism?

When New Testament scholars use the term biblical criticism what do they mean? There had been a gross misunderstanding of the term biblical criticism, even among scholars of New Testament who handle it. It does not mean criticising to destroy the very essence of the Bible; neither does it mean arguing to dispute the truth, inerrancy and the authority of the Scriptures. This tilts towards destructive criticism. Ituma agrees with McDowell (1985:5) that it is "the examination of a problem, text or issue, etc. to determine its authenticity, reliability or meaning" and further affirms that the use of the word criticism does not always mean fault finding (Ituma 2016). It does not present a destructive tendency.

Historiography of Biblical Criticism of the New Testament

According to Richard Simon's *Critical History* (1685) both Old and New Testament criticism originated in the rationalism of the 17th and 18th Century and developed within the context of the scientific approach to the context of the scientific approach to the humanities which grew during the 19th century. There are strands of historical record and development of biblical criticism. Modern biblical Criticism of the Testament dates back to the work Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694-1768). His application of Greek and Latin textual studies to the New Testament paved the way for the 19th century David Strauss, Ernest Renan, Johannes Wiess, Albert Schweitzer (1875-1965) (Schweitzer 1910). Schweitzer's book *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1906) demonstrated that the 19th century "lives of Jesus" were reflections of the authors' own historical and social contexts. Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) (Regius Professor at Cambridge University), worked with Fenton Anthony Hort (1828-1892) (Cambridge Professor of Divinity), to deliver a new critical edition of the Greek New Testament (Westcott & Hort 1985: 583). These legends of biblical criticism were Anglican Bishops and clergymen. Hort and Westcott were influential. Both served as revisers/translators of the Revised Standard Version of 1881 a major recasting of the authorised or King James Version of the English Bible. Constantine Von Tischendorf an astute biblical scholar who

discovered Codex *Sinaiticus* and delivered his *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Brown 1968:1104).

There are two dimensions to biblical criticism- "Higher criticism" and "Lower criticism." The implications of "higher criticism" were not welcomed by many religious scholars, not least the Catholic Church. Pope Leo XIII (1844-1918) condemned secular biblical scholarship in his encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*. H. J. Holtzmann was significant in establishing a chronology for the composition of the various books of the New Testament, which formed the basis for future research on the subject of biblical criticism. He established the two- source hypothesis (The Markan priority and Quell as the source of Matthew and Luke). H.B. Streeter later propounded the four-source theory that later gave rise to offering solution to the Synoptic problem that gave New Testament scholars the fact about the sources of the synoptic gospel tradition- Mark, Quelle, Matthew and Luke's tradition. By the first half of the 20th Century, a new generation of scholars including Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann in Germany, Roy Harrisville and others in North America decided that the quest for the Jesus of history had reached a dead end. Barth and Bultmann decided that New Testament scholarship should be mainly concentrated on the kerygma-the message of the New Testament. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the 1948 revitalised the interest in the possible contribution archaeology could make to the understanding of the New Testament.

Perspectives and Taxonomy of Biblical Criticism

There are diverse perspectives and taxonomy of Biblical Criticism which students of the New Testament, as well as biblical studies as a whole, must study in the course of their undergraduate and post-graduate studies. These are: 1. Textual criticism (sometimes referred to as "lower criticism"), 2. Source Criticism, 3. Form Criticism and tradition/history; 4. Redaction Criticism which studies the collection, arrangement, editing and modification of sources based on author's theological motive and sociological background; 5. Canonical Criticism; 6. Rhetorical Criticism which involves modern application of techniques of rhetorical analysis to biblical texts; 7. Narrative Criticism; 8. Psychological Criticism; 9. Socio-scientific criticism which is a contemporary form of multidisciplinary criticism drawing on theories and models from the Social Sciences. It is thus concerned with the historical world behind the text. 10. Postmodernist Criticism; 11. Feminist Criticism.

By choice, and in order to achieve the purpose of this paper, we give special concern and concentration to textual criticism.

Textual Criticism

Textual criticism as a major strand of biblical criticism involves a critical study of the texts of the Bible –digging deep beyond the sacred pages, attempting to discover the original words of the writer, and solving textual problems discovered. It involved the comparison of witnesses to the periscope, as well as text of the scripture, such as manuscript copies, early translations and citations. It is an excavation as well as a critical investigation or critical study of the texts of the scriptures beyond the sacred pages of the Bible –going beyond the layers of what is seen written on the surface, penetrating into the inner layers, beyond effervescence understanding of the text. This

excavation is technically known as textual criticism. Textual criticism is beyond the Sunday school type of Bible studies that goes on in the Christian churches. Biblical, as well as textual criticism, is the biblical scholarship that is modern, critical, analytical and scientific study of the Scriptures. Why this waste of time, energy and effort in studying the Scripture through this method? Many had asked.

The very reasons behind biblical or textual criticism according Ngele(2013: 38) are that : i) the Bible is a historical document written in time and space beyond the reader ii) It was written to a particular people with a specific purpose with specific instructions iii) It was written to a particular culture, therefore there are always cultural gap-hence some scriptures require cultural hermeneutics to handle them ;iv) Texts of the scriptures have peculiar *Sitz im Leben*. Chinwokwu (2015), alluded to the need to know that, as a result of diverse authors theological motif and *Sitz im leben* , the tool of redaction criticism known in German as *Redaktionsgeschichte* ,which Dubeluis(1971), Perin (1996), Manton (n.d) and other biblical scholars affirm is modern. It also complies with scientific method of research based on using unambiguous facts to carry out data analysis. Though it deals with ancient materials, the method of enquiry is scientific, analytical and deductive. By this knowledge, it is sheer absurdity for biblical of both Old and New Testament to look up to academic fields such as behavioural science (Psychology), Sociology and Education to borrow their research design, method of enquiry ,chi data analytical approach before they carry out their research.

However, the new paradigm brought in by Professor Vincent Nyoyoko, a visiting External Examiner at the Department of Religion and Cultural Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, that in carrying out biblical research in the university, field work in form of field surveys with interviews and application of questionnaires, which were hitherto seen as anathema in biblical studies, had been seen as a welcome experience. This postmodern development in our study of the New Testament in the Department of Religion and Cultural Studies had held higher degree students go into the field to investigate how our targeted audience sees the text of the Bible. It had helped the students check how *Sitz im leben* , as well as sociological background, rhyme with that of the sociological locale for which the research was carried. It will interest readers to know that *Sitz im leben* a German phrase literally translated to mean 'situation in life' implies a sociological background , real life setting and social context of the text of the scriptures which scholars had discern in the study of the Biblical text(Perin 1996:2).

Textual criticism is usually seen as the attempt to define the text in its *original* form. This is literary criticism. However, there is a marked distinction between textual criticism from literary criticism: textual critics of the Bible often see themselves as seeking to define the text in its *final* form. This is direct contrast to literary critics.

In a related development, textual criticism is sometimes referring to as 'lower criticism.' It refers to the examination of the text itself to identify its provenance or to trace its history. It takes as its basis the fact that errors inevitably crept into texts as generations of scribes reproduced each other's manuscripts.

A Critical Overview of Westcott and Hort's Resonating Contribution to the Development of Biblical (Textual) Criticism The Development of the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament

An astute biblical scholar like Epp (1993) gave a detailed information on Brooke Foss Westcott (1825 – 1901), Regius Professor at Cambridge University, who became the Bishop of Durham and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892), Hulsean Professor and then Lady Margret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. These scholars began preparations for a new critical edition of the Greek New Testament in 1853, when they agreed upon a plan during a brief talk together. They thought at the time that it would take a few years, but the edition appeared in 1881 under the ambitious and somewhat arrogant title, *The New Testament Graece* (1969-72) had been issued, with its extensive critical apparatus. In contrast, the Westcott-Hort's *Appendix* (in volume 2) provided 142 pages of "Notes on Select Readings." In terms of the Greek New Testament text itself, however, the dictions of Tischendorf, and of Westcott-Hort were quite similar, since both relied heavily upon the mid-fourth century Codices Sinaiticus (ⲛ) and Vaticanus (B). The latter (B), had been in the Vatican Library at least since 1475, but during much of the first half of the nineteenth century it was largely inaccessible to scholars. As its New Testament text became more readily available – beginning in 1859, with a reliable edition in 1868 scholars such as Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort recognised its value alongside the newly discovered Sinaiticus, which Tischendorf named after Sinai Mountain from where it was discovered; and had brought to light, accompanied by much publicity, between 1844 and 1859. The major differences between the two editions resulted largely from Tischendorf's understandable preference for Sinaiticus in contrast to Westcott-Hort's preference for Vaticanus. It is not surprising, then, to discover that the texts of Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort, though showing the expected differences, still were so much in agreement.

Incidentally, the two Greek New Testaments currently used most widely, a common text; and that text, with few changes from the earlier Nestle editions over eighty years, also stands closer to that of Westcott-Hort than to any other edition. This suggests that the text of the Greek New Testament used over the past 130 years has remained relatively stable. It is important to remember however, that the manuscript evidence for our critical text has expanded enormously over the past century and a half, notably by the discovery of numerous papyrus manuscripts containing fragments or extensive portions of New Testament text. Westcott-Hort utilised no papyri in constructing their text, but they now total 118.

The Westcott-Hort Text as a Landmark in Textual Criticism

Epp paid a resounding ovation on the works of Westcott and Hort which he saw as a land mark in biblical scholarship ,especially in Biblical Criticism. According to him: the Greek text of Westcott-Hort was influential even before its publication, for both scholars served as revisers/translators of the Revised Version of 1881, a major recasting of the Authorized or King James Version of the English Bible. As early as 1870-1871, Westcott and Hort, both Anglican clergymen, shared their text of the Gospels and Epistles with the

revision committee and (along with E. H. A. Scrivener) were accepted as the authorities on textual matters. The stamp of Westcott-Hort can be seen in the RV's reliance on Codices Sinaiticus (Ⲙ) and *Vaticanus* (B) and in the way their textual views are reflected in the revision, though in the final analysis Westcott-Hort's readings were preferred over others in only sixty-four instances—due mainly, again, to differing estimates of Ⲙ and B. In the final analysis, the Greek text behind the KJV and that which (theoretically) lay behind the RV differed in some 5800 readings. The RV was published five days after the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament was issued (Epp 1985).

Far more important, of course, was the influence of the New Testament in the Original Greek as a critical text, for it was the result of fresh and carefully devised text-critical principles, bound together by powerful logic into a systematic theory of the history of the text. Their formulation of internal evidence of readings, as consisting of intrinsic probability (what the author was most likely to have written) and transcriptional probability (what copyists were most likely to have transcribed), led to their use of the internal evidence of documents (asking which manuscripts more likely represented the original text. This was based on the frequency of individual original readings that they contain). Naturally, Codex *Vaticanus* and (to a somewhat smaller degree) Codex Sinaiticus rose above all other Greek manuscripts when documents were assessed in this way for quality, standing out as the purest and best manuscripts in Westcott and Hort's view. The basic principle operative here was that knowledge of documents should precede final judgment upon readings (Goodacre 1997: 66-77).

Some Vital Scientific Documents to Enable New Testament Students engaged in Textual Criticism

There is a growing concern that stares the faces of biblical scholars over the text of a scripture. This has to do with handling biblical as well as textual Criticism of a particular pericope as well as texts of the New Testament. This is seen as textual problem by biblical scholars. The question here is how do we get this problem solved? Biblical, as well as the New Testament, is burdened with the task of use of textual apparatus which Westcott and Hort named critical apparatus. What is textual apparatus is scientific tool employed by New Testament scholars in handling textual criticism as a segment of biblical exegesis. Textual apparatus contains footnotes, symbols and critical notations used to determine the level of certainty and authenticity of disputed manuscripts in variant readings. Just as physical scientists such as micro-biologists, chemists, pharmacists and pharmacologists enter into their laboratories making use of the pipettes, burettes, Bunsen burner and their clinical flasks, acid base and other scientific instruments to find out culture from specimen and carry out empirical investigation, so do New Testament scholars make use of textual apparatus— a scientific instrument of exegetes of sacred scriptures in executing the task of solving critical problem in the texts of the sacred scriptures. These symbols are represented in Roman numeral and alphabets in form of A, B, C, D, W, f1-234, and { } , [] etc.

For instance, in variant reading, the researcher takes a critical overview of Raymond Brown (ed) *et al* ingenuous note on key uncials and other earliest manuscripts of the Judeo-Christian tradition:

1. *Codex Sinaiticus*. { Ⲙ, } . Codex Sinaiticus { Ⲙ, or 01 } is the oldest uncial document and most reliable of all known manuscript. It is the only codex to contain the entire New Testament, namely The Gospel, Acts of the Apostles, Pauline and General Epistles and Revelation. In origin and text, it is Alexandrian and mid-4th Century. It was discovered by Constantin von Tischendorf at St Catherine's Monastery in the Sinai vicinity. He designated it with Hebrew alphabet -aleph Ⲙ rather than 'A' to make it (in his thought) superior. Tischendorf named it after Sinai, the environment he discovered it. It is now in London Library (Metzger 1994:6). When Ⲙ is seen in Textual apparatus, it points to the attestation of Codex *Sinaiticus* as one of the most reliable manuscripts (mss) attestation in at the textual variant. It is considered most reliable manuscript in variant readings.
2. *Codex Vaticanus* (B or 03) . Codex *Vaticanus* is Alexandrian in origin and text. It is one of the oldest uncials. It was dated 4th Century. It was regarded by Westcott and Hort as the finest and neutral manuscript (Brown et al 1968: 1194). When {B} is seen in Textual apparatus, it points to the attestation of manuscript evidence in variant reading. It shows also that it is a highly reliable manuscript in variant reading. It was named after Vatican City library where it is domicile.
3. *Codex Alexandrinus*. (A or 03) is seen in textual apparatus, it points to the attestation of When A is placed in the bracket. This is a 5th Century manuscript. Part of the codex has a Byzantine text. It is Alexandrian named after Alexandria in Egypt -the city it was developed. It was sent as a gift by Patriarch of Alexandria as a gift to the English King Charles in 1627 (Brown et al 1968:1104). Its presence in variant reading means there is no doubt about the manuscript. Although it contains the whole NT some parts have been lost.
4. *Ephraemi Rescriptus* (C or 04). It is 5th Century manuscript. As its name implies it is palimpsest- as earlier writing washed or scraped off and the skin reused for later writing. It also considered a great uncial. It is named after Ephraeme of Syria who is believed to have discovered it. It is frequently byzantine (Brown et al 1968:1104).
5. *Codex Bazaee* (D). It dates late 5th Century AD. It considered more interesting than reliable. It is now preferably termed the D-text which is known as Codex Bazaee. When it is seen in Textual apparatus, it portrays the attestation of Codex Bazaee manuscript. It also shows there is a higher degree of doubt in variant reading. It is a Western text, roughly equal in age to the Neutral text, but described as having suffered paraphrastic

expansion and other corruptions by Westcott and Hort. It was named after Theodore Beza, the reformer of Geneva, who publicised it. It was presented to Cambridge University in 1581 (Brown et al 1968 :1104).

6. Codex Washingtonensis {W}. It is a late 4th and early 5th Century A.D. When it is seen in the textual apparatus, it portrays attestation of Codex *Washingtonensis*. It signifies a very high degree of doubt on the issue in question. It is considered the most important biblical manuscript in the USA. It was acquired in Egypt in 1906 by C. L. Freer; it contains the four gospels in the Western Order (Matthew, John, Luke and Mark). Its ending of Mark after (After 16: 14) is peculiar (Brown et al 1968 :1104). There are other documents and relevant manuscripts that are vital to this paper, but due to the very objective of this study, readers are enticed to select vital literature on the subject matter and in addition be in the NT classes for further and more detailed intellectual engagement.

Challenges of Post Modernism to Textual Criticism –From the Prism of Westcott and Hort’s Resonance

William Sunday refers to a letter printed by Hort in 1851 when he was only twenty three years of age in which he provided a forecast of the future by referring to the “villainous” and vile *textus receptus* and said “leaning on the late MSS; it is a blessing there are such early ones.” (Sunday 1897: 95-211). Just two years later, after Westcott and he had planned their edition, Hort wrote “Our objective is to supply a portable Greek Testament which shall not disfigure with Byzantine corruptions.” Current trends in New Testament scholarship pose critical challenges to this Hort and Westcott ideology held overtime among English world. This formulation presented itself as powerful and compelling to most, although refinements and revisions were inevitable as scholars applied and studied it over the intervening 120 years. For example, the question-begging term “Neutral” (implying a pure text unaffected by the normal corrupting processes) was deemed inappropriate in face of the realities of textual transmission; and the term “Western” was judged inaccurate since it is supported by such eastern witnesses as the Syriac versions, and because even its chief representative, Codex Bezae (D), may have originated in the East. Also, a new text-type proposed in the 1920s, the Caesarean, has not stood the test of time. Although it was prominent among the text-types discussed in the introduction of the first edition of the United Bible Societies’ *Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, championed by Metzger (1994:6), it is subsumed under the Western text-type in the second edition.

Today, the basic scheme of text-forms devised by Westcott-Hort survives, though slightly modified in its components and enhanced by myriad manuscript discoveries, resulting in two (rather than three) early competing text-types (the B-Text and the D-Text) and a later, derivative text-type (the Byzantine Text). The influence of Westcott and Hort on virtually all subsequent New Testament textual criticism is one reason why their Greek text (with Hort’s companion volume of introduction) became a landmark of large proportions in the modern history of New Testament studies and particularly in the

development and establishment of its early or (many would say) earliest text-form.

The text became a landmark in another way as well. Karl Lachmann’s 1831 edition, represented the decisive break with and the triumph, at least in principle, over the centuries-long reign of the *textus receptus* or “received text” (i.e., the Byzantine text), both in the text he presented—which Lachmann claimed only to be the New Testament text of the fourth century—and in the principles he enunciated for establishing the text. Basically his method involved reliance on the fewer early witnesses rather than on the numerically superior later manuscripts. The fulsome *textus receptus* had evolved from the fourth century until printing was well established, and, as manuscripts containing it multiplied to meet the needs of the church, it became the widespread and almost universally used “ecclesiastical” text. After the invention of printing, it constituted the text of Erasmus’s *Greek New Testament* (1516) (Epp 19993), the first one published, and of innumerable printed editions thereafter. To break the fourteen-hundred-year hold of this text on the church was no small achievement despite the fact that Lachmann’s work was built upon the pioneering labours of Richard Bentley (1720), J. A. Bengel (1725-1734), J. J. Wettstein (1751-1752), and J. J. Griesbach (1775-1807). Following Lachmann, editors of the Greek New Testament continued down this increasingly well-trod path until, just prior to Westcott-Hort, the emphasis on early manuscripts and on concomitant principles for accrediting readings to be placed in one’s text attained a high degree of refinement with Tischendorf’s Greek New Testament (1869-1872) and its magisterial *Prolegomena* (1894) by his colleague Caspar René Gregory, and with the work of S. P. Tregelles (1856-1872).

Westcott-Hort’s Greek Testament, while built upon the principles of Tischendorf and Tregelles and constructed on the basis of the hard-won criteria for judging variant readings, also utilised the sophisticated history and theory of the text that Hort so thoroughly described and so ably defended in the introductory volume. To be sure, the textual heroes just mentioned, who proceeded and followed Lachmann, were impressed by early manuscripts as they came to light and were utilising them to question the seemingly indomitable reign of the *textus receptus*. Prominent in these discussions, among others, were manuscripts such as Codex Alexandrinus (A, 5th century), known since 1098; Codex Bezae (D, late 4th or early 5th century), named after Theodore Beza in 1581; who publicized it; Codex Claromontanus (D^{Paul}, 6th century), also used by Beza; and Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C, 5th century), discovered prior to 1717. In a sharp affirmation Epp (2007) equivocally that, no one, not even Tischendorf, had presented a comprehensive and compelling theory to explain how the late text had developed from the earlier ones, or how the early texts were related to one another. Westcott-Hort provided such a history, and thus their text represents a final and finely refined triumph over the *textus receptus*.

Conclusion

It is worthy to lend credence across quarters to the Westcott and Hort text as a landmark constituting the final and most refined triumph over the *textus receptus*, however, in no way minimises the

significant and sometimes daring contributions of the aforementioned text-critical pioneers and certainly does not diminish the monumental contributions of Tischendorf and Gregory or the indefatigable Tregelles. Indeed, apart from Tischendorf's innumerable manuscript discoveries, and his critical editions, Westcott-Horts landmark text never could have been realised; every important achievement of scholarship, after all, rests upon and rises from the foundations built by others. Hence no man is an island; not even among biblical scholars in Old and New Testament field of biblical studies with special emphasis on biblical criticism cum textual criticism.

Finally, in the prism of Westcott and Hort, as assessed by Eldon Epp's modern manuals on New Testament textual criticism, along with the vast array of historical and methodological studies in the field, have carried forward from Westcott- and Hort (1881-1882) milestone the fascinating story of how our text has been transmitted and evaluated—a process now spanning more than two millennia. The rewards of such study will be far richer for those who know and use Westcott-Horts text and who understand its theoretical foundations. The foregoing discourse and treatise could serve as an apogee of biblical scholarship, especially by urging students of the New Testament, to take a peep into the beautiful world of New Testament scholarship with regards to biblical and textual criticism. Through this venture, they will contribute to the existing body of knowledge following the light and footprints of Westcott and Hort on the partway to make the bible clearer and more interesting to readers and interpreters in the contemporary church and human society. Hence, the study submits categorically that, through textual criticism done with the tool of textual or critical apparatus as a scientific instrument, students of New Testament can uphold biblical inerrancy-flawlessness of the truth in the message of the Bible in the midst of alleged textual discrepancies.

References

- Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland (1989). *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. 2d ed. Translated by Erroll E. Rhodes. Grand Rapids, Michigan.: Eerdmans
- Aland, Kurt. (1965) "The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research." Pages 325-46 in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*. Edited by J. Philip Hyar. Nashville Abingdon
- Schweitzer, A (1910). *The Quest for Historical Jesus* . England: Oxford University Press.
- Ituma. E.A (2016). *Welcome to the New Testament*. UNN: Society for Research and Academic Excellence
- Bengel, J. A (1725-1734) in *New Testament Greek* by B.F.Westcott and F.J.R. Hort eds.
- Chinwokwu, E.N (2015). *A Critical Introduction to the Tradition of Jesus* . Nsukka: University of Nigeria Press
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman (1969). "Genealogical Method: It's Achievements and Its Limitations. Pages 63-83 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, Ernest Cadman Colwell (ed). Leiden: Brill
- (1969). "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program." Pages 148-71 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Ernest Cadman Coldwell (ed). Leiden: Brill
- Epp, Eldon Jay (1993) "Decision Points in Past, Present, and Future New Testament Textual Criticism." Pages 1744 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Eldon J Epp and Gordon D (eds). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans
- (1993)"The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism." Pages 83-108 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D (eds) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans
- (1993)"The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?" Pages 141-73 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon (eds). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans
- (1985). *"The Development Of The Westcott & Hort New Testament"* pp.Xi-Xviii : A forward to Brook Foss Westcott & Fenton John Anthony Hort, by Eldon Jay Epp
- Fee, Gordon D. (1993) "The Majority Text and the Original Text of the New Testament." Pages 183-208 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D(eds), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans
- (1993) "The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria. Pages 247-73 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D (eds). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Goodacre, M (1997). *Current trends in New Testament Studies* , New York: Macmillan
- Hort, Arthur Fenton (1896). *Life and Letter of Fenton John Anthony Hort*. 2 vols. London: Macmillan
- Kenyon, Frederic G (1933). *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*. Schweich Lectures, 1932. London: British Academy
- McDowell Josh(1981) " More Evidence that Demands a Verdict." Historical Evidences for the Christian Scriptures. San Bernardino : Here is Life Publishers. Inc. 1981
- Dubelius , M (1971). *From Tradition to Gospel*. London : James Clark &Co. Ltd
- Manton, M. *A Dictionary of Theological Terms* England: Grace Publication Trust
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman (2005). *The Text of the New Testament: Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press
- Metzger, B M (1971/1994), *Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (1st &2nd eds.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft

- Ngele, Omaka . K.(2013). *Exousia and the evangelical Mandate in Matthew (Evolving a political Theology for National Socio-politics Transformation)*. Germany : Lambert Publishers.
- Perrin, P(1996) . *What is Redaction Criticism?* Philadelphia : Fortress Press
- Patrick, Graham A.(1988). *F J. A. Hort: Eminent Victorian*. Sheffield, UK: Almond Press.
- Raymond Brow ,et al (eds) (1968). *Jerome Biblical Commentary*, New Jersey : Englewood .
- Rupp, E. G(1970). *Hort and the Cambridge Tradition: An Inaugural Lecture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Salmon, George.(1897). *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. London: John Murray
- Sanday, William(1897). "The Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort." *AJT* 1 (1897): 95-211
- Souter, Alexander (1954). *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Revised by C.S. C. Williams. London: Duckworth.
- Strong. T. B. (1900) "Dr. Hort's Life and Works." *JTS* 1: 370-86.
- Vincent, Marvin R.A (1903). *History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, New York: Macmillan
- Westcott, Arthur. *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, 2 vols. London: Macmillan
- Westcott Brook F & Fenton John Anthony Hort (1985), *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. Cambridge: Macmillan