

**A SPECIME OF AN INTENDED  
PUBLICATION, BEING EXAMINATION  
OF THE FIRST SIX PAGES OF  
PROFESSOR PERSON'S IVTH LETTER  
TO ARCHDEACON TRAVIS**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649333820

A specime of an intended publication, being examination of the first six pages of professor person's IVth letter to Archdeacon Travis by Francis Huyshe

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**FRANCIS HUYSHE**

**A SPECIME OF AN INTENDED  
PUBLICATION, BEING EXAMINATION  
OF THE FIRST SIX PAGES OF  
PROFESSOR PERSON'S IVTH LETTER  
TO ARCHDEACON TRAVIS**



## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THIS publication is occasioned by an advertisement in the newspapers, which announced, that we might expect a Defense of Mr. Porson against Bishop Burgess, by Crito Cantabrigiensis. My veneration of the abilities and acquirements of Mr. Porson is unbounded: "forty thousand" sons "could not, with all their quantity of love, make up my sum." I can speak of him only, as Dr. Parr does, "Richard Porson, του πανυ θαυμαστου." But if you talk of "an invincible love of truth, an inflexible probity," you sap the foundation of my idolatry; and he stands within the prospect of comparison with his blundering correspondent. The reader has before him a specimen of my reasons for saying, that if the world was taken captive by him at his will; his own understanding did not bow to that will. And I have to make my grateful acknowledgments to Crito Cantabrigiensis, for his irresistible excitement to this part of my proposed work; as the whole probably would otherwise have been deferred till the night cometh, when no man can work. Should he think this not sufficient to establish my opinion; he shall have more of it; and he shall have it too, upon the Complutensian edition, and the Ravian MS.; upon Erasmus's third edition, and the MS. that was sent to him from

England; upon the kindred reading discovered in the Montfortian MS.; upon the West African recension; and above all, upon the internal testimony of the passage—till he cries “hold, enough.” But I am not without my hopes, that the favour, conferred upon me by Crito Cantabrigiensis, may be repaid by my saving him the expense of paper and print: and I feel confident of being allowed to doze out whatever may yet remain of the evening of life, without interruption from any other quarter. I have not to learn the truth of what the Trojan lady said,

λογος γαρ εκ τ' αδοξουτωνων  
 Κακ των δοκουτων αυτος ου ταυτον σθενει.

And I am satisfied with thus publicly entering my protest on these heads; and with having furnished a clue, by which any one, who will use a little industry, may extricate himself from that labyrinth of fraud, which nearly two centuries have now been constructing round Stephanus and the received text.

*July, 1827.*

## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
Absurdity of Mr. Travis . . . . .	1
MSS. of the margin out of the question—the received text established by the first set . . . . .	2
Mr. Gibbon's fraud in giving the option between fraud and error . . . . .	ib.
_____ in deciding that the error of Stephanus was typographical . . . . .	3
Mr. Porson's support of Gibbon, though he is sensible of the fraud . . . . .	ib.
Cheat of talking of the " <i>Prudence</i> " of Erasmus . . . . .	ib.
Cheat of talking of the jealousy of the Sarbonne . . . . .	4
The third edition of Stephan has nothing to do with the question . . . . .	6
Collations "not published entire" only that of XV of the MSS. and one of the editions . . . . .	8
Audacious assertion of Mr. Butler . . . . .	9
Absurdity of supposing Henry to have been the sole collator of all the editions . . . . .	10
No ground for it, from Henry's words in his preface to Marlorat . . . . .	11
Similar false inference from Henry's words in his Concordance . . . . .	12
Mr. P. quotes Beza where he gives his computation of the number of all Stephan's MSS. . . . .	13
Different appeals of Beza in his different editions for the authenticity of his various readings from them . . . . .	ib.
Four pieces of craft in Mr. Porson to substantiate his charge of craft against Stephan . . . . .	15
Mr. Porson driven to a similar mode of construction with that of Mr. Travis to get rid of Stephan's evidence . . . . .	17
No ground for suspecting Stephan's account of the collation of $\beta$ . . . . .	18
Stephan's declarations at the beginning of his critical labors, and again after their conclusion . . . . .	19
Agreement of the critics to make Stephan's text to have no manuscript authority . . . . .	ib.

	PAGE
Nothing known of half the MSS. from which Stephan's first edition was formed . . . . .	20
Wonderful confession attributed to Stephan . . . . .	21
Mr. Porson allows that Griesbach takes this for granted (in his first ed.) . . . . .	22
Mr. Porson does so himself . . . . .	23
Remonstrance against Dr. Adam Clarke's praises . . . . .	ib.
— against Mr. P.'s assumption . . . . .	24
Mr. Porson still professes to produce one instance of Stephan's giving his text contrary to his MSS. . . . .	25
This instance is not from the edition that first gave the disputed passage in the new form . . . . .	ib.
Mr. Porson does not venture to grapple with the question, or attempt to shew that Stephan ever varied from all his MSS. . . . .	26
Wetsten's courageous assertions, which Mr. P. has not the hardihood to repeat . . . . .	ib.
Wetsten takes Stephan's words as admitting that he varied from all his MSS. . . . .	ib.
Mr. Travis adopts this construction and pretends to justify such conduct . . . . .	27
Dr. Hales follows Travis and glories in it . . . . .	ib.
Charge against Erasmus of giving Matt. ii. 11. contrary to all his MSS. —shewn to fail . . . . .	28
The defenders of Stephan consistent in their blunder . . . . .	29
Wetsten has himself demonstrated that the expression used by Stephan, could in no instance convey more than two thirds of one set of his MSS. . . . .	30
Consideration of Beza's testimony on Matt. ii. 11. . . . .	31
The fraudulent insertion Stephan's words traced to Morin . . . . .	33
Griesbach in his 2nd edition, no longer able to take the point for granted, has recourse to laughter . . . . .	34
— and to Morin's expedient of inserting "swis" . . . . .	35
—'s statement shows that this would make Stephan contradict his own declarations more than a hundred times . . . . .	ib.
Bishop Marsh repeats this . . . . .	ib.
Morin's expedient, which the critics thus adopt, proves too much. Accordingly there is a second device to confine what Stephan says to <i>manuscript</i> . . . . .	36
By the acknowledgment of the critics the credit of Stephan's text was never disputed till Morin's days, though, according to them, he avowed more than 100 times, that he had deviated from all his MSS. . . . .	38
No motive attempted to be assigned for the conduct they attribute to Stephan . . . . .	40



CONTENTS.

vii

	PAGE
Stephan might find in his MSS. what you can find only in the Complutensian or Erasmus . . . . .	42
No doubt can remain of the authority of Stephan on 1 John v. 7, 8. ; if the frauds respecting the number of his . . . . . ed . . . . .	43
Mr. Porson's own position proves decisively that the text given by Stephan at 1 John v. 7, 8. must have come from his MSS. . . . .	44
Bishop Marsh lays down the real fact with respect to Stephan's text in this passage, and so dissipates the singularly ingenious contrivance of Mr. Gibbon . . . . .	ib.
Mr. Porson is compelled to assert that Stephan had the <i>consent</i> of both the Complut. and Erasmus ; when by his own showing, both of them actually <i>dissect</i> . . . . .	45
Shifts and contradictions of the critics who assert that Stephan did not follow manuscript authority in this passage . . . . .	46
Mr. Porson's own statement respecting Stephan's text carries conviction of his honesty . . . . .	48
Mr. P.'s theory makes S. go backwards and forwards between the Complut. and Erasmus four times over to collect his text for the two disputed verses . . . . .	49
Besides the absurdity of this, it flatly contradicts the decision of the critics, that Stephan never took any thing from the Complut., but in the Revelations . . . . .	50
It depends upon the trick of making two "printed guides" to be taken together for one passage ; when the charge respecting <i>printed guides</i> alleged only <i>one</i> for each division of the N. T. . . . .	51
Fraud of Griesbach's statement . . . . .	ib.
The author willing to rest on this confutation of the conspiring critics without producing any of the evidence for Stephan . . . . .	52



## EXAMINATION,

&c.

---

— — — — —  
— — — — —  
Mr. Porson in his fourth Letter attacks the testimony of Stephanus to the disputed passage of St. John ; and he prefixes the motto,

“ What, will the line stretch out to the crack of doom ?”

I reply, not by my pulling. I claim nothing here but the authority of one of Stephanus's *unmarked* MSS.

The Letter begins, p. 54.

“ How formidable an host you are now leading to battle ! Sixteen MSS. of Robert Stephens, all containing the heavenly witnesses ! We may however spare our alarms ; for all these MSS. upon a nearer inspection will prove *Phantoms bodiless and vain, empty visions of the brain.*”

I cannot be satisfied with calling them “ *empty visions.*” If Mr. Porson had not taught me, p. 26, to “ acquiesce in the milder accusation of shameful and enormous ignorance ;” I should have declared that the man who could possibly cite any of those sixteen copies, must have been bribed to betray the cause, and to ruin the authority of Stephanus's editions. After Mr. Porson's having demonstrated, as he certainly has done, that “ the semicircle is wrong placed” in the text of the folio (i. e. that it ought to have comprehended not merely *εἰ τοῦ ἡρατοῦ* as not appearing in the seven MSS. of the margin, but the whole of what