

MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE CLASS

by Dr Thomas Holland

Holland's educational course on manuscript evidence and textual criticism, emphasizing the preservation of Scripture through its transmission in copies and translations. He argues from 2 Timothy 3:15-17 that transmitted texts should be regarded as holy Scripture.

12 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 01 LESSON ONE
2. 02 LESSON TWO
3. 03 LESSON THREE
4. 04 LESSON FOUR
5. 05 LESSON FIVE
6. 06 LESSON SIX
7. 07 LESSON SEVEN
8. 08 LESSON EIGHT
9. 09 LESSON NINE
10. 10 LESSON TEN
11. 11 LESSON ELEVEN
12. 12 LESSON TWELVE

01 LESSON ONE

LESSON ONE: A Biblical Starting Point So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. (Rom 10:17)

Why do we believe salvation is by the grace of God apart for our own efforts and works? Is it because of the way we feel, or because of what God says about salvation in the Bible? As Christians, we believe that there was a world-wide flood which destroyed the whole world with the exception of Noah and his family. Why? Is it because some claim to have found the ark on Ararat or because the Bible claims the flood as fact? Bible-believing Christians believe in special creation and not the theory of evolution to explain the origin of man. Why so? Is it because we have had scientific creationists prove the point, or because the Bible has something to say on this issue? The Bible-believing Christian begins his or her search for the truth with the Word of God (Rom 10:17). By faith, we accept what God has said and then allow Him to prove it correct. It would seem strange indeed for us to expect any less when it comes to the issues of textual criticism, translational accuracy, and the preservation of scripture. Unfortunately most Christians fail to take the time to see if God has anything to say concerning these vital issues. However, like all truly important things in life, He does. To begin with, God does not place much faith in the credibility of man with regard to His Holy Word. In Rom 3:4 we are reminded, Let God be true, but every man a liar. This being the final divine word on the subject, we must conclude that every scholar, every professor, every teacher, and every doctor is defined by God as a liar. This includes the good and godly scholar, as it does the fair and careless one. This covers every man, woman and child. This also includes me. None of our words are final, because we are defined by God as liars. The only one who is true is God.

God proclaims that His words are true (John 17:17) and without error (Psa 119:140). He declares that His words are infallible proofs of truth (Acts 1:3). He claims to have given us the scriptures by holy and divine inspiration (2Ti 3:16; 2Pe 1:21). And the Lord of Hosts states that He will keep and preserve His words longer then the existence of either heaven or earth (Psa 12:6-7; Mat 5:18; Mat 24:35). In fact, God says they are incorruptible (1Pe 1:23).

Man was not given the job of correcting God's word. He is told not to add to or take from the words of the Lord (Deu 4:2; Pro 30:6; Rev 22:18). The keeping of God's word is God's job, not man's. Concerning the words of the Lord, the inspired writer reminds us that, Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.(Psa 12:7).

Man can not be trusted with this job. He will think the can do a better job than God and add to them. Or else, he will think that a passage would read better if he takes something away. Man does so because he is a liar.

Further, God does not permit us to view His word as simply a good translation or the best available text to-date. The scriptures are not to be seen as the work of men, but instead as the word of God. Paul writes: For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the

word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe. (1Th 2:13).

All of this provides the Bible-believing Christian with a different starting point than the one which has influenced the thinking of modern Christendom. He starts with the firm belief that God has inspired and given His word free from all human error, and that this same God has kept and preserved His words. The Bible-believing Christian begins with Scripture and ends with full assurance that God was able to do what He proclaimed He would do. Where do the modern scholars and translators begin? What is their view concerning the giving and keeping of God's words and what is their final conclusion? Note the following. In his book, Dr. Alexander Souter defines the study of textual criticism in this manner.

Textual criticism seeks, by the exercise of knowledge and trained judgment, to restore the very words of some original document which has perished, and survives only in copies complete or incomplete, accurate or inaccurate, ancient or modern. If we possessed the twenty-seven documents now composing our New Testament exactly in the form in which they were dictated or written by their original authors, there would be no textual criticism of the New Testament. The original documents, however, have long perished, and we have to make the best of the copies which have survived, by howsoever many removes they may be distant from their ultimate originals. (The Text and Canon of the New Testament, 1917; p. 3. Dr. Souter was Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis in Mansfield College, Oxford). From a human viewpoint, this definition seems logical. Dr. Souter, nevertheless, does not look to Divine intervention for the preservation and keeping of the Holy Script, but to knowledge and trained judgment. Therefore, the preservation of the word of God, according to Souter, rests in the hands of learned men.

Dr. Donald A. Carson carries the thought of copyist error to its earliest point, making the writings which Paul had just finished subject to human errors.

Paul might write a letter to the church in Colossae while sitting under house arrest in Rome. . .but that letter was soon copied by several within the church, and by a few more in the sister church at nearby Laodicea. Perhaps one of the members on a business trip to Macedonia took a copy with him; and while in Philippi he copied out the Letter to the Phillipians at the same time someone in the church at Philippi copied out the Letter to the Colossians. Of course any error that the Colossian businessman inadvertently introduced into his own copy of Paul's letter to the Colossians would get picked up by the Philippians copier. (D.A. Carson; The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism, 1979; p. 16)

Drs. Geisler and Nix also depend upon the science of textual criticism to solve various errata that have crept into the process of transmission.

Since the Scriptures have undergone some two thousand years of transmission, it is only natural to ask: How much has the Bible suffered in the process? Or, to put it more precisely: Is the twentieth century English Bible an accurate reproduction of the first century Greek Testament and the Hebrew Old Testament? The answer to this question comes from the science of textual criticism, (Norman Geisler and William Nix in their book, A General Introduction to the Bible; 1968; p. 211) In his attempt to address the KJV Only movement, James R. White compares the issues of textual criticism with errors in sports.

Men make mistakes, even when they are trying really hard. The greatest baseball player still strikes out. The greatest basketball player will miss the clutch free-throw and lose a game once in a while. The best archer will sometimes fire an arrow wide of the target. To err is human. . .there is not a single handwritten manuscript of the Bible, in Greek or Hebrew, that does not contain, somewhere, an error, an oversight, a mistake. To err is human. (The King James Only Controversy; 1995, p. 36) The conclusion of this, as set forth by modern scholarship, can be seen in the first line of the closing paragraph in the preface to the New International Version.

Like all translations of the Bible, made as they are by imperfect man, this one undoubtedly falls short of its goals.

Thus, the judgments and insights of scholars, their desire to excel in the discipline of textual criticism, will only provide imperfection that falls short. As one can see, modern scholarship begins with the knowledge of men and the science of textual criticism. Their final conclusion is not certainty, but ambiguity. They are certain that they are right, but they are uncertain as to the final product.

There is a three-fold process in the giving of Scripture. 1). Inspiration. 2). Canonicity. 3). Transmission. The topic of inspiration is prone to objection by scholarship in what is called higher criticism. This asks the question as to what is meant by inspiration, and does this include inerrancy? The Bible-believing Christian embraces the Scriptures as both inspired and inerrant. The reason for doing so is because the Bible claims to be both. The canon of Scripture differs among Protestants and Catholics as to what books are to be considered part of the Holy Writ. Again, Bible-believing Christians accept the sixty-six books which consists of our Old and New Testaments, and reject apocrypha books as inspired. The issue of transmission is called lower criticism or textual criticism. This covers both textual and translational issues concerning the Scriptures. Not, is it inspired, but was it copied correctly and/or translated correctly.

Here something needs to be stated about the words inerrant and infallible. In his book, *The Battle For The Bible*, Dr. Harold Lindsell states these two words are interchangeable and basically teach the Bible is without error (Lindsell, p. 27). There is, however, a slight difference to which the student of manuscript evidence should be aware of. While they are synonyms for each other, there is a variance. The word inerrant means without error. That is to say the Bible has no error; it is truth without any mixture of error. This is the fundamental belief among evangelical Christians, as pointed to by Lindsell, and applies to the original autographs, the writers being inspired by the Holy Ghost. Infallible carries the meaning further. Webster defines it as, "incapable of error." Therefore, infallibility would mean the Scriptures were not only given without error, but are incapable of becoming errant. That is to say, they are incorruptible (1Pe 1:23). And, if they are truly infallible (incorruptible), then the Church of God has always had these inerrant words and still possesses them today; without the fallibility of human error interjected into their content.

It seems rather amazing, from a Scriptural point of view, that God was able to give His words without error and provide us with the knowledge as to which books were His words, only to lose them in the process of transmission. Yet, this is what modern scholarship expects us to believe as demonstrated by the earlier quotations. Thus, according to those listed above, the Bible (all sixty-six books) was given by inspiration of God, but must depend upon the integrity and intelligence of scholarship to provide for us the best and most accurate copy of what was initially

given. At this point, the Bible-believing Christian must insist that God did not profess to give us His words and allow them to be lost or tainted. The references given at the beginning of this lesson show that our Lord has stated otherwise (Psa 12:6-7; Mat 5:18; Mat 24:35; 1Pe 1:23). He gave us His words (inspiration and canonicity) and He has kept His words (transmission and preservation). They are both inerrant and infallible. The final authority rests with God, not with scholarship (Heb 4:12-13). However, man likes to assert this role. When the claim is made that two or more translations or texts are the final authority, and they differ in subject or content; then an additional authority must be introduced to resolve the conflict. Scholarship has reserved for itself this role. It judges which translation or text is the correct one. In so doing, it has made itself the final authority. In his explanation of preservation, James R. White notes the differences in various translations and texts and states,

You see, if readings could just disappear without a trace, we would have to face the fact that the original reading may have fallen through the cracks as well. But the tenacity of the New Testament text, while forcing us to deal with textual variants, also provides us with the assurance that our work is not in vain. One of those variant readings is indeed the original. We are called to invest our energies in discovering which one it is. (The King James Only Controversy; p. 48).

However, scholarship DOES claim that some readings have disappeared. For example, Dr. Charles Ryrie states in his Study Bible concerning the reading of 1Sa 13:1, The original numbers in this verse have apparently been lost in transmission. (Ryrie Study Bible, p. 432).

White, himself, does not believe the ending of Mark 16:9-20 to be the proper ending of that gospel, but was added at some later date. Have we lost the real ending to Mark's gospel? If not, where is it? As one can see, redefining preservation leaves us on shaky ground. The Scriptures remind us that It is better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in man. (Psa 118:8); and, As for God, His way is perfect; the word of the LORD is tried: He is a buckler to all them that trust in Him. (2Sa 22:31).

We can not trust man, for he will lie (Rom 3:4). The arm of flesh will fail us (2Ch 32:8). But we can be assured that God is quite able and has kept and preserved His words without error and that we still have these preserved words today.

One additional note by Mr. White concerning the issue of preservation. On page 47 of his book, The King James Only Controversy, he states:

KJV Only advocates are quick to assert that those who do not join them in making the KJV the final authority in all things do not believe in the preservation of the Scriptures. Almost all KJV Only books will contain a section on how God has promised to preserve His words, and they will, of course, assume that these words are found in the KJV. At this point they believe themselves to be holding the high ground in the debate, fighting for a belief that all Christians would naturally defend: the idea that God has revealed himself, and has done so in such a way that we can continue to know that revelation perfectly today.

I quote from Bro. White for this reason: I have not stated in the above lesson which translation, if any, is the preserved word of God. Only that we are forced to believe that God has kept and preserved His words without error, if we are to believe the Scriptures. God simply said He would keep and preserve His words, now and forever. I have not insisted that you believe that this

preserved word of God is the King James Bible (although I do and will give reason as to why in later lessons). I have insisted that God said He would preserve His words, and that modern scholarship ultimately denies Biblical preservation and replaces it with human uncertainty. Our Biblical starting point is the assurance that God gave us His words and has preserved them, "from this generation for ever." For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven. (Psa 119:89).

PROBLEM PASSAGES: The question was asked: "When Jesus confronted Peter and thrice asked, 'Do you love me?' he used two different words in Greek, why wasn't this captured in the English translation? Of the two occurrences which do use the same word, does the voice change or is it constant." The passage is found in John 21:15-17 which reads as follows.

15: So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs.

16: He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep.

17: He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep.

There are two different Greek words translated as love in this passage. One is agape and the other is phileo. According to the Greek text (and this is true of all Greek texts) the first two times Jesus uses the word love He uses the Greek word agape. Both of these times Peter responds with phileo. On the third time, when Jesus speaks the word love, the word phileo is used by Christ. To this, Peter responds with phileo. Some suggest that the Greek word agape means a deeper love, while the Greek word phileo means friendship or affection. The King James Bible is not alone in translating both words the same way. The standard Spanish translation is the Valera. What the KJV is to the English-speaking world, the Valera is to the Spanish-speaking world. Each time the Lord asks, "me amas?" to which Peter replies, "Si, Senor; tu sabes que te amo." In every case, the Spanish word for love is used, not two different words. The standard French Bible is the Louis Segond. All three times the Lord uses the word, "m'aimes-tu," and Peter replies with "t'aime." It is the same French word for love. The Italian Bible is the Giovanni Diodati. In the gospel according to Giovanni (John), the Italian word "amo" is used throughout the passage.

And, of course, Luther's German Bible uses the German word for love, which is, "lieber."

Even the NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV, TEV, and NEB translated both Greek words as love in this passage. So the KJV is not at all alone in its translation. Leaving the Greek to use two different words.

Or, is it? Most scholars teach the two different Greek words agape and phileo, mean two different things, or at the very least, two different types of love (such as, I love my wife and I love pizza). However, this does not bear itself out in the Greek New Testament. The simple fact is that these two words are used interchangeably, both meaning love. If phileo means friendship and not godly love, then why does Christ use it in Rev 3:19? "As many as I love, I rebuke."

Read John 20:2. Is it agape or phileo? How about John 16:27? Is this agape or phileo? How about John 5:20 or 11:3,36? Reading the context of these passages and being told that agape means godly love one might think this is the Greek word used in these passages. However, the word phileo is used in all. Both words mean love and are used interchangeably.

There is also another dimension of this argument which most scholars and Bible teachers ignore. We do not know that this passage was originally spoken in Greek. It may have been spoken in Hebrew or Aramaic. And, for that matter, we do not know what the original Greek manuscript had. We only know how the copies read.

Finally, the real issues here was not the change of Greek words. Peter was not grieved because Christ had changed Greek words. He was grieved because he asked three times. It was not the change in words or tense that disturbed Peter. It was, "because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me?" Does not this passage in John 21:1-25 prove the point that agape and phileo are interchangeable? Jesus asks, "lovest (agape) thou me" (vs. 15), "lovest (agape) thou me" (vs. 16), and "lovest (phileo) thou me" (vs. 17). When Christ asks this last time, the texts states, "He saith unto him THE THIRD TIME" (vs.17). This is true only if these two words are interchangeable. If they are not interchangeable and carry different meanings, the text is in error, for it was not the third time. If the two words carry the same meaning, the text would be correct as it stands in the Greek manuscripts.

02 LESSON TWO

LESSON TWO: Presenting Some Basics In our first lesson we began with a Biblical starting point for the study of textual criticism and a proper understanding of the doctrine of preservation. Our conclusion consequently agrees with the Psalmist in saying "Thy word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it." ().

We can see this principle of preservation of both the text and the translation of the New Testament itself. In Paul's letter to Timothy, the Apostle makes reference to the holy scriptures: And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works (2Ti 3:15-17).

Here, Paul tells Timothy that he has known the holy scriptures ever since he was a child. Yet, we must recognize that all Timothy had were copies and translations of the original Hebrew texts. Young Timothy did not have access to the original autographs of any of the Old Testament writers. In the preservation of God, Paul refers to these copies as holy scriptures. It would be unbiblical of us to think less of the word of God today.

How unfortunate that we find ourselves in a debate over this issue with born-again Christian scholars and teachers. When we say, "Thy word is very pure," the born-again translator says of translations, "None is perfect, but the poorest is better than none." (Jack Lewis, *The English Bible*, 1981, p. 365). The real difference lies in the approach taken. The passage in Timothy states, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." The tense of this verse demonstrates the difference between the Bible-believing Christian and modern scholarship. The Bible-believer agrees that all scripture IS given. The modern conservative scholar believes it WAS given. It is our conviction that God used the correct tense, and that the modern scholar is incorrect.

There are many issues which arise concerning the preservation of Scripture. Several of these will be covered in the upcoming lessons. We will look at the various lines of manuscripts and a history of both Biblical preservation and those who sought to correct it (2Co 2:17). We will also note several of the differences between modern versions and the Authorized Version. We will discuss text types and bring to light the debate concerning the differences in texts. We will also observe some of the argumentation raised by modern scholars and address their concerns. However, we must first lay a foundation of basic understanding in regard to textual criticism. It is with that purpose in mind that we begin this lesson.

ANCIENT TEXTS: The Bible was not originally written in English. The Old Testament was written in Hebrew and Aramaic. The New Testament was written in Greek. However, we no longer have any of these original manuscripts. The attempt to reconstruct what was originally given is the study of textual criticism.

There are more manuscripts of the New Testament than any other ancient writing. To date, we have over 5,000 Greek manuscripts, and over 9,000 manuscripts of ancient translations of the New Testament. Where these manuscripts disagree, it is called a textual variance. For the purpose of this class, we are concerned with the manuscripts and their variance as they relate to the New Testament.

It is important to make basic definitions of terms. This will allow the student to comprehend what is communicated and recognize when others are using terms improperly. By originals or autographs we do not mean copies. We mean what was originally penned by the original writers of the Old and New Testaments. We no longer have any of these autographs. Only copies remain. By manuscripts we mean handwritten copies of the originals or copies of copies. They are written by hand and thus called manuscripts. They may be whole books, portion of books, or fragments.

Greek Texts does not mean the original Greek nor does it mean the Greek manuscripts. It means a Greek New Testament that has been reconstructed by various manuscripts and other sources. Since manuscripts differ, and sources disagree, we have a variety of Greek Texts. Some of these are Stephanus Greek Text, Beza's Greek Text, Elzevir's Greek Text, Westcott and Hort Greek Text, Nestle's Greek Text, and the United Bible Society's Greek Text. The history of New Testament manuscripts is divided, roughly, into three periods: papyrus, vellum, and paper. The manuscripts we have were written on one of these three, and often reflect the date of the manuscript.

Papyrus is made from the papyrus plants, which grew in abundance in Egypt. The inner bark of the plant was cut into thin strips and were laid side by side and then crossed with other strips. They were then pressed together and sun dried. The papyrus was, for the most part, written only on one side and bound together in rolls. The custom was to write in very narrow columns that had no separation of words, accents marks, or punctuation. So, Php 1:1-2 would read something like this:

PAULANDTIMOTHEUSTHESERVANTSOFGOD
TOALLTHESAINSTSINCHRISTJESUSWHICHAREATPHIPI
WITHTHEBISHOPSANDDEACONS
GRACEBEUNTOYOU
ANDPEACEFROMGODOURFATHERANDFROMTHE
LORDJESUSCHRIST

(Just as a side note, one can see from this example that the early scribes were not concerned with making an easy to read translation or text of the Bible.)

Paragraphs were marked with a line in the margin of the text. A line in the margin meant a new paragraph was beginning. (The Greek word para means beside, and the Greek word graph means writing. Thus, paragraph.) The papyrus manuscripts are very fragile. Most of what we have are fragments. This period lasted until the seventh century.

Next, we have the manuscripts written on vellum (or in some cases on parchment). This covers the period from about the end of the third century to the fifteenth century. The narrow columns that were used in the papyrus manuscripts were maintained in the vellum manuscripts. Vellum are dried animal skins which were cut into leaves and formed into a book. In textual criticism, a book is

called a codex. Some vellum manuscripts maintain the same style of writing used in papyrus manuscripts. This style is referred to as uncials, which consists of all capital letters written without accent marks, punctuation, or separation of words or sentences. Later, around the ninth century, the use of small letters with spacing between words was used. These manuscripts are referred to as minuscules or cursive.

Manuscripts written on paper cover from about the fourteenth century to the present. Up until this period, it was rare to have a complete Bible in one book. Most of the papyrus and vellum manuscripts are fragments, passages, or maybe a book of the New Testament. But, in the thirteenth century whole books containing all or most of the New Testament became common.

SOURCES FOR NEW TESTAMENT TEXTS:

There are three classes of evidence used by textual critics in the reconstruction of the New Testament. (I use the term reconstruction because it is a term used by textual critics. However, I personally do not believe the New Testament needs to be reconstructed in the common use of the word because I do not believe it was ever lost.)

First, the main source for reconstructing the New Testament comes from Greek manuscripts. These manuscripts exist in the forms listed above. There are variances in all Greek manuscripts. These manuscripts are classified into one of four families, or textual types.

1) The Byzantine Text. The name is derived from the Byzantine Empire because it is the type of text copied by Byzantine monks. Most manuscripts are of this family. In fact, there are far more manuscripts of this type than of the other three combined. For this reason the family is sometimes called the Majority Text. This line of manuscripts would also reflect the Greek Texts used to translate the King James Bible. This textual line is also called the Traditional Text.

2) The Alexandrian Text. The name comes from Alexandria, Egypt, where most of these texts were prepared by scribes. It is from this family of manuscripts most modern version are based. The three main manuscripts of this family are Alexandrinus (5th century), Sinaiticus (4th century), and Vaticanus (4th century).

3) The Western Text. There is a debate among scholars if this is a real family of manuscripts or not. Some believe it reflects a different family. Others believe the differences are so minor that they do not deserve a classification of their own.

4) The Caesarean Text. This family seems to be a mixture of the above family of manuscripts. Some believe it was derived in Egypt by Origen and brought to Caesarea. Because it is a mixture, some question if this also should be classified as a family. For the most part, therefore, there are two main families of manuscripts. It is the differences between these two lines that make for the majority of the difference in modern translations and the King James Version. When one takes the Textus Receptus, which was based on the Byzantine line of manuscripts, and compares it with the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament, which was based on the Alexandrian line of manuscripts, there are close to 6,000 differences within the two Greek Texts. This is roughly 10% of the text. The second source for making a Greek Text comes from ancient versions. Since these versions were translated from something, they are used as a source for establishing a Greek Text. Like the Greek manuscripts, there are a variety of ancient versions, and not all of these agree.

Among these are the Old Latin versions (including both the Old Latin and Jerome's Latin Vulgate), Syriac (including the Old Syriac and the Peshitta), Coptic (Egyptian), Gothic (early German), Armenian, Ethiopic, and others. These are useful because they not only had to have a source for their translation, but also show what the non-Greek reading world used. The third source comes from the quotations of the early Church Fathers. These are called Patristic citations. When the theological writers of the first few centuries quoted scripture, their quotations are used. Again, we have a difference in several of the quotations, showing that from the very start there were differences in New Testament texts. More will be given about some of the early Church Fathers in later lessons. Of course, this is something the Bible-believer recognizes. Paul warned that "For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ." (2Co 2:17). And again, "But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." (2Co 4:2). There have always been those who sought to corrupt the incorruptible word of God. And, like Satan, questions and quotes scripture dishonestly for their own gain (Gen 3:1; Mat 4:6). This is not to say all the early church theologians or manuscripts are corrupt. It is to say that we can not trust any one of these sources as the final authority. Instead, we must depend upon the providence of God to preserve His words without error and then demonstrate where this preserved word is.

Other sources would be lectionaries and apocryphal writings. Lectionaries were books used by the early church which contained lessons and hymns. There were also citations from passages of scripture. These would show that certain scriptures were in use at a given time, and substantiate a questioned text.

Apocryphal writings would be citations from books contemporary with the New Testament but were not inspired. Often they quote scripture. Allow me to illustrate with a few examples. The King James Bible reads, "For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ" (Rom 14:10). Most modern versions read as the New American Standard Version: "For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God." The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians quotes the verse, "And must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." (2:18). Rather Polycarp wrote this letter or not we do not know. We do know that manuscripts of the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians date to 150 AD. Thus we have a second century reading supporting the textual variant in favor of the Traditional Text and the Authorized Version of 1611. The same is true of 1Jn 4:3 --"And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." Modern versions leave out the phrase "is come in the flesh." Again, in Polycarp to the Php 3:1 we read, "For whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, he is antichrist." We can see that the writer of this book agreed with the rendering of the King James Bible.

Another example using Polycarp comes from 1Ti 6:10 : "For the love of money is the root of all evil." Modern versions read,"a root." But Polycarp's letter to the Philippians, 2:5, reads, "But the love of money is the root of all evil." There are many other examples, but these illustrate the point.

VIEWS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM: For the purposes of this class, there are three main views concerning textual criticism. They are listed as follows. 1) Modern Textual Criticism. 2) The

Traditional Text. 3) The King James Bible as the Preserved Word of God for the English-speaking people.

Modern Textual Criticism: To say most textual critics hold to modern textual theories would be a vast understatement. Almost all who study textual criticism support the modern approach. Thus, this is the view of modern scholars, rather conservative, moderate, or liberal. Basically there are two fundamental principles to this approach of textual criticism; the age of known existing manuscripts and the use of eclecticism. In the past 150 years several manuscripts have been found which pre-dated existing manuscripts. The famed manuscripts of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus date to the fourth century. They were discovered and used in the 1800's. Some papyrus date before the fourth century. For example P52 dates to early second century, and P66 dates to around 200 AD.

Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus are questionable as they have added passages and books to the contexts of both the Old Testament and New Testament, while omitting other portions of scripture. Sinaiticus contains most of the Old Testament and all of the New (except for Mark 16:9-20; John 7:53; John 8:1-11; and some other verses). The Old Testament Apocrypha books are contained in Sinaiticus placed within the Testament as part of the sacred text. It also contains some New Testament Apocrypha books as part of the New Testament text. For example it contains the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermans as scripture. Vaticanus does likewise with Apocrypha books in both Testaments as part of the Biblical text. (Vaticanus has Matthew through Heb 9:14. The remainder of the NT is missing.)

Codex Bezae (which is also called D and dates between 450 to 550 AD) adds to the text. One, of the many examples, is found in Luk 6:5, "On that day, seeing a certain man working on the Sabbath, he (i.e. Jesus) said to him, Man, if you know what you are doing, blessed are you. But if not, cursed are you and a transgressor of the law." (Dr. Kenneth Clark, *The Transmission of the New Testament as found in The Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 12; 1980, p. 623). These type of additions are found throughout various manuscripts within the Alexandrian and Western line. And, it is from these manuscripts that many of the changes and revisions within both the Greek and English New Testament are based.

Age may not be the determining factor in the authenticity of a given manuscript. Manuscripts which are not used would naturally last longer than manuscripts where were used. Also, most of the papyrus manuscripts we have come from Egypt and reflect the Alexandrian Text. The climate of Egypt is more conducive than the climate of other places in the world for keeping old documents. Most of the Gnostic Gospels come from manuscripts found in Egypt. Many of the supporters of the Traditional Text (such as Edward F. Hills, Zane Hodges, Robert Wilson, Peter Ruckman, and David Otis Fuller) have stated or suggested that Gnosticism influenced the philosophy of the scribes copying the manuscripts in Egypt. Gnosticism is known as an ancient heresy, teaching that all that is spiritual is good and all that is physical is evil. The heresy also suggests that since Jesus was created, and all that is physical is evil, Christ was not coming back in the flesh. This is the false doctrine which John addresses in his first epistle. Thus manuscripts coming from Egypt are questionable. The Traditional Text:

What has been called the Majority Text is based on this view of textual criticism, as is the Received Text (also called the Textus Receptus). Until the publishing of textual scholars, such as

Westcott and Hort, this view was the main view. In fact, one could argue until the early 1800's it was the only view, at least where Protestant scholarship is concerned. Dr. Kurt Aland (of the Aland Greek NT and the Institute for NT Textual Research) wrote:

Finally it is undisputed that from the 16th to the 18th century orthodoxy's doctrine of verbal inspiration assumed this Textus Receptus. It was the only Greek text they knew, and they regarded it as the 'original text.' Close beside it there was Luther's translation of the New Testament which in practice frequently enjoyed the same esteem, although there were differences between its various editions, just as there were for the Greek text. ("The Text of the Church?" in Trinity Journal, Fall, 1987. p.131).

Critics of the Traditional Text cite that this line of manuscripts is recent and not reflective of early manuscripts. It is true that the majority of all Greek manuscripts date after 1000 AD, but to insinuate that there is no textual support for this line before 1000 AD is absurd and without informative substance. The Chester Beatty Papyri (P. 45, 46, and 66) all have readings that reflect the Traditional Text against all other line of manuscripts. These papyri date to the early third century. Codex W dates from the fourth to early fifth century. It contains the Gospels, yet uses several of the various lines of manuscripts. While most of Mark and part of John reflect the Alexandrian and Western lines, "(all of) Matthew and Luk 8:13-56; Luk 9:1-62; Luk 10:1-42; Luk 11:1-54; Luk 12:1-59; Luk 13:1-35; Luk 14:1-35; Luk 15:1-32; Luk 16:1-31; Luk 17:1-37; Luk 18:1-43; Luk 19:1-48; Luk 20:1-47; Luk 21:1-38; Luk 22:1-71; Luk 23:1-56; Luk 24:1-25 are Byzantine (Traditional text)" (Geisler and Nix, A General Introduction to the Bible, p. 281). Even Codex A (i.e. Codex Alexandrinus, dating around 450 AD) reflects the Traditional Text in the Gospels, leaving the Epistles to reflect the Alexandrian line. And, of course, the early translations such as the Peshitta (second century) and the Gothic (dating around 350 AD) also reflect the Traditional Text over against the Alexandrian Text. In fact, Sir Fredric Kenyon, noted textual scholar, has stated that the Gothic version represents the type of text, "which is found in the majority of Greek manuscripts" (Handbook To The Textual Criticism Of The New Testament by Kenyon, p. 240). The best manuscripts are the ones which have been traditionally used by Bible believing Christians throughout the years, and the vast majority of all existing manuscripts reflect this type of manuscript. These manuscripts were used to produce the King James Bible and reflects the history of early Protestantism and Reformation. Additionally, many of the old early translations agree with this line of manuscripts, as do some very early papyrus manuscripts. The question has been asked, why would God allow the majority of manuscripts to be of this line if it is incorrect, while only a handful of manuscripts reflect the views of modern textual critics? (Such was the question raised by Dr. John Burgon). We would also ask; If this line is the wrong line of manuscripts, why would God allow born-again Christians to use this line and suffer persecution, while giving to those who were persecuting the true Church the correct line? Is that consistent with the nature of God? If those who were persecuting the Church had the correct line of manuscripts, why did they prohibit it from being translated for so many years, even hiding it from their own people? If the Traditional line of manuscripts is not the correct line, why has God so greatly blessed this line and the translations of the Traditional Text throughout the history of the Church? Would not God bear witness to which is good and which is corrupt? (Mat 7:15-20) The King James Version View: This view draws most of its textual support form the Traditional Text, since the Greek Text which underlined the King James Version came from the Traditional Text. The view

covers preservation, final authority, and the Sovereignty of God. The view states that the Authorized Version is the preserved word of God for the English-speaking people. It stands as the final authority for all matters of faith and practice without any proven error. The Sovereign hand of God can be seen in using this version to bring revival and reform. This view begins with a basis of Scriptural promises. Namely, that God would keep and preserve His words. (Psa 12:6-7; Mat 4:4; Mat 5:18; Mat 24:35; 1Pe 1:23). Preservation would mean more than a general term. It would mean that God kept all of His words without error, and that these words are preserved in a book which can be read and tested. Throughout church history God has kept His words, and since 1611 for English-speaking people, it is found in the Authorized Version. The information in this lesson will provide the student with a basic understanding of some of the terms used in the study of textual criticism, and in our study of the King James Bible and its text. Additional information will be provided in time as we look more closely at opposing views in this study. In our next lesson we will cover some of the differences in the Greek texts as reflected in various English translations.

QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS: In our first lesson, I called this section Problem Passages. I think it would be better to call this section Questions From Students, in that some of the questions received deal with areas other than problem passages. Such is the following question.

"I love the KJV of the Bible and it's all I use. My one question would be about the new KJ21 ... do you know about it ... what do you think ... are there any specific problems with it? Thank you."

All I can offer is my opinion. I do not own a copy of the KJ21, so I had to borrow one from my library. My observations, therefore, are not in-depth. KJ21 stands for the 21st Century King James Version. It was published in 1994 by Deuel Enterprises, Inc. in Gary, SD. This is not a new translation or revision of the King James Bible. Instead, it takes the text of the KJV and seeks to update some of the words considered outdated. This was the same thing Porter Barrington did with his Christian Life New Testament. Words like minish become diminish and prevent become precede. It keeps archaic words which are still understandable to modern readers, such as "thee, thou, hath, art, cometh, and hast." The text is not presented in column verse form as most King James Version's of the Bible are. Instead it is presented in paragraph form like many modern versions have been. Some verses are placed in bold print because they denote "the most powerful, most familiar, best loved, and most often quoted and memorized." (from KJ21, p. v). It also contains an appendix which I was glad to see. The KJ21 has added the original Preface to the KJV entitled The Translators to the Reader (presented in an updated and abridged form). The editors of the KJ21 states: For your ease of reading, we have replaced obsolete and archaic words by the most exact modern synonyms, painstakingly chosen so as to insure no change in meaning. For example, the word gins has been replaced by traps; bewray by betray; stablish by establish; dehort by dissuade; reins by inmost being; minish by diminish; wist by knew; listed by pleased; carefully by intricately. These are only a few examples among many. (Preface, p. ix)

I can say that this statement, and the examples used, cause me some alarm. First, if these are "only a few examples among many" I wonder what the other changes are. What are the "many"? It is my nature to be skeptical when men take it upon themselves to alter God's word. Even when the motivation is to clarify, sometimes context is compromised. In times past, I have been told that modern version simply revise the "obsolete and archaic words" in the Authorized Version; only to find that the text has been changed or words and verses omitted. I was told the New Scofield

Reference Bible simply updated many of the "archaic words" of the King James, but did not change the text; then discovered that this was not true. (Such as in Dan 3:25 where the KJV states "and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." The NSRB reads "a son of the gods," thus taking Christ out of the fiery furnace). And so it was with the New King James Version, changing the text while claiming it was a King James Bible. I always become skeptical when I am lied to.

Secondly, I have noticed that when others care for my "ease of reading" and revise the text with "no change in meaning," that it does in fact change. Even though it may surprise some, God is not concerned with my "ease of reading." Instead, He expects me to study and search it out for myself (2Ti 2:15; Pro 25:2; John 5:39). Otherwise, our Lord never would have taught in parables. He did not do so to make it easy or to illustrate, He did it, "because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand." (Mat 13:13 and context).

Thirdly, once the words have been changed, the meaning is changed. We approach our study of the Bible with the attitude of "what does it mean?". God's attitude in scripture has always been, "what does it say." What God says is more important than what we think it means.

Finally, once you change the words, you have destroyed the cross-reference. We study and understand scripture in light of scripture. The word sheds light on the word. If words are replaced with modern words, our cross-reference has been rendered ineffective. One of the examples given by the editors of the KJ21 is that reins has been changed to inmost being. The word reins appears 15 times in the KJV. Of these, only 6 times has it been changed to inmost being (Psa 26:2; Psa 73:21; Pro 23:16; Jer 12:2; Jer 17:10; Jer 20:12. Instead it appears as loins (Job 16:13), heart (Job 19:27), souls (Psa 7:9), inner self (Psa 16:7), reins (Psa 139:13; and Isa 11:5), passions (Jer 11:20), inmost parts (Lam 3:13), and thoughts (Rev 2:23). One could argue that these words mean the same thing most of the time. But then we are back to "what it means" instead of "what it says." If I want to see how God uses the English word reins in His Book, I will have trouble doing so in the KJ21.

Another concern is found in Acts 7:45. The King James Bible reads, "Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles, whom God drave out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David;" Here, the KJ21 has changed the text to read "which also our fathers, who came later, brought with Joshua into the territory of the Gentiles, whom God drove out before the face of our fathers until the days of David." This is an example of the editors disregarding what the text says, and translating what they think it means. This is not updating "obsolete and archaic words," unless they think Jesus is either obsolete or archaic in this passage. Nor is this a clarification of Greek. The Greek word used is *lesou* (which is the genitive form of *lesous*; the Greek word for Jesus.) If one is reading the Greek text (any Greek text) it would read just as the King James Bible reads. Nor, is the KJ21 consistent in its changing of the text when the editors believe the word *lesou* should be Joshua. In Heb 4:8 the same Greek word is used and revised as Joshua in modern versions of the Bible (such as the NASV, NIV, and NRSV). Yet, the KJ21 renders the passage "For if Jesus had given them rest, then He would not afterwards have spoken of another day." If *lesou* in Acts 7:45 means Joshua, then why not translate it as Joshua in Heb 4:8? (The real truth is that the Holy Spirit, in Greek or in the English of the KJV, shows no difference because Joshua of old is a picture of Jesus; in that Joshua is a type of the second coming of Jesus Christ leading the nation of Israel into the promised land).

I am sure there are other examples and passages where the KJ21 falls short of its predecessor. However, that will be up to the student to research and locate additional examples.

I am not sure that the KJ21 will make a great deal of difference. Those who wish to revise or change the Authorized Version are never satisfied with what they have accomplished. This is why we have had so many versions and revisions over the past one hundred years. We have been told that some versions are given to make the Bible stronger in its text. So out comes the RV, ASV, RSV, ASV, Amp., NASV, and so on, only to fall out of favor within a few years and replaced with a newer version or revision. We have also been told that some versions are given to simplify the meaning of the Bible. So out comes the TEV, NIV, NRSV, TLB, Phillips, and so on. One wonders how many times it needs to be made simple.

I do not believe the KJ21 will be effective. Those who stand for the preservation of the word of God will not use it as their main Bible. Those wishing for an easy to read version will still use the NIV (which is revised every five years) or one of its kind. Sooner or later we will begin to understand that the Bible is God's Book, and if there is to be any revision or retranslating, it will be up to God to bring it to pass. And if He ever does, He will testify to it as He has the Authorized Version for the past four hundred years.

03 LESSON THREE

LESSON THREE: Listing some differences Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? (1Co 5:6) In the past two lessons we have laid a Biblical foundation for the study of manuscript evidence and discussed some basic terms and principles in the study of textual criticism. The focus of this lesson will deal with some of the differences found in translations of the Bible. It would be rather fallacious of us to discuss the topics and discoveries of textual criticism if we provided no evidence of any textual changes. Therefore, in this lesson we will list several of the textual changes between the Authorized Version and modern translations.

Those who claim that modern versions of the Bible and the King James Version differ only in that the modern versions update the archaic language found in the Authorized Version are either ill-informed or dishonest. Yet, this seems to be the major conception of many who use or support modern translations. All one need do to verify this point is ask the layperson who uses a modern version why they use it. A common response will be that the King James is too hard to understand and the modern version uses today's language.

There are those who are more informed on the subject and recognize that there are in fact translational and textual differences as well. However, these differences are either disregarded as unimportant or downplayed as extremely limited in nature. This can be illustrated in the following quotation by John R. Kohlenberger III.

First of all, and perhaps most important, is the reassurance that the number of possible variations in the text of the Bible is very small and does not affect any major teaching of Christianity. Many variations, in fact, are trivial. In 1Co 7:15, for instance, some manuscripts read, "For God has called us to peace," and others read, "For God has called you to peace." This change of person (in Greek only one letter's difference) does not affect Paul's point at all. (All About Bible, Oxford University Press, 1985. p.14). The point he makes is two-fold. First, no major doctrine is affected in any major translation of the Bible. Second, textual variations are small and trivial. Neither of these two points are correct.

First of all, one can prove major fundamental doctrine from any translation of the Bible. That does not mean that the doctrine is unaffected. For example, one can prove the Deity of Jesus Christ and the Biblical doctrine of the Trinity using the New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures (the official translation of the Jehovah's Witnesses), yet both of these Biblical truths are affected and changed in the NWT. The doctrines can be established, but are weakened in the NWT. Again, the virgin birth can be proven using the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. Yet it is rejected by many conservatives because the doctrine of the virgin birth is compromised in Isa 7:14 in the RSV (and NRSV). The doctrine of the blood atonement is impaired in the Today's English Version by changing blood to death in many references. Yet, the doctrine can be established using the TEV. The question is not, can we prove the doctrine? The question is, has the word of God been compromised? (Mat 16:12; 1Co 5:6).

Secondly, the textual variations are not simply small or trivial. True, many of the variations in the differing Greek texts and manuscripts are not of major importance, but many others are. And the variance is by no means small but reflect a large portion of the New Testament. All one needs to do to verify this point is secure a copy of the United Bible Society's Greek New Testament (any edition) and notice the textual variances on almost every page of this critical text. As stated in lesson two, the Greek text which underlined the King James Bible and the Greek text of Westcott and Hort (used for the Revised Version of 1881) differ over 5,000 times. Additionally, the number of changes which have occurred in the English translation of the Westcott and Hort text number well over 30,000.

Both of these points are established by Dr. Jack Lewis in his book, *The English Bible From KJV to NIV: A History and Evaluation* published by Baker Book House, 1981. It should be noted that Dr. Lewis helped with the translation of the New International Version and is not a King James only advocate. Concerning the Greek text of the Revised Version of 1881, Dr. Lewis writes, but the project ended with 5,788 changes in the underlying Greek text of the New Testament which was followed. About one-fourth of these are said to alter the subject matter. (Lewis, pp. 69-70. The are said comes from a book by Sir Frederick G. Kenyon entitled, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts.*) Dr. Lewis goes on to state about the American Standard Version of 1901 that, The instruction stated that the style and language of the KJV were to be maintained; nevertheless, in the end more than 36,191 corrections of various sorts were made in the New Testament. These included changes resulting from alterations in the Greek text itself, changes where the KJV appears to have chosen the poorer of two readings, changes where the KJV is ambiguous or obscure, changes where the KJV is not consistent with itself in rendering phrases or passages that are alike or paralleled, and changes that are required because of the other changes made. (Lewis, p. 70).

While I differ with Dr. Lewis' conclusions, his citation provides proof that the changes made in modern versions reflect more than the updating of language. Further, Dr. Lewis not only gives us a total of changes made in the two differing Greek texts (5,788) but establishes that additional changes have been made in the English translations (36,191 in the ASV). And these changes do not account for the thee's and thou's found in the KJV because the ASV also uses thee and thou in its text. Thus, we see the changes are by no means small.

One notable difference deals with the number of verses omitted from modern versions of the Bible. While there are many places where phrases or words have been either changed or omitted, here we see whole verses omitted or bracketed in modern versions as compared with the KJV. For example, both the New American Standard Version (NASV) and the New International Version (NIV) omit the following verses.

Mat 17:21 Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.

Mark 7:16 If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.

Mark 9:44 Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. (Also true of verse 46 which reads the same).

Mark 11:26 But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.

Mark 15:28 And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.

Luk 17:36 Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

Luk 23:17 (For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)

John 5:4 For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.

Acts 8:37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

Acts 15:34 Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still.

Acts 24:7 But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands, Acts 28:29 And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.

Rom 16:24 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

1Jn 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

These same conservative translations (NASV and NIV) also bracket Mark 16:9-20 (the ending to the Gospel of Mark) and John 7:53; John 8:1-11 (about the woman caught in adultery). They footnote these two passages stating "The earliest and most reliable manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 16:9-20/Joh 7:53; John 8:1-11" (NIV), thus calling into question the scriptural authority of these two passages. The Revised Standard Version (RSV), New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), and New English Version (NEV) go further by not only omitting the above references from their text, but also omit the following verses.

Mat 12:47 Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee.

Mat 18:11 For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.

Mat 21:44 And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.

Mat 23:14 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer:

Luk 22:20 Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.

Luk 24:12 Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass.

Luk 24:40 and when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet. By confining these verses to footnotes, these translations demonstrate that the Greek text from which they are

translated from do not contain these verses as part of their text. As Bible-believing Christians, this leaves us with a dilemma. Three times the Bible warns against adding to or taking from the word of God (Deu 4:2; Pro 30:6; and Rev 22:18). Therefore, we must conclude that the Greek texts which underline modern translations are corrupt in removing these verses from the text, or else the Greek text which underlined the KJV is corrupt for adding these verses to the text. Either way, one cannot be Biblical and believe that the KJV and modern versions are both the word of God. It is obvious that one of these lines has either added to or taken from the word of God, which is a violation of scripture. Which ever one is shown in error, is corrupt and must be rejected by the Bible-believing Christian.

Differences may be noted by comparing the KJV with the NIV. These are the two best selling versions of the English Bible, and are both considered conservative translations.

KJV RENDERING

NIV RENDERING

Mat 6:13 And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

Mat 6:13 And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.

Mat 9:13 But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

Mat 9:13 But go and learn what this means: I desire mercy, not sacrifice. For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners.

Mat 20:23 And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.

Mat 20:23 Jesus said to them, You will indeed drink from my cup, but to sit at my right or left is not for me to grant. These places, belong to those for whom they have been prepared by my Father.

Mark 1:2 As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

Mark 1:2 It is written in Isaiah the prophet: I will send my messenger ahead of you who will prepare your way.

Mark 6:11 And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city.

Mark 6:11 And if any place will not welcome you or listen to you, shake the dust off your feet when you leave, as a testimony against them.

Luk 2:33 And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

Luk 2:33 The child's father and mother marveled at what was said about him.

Luk 4:4 And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.

Luk 4:4 Jesus answered, It is written: Man does not live on bread alone.

John 1:18 No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

John 1:18 No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only, who is at the Father's side, has made him known. (The NASV reads, "No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him.")

Acts 2:30 Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;

Acts 2:30 But he was a prophet and knew that God had promised him on oath that he would place one of his descendants on his throne.

Acts 9:6 And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.

Acts 9:6 Now get up and go into the city, and you will be told what you must do.

Rom 1:16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

Rom 1:16 I am not ashamed of the gospel, because it is the power of God for the salvation of everyone who believes: first for the Jew, then for the Gentile.

Rom 8:1 There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

Rom 8:1 Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus,

Col 1:14 In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:

Col 1:14 In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.

1Ti 3:16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

1Ti 3:16 Beyond all question, the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in a body, was vindicated by the Spirit, was seen by angels, was preached among the nations, was believed on in the world, was taken up in glory.

Rev 1:6 And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

Rev 1:6 And has made us to be a kingdom and priests to serve his God and Father--to him be glory and power for ever and ever! Amen.

Rev 1:11 Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.

Rev 1:11 Which said: Write on a scroll what you see and send it to the seven churches: to Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea.

If these few examples do not suffice, the student is free to compare any of the following references with any major modern translation of the Bible. Again, these are only a few of the many changes found within the two line of Greek texts as reflected in English translations.

Mat 5:27; Mat 5:44; Mat 13:51; Mat 15:6; Mat 15:8; Mat 19:9; Mat 19:20; Mat 20:7; Mat 20:16; Mat 20:22; Mat 22:13; Mat 23:4-5; Mat 25:13; Mat 26:3; Mat 26:60; Mat 27:35; Mat 28:2; Mat 28:9.

Mark 1:1; Mark 1:14; Mark 1:42; Mark 3:5; Mark 3:15; Mark 6:33; Mark 6:36; Mark 7:2; Mark 7:8; Mark 8:9; Mark 8:26; Mark 9:38; Mark 9:45; Mark 9:49; Mark 10:7; Mark 10:21; Mark 10:24; Mark 11:8; Mark 11:10; Mark 11:23; Mark 12:23; Mark 12:29-30; Mark 12:33; Mark 13:11; Mark 13:14; Mark 14:19; Mark 14:27; Mark 14:68; Mark 14:70; Mark 15:3.

Luk 1:28-29; Luk 2:42; Luk 4:5; Luk 4:8; Luk 4:18; Luk 5:38; Luk 6:45; Luk 7:31; Luk 8:43; Luk 8:45; Luk 8:48; Luk 8:54; Luk 9:10; Luk 9:54-56; Luk 10:38; Luk 11:2; Luk 11:4; Luk 11:11; Luk 11:44; Luk 11:54; Luk 12:39; Luk 17:9; Luk 17:24; Luk 18:24; Luk 19:45; Luk 20:13; Luk 20:23; Luk 20:30; Luk 22:31; Luk 22:64; Luk 22:68; Luk 23:23; Luk 23:38; Luk 24:1; Luk 24:36; Luk 24:42; Luk 24:46; Luk 24:51-52.

John 1:27; John 3:13; John 3:15; John 5:3; John 5:16; John 6:11; John 6:22; John 6:47; John 6:51; John 7:46; John 8:9-10; John 8:59; John 9:6; John 10:13; John 10:26; John 11:41; John 12:1; John 13:32; John 16:16; John 17:12; John 19:16.

Acts 2:47; Acts 3:11; Acts 7:37; Acts 9:5; Acts 10:6; Acts 10:12; Acts 10:21; Acts 10:32; Acts 13:42; Acts 15:18; Acts 15:24; Acts 18:21; Acts 20:15; Acts 21:8; Acts 21:22; Acts 21:25; Acts 22:9; Acts 22:20; Acts 23:9; Acts 24:6; Acts 24:8; Acts 24:26; Acts 26:30; Acts 28:16.

Rom 9:28; Rom 9:32; Rom 10:15; Rom 11:6; Rom 13:9; Rom 14:6; Rom 14:21; Rom 15:24; Rom 15:29.

1Co 6:20; 1Co 10:28; 1Co 11:24; 1Co 15:54.

2Co 5:17; 2Co 12:9; 2Co 13:2 Gal 3:1; Gal 4:15; Gal 5:19; Gal 5:21.

Eph 1:15; Eph 3:14; Eph 5:30.

Php 3:16; Php 3:21; Php 4:23.

Col 1:2; Col 2:18; Col 3:6.

1Th 1:1; 1Th 2:15; 1Th 3:2.

1Ti 1:17; 1Ti 3:3; 1Ti 5:4; 1Ti 5:16; 1Ti 6:5; 1Ti 6:7.

Heb 2:7; Heb 3:6; Heb 7:21; Heb 8:12; Heb 10:30; Heb 10:34; Heb 11:11; Heb 11:13; Heb 12:20.

1Pe 1:22; 1Pe 4:3; 1Pe 4:14; 1Pe 5:2; 1Pe 5:5; 1Pe 5:11.

2Pe 1:21; 2Pe 3:10.

1Jn 4:3; 1Jn 5:13.

Rev 1:8; Rev 5:14; Rev 11:1; Rev 11:17; Rev 14:5; Rev 15:2; Rev 21:24; Rev 22:14; Rev 22:19.

There are also places where translations differ among themselves which do not account for the differences in the Greek texts.

KJV RENDERING

MODERN RENDERING(S)

1Co 7:36 But if any man think that he behaveth himself uncomely toward his virgin, if she pass the flower of her age, and need so require, let him do what he will, he sinneth not: let them marry.

1Co 7:36 If anyone thinks his is acting improperly toward the virgin he is engaged to, and if she is getting along in years and he feels he ought to marry, he should do as he wants. He is not sinning. They should get married. (NIV) But if any man thinks that he is acting unbecomingly toward his virgin daughter, if she should be of full age, and if it must be so, let him do what he wishes, he does not sin; let her marry. (NASB)

There are three differing translations of the same Greek phrase, ten parthenon autou (the virgin of him).

2Co 2:17 For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.

2Co 2:17 Unlike so many, we do not peddle the word of God for profit. On the contrary, in Christ we speak before God with sincerity, like men sent from God. (NIV)

The same Greek word *kapeleuontesis* translated as *corrupt and peddle*, which are two different meanings.

Tit 2:11 For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men,

Tit 2:11 For the grace of God has appeared for the salvation of all men, (RSV)

The same Greek phrase can be translated either way, and thus convey two different meanings.

While I have limited the discussion to the differences in translation of the New Testament, the same can be seen in how modern versions differ in the Old Testament.

KJV RENDERING

MODERN RENDERING(S)

1Sa 13:1 Saul reigned one year; and when he had reigned two years over Israel,

1Sa 13:1 Saul was thirty years old when he became king, and he reigned over Israel forty two years. (NIV) Saul was forty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned thirty-two years over Israel. (NASB) Saul was . . . years old when he began to reign; and he reigned . . . and two years

over Israel. (NRSV)

2Sa 21:19 And there was again a battle in Gob with the Philistines, where Elhanan the son of Jaareoregim, a Bethlehemite, slew the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

2Sa 21:19 Then there was another battle with the Philistines at Gob; and Elhanan son of Jaare-oregim, the Bethlehemite, killed Goliath the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam. (NRSV)

Dan 3:25 He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in The midst of the fire and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.

Dan 3:25 He answered and said, Look! I see four men loosed and walking about in the midst of the fire without harm, and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods. (NASB)

There are also many places where names referring to Deity are either removed or not fully used. To counter this, James R. White has developed what he calls an expansion of piety theory. He states, "It led people to naturally expand the titles used of the Lord, possibly even without their conscious effort to change the text." (The King James Only Controversy, p. 46). Thus, according to White, phrases such as Lord Jesus Christ were really Lord Jesus. White offers 23 examples. The truth is that there are far more than 23 times in the New Testament where the names of Deity are omitted by modern versions and their Greek texts. The Nestle Greek text has 230 such omissions while the United Bible Society's Greek text has 212. This is reflected in the modern translation as well. The NASV has 210 such omissions, the NIV has 173, and the RSV has 213. The sheer number of such omissions demonstrate the White's expansion of piety theory is erroneous. It is possible to conceive that somewhere in the process of transmission a scribe unconsciously added Christ to Lord Jesus or Lord to Jesus Christ. But to have this occur over 200 times would be a deliberate act, not an unconscious expansion as White suggests.

Further, some of these omissions consists of more than a partial removal of a phrase. Divine names and titles are omitted such as Spirit, Father, God, Son of Man, Master, the Son, The Beginning, The Ending, as well as, Lord, Christ, and Jesus. Since the Bible says of Christ, "that in all things he might have the preeminence." (Col 1:18), it might do us well to have a Bible that maintains the names and titles of Deity over 200 times more than modern versions do. So that the student may "search the scriptures" to see if these things are so, the following are the references where the names and titles of Deity are omitted.

Mat 4:12; Mat 4:18; Mat 4:23; Mat 6:33; Mat 8:3; Mat 8:5; Mat 8:7; Mat 8:29; Mat 9:12; Mat 12:25; Mat 13:36; Mat 13:51; Mat 14:14; Mat 14:22; Mat 14:25; Mat 15:16; Mat 15:30; Mat 16:20; Mat 17:11; Mat 17:20; Mat 18:2; Mat 18:11; Mat 19:17; Mat 21:12; Mat 22:30; Mat 22:32; Mat 22:37; Mat 23:8; Mat 24:2; Mat 25:13; Mat 28:6.

Mark 1:1; Mark 1:41; Mark 5:13; Mark 5:19; Mark 6:34; Mark 7:27; Mark 8:1; Mark 8:17; Mark 9:24; Mark 10:6; Mark 10:52; Mark 11:10-11; Mark 11:14-15; Mark 11:26; Mark 12:27; Mark 12:32; Mark 12:41; Mark 14:22; Mark 14:45.

Luk 2:40; Luk 4:4; Luk 4:41; Luk 7:22; Luk 7:31; Luk 8:38; Luk 9:43; Luk 9:56-57; Luk 9:59-60; Luk 10:21; Luk 12:31; Luk 13:2; Luk 13:25; Luk 21:4; Luk 22:31; Luk 22:63; Luk 23:42-43; Luke 24:36

24:36.

John 3:2; John 3:34; John 4:16; John 4:42; John 4:46; John 5:17; John 5:30; John 6:14; John 6:39; John 6:69; John 8:1; John 8:4; John 8:6; John 8:9-11; John 8:16; John 8:20-21; John 8:29; John 9:35; John 11:45; John 13:3; John 13:32; John 16:16; John 18:5; John 19:38-39.

Acts 2:30; Acts 3:26; Acts 4:24; Acts 7:30; Acts 7:32; Acts 7:37; Acts 7:46; Acts 8:37; Acts 9:5-6; Acts 9:29; Acts 15:11; Acts 15:18; Acts 16:31; Acts 19:4; Acts 19:10; Acts 20:21; Acts 20:25; Acts 22:16; Acts 23:9.

Rom 1:16; Rom 6:11; Rom 8:1; Rom 14:6; Rom 15:8; Rom 15:19; Rom 16:18; Rom 16:20; Rom 16:24.

1Co 1:14; 1Co 5:4-5; 1Co 6:20; 1Co 9:1; 1Co 9:18; 1Co 10:28; 1Co 11:29; 1Co 15:47; 1Co 16:22-23.

2Co 4:6; 2Co 4:10; 2Co 5:18; 2Co 10:7; 2Co 11:31.

Gal 1:15; Gal 3:17; Gal 4:7; Gal 6:15; Gal 6:17.

Eph 3:9; Eph 3:14; Eph 5:9.

Php 4:13.

Col 1:2; Col 1:28; Col 2:2.

1Th 1:1; 1Th 2:19; 1Th 3:11; 1Th 3:13.

2Th 1:8; 2Th 1:12; 2Th 2:4 1Ti 1:1; 1Ti 2:7; 1Ti 3:16; 1Ti 5:21.

2Ti 4:1; 2Ti 4:22.

Tit 1:4.

Philemon verse 6.

Heb 3:1; Heb 10:9; Heb 10:30.

Jas 1:12.

1Pe 1:22; 1Pe 5:10; 1Pe 5:14.

1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 3:16; 1Jn 4:3; 1Jn 5:7; 1Jn 5:13.

2 John verses 3,9.

Jude verse 4.

Rev 1:8-9; Rev 1:11; Rev 12:17; Rev 14:5; Rev 16:5; Rev 19:1; Rev 20:9; Rev 20:12; Rev 21:3-4; Rev 22:21. As the student studies all of these examples, which are only a few of the 5,788 differences in the two Greek texts, the conclusion must be that the two texts do differ and do so substantially. The claims, therefore, that all a modern version does is update the outdated language of the Authorized Version, or that the changes made are small in number and trivial in content, are obviously erroneous. In our next two lessons we will cover the history of these two

lines of manuscripts and account for the cause of perversion as well as preservation.

QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS:

How do manuscripts support Paul's discussion of the "Baptism for the Dead". It is only mentioned once in the KJB and I can find no doctrine to support it. The passage comes from 1Co 15:29 and reads as follows, "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?"

It is mentioned only once in the KJB, but than it is also mentioned only once in the NASV and the NIV (and other modern versions). This is not a limited translation of the King James, nor is it a variance in the wording of the Greek. Both the Greek text of the King James and the Greek text of modern versions have the same Greek words. The only variation deals with punctuation. The King James places the question after the second clause, "if the dead rise not at all?". Modern versions and their Greek texts place the question after the first clause, "Otherwise, what will those do who are baptized for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they baptized for them?" (NASV). The student will recall that old Greek manuscripts (uncials on either papyrus or vellum) did not have word separation or punctuation. And, the minuscules did not always use punctuation either. Since we no longer have any of the autographs, it is hard to say how they were written or where the punctuation was placed. This verse has been used to support the Mormon doctrine of baptizing for the dead (which was not limited to the modern Mormon). The question here is theological and not one dealing with textual criticism. I do not believe the answer to this problem passage will be found in where the proper placement of the question mark belongs. I believe the context sheds light on the text. As one reads the context, it is obvious that Paul is building a case about the resurrection (both of Christ and of the saints). It is important to notice how the persons are used in this passage. The verse states, "Else what shall they do" and "why are they then baptized for the dead?". The next verse reads, "And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?". Notice how the text changes persons from third person plural to first person plural. The text changes from they to we. If baptism for the dead were a part of Christian doctrine and needful in the church, Paul would have included himself and other believers in the act of baptizing for the dead (i.e. "Else what shall we do" and "why are we then baptized for the dead?"). Also, he and others would have mentioned this doctrine elsewhere in scripture if it were to be a Christian practice. Instead it is limited to one passage, which is offered to discuss the resurrection.

Personally, I believe Paul was using an example. Cults and heretics in Paul's day were practicing the doctrine of baptizing for the dead in hope of saving the souls of the departed. Paul's point is, if there is no resurrection, then why do we see non-Christians practicing a doctrine in hope of saving those who have already died? Even the heathen, in their false worship, recognize there is a resurrection, which is why they baptize for the dead. The resurrection is, therefore, a universal belief among all religions. This would not be the first time Paul compared the false practices of the heathen with Biblical truths to illustrate scriptural teachings (Acts 17:22-34; Rom 1:18-23).

Yours in Christ Jesus,

Thomas Holland

Psa 118:8

Additionally, Dr. Thomas Cassidy and Brother Thomas Hubeart sent me e-mail on the topic of Baptism for the Dead. Although this [class] deals with theology and not manuscript evidence, I thought it might be of interest to those wishing to read other views concerning this subject. I thank these two brothers for sending me the attached points of view. ... I hope this information is a blessing to all.

Subj: Re: Lesson Three Date: 96-02-07 13:14:52 EST From: tcassidy@sisna.com From: tcassidy@sisna.com (Dr. Thomas Cassidy) To: User192905@aol.com At 03:23Amo 2:1-16/7/96 -0500, User192905@aol.com wrote: May I offer a different view of the passage in question?

Paul begins talking about the resurrection in verse 20, and spends the next 8 verses making it very plain that not only Christ rose from the dead, but that the Apostles and Prophets will also rise physically on that coming resurrection day. In verses 29 through 34 Paul asks some questions concerning Christian practice (not doctrine). If Christ, the Apostles, the Prophets, are all dead, why be baptized on the basis of their teaching, for their teaching was obviously wrong. Baptism pictures the death, burial, and RESURRECTION. If there is no resurrection, baptism does not make any sense, and to be baptized because a bunch of dead guys said so is just plain silly. Paul then says the same thing about preaching and missions work. If all the guys that said to do that are dead forever, why take orders from a bunch of dead guys?

Why put my life in danger for nothing? Why fight with beasts (and men!) if the Gospel of the Resurrection (see verse 4) is not true. He then says in verse 34, "Awake to righteousness, and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God: I speak this to your shame." Because some of these Corinthian believers did not believe in the resurrection, they were not keeping the great commission, and many of their friends and neighbors had not heard the Gospel from them. Paul says "Shame on you and your unbelief."

Seems to fit the context of the truth of the resurrection.

Thomas Cassidy tcassidy@sisna.com Subj: Re: Lesson Three (Baptism for the Dead) Date: 96-02-07 19:50:29 EST

From: BasFawltly

To: User192905

Doc: Your "questions from students" section this time reminded me of something I had posted in one of the download libraries of the religion forum, giving the exposition of Thomas Scott on the passage. Perhaps you will find it of interest. :) (I would circulate it among the class, but I find that with all the changes that have been made and the "BCC" we are doing to keep everyone from getting a bunch of names on each transmission, I don't have an updated class list! :O Well, perhaps if you find it adds anything to what you've already said so well, you can cite it in your next installment.)

Best in Christ,

(The other) TH.

"1Co 15:29 (KJV) Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?" This passage has given rise to many novel and bizarre interpretations by groups attempting to claim scriptural justification for "baptism for the dead"--a justification, let it be noted, that cannot be built on any clear doctrinal passage in the Bible. As many Christians consider it a problematic passage, and because many groups such as the Mormons exploit the misunderstanding of this passage by Christians (see, for example, Stephen E. Robinson, *Are Mormons Christians?*, Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1991, p. 19), I thought it would be useful to circulate the comments of Rev. Thomas Scott on it.

I do not have any other information on Rev. Scott other than that found in an old (1832) copy of Vol. 3 of his commentary on the Bible, but it appears from this that he was "Rector of Aston Sanford, Bucks." (according to the title page), indicating that he was British. Also, he was active toward the close of the 18th century, since he quotes from his own answer to Thomas Paine's *Age of Reason*. However, Scott's work is of such quality that it recommends itself, and his treatment of this verse may be found especially helpful by Christians.

Here are Scott's comments on the verse: The expression "baptized for the dead," has given occasion to a variety of ingenious conjectures and learned discussions. Some argue that [it] only means, 'baptized in the name of one who certainly died, and who, "if the dead rise not," 'still remains among the dead.' But the word rendered "dead" is plural, and all the labour bestowed to remove that difficulty is to no purpose. Others suppose, that the apostle refers to a practice, which, it seems, at one time prevailed in the church, of baptizing a living person in the stead, and for the supposed benefit, of one who had died unbaptized. But who can imagine, that so absurd and gross a superstition was customary, when the apostle wrote? Or that, if it were, he should sanction it?

Beza, rather triumphantly, concludes that he has discovered and fixed the true interpretation; and that the apostle meant the washing of the dead bodies, among the Jews and Christians, before burial; (Acts 9:37.) which he thinks was a profession that they expected a resurrection. But the use of the word baptize, in such a connexion, could hardly be expected; and the words will not bear that sense, by any fair interpretation.

Hammond contends, that it means the profession of faith, concerning the resurrection of the dead, which was required of persons at their baptism, which represented, as he thinks, the burial and resurrection of Christ. 'Why did they profess this, if they did not believe it?' But this is far from satisfactory: for the peculiar circumstances of some persons, when they were baptized, seem evidently intended. 'What this baptizing for the dead was, I confess I know not; but it seems by the following verses, to be something, wherein they exposed themselves to the danger of death.' [says John] Locke. The following interpretation, however, suggested by Dr. Doddridge, who received it from Sir Richard Ellis, appears the true one. The apostle refers to the case of those, who presented themselves for baptism, immediately after the martyrdom of their brethren, or at their funerals; as if fresh soldiers should enlist and press forward to the assault, to supply the places of those who had fallen in battle. Thus they professed their faith in Christ, and ventured the rage of their enemies, at the very time when others had been put to death for the gospel. But what advantage could they propose to themselves from such a conduct, if there were no resurrection? Or what wisdom could there be in so doing? For in this case, Christianity itself would lose the great

evidence of its truth; even the immortality of the soul might be called in question; believers were yet "in their sins;" and they who died as martyrs had lost their souls, as well as their lives. This might show the Corinthian speculators how greatly their notions tended to discourage men from professing the gospel in times of persecution, and to make them afraid and ashamed to own the cause of Christ. If this were the case, why did Christians in general, or the apostles and evangelists in particular, live in continual and imminent danger of suffering and death, by their open profession of the gospel, and their zeal in promoting it? They could have no sufficient encouragement for so doing, if the dead should never arise.

(SOURCE: Thomas Scott, *The Holy Bible . . . with Explanatory Notes, Practical Observations, and Copious Marginal References*, Vol. 3 [New Testament], New York: Collins & Hannay, 1832, pp. 601-2. Paragraph divisions added.)

04 LESSON FOUR

LESSON 4: Early heresies and the Western and Alexandrian line

(NOTE: The student should be forewarned that the material in these next two lessons is lengthy but essential in the understanding of textual criticism and our approach to that study.)

Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. (Mat 7:17-20)

EARLY HERESIES The Bible warns that there would be those who would "corrupt the word of God" (2Co 2:17) and handle it "deceitfully" (2Co 4:2). There would arise false gospels with false epistles (2Th 2:2), along with false prophets and teachers who would not only bring in "damnable heresies" but would seek to "make merchandise" of the true believer through their own "feigned words" (2Pe 2:1-3). It did not take long for this to occur. In the days of the Apostles, and shortly afterwards, several doctrinal heresies arose. Docetism, Marcionism, Gnosticism and Allegoricalism were four of these heresies. Their early beginnings are referred to in the New Testament in such places as Gal 1:6-8; 1Jn 4:3; 2Jn 1:7; and Jude 1:3-4. These heresies not only plagued the early Church, but are still with us today, in modern form, in many contemporary Christian cults. These false doctrines had an influence on the transmission of scripture and account for some of the differences in the line of manuscripts.

DOCETISM This was a form of Gnosticism which taught that Christ's body was a phantom and not physical. Only the spiritual was good, while the physical was evil. The nature of Christ was two-fold, spiritual and physical. Jesus was the physical, Christ was the spiritual. The Christ departed Jesus at the crucifixion, and left him on the cross to suffer and die. The Docetics (and Gnostics) wrote their own Gospels including The Acts of John and The Gospel of Peter. The Gospel of Peter was cited by Justin Martyr, Origen, and Eusebius, but was not discovered by scholars until 1886. While excavating the grave of a monk, a French archaeological team discovered this manuscript in Egypt. Only a small portion of it remains, but what does give a differing account of the crucifixion than the four Gospels. This separation of the Christ from Jesus is seen in the following quotation. And many went about with lamps, supposing that it was night, and fell down. And the Lord cried out, saying, My power, my power, thou hast forsaken me. And when he had said it he was taken up. And in that hour the veil of the temple of Jerusalem was rent in twain. (Gospel of Peter, verse 5).

Thus, according to the Docetics, the power of Jesus, the Christ, left him while he was on the cross. The account of the resurrection is also Docetic. And in the night in which the Lord's day was drawing on, as the soldiers kept guard two by two in a watch, there was a great voice in the heaven; and they saw the heavens opened, and two men descend from thence with great light and approach the tomb. And that stone which was put at the door rolled of itself and made way in part;

and the tomb was opened, and both the young men entered in. When therefore those soldiers saw it, they awakened the centurion and the elders; for they too were hard by keeping guard. And as they declared what things they had seen, again they see three men come forth from the tomb, and two of them supporting one, and a cross following them: and of the two the head reached unto the heaven, but the head of him who was lead by them overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice form the heavens saying, Thou has preached to them that sleep. And a response was heard from the cross, Yea. (Gospel of Peter, verses 9-10). The Docetics used and corrected the Gospel of Mark as demonstrated by Irenaeus,

Those who separate Jesus from Christ and say that Christ remained impassible while Jesus suffered, and try to bring forward the Gospel According to Mark, can be corrected out of that, if they will read it with a love of the truth. (Ireaneus' Against Heresies, cited from Early Christian Fathers Vol 1; translated by Cyril C. Richardson and published by The Westminster Press, page 382). The Latin manuscript k may reflect such tampering and has been suggested so by Dr. Edward F. Hills. Mark 16:4 reads as follows in k,

Suddenly, moreover, at the third hour of the day, darkness fell upon the whole world, and angels descended from heaven, and as the Son of God was rising in brightness, they ascended at the same time with him, and straightway it was light. This citation from k matches the citation from the Gospel of Peter about the resurrection. It also contains the short ending to Mark and omits verses 9-20, as many modern translations and their Greek texts do. We can conclude from this that the Docetics used a copy of Mark which would read like many contemporary translations.

MARCIONISM

Marcion was influenced by the Gnostic, but not to the degree of fully embracing Gnosticism. Instead, he developed his own religious following, vowing to complete the work of St. Paul and separate Judaism from Christian teachings. However, he did so in a very anti-Semitic way. In 140 AD he went to Rome and established his doctrines, teaching that the God of the Old Testament could not have been the Father of Jesus Christ, because Christ speaks of His Father as a God of love and the God of the Jews was a God of wrath. Marcion taught that Jehovah, the God of the Old Testament, created the world, but that all created flesh was evil. The soul was created by a greater god over Jehovah. This other god created the spiritual realm and was the true Father of Jesus Christ. To release man's soul from his flesh, this greater god sent Christ. Christ appeared, in the form of a thirty-year-old man, in an unreal-spiritual body, not a physical one. Salvation was gained by renouncing Jehovah and all things physical. Marcion rejected the Hebrew Scriptures, and their quotations in the New Testament. The followers of Marcion issued their own New Testament composed of Luke and Paul's letters. This would account for some of the variations in these books among the manuscripts, seeing that the followers of Marcion would want these books to reflect their doctrines. The same is true today when contemporary cults slightly alter scripture to reflect their own private interpretation.

Again, Irenaeus points out that "Marcion cut up that According to Luke" (Ireaneus' Against Heresies, p. 382). This would account for the large number of changes found in varying manuscripts of Luke and the large number of verses omitted (as shown in lesson three). It is, for example, understandable why the phrase "And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet." (Luk 24:40) would be omitted by Marcion, since he did not believe in the

physical resurrection of Jesus but only in a spiritual resurrection. In fact, the apparatus of the United Bible Society's Greek text points out that this verse is omitted by both Marcion and Codex D (UBS, 2nd ed., p. 317). This verse is omitted from the text of the NEB and RSV. Thus we see that Codex D, which is a Western line of manuscripts in the Gospels, and the RSV reflect some of the tampering done by Marcion and his followers.

GNOSTICISM

Gnosticism was by far the most influential heresy faced by the early Church. Not only did the Gnostic corrupt many readings found in the New Testament, but offered their own writings as inspired scriptures, such as the The Gospel of Thomas, The Gospel of the Ebionites, The Acts of Andrew, and The Gospel of Mary (Magdalene). Gnosticism had a variety of forms and sects which broadened its base and growth. Historian Will Durant calls Gnosticism "the quest of godlike knowledge (gnosis) through mystic means" (The Story Of Civilization Vol. III, p. 604). As in Docetism and Marcionism, the Gnostics taught that the physical was evil and the spiritual was good. Thus, a good god (spiritual) could not have created a physical world, because good can not create evil (that is the spiritual would not create the physical). So the Gnostic god created a being (or a line of beings called aeons) removing himself from direct creation. One of these aeons, or gods, created the world. The so-called Christian Gnostics believed that Jesus was one of these aeons who created the world. Some Gnostic taught that Jesus did not have a physical body. When he walked on the earth, he left not footprints because he never really touched the earth (he being spiritual and the world physical). Others taught that only our spiritual bodies were important, so the physical body could engage in whatever acts they desired because only the spiritual body would be saved. Still other Gnostics taught that the physical body was so evil that it must be denied in order for the spiritual body to gain salvation, thus shunning marriage and certain foods (1Ti 4:1-3). The influence of Gnosticism can be seen in some of the heresies of today. For example, many of the teachings stated above are found, in revised form, in the teachings of the Watchtower of the Jehovah's Witnesses. To the Jehovah's Witness, Jesus is a created god, not God manifest in the flesh. It is no wonder that the Watchtower's New World Translation omits "God manifest in the flesh" in 1Ti 3:16 and replaces it with "He was made manifest in flesh." The Greek text which underlines the NWT has made the change, so it is natural for the Watchtower to prefer the reading which reflects its doctrine. The same is true of John 1:18 where the NWT reads, "the only-begotten god" (Gk. monogenes theos). Again, this is because the Greek text of the NWT reads differently from the Greek text of the KJV, "only begotten Son" (Gk. monogenes heios). What is amazing is that in both of these examples, the NASV agrees with the NWT because they are both based on the same Greek text. Thus, false doctrine has influenced the various manuscripts, just as it influences translations today. The phrase "only begotten god" is supported by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Jerome, papyrus 66 and the Alexandrian line of manuscripts. The phrase "only begotten Son" is quoted by Chrysostom, Tertullian, Basil, the Old Latin and Old Syrian translations and the majority of all Greek manuscripts.

Another example of some Gnostics teachings concerns the dual sexual nature of God. In her book, The Gnostic Gospels, Elaine Pagels points out that the some Gnostic taught that God was both Father and Mother. Pagels writes,

One group of gnostic (sic) sources claims to have received a secret tradition from Jesus through James and through Mary Magdalene. Members of this group prayed to both the divine Father and Mother. . . Since the Genesis account goes on to say that humanity was created male and female (1:27), some concluded that the God in whose image we are made must also be both masculine and feminine--both Father and Mother. (pp. 58-59).

Pagels also points out that Clement of Alexandria was influenced by this false doctrine of a masculo-feminine God. "Clement," writes Pagels, "characterized God in feminine as well as masculine terms" (p.81). She then cites Clement as writing, The Word is everything to the child, both father and mother, teacher and nurse. . . .The nutriment is the milk of the Father. . .and the Word alone supplies us children with the milk of love, and only those who suck at this breast are truly happy. For this reason, seeking is called sucking; to those infants who seek the Word, the Father's loving breasts supply milk. (p. 81).

It would seem that both Clement and the Gnostics would be pleased with the modern politically correct Inclusive Version (published by Oxford Press). The Lord's prayer reads, "Our Father-Mother in heaven, hallowed be your name. Your dominion come, Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." All references to God in this translation reflect the masculo-feminine doctrine of the Gnostics and Clement of Alexandria.

ALLEGORICALISM The majority of early Church Fathers, especially from the Alexandrian and Western line, relied heavily upon Allegoricalism. This is not an organized heresy, as the other three are; instead it is a general interpretation of the scriptures. To allegorize scripture means to interpret the word spiritually and not literally. To the Allegoricalist, the words of scripture are not as important as the meaning or teaching of scripture. The word is not to be taken literally, but carries a deeper, spiritual message. This is why many of the early Church Fathers did not use precise quotations from the New Testament, as much as they did allusions and loose citations. What the Bible means, to them, was more important than what it said. This form of spiritualizing the scriptures is not only reflected in many of the writings of the early Church Fathers, but is a prominent view of Biblical interpretation today. It is the primary view of both moderate and liberal theologians, and the developed interpretation of the Roman Catholic Church. It is also reflective of how one translates the scriptures as well as interprets. If the message is more important than the words, than all we need to do is translate the message and not the words. This is the difference between two methods of translation, the formal equivalent (that is, word for word translation), and dynamic equivalent (that is, thought for thought translation). Examples of formal equivalent translations would be the KJV (of the Traditional text) and the NASV (of the Alexandrian text). Dynamic equivalent translations would be illustrated by versions like the NIV, TEV, and NRSV.

THE LINE OF MODERN TRANSLATIONS

Jesus taught us that if a tree is corrupt, the fruit will be corrupt. Likewise, if a tree is good, the fruit will be good (Mat 7:17). He was speaking of false prophets. False prophets and false teachers corrupt the scriptures (2Pe 2:1-3). We are told we can recognize these false prophets and teachers by their fruits. An apple tree produces apples, a fig tree brings forth figs. So the fruit of the false prophet is false prophecies and the fruit of the false teacher is false doctrine. If a man's doctrine is in suspect of being corrupt, we must conclude that he will do the same to the scriptures (2Co 2:17). So, if a man's teachings are good and sound, we can expect that those sound

teachings came from sound scriptures. The two go hand in hand. In the transmission of scripture, we must understand that there will always be a line of perversion as there will be of preservation. According to our Lord, we must become fruit inspectors. The remainder of this lesson and the next will demonstrate both lines in operation. The following are a few of the Western (Rome) and Alexandrian (Egypt) Church Fathers stating some of their doctrines and influences upon the study of textual criticism. Additionally, the same is shown concerning a few contemporary scholars who have likewise influenced the study of textual criticism and laid the foundation for modern translations of the Bible.

TATIAN (110-180 AD)

Tatian, a disciple of Justin Martyr, was a doctrinal apologist and textual scholar. In 170 AD he produced a harmony of the Gospels known as the Diatessaron (Greek meaning, through the four). It is thought that this harmony was written in Greek and translated into Syriac, but it is possible that it was originally written in Syriac. The Bishop of Syria, Theodoret, thought it so corrupt that he had all 200 known copies destroyed. Today, we only have a fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron along with two Arabic translations and a commentary on it.

Geisler and Nix point out that Tatian "came under the influence of Gnosticism after the death of Justin." (A General Introduction To The Bible, p. 351). Eusebius records several of Tatian's heretical views in his Ecclesiastical History. Eusebius writes,

He (Tatian) established his own type of doctrine, telling stories of invisible Aeons (the line of gods the Gnostics believed in), like the followers of Valentinus, and rejecting marriage as corruption and fornication similarly to Marcion and Saturninus. And as his own contribution, denied the salvation of Adam. . . .Tatian composed in some way a combination and collection of the gospels, and gave this the name of The Diatessaron, and this is still extant in some places. . . (from the Loeb edition, Vol. I p. 397. The still extant would show that the Diatessaron was still in use in the fourth century when Eusebius wrote).

Tatian's harmony omits verses such as Mat 21:44; Luk 23:17; Luk 24:12; and John 7:53; John 8:1-11. However, since we do not have the original Diatessaron, but only two Arabic translations and one commentary, it is hard to say how much influence the Diatessaron had on any line of manuscript. Nevertheless, in the Diatessaron, we see that Gnosticism had an influence on the transmission of scripture within the first hundred years of the completion of the New Testament.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (150-215 AD)

Titus Flavius Clement was born of pagan parents in Athens, Greece. He was influenced by Christian doctrine, yet held that the Greek poets were likewise inspired by God but in a diminutive sense. He went to Alexandria, Egypt, and became head of the Catechetical School located there in about 200 AD. A few years later he was forced to leave Egypt under the persecution of Septimius Severus. He died in Cappadocia around 215 AD.

There are approximately 2,400 New Testament quotations by Clement in his writings. Alexander Souter states that Clement "is not a very careful quoter of Scripture, but . . . it is known that in the Gospels he used a text closely related to Codex Bezae (D)." (The Text and Canon of the New Testament, p. 81). Dr. Kurt Aland states that Clement's citations disagree with the Traditional text

(from which the KJV came from) 56% of the time. Twenty-four percent of the time his citations agree with the Alexandrian line of manuscripts, with 29% being in common with both. Only 15% of the time does Clement choose the reading of the Traditional text. ("The Text of the Church" from the Trinity Journal; Fall 1987, p. 139). The point here is that Clement is quoted with authority for his citations of scriptures by modern textual scholars, and that Clement uses a text which is not in alignment with the Traditional text. The question we must ask ourselves is, what were the teachings of Clement and do they agree with Biblical doctrines found in the New Testament?

We have already learned that Clement was influenced by the Gnostics in his view of God as both Father and Mother. Below are a few additional teachings of Clement as cited from his *The Instructor Of Children* (about 202 AD). All quotations are cited in *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, edited by W. A. Jurgens and published by the Liturgical Press of Collegeville, Minnesota. Many of the dogmas of the Roman Catholic church can be found in the teachings of Clement of Alexandria.

Baptism: "When we are baptized, we are enlightened. Being enlightened, we are adopted as sons. Adopted as sons, we are made perfect. Made perfect, we are become immortal. . .It is a washing by which we are cleansed of sins; a gift of grace by which the punishment due our sins are remitted; an illumination by which we behold that holy light of salvation--that is, by which we see God clearly." (p.178). Thus, salvation follows baptism.

Eucharist: "(The Church is) calling her children about her, she nourishes them with holy milk, that is, with the Infant Word. . .The Word is everything to a child: both Father and Mother, both Instructor and Nurse. 'Eat My Flesh,' He says, 'and drink My Blood.' The Lord supplies us with these intimate nutriments. He delivers over His Flesh, and pours out His Blood; and nothing is lacking for the growth of His children. O incredible mystery!" (p.179) That is to say, to drink the Blood of Jesus is to share in His immortality. The strength of the Word is the Spirit, just as the blood is the strength of the body. Similarly, as wine is blended with water, so is the Spirit with man. The one, the Watered Wine, nourishes in flesh, while the other, the Spirit, leads us on to immortality. The union of both, however, --of the drink and of the Word,--is called the Eucharist, a praiseworthy and excellent gift. Those who partake of it in faith are sanctified in body and in soul. By the will of the Father, the divine mixture, man, is mystically united to the Spirit and to the Word." (p. 179). Therefore, the Eucharist is necessary for salvation, it is the receiving of Christ, as taught by Clement.

Scripture: "Divine Scripture, addressing itself to those who love themselves and to the boastful, somewhere says most excellently: 'Where are the princes of the nations, and those who rule over the beasts which are upon the earth; they that take their diversion among the birds of the air; they that hoard up silver, and the gold in which men trust--and there is no end to their acquiring it; they that work in silver and in gold and are solicitous? There is no searching of their works; they have vanished and have gone down into Hades.' " (p.179). What Clement calls "Divine Scripture" is the Old Testament Apocrypha book of Baruch 3:16-19. Thus he believed it to be inspired.

Deity of Man: "That which is true is beautiful; for it, too, is God. Such a man becomes God because God wills it. Rightly, indeed, did Heraclitus say: 'Men are gods, and gods are men; for the same reason is in both.' " (p.179). Like Mormonism, Clement taught man becomes a god.

Nature of God: "Nothing exists except that which God causes to be. There is nothing, therefore, which is hated by God; nor is there anything hated by the Word. Both are one." (p.179) How does this align with Luk 14:26; John 12:25; Rom 9:13; Heb 1:9 and Rev 2:6? Clement sounds like he is quoting the doctrine of Marcion in rejecting the fact that God can hate.

ORIGEN (185-254 AD) When Clement left Alexandria because of the persecution, Origen succeeded him as head master at the Catechetical School. Origen developed the allegorical interpretation of scripture. He took the Bible symbolically, yet what is clearly symbolic he took literally. For example, upon reading Mat 19:12, he castrated himself. As a textual scholar, he produced the Hexapla which was a Bible containing six translations of the Old Testament, including the famous Septuagint (also known as the LXX). He considered the Old Testament Apocrypha as inspired scripture and included them in his Hexapla. Additionally, Origen considered some New Testament Apocrypha books as inspired, such as The Shepherd of Herman and The Epistle of Barnabas (see *The Lost Books of the Bible*, World Bible Publishers; pp.145 & 197).

Historian Will Durant notes that: The literal meaning of Scripture, argued Origen, overlay two deeper layers of meaning--the moral and the spiritual--to which only the esoteric and educated few could penetrate. He questioned the truth of Genesis as literally understood: he explained away as symbols the unpleasant aspects of Yahveh's (Jehovah) dealings with Israel; and he dismissed as legends such stories as that of Satan taking Jesus up to a high mountain and offering him the kingdoms of the world. (*The Story Of Civilization*, Vol. III; p.614) Thus Origen held to this same doctrine as proclaimed by the heresy of Marcion.

Further, Durant quotes Origen as saying, "Who is so foolish as to believe that God, like a husbandman, planted a garden in Eden, and placed in it a tree of life. . .so that one who tasted of the fruit obtained life?" (*Ibid.*, p. 614).

Additional doctrines of Origen can be seen in the following quotations from his work, *The Fundamental Doctrines*. As with Clement, the citations come from Jurgens' *The Faith of the Early Fathers*.

Jesus Christ: "Secondly, that Jesus Christ Himself, who came, was born of the Father before all creatures; and after He had ministered to the Father in the creation of all things,--for through Him were all things made."(p. 191). Thus Christ is a created being. This follows the teachings of the Gnostics, the Docetics, and is seen today in the teachings of the Jehovah's Witnesses.

"For it is just as unsuitable to say that the Son is able to see the Father, as it is unbecoming to suppose that the Holy Spirit is able to see the Son. It is one thing to see, another to know. To see and to be seen belongs to bodies. To know and to be known belongs to an intellectual being. That, therefore, which is proper to bodies, is not to be attributed to either the Father or to the Son; but that which pertains to deity is common to the Father and the Son." (p. 193). Again, the influence of Gnosticism can be seen in this citation. This is the same heresy which John warns against in both 1st and 2nd John. The Holy Ghost: "Third, they handed it down that the Holy Spirit is associated in honor and dignity with the Father and the Son. In His case, however, it is not clearly distinguished whether or not He was born or even whether He is or is not to be regarded as a Son of God." (p. 191). Thus, the Holy Ghost becomes one of the aeons of Gnosticism.

Salvation: "After these points, it is taught also that the soul, having a substance and life proper to itself, shall, after its departure from this world, be rewarded according to its merits. It is destined to obtain either an inheritance of eternal life and blessedness, if its deeds shall have procured this for it, or to be delivered up to eternal fire and punishment, if the guilt of its crimes shall have brought it down to this." (p. 191). This is teaching another gospel (Gal 1:8) which claims salvation by works.

Restoration from Eternal Fire: "Now let us see what is meant by the threatening with eternal fire. . . It seems to be indicated by these words that every sinner kindles for himself the flame of his own fire and is not plunged into some fire which was kindled beforehand by someone else or which already existed before him. . . And when this dissolution and tearing asunder of the soul shall have been accomplished by means of the application of fire, no doubt it will afterwards be solidified into a firmer structure and into a restoration of itself." (p.196). Much like the teachings of Mormonism, Origen believed in restoration for those in eternal fire (hell). The Sun and Stars: "In regard to the sun, however, and the moon and the stars, as to whether they are living beings or are without life, there is not clear tradition." (p. 192). Again, early Mormonism taught that the planets, moons, and stars were alive.

Here is a man of questionable doctrine. This is not a matter of differing interpretations of scriptures; this is a matter of false teaching. Like the current teaching of the Watchtower, Origen believed in the dualistic nature of Jesus Christ. Like the teachings of the Mormons, Origen believed in a restoration for those in hell, and wonders if the sun, stars, and moon have life. If someone had the beliefs of Origen, we surely would not be content to have him revising or editing our Bibles. Yet this is what has happened. And, if one does not believe that personal doctrine will interfere with translation, make a close examination of the NWT produced by the Watchtower. Or, for that matter, why do we classify translations of the Bible as *liberal* and *conservative*? Does this not show that theological bias still enters into the process of current translations of the Bible? If it does so today, then it did so in the days of Origen as well.

Origen's position as a textual critic is unquestionable. Not only because of the Hexapla, but because of his many scriptural quotations. Origen was one of the most prolific writers of his day, writing over 6,000 items and books. In these he makes almost 18,000 quotations and allusions from the New Testament. His citations are both Alexandrian and Western in nature. Dr. Aland shows that Origen's scriptural citations are mostly Alexandrian just like modern translations of the Bible are (The Text of the Church, p. 139).

Further, we can see the influence Origen had on other manuscripts. One of the subscriptions in Codex Sinaiticus (which we discussed in lesson two, and will expand on later in this lesson) states, "Taken and corrected according to the Hexapla of Origen. Antonius collated: I, Pamphilus, corrected." (Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament, p.23). Pamphilus, along with Eusebius, was a disciple of Origen. Therefore, we can see the influence Origen had on Codex Sinaiticus as stated in a footnote of that codex.

EUSEBIUS (263-340 AD)

Eusebius Pamphili, Bishop of Caesarea, was a church historian and textual critic who was responsible for writing the Ecclesiastical History of the church in 325 AD. His work provides us with many accounts of what was occurring in the early church, and especially during the canonization

of Scripture. However, as noted by Historian Will Durant, Eusebius sometimes glossed over some facts, as he did in his work on the Life of Constantine. Durant calls it, "honest dishonesty" (The Story of Civilization, Vol. III; p.663) and says, "One would never guess from this book that Constantine had killed his son, his nephew, and his wife." (Ibid.) Additionally, Durant states that, "Some exaggeration may have crept into the report" (Ibid., p. 649) concerning Eusebius' account of early Christian martyrs. For example, in recording the martyrdom of Polycarp, Eusebius states that when Polycarp was stabbed that, "there came out a dove" from the wound.

He also produced a form of the Gospels dividing them into paragraphs and numbering them for cross-reference (they were not divided as we have verse and chapter divisions today in our Bibles, but did provide a basis of division). Concerning the canon of Scripture, Eusebius questioned the authenticity of James, 2Pe 2:1-22 and 3 John, and the book of Jude. In regard to 2 Peter, he noted, "But the so-called second Epistle we have not received as canonical, but nevertheless it has appeared useful to many" (Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I; p. 193). To Eusebius, these scriptures were good books, but not inspired.

Emperor Constantine ordered Eusebius to produce fifty copies of the Bible. Constantine stated these copies were to "be written on prepared parchment in a legible manner" (Geisler and Nix, A General Introduction to the Bible, p. 181). Some have suggested that the famous manuscripts Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were two of these fifty copies, and these two manuscripts provide the basis of many of the changes in modern translations today. This was the view of Tischendorf, Hort, and Souter as they comment on the subject. If this is true, than Eusebius not only produced the famous Alexandrian manuscripts, but also advocated a text type that supports this same line of manuscripts. And from the many citations of Eusebius, it is certain that he did favor the Alexandrian family.

Eusebius was influenced by Origen of Alexandria. He and Pamphilus "founded at Caesarea a library of biblical and patristic writings on papyrus rolls, the nucleus of which consisted of Origen's voluminous writings, especially his editions and interpretations of biblical books." (Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament, p. 23). Pamphilus was educated at Alexandria and was a disciple of Origen; Eusebius was Pamphilus' "pupil and protege" (Ibid. p.84). No doubt, the views and textual changes of Origen found their way into the textual work of Eusebius.

JEROME (340-420 AD)

Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus, known to us as St. Jerome, was responsible for producing the Latin Vulgate. Pope Damasus requested Jerome to produce a new Latin Version of the Old and New Testament in 383 AD. Reluctantly, Jerome agreed knowing that his version would not be welcomed considering that Christendom had already begun to divided itself in regard to which line of manuscript, and which translation, best reflected the original autographs. In 405 AD Jerome finished the Latin Vulgate and gave the Roman Catholic Church its official Latin Bible.

Most textual scholars believe that Jerome revised the Old Latin manuscripts according to his knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. (Jerome was one of the first scholars to be fluent in both Biblical languages). However, we do not possess many Latin versions which predate the Vulgate of Jerome and what we do have are fragmentary. As illustrated in the citations of Tertullian, Alexander Souter wrote, "It is perfectly clear from references in Tertullian, who wrote at Carthage

(mainly in Latin, but also in Greek) between AD 195 and 218, that Latin translations of at least some parts of Scripture existed in his time." (The Text and Canon of the New Testament, p.35). The vast majority of Old Latin manuscripts which we now possess were written after the Vulgate and are divided into two groups, African and European.

Jerome was influenced by the work of Eusebius. Again, Souter notes, "It would seem, therefore, that we must look to Egypt for the origin of (Codex Sinaiticus) also. St. Jerome at Bethlehem had a MS.(i.e. manuscript) closely related to (Sinaiticus), in St. Matthew's Gospel, as we learn from his references in his commentary on that Gospel." (Ibid., p. 23). Sir Frederic Kenyon agrees and adds, "[Jerome] did so with reference to the oldest and best Greek manuscripts he could find, most of which seem to have belonged to what we have called the Alexandrian family. Indeed, the Codex Sinaiticus is the Greek manuscript which most conspicuously agrees with the Vulgate." (The Story of the Bible, p. 110).

It should be noted, however, that Jerome was more willing to reach a compromise and not make as many changes to the text as one finds in the Alexandrian line. Kenyon continues and notes, "Jerome, however, more cautious than our own Revisers (i.e. the RV of 1881) was sparing in his alterations; he tells us himself that he often left passages untouched which he might have corrected, in order to preserve the familiar form, and only made changes where he thought them material." (Ibid.) This would account for several verses in the Vulgate which follow the Traditional text instead of the Alexandrian. This is also noted by Dr. Edward F. Hills in his book, The King James Version Defended, regarding the Vulgate as a possible "movement toward the Traditional (Byzantine) Text" (p.187).

One thing is certain; the Latin Vulgate of Jerome became the standard Bible of the Roman Catholic Church and remained so for centuries. It is a clear connection between the Alexandrian line of manuscripts and the Westcott and Hort theory of textual criticism which will be discussed shortly. Despite that it sometimes reads in favor of the Traditional text, it is an early official translation which supported the Alexandrian line, and only agrees with the Traditional text as a compromise. In 1546 at the Council of Trent, the Roman Catholic Church made the Vulgate the official Bible of Catholicism. As far as the Catholic Church was concerned, there was therefore no need for additional textual studies or translations in the language of the people. This was a Latin Church and it had its Latin Bible with the mass in Latin. For the centuries that followed, all that was necessary was the Vulgate. And this remained the position of the Roman Catholic Church until the 1960's with the Second Vatican Council.

TISCHENDORF (1815-1874 AD)

Constantin von Tischendorf is responsible for providing the Protestant world with two of the oldest known uncials, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. These two manuscripts date somewhere between 325-350 AD. In lesson two we briefly discussed the contents of these two manuscripts. It is important to understand that both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus are two of the best examples of the Alexandrian line of manuscripts, and are responsible for a number of changes found in modern versions of the Bible. "These two manuscripts formed the basis of the text prepared by the 19th century scholars Westcott and Hort, and the parallel text used by the editors of the Revised Version." (Eerdmans' Handbook to the Bible, p.73). Tischendorf, along John Anthony Hort and later Alexander Souter, believed these two codices to be part of the 50

scriptures ordered by Constantine and produced by Eusebius.

Tischendorf "edited more New Testament documents and more editions of the New Testament than any other scholar (of his day)" (Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p.102). By the age of twenty-nine, he had already produced three editions of the Greek New Testament. Believing the Alexandrian line of manuscripts reflected the better readings, Tischendorf set off in search for additional manuscripts. In 1844 he visited the monastery of St. Catherine located at Mt. Sinai. While there he "saw in a basket a number of leaves of vellum with fine and obviously very early uncial writing on them, which he was informed were about to be destroyed, as many similar leaves had already been." (Kenyon, *The Story of the Bible*, pp. 57-58). He was allowed to keep forty-three leaves which he noted were from the Greek Septuagint. He recognized that these were of the same line as Codex Alexandrinus, but about a hundred years older than that manuscript. A second visit to the monastery occurred in 1853 with nothing found. However on his third visit, in 1859, on the last night of his stay, Tischendorf was shown the codex which has come to be known as Sinaiticus. He was denied custody of the manuscript at that time. He went to Cairo to speak to the Superior who granted him the codex. A camel-rider was sent to the monastery and retrieved the manuscript, but it was not until nine months later, after Tischendorf paid a good sum, that he was given the codex. As the student recalls, Sinaiticus contains over half of the Old Testament and all of the New except for large passages such as Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53; John 8:1-11, along with several other verses as demonstrated in lesson three. It has the Old Testament Apocrypha laced within it as scripture and the New Testament Apocrypha books of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas, also listed as inspired scripture.

Codex Vaticanus, which was known to have been in the Vatican Library since 1475, receives its name because it is the property of the Vatican. No Protestant minister or scholar was permitted to view this codex for four hundred years until a facsimile was produced by Rome in 1890. There were two exceptions to this rule. They are S.P. Tregelles, who viewed it in 1845 and reproduced a memorized copy of it. And Constantin Tischendorf who viewed it between 1843 and 1866. Vaticanus is missing Gen 1:1-31; Gen 2:1-25; Gen 3:1-24; Gen 4:1-26; Gen 5:1-32; Gen 6:1-22; Gen 7:1-24; Gen 8:1-22; Gen 9:1-29; Gen 10:1-32; Gen 11:1-32; Gen 12:1-20; Gen 13:1-18; Gen 14:1-24; Gen 15:1-21; Gen 16:1-16; Gen 17:1-27; Gen 18:1-33; Gen 19:1-38; Gen 20:1-18; Gen 21:1-34; Gen 22:1-24; Gen 23:1-20; Gen 24:1-67; Gen 25:1-34; Gen 26:1-35; Gen 27:1-46; Gen 28:1-22; Gen 29:1-35; Gen 30:1-43; Gen 31:1-55; Gen 32:1-32; Gen 33:1-20; Gen 34:1-31; Gen 35:1-29; Gen 36:1-43; Gen 37:1-36; Gen 38:1-30; Gen 39:1-23; Gen 40:1-23 w:1-23; Gen 41:1-57; Gen 42:1-38; Gen 43:1-34; Gen 44:1-34; Gen 45:1-28; Gen 46:1-28; 2Ki 2:5-7; 2Ki 2:10-13; Psa 106:27-48; Psa 107:1-43; Psa 108:1-13; Psa 109:1-31; Psa 110:1-7; Psa 111:1-10; Psa 112:1-10; Psa 113:1-9; Psa 114:1-8; Psa 115:1-18; Psa 116:1-19; Psa 117:1-2; Psa 118:1-29; Psa 119:1-176; Psa 120:1-7; Psa 121:1-8; Psa 122:1-9; Psa 123:1-4; Psa 124:1-8; Psa 125:1-5; Psa 126:1-6; Psa 127:1-5; Psa 128:1-6; Psa 129:1-8; Psa 130:1-8; Psa 131:1-3; Psa 132:1-18; Psa 133:1-3; Psa 134:1-3; Psa 135:1-21; Psa 136:1-26; Psa 137:1-9; Psa 138:1-6; Mark 16:9-20; John 7:53; John 8:1-11; and Heb 9:14 to the end of Revelation. Both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are of the Alexandrian line of manuscripts.

WESTCOTT AND HORT

Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892) produced a Greek New Testament in 1881 based on the findings of Tischendorf. This Greek NT was the basis for the Revised Version of that same year. They also developed a theory of textual criticism which underlined their Greek NT and several other Greek NT since (such as the Nestle's text and the United Bible Society's text). Greek New Testaments such as these produced the modern English translations of the Bible we have today. So it is important for us to know the theory of Westcott and Hort as well as something about the two men who have so greatly influenced modern textual criticism. In short, the Westcott and Hort theory states that the Bible is to be treated as any other book would be. Sir Frederic Kenyon sets forth the idea as follows: Where alternative readings exist he (i.e. the textual scholar) will therefore tend to choose the harder rather than the easier, the shorter rather than the longer, the reading that differs from that in another Gospel rather than one which coincides; because, if alteration has taken place, it is likely to have been in the direction of the easier, longer, and harmonized readings. Such seems in particular to be the character of the Alexandrian text. (The Story of the Bible, p.111). The Bible is therefore looked upon as a naturalistic book without Divine intervention preserving the text from corruption. In fact, according to Kenyon, where the text does not harmonize with the rest of the Bible is probably the correct reading. In such logic we can see the seeds of humanism replacing the spirituality of the Bible.

Westcott and Hort believed the Greek text which underlined the KJV was perverse and corrupt. Hort called the Textus Receptus vile and villainous (Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, Vol. I, p.211). They believed the Traditional text did not exist until the fourth century and was created by Lucian of Antioch as an act of the Church council to unify the Western and Alexandrian line of manuscripts. This mixing of the two lines and filling them with additional texts is called conflation. The manuscripts of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are considered neutral by Westcott and Hort as stated in their book, The New Testament in the Original Greek. So, according to this theory, the text of the KJV is conflated by using both the Western and Alexandrian line, and adds to the Bible with its own additions. The manuscripts of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, which is supposed to be a neutral text, would reflect what the original autographs said.

There are several problems with the theory. First, as will be seen [in Lesson Five], many of the early Church Fathers' citations reflect the Traditional text with the fuller readings long before the fourth century. Second, there is no evidence that there ever was a council or even a conference of scholars in Antioch to produce this "conflated" text. Even Kenyon, who supports modern versions, wrote, "We know the names of several revisers of the Septuagint and Vulgate, and it would be strange if historians and Church writers had all omitted to record or mention such an event" (Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, p.302). Thirdly, since God has told us that we are not to add to His word, it would be a strange thing indeed for Him to support a Greek line of manuscripts and bless an English translation of the Bible that added to His word. Yet the line of manuscripts which Bible-believing Christians have read, used, and believed for almost two thousand years is of the Traditional text. And no English translation has been so greatly used and blessed by God as the KJV has. If the KJV has so grossly added to the word of God as claimed by Westcott and Hort, why has God blessed it so richly for the past 400 years? Additionally, if Westcott and Hort are the fathers of modern textual criticism and the restorers of the true text, should we not know something of their beliefs to see if they are consistent with scripture? This would be harmonious with the teaching found in Mat 7:17.

Scriptures:

"I reject the word infallibility of Holy Scriptures overwhelmingly." (Westcott, The Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott, Vol. I, p.207).

"Our Bible as well as our Faith is a mere compromise." (Westcott, On the Canon of the New Testament, p.vii).

"Evangelicals seem to me perverted. . . There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, especially the authority of the Bible." (Hort, The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, Vol. I, p.400)

Dr. Wilbur Pickering writes that, "Hort did not hold to a high view of inspiration." (The Identity of the New Testament Text, p.212)

Perhaps this is why both the RV (which Westcott and Hort helped to translate) and the American edition of it, the ASV, translated 2Ti 3:16 as, "Every scripture inspired of God" instead of "All scripture is given by inspiration of God," (KJV).

Deity of Christ:

"He never speaks of Himself directly as God, but the aim of His revelation was to lead men to see God in Him." (Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 297).

"(John) does not expressly affirm the identification of the Word with Jesus Christ." (Westcott, Ibid., p. 16).

"(Rev 3:15) might no doubt bear the Arian meaning, the first thing created.<<(Hort, Revelation, p.36).

Perhaps this is why their Greek text makes Jesus a created god (John 1:18) and their American translation had a footnote concerning John 9:38 "And he said, Lord I believe and he worshipped him." which said, "The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to a creature, as here, or to the Creator." Thus calling Christ "a creature."

Salvation:

"The thought (of John 10:29) is here traced back to its most absolute form as resting on the essential power of God in His relation of Universal Fatherhood." (Westcott, St. John, p. 159).

"I confess I have no repugnance to the primitive doctrine of a ransom paid to Satan. I can see no other possible form in which the doctrine of a ransom is at all tenable; anything is better than the doctrine of a ransom to the father." (Hort, The First Epistle of St. Peter 1:1-2:17, p. 77).

Perhaps this is why their Greek text adds "to salvation" in 1Pe 2:2. And why their English version teaches universal salvation in Tit 2:11 "For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men," (ASV).

Hell:

"(Hell is) not the place of punishment of the guilty, (it is) the common abode of departed spirits." (Westcott, Historic Faith, pp.77-78).

"We have no sure knowledge of future punishment, and the word eternal has a far higher meaning." (Hort, Life and Letters, Vol. I, p.149).

Perhaps this is why their Greek text does not have Mark 9:44, and their English translation replaces "everlasting fire" [Mat 18:8] with "eternal fire" and change the meaning of eternal as cited by Hort in the above quote.

Creation:

"No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history--I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did." (Westcott, cited from Which Bible?, p. 191).

"But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. . .My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable." (Hort, cited from Which Bible?, p. 189)

Romanism:

"I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry (the worship of the Virgin Mary) bears witness." (Westcott, Ibid.)

"The pure Romanish view seems to be nearer, and more likely to lead to the truth than the Evangelical." (Hort, Life and Letters, Vol. I, p. 77) In defending Westcott and Hort, James R. White writes:

Anglican piety, especially in the context of the times in which Westcott and Hort lived, provided all sorts of ammunition for demonstration that neither of these men was a fundamentalist Baptist, a point that Westcott and Hort would certainly have admitted. The fact that the KJV was translated by 'baby-sprinkling' Anglicans does not seem to bother those who bring up Westcott and Hort, however." (The King James Only Controversy, pp. 122-123 fn).

It is one thing to have doctrinal differences on baby-sprinkling and perhaps a few other interpretations. It is another to be a Darwin-believing theologian who rejects the authority of scriptures, Biblical salvation, the reality of hell, and makes Christ a created being to be worship with Mary his mother. Yet, these were the views of both Westcott and Hort.

SINCE 1881:

James R. White is correct in stating, "modern textual criticism has gone far beyond Westcott and Hort" (Ibid., p.122). While Westcott and Hort may be considered the parents of modern textual criticism, we must also recognize the efforts produced by their children. We have had several Greek New Testaments appear, such as the Nestle text, Aland text, and the United Bible Society's text all with various editions.

There have been several findings since the discovery of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Perhaps the most famous deals with textual criticism of the Old Testament with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Concerning the New Testament there is the John Rylands fragments known as papyrus 52 (P52), a Greek manuscript which some date between 117 and 138 AD. They were discovered in Egypt and contain five verses from the gospel of John. They now reside at the John Rylands

Library in Manchester, England.

Sir Alfred Chester Beatty provided several papyrus manuscripts known as P45, P46, and P47. They date to around 250 AD or later and are a mixture of Western and Alexandrian readings. Also we have the findings of M. Martin Bodmer with P66, P72, and P75. These also date to around the same time as the Beatty manuscripts and have a mixture of Western and Alexandrian readings. Although with both, there are times when these papyrus "shows frequent independence" (A General Introduction to the Bible, p.270) and have Traditional text readings in them. Dr. Wilbur N. Pickering has provided us with statistical evidence by quoting Dr. G. D. Fee findings, which show that these manuscripts do support the Traditional line at times and stand in opposition to the Western and Alexandrian, information which the modern textual scholar somehow forgets to provide us with.

Pickering notes a comparison of John 1:1-51; John 2:1-25; John 3:1-36; John 4:1-54; John 5:1-47; John 6:1-71; John 7:1-53; John 8:1-59; John 9:1-41; John 10:1-42; John 11:1-57; John 12:1-50; John 13:1-38; John 14:1-31 and states, "P66 agrees with the TR (i.e. the Textus Receptus Greek text) 315 times out of 663 (47.5%), with P75 280 out of 547 (51.2%)" (The Identity of the New Testament Text, p. 56). He also noted that out of 43 places where all these manuscripts have the same passages of scripture, P45 agreed with the Traditional text 32 times, P66 agreed 33 times, and P75 agreed 29 times (Ibid. p. 55). This being the case, these manuscripts are a mixture of textual families.

Modern scholars are quick to point to these manuscripts as proof that the Alexandrian line is the oldest and closest to the original autographs. However, this is no surprise to the Bible-believing student as we are aware that corruption of scripture date much earlier than 200 AD. As stated at the beginning of this lesson, even at the time of the Apostles, there were those who sought to corrupt the word of God. All these Greek manuscripts mentioned were discovered in Egypt and have more to do with Clement of Alexandria and Origen than the original autographs, and they show how textual critics of the second and third century were willing to alter the word of God.

We have now discussed the line which has produced the modern versions of the Bible. In our next lesson we will do the same with the line that produced the Authorized King James Version of 1611. It will then be left to the student to decide which tree he or she will partake when digesting God's infallible Word.

QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS:

One student writes concerning the difference in readings between the KJV and the NIV in Rom 9:5.

"Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." (KJV).

"Theirs are the patriarchs, and from them is traced the human ancestry of Christ, who is God over all, forever praised! Amen." (NIV). The question had to do with which one is the better translation. Some, such as D. A. Carson (The King James Version Debate, p.64) and James R. White (The King James Only Controversy, p.196) use this verse to show that modern versions such as the NIV have a stronger reference to the Deity of Christ than the KJV, because the NIV claims Christ is "God over all" while the KJV says Christ is "over all." Yet, the NASV reads much like the KJV in

this passage. This is, therefore, a very weak argument expounded by these two scholars.

First of all, the Deity of Christ is firmly attested to in the KJV and lacking in the NIV in 1Ti 3:16 and Rev 1:6. The passage in 1 Timothy calls Christ "God manifest in the flesh" in the KJV, while the NIV simply says, "He appeared in a body," leaving the reader to guess who the He is. The same is true with the passage in Revelation. The KJV says "unto God and his Father" thus clearly calling Christ God, for who is the Father of God the Son except for God the Father? The NIV, like all other modern versions, reads, "to serve his God and Father," thus removing the Deity of Christ in this passage altogether. And, of course, there is the proof text for the doctrine of the Trinity as found in 1Jn 5:7, which is omitted in the NIV. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." All the NIV has in this verse is, "For there are three that testify:" and then footnotes the reference to the Trinity questioning its validity by stating, "Late manuscripts of the Vulgate (read)" and then quotes the verse followed with, "not found in any Greek manuscripts before the sixteenth century." (The student should note that 1Jn 5:7 will be discussed in more detail in the following lesson).

Secondly, this is not a matter of textual difference, nor of translation since the text reads the same in either the Alexandrian or the Traditional texts. The Greek simply says, "o on epi panton Theos eulogetos eis tous aionas amen" (the one who is over all God blessed for ever amen). It is a matter of where one places the comma, and the Greek manuscripts, as the student will remember, do not have punctuation marks. It would be difficult to debate the cultist who denies the Deity of Christ using an NIV reading of Rom 9:5 based solely upon the placement of the comma, considering the Greek manuscripts did not have commas.

There is no question that Jesus Christ is God (John 1:1). The Bible reveals God as one God in three persons (Mat 28:19; 1Jn 5:7). All three persons are one God. This is the doctrine of the Trinity. Within the Trinity, there is not only unity, but order. Paul illustrates the headship of the husband over the wife by stating that, "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God." (1Co 11:3) Thus the Father is the head of the Son, not the Son over the Father. Jesus even refers to the Father as "my God" in John 20:17. The Father does call the Son "God" in Heb 1:8, but the Father does not call Christ his God. In fact, the next verse says, "therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows," again calling the Father the God of the Son. They are separate persons in one Godhead and in Christ, "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." (Col 2:9) Thus, there is an order within the Trinity.

If the NIV is correct in its translation of Rom 9:5, then Christ is God over all, including the Father. He becomes the God of the Father, and the order within the Trinity is broken. However, if Christ is "over all," then He is still God, still equal to the Father (Php 2:6) but not God over the Father.

I hope that this answers the question concerning Rom 9:5, and that this whole lesson has aided the student in their understanding of textual criticism and the preservation of scripture by God as He promised He would do.

05 LESSON FIVE

LESSON FIVE: The Traditional Text Line For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe. (1Th 2:13) **INSPIRATION AND PRESERVATION** The Biblical approach to textual criticism stands in direct contrast to the concepts and theories of modern textual scholars and their accepted texts and translations. While textual evidence and studies is by no means to be ignored, neither is the guiding presence of the Author of Holy Writ. The pure naturalist approach only considers the physical evidence and man's intellectual understanding of that limited evidence. The Biblical approach not only considers the physical evidence, but also looks beyond to see the spiritual evidence as well. Without Divine intervention, there is no preservation (Psa 12:6-7). And, unless we are unfairly accused, intervention differs from inspiration.

Here, we shall take a brief pause to define the difference. Too often those who believe the KJV to be the preserved word of God for the English-speaking people without proven error are said to believe that the KJV translators were inspired in the same sense that the original writers were inspired. Some have even suggested we must additionally believe that men, such as Erasmus, who produced Greek texts that were the bases for the KJV must likewise be inspired, and that even the copyist who copied the Traditional text in Greek (called the Byzantine text) were also Divinely inspired. This tendency to overstate the view of the Bible-believer has recently been dogmatically expressed by James R. White in his book, *The King James Only Controversy*. "Most King James Only advocates. . . believe that the KJV itself, as an English language translation, is inspired and therefore inerrant." (p.3). And that some "truly believes that God supernaturally inspired the King James Version in such a way that the English text itself in inerrant revelation." (p.4). Additionally, concerning the Greek Textus Receptus, White writes, "Anyone who believes the TR to be infallible must believe that Erasmus, and the other men who later edited the same text in their own editions (Stephanus and Beza), were somehow inspired, or at the very least providentially guided in their work. Yet, none of these men ever claimed such inspiration." (p.58). The last statement comes closest to the truth, for there is a difference between being guided by God and being inspired by God. An illustration of this can be seen in any publication of the KJV. A publisher may or may not be guided by God in publishing the text of the KJV; however, this does not indicate that he was Biblically inspired. Simply because one copied the Traditional Text does not mean he was Biblically inspired to do so. This may indicate providential guidance, but is not indicative of scriptural inspiration. It is also of interest that White consistently associates inspiration with inerrancy or infallibility. While it is true that the inspired word of God is inerrant, it does not mean that just because something is inerrant it is therefore inspired. Because a person or position Isaiah 100% correct does not mean that either one is Biblically inspired. A child may finish a test without error, but this does not mean the child was inspired supernaturally. Yet because God is truth and does not err, when He inspires as He did the writers of Holy Scripture, He did so without the intervention of human mistakes and errors.

Webster defines inspiration as "Any influence (that) . . .inspires," and that inspires means to, "stimulate to activity" (New American Webster Handy College Dictionary, 1981 ed.). In a general sense of the word, therefore, we must say that the translators were inspired only in that they were moved to produce the work. However, that is not how the word is used in the theological and Biblical sense. Biblical inspiration means "that the writers were so empowered and controlled by the Holy Spirit in the PRODUCTION (the emphasis is mine) of the Scripture as to give them divine and infallible authority." (Dr. Emery Bancroft, Elemental Theology, Zondervan Pub. 1960, p.8). Preservation, on the other hand, has to do with the keeping of what has already been divinely produced. It is the assurance that the God who gave the word without error in the first place was able to keep the word without error for us today.

Admittedly the differences between the two may at first seem indistinguishable, especially when we arrive at the same answers to the following questions. Is the Bible inspired by God? The Biblical answer is yes (2Ti 3:16). Has the Bible been preserved by God? Again, the Biblical answer is yes (Psa 12:6-7). According to the verses just given, was the Bible inspired by God with error? Of course not since God is not a God of error. Was the Bible preserved by God with error? Again, the verses would tell us no because the context of Psa 12:1-8 says the preserved word is pure. Both inspiration and preservation start with God and end with inerrancy. The difference is this: inspiration deals with inception, or what was originally given and produced by God. Preservation is a process of God taking what He gave and keeping it for all generations. The Bible-believing Christian believes his Bible was both inspired by God without error and preserved by God without error. It was infallibly given and remains that way today (1Pe 1:23). It is, therefore, not only the work of man, but the very word of God.

Such was the attitude of the New Testament Christian as stated by the Apostle Paul in 1Th 2:13. The word which was preached and received among them was considered not just the word of man, but as it is in truth, the word of God. This attitude is essential for at least two reasons. First, it excludes the approach that all texts and or translations are simply a work produced by good men. It demands that we recognize the ongoing providence of God in preserving what He has given and is able to provide us with His word without error. It requires us to ask ourselves if the Bible we received is the word of God? If so, is it truth without any mixture of error, or does it contain copyist and translational errors that have crept in throughout the centuries? Is it the very word of God, or the best translation available from the very best manuscripts? If it has textual, copyist, or translational error, it fails the test as set up by the Holy Scriptures themselves. Second, this passage offers evidence in helping us to see where this preserved word is. The proof is two-fold, in that it is not only RECEIVED by the born-again believer, but it EFFECTUALLY WORKS in the born-again believer. THE APOSTLES The Biblical approach by the Apostles differs from that of the modern textual critic. Their attitude in the citation of scripture is one of "thus sayeth the Lord," and, "it is written." Not "the older manuscripts read," or "a better translation would be." They believed that the scriptures of both testaments were not only divinely inspired but kept and preserved by the guiding hand of the living Lord. They also warn against those who would change and corrupt the word of God. And that the purpose of those who would do so was to make merchandise of the believers faith. The Bible, to the Apostles, is incorruptible (1Pe 1:23) in spite of the many who would seek to corrupt it (2Co 2:17). THE BELIEVERS IN ANTIOCH The Church at Antioch has a noteworthy position in scriptures. It is the first place where the born- again believer

is called a Christian, "And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." (Acts 11:26). It is also interesting to see that where both Antioch and Alexandria are mentioned in the same passage, Antioch is listed as a place of service, while Alexandria is listed as a place of disruption. And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of ANTIOCH: Whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them. And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith. And Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people. Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and ALEXANDRIANS, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen. And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake. (Acts 6:5-10) The Bible-believer finds this rather interesting in that the line of modern translations has its source in Alexandria, while the Traditional Text has its source in Antioch of Syria where the disciples were first called Christians. And, as we examine the Biblical text of these believers in Antioch we find that it reflects the same text as found in our English Authorized Version of 1611.

IGNATIUS (d. 107 AD)

Saint Ignatius (or Theophorus) was the bishop of Antioch, Syria. Historian Will Durant states that with Ignatius, "began the powerful dynasty of the post-apostolic Fathers " (The Story of Civilization, Vol. III, p. 611). Additionally, Church Historian Earle Cairns informs us that Ignatius "was arrested by the authorities because of his Christian testimony and sent to Rome to be killed by beasts in the imperial games." (Christianity Through the Centuries, Zondervan Pub., 1967 ed., p. 78). While on route to his martyrdom, this wonderful saint wrote seven letters, six to different churches (Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, and Smyrnaeans), and one epistle to Saint Polycarp.

Ignatius was both sound in doctrine and spirit. He knew several of the Apostles personally and sought to follow their examples as believers in Christ. Dr. Michael Green states, "There was a conscious attempt by Ignatius and Polycarp, for instance, to imitate (St.) Paul. . ." (Evangelism in the Early Church, Eerdmans Pub. 1970, p.133). Green further states that, "Something indeed of St. John's theology can be traced through Ignatius. . ." (Ibid.). And, in his epistle to the Romans, Ignatius himself makes reference to both Peter and Paul stating, "I do not, as Peter and Paul, command you." (2:6). Paul wrote, "Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me." (1Co 4:16) Ignatius lived this admonition. His doctrine is Biblical. The Trinity is proclaimed by Ignatius. He states that Christians should be found, "in the Son, and in the Father and in the Holy Ghost" (Magn. 4:4). He refers to Christ as, "our God" (Roma.1:13 and Smyr. 1:2), thus repeatedly affirming the Deity of Jesus Christ. Concerning Biblical salvation he writes, "Let not man deceive himself; both the things which are in heaven and the glorious angels, and princes, whether visible or invisible, if they believe not in the blood of Christ, it shall be to them to condemnation." (Smyr. 2:12). His personal profession of faith is found throughout all of his epistles, but eloquently and scripturally stated in his letter to the Trallians: "Stop your ears therefore, as often as any one shall speak contrary to Jesus Christ; who was of the race of David, of the Virgin Mary. Who was truly born and did eat and drink; was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was truly crucified and dead; both those in heaven and on earth, being spectators of it. Who was also truly raised from the

dead by his Father, after the same manner as he will also raise up us who believe in him by Christ Jesus; without whom we have no true life." (Trall.2:10-12).

Ignatius reflects a Christian attitude in regard to others and rejects the anti-Semitism that was reflected by the heretic Marcion, and even from some of the comments later made by Origen. Instead, Ignatius agrees with scripture and breaks the walls of racism in a day when the Jews were despised by the Gentile nations. He writes, "That he (Christ) might set up a token for all ages through his resurrection, to all his holy and faithful servants, whether they be Jew or Gentiles, in one body of his church." (Smyr. 1:6). As he reflects his death, Ignatius writes, "For I am the wheat of God and I shall be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ. Rather encourage the beasts that they may become my sepulcher; and may leave nothing of my body; that being dead I may not be troublesome to any." (Roma.2:3-4). In fact, he seemed concerned that the believers in Rome would somehow try to stop his execution and states, "Suffer me to be food to the wild beasts; by whom I shall attain unto God." (Roma. 2:2). He firmly proclaims, "I would rather die for Jesus Christ, than rule to the utmost ends of the earth." (Roma.2:14).

Sadly, the scriptural citations made by Ignatius are often ignored or belittled as unimportant in the study of textual criticism. Geisler and Nix simply write, "Although (Ignatius) did not give references to particular citations from the Scriptures, he did make many loose quotations and allusions to them." (A General Introduction to the Bible, p.100). It is true that Ignatius does not cite chapter and verse (nor did any of the other Church Fathers or Apostles for that matter) and often simply makes allusions. However, it should be remembered that he was not writing a theological dissertation. He was on his way to be martyred and was most likely citing scriptures from memory. What is often overlooked is the content of these Biblical citations and allusions. In reference to his writings, Souter says, "[It] hardly [has] any bearing on the choice between variants in the passages of the New Testament." (The Text and Canon of the New Testament, p.76). With this brief statement, the writings of Ignatius are dismissed as having no impact on the study of textual criticism. Perhaps this is because the Biblical citations used by this early Church Father does not disagree with the text of the Authorized Version. In fact, the text of Ignatius reflects the reading found in the Traditional Text. An example of this is found in Ignatius' letter to the Ephesians. It will be remembered by the student that there is a textual variant of great importance found in 1Ti 3:16. The KJV reads, "God was manifest in the flesh." Modern versions, using the Alexandrian Text, read, "He was revealed in flesh" (NRSV). There is a difference between saying He and saying God. The KJV makes a clear proclamation of the Deity of Jesus Christ in this verse. What is important here is that Ignatius apparently used a Bible which reflected the reading found in the KJV. He writes, "There is one physician, both fleshly and spiritual; made and not made; God in the flesh" (Eph 2:7) and "God himself being made manifest in the form of a man." (Eph 4:13). Ignatius uses the Greek word for God (Theos), and for flesh (sarki) in the first citation and the Greek word for manifest (using the form phanerosas) in the second, as does the Greek text of the KJV in 1Ti 3:16. If Ignatius had used the Greek word ieos (he), the supporters of modern versions would no doubt have claimed that Ignatius was using a Greek text which supported the reading found in the Alexandrian and Western line of manuscripts. The fact is that Ignatius' text reflects the Traditional reading, found in the KJV and the Majority Text, and not the Alexandrian found in Codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and modern translations.

It is also interesting to read the phraseology of Ignatius in reference to the person of Jesus Christ. Over and over he refers to the Second Person of the Trinity as the "Lord Jesus Christ." This full use of the title and person of Christ is found in almost every letter of Ignatius and used several times over in those letters. I state this because the student will remember that James White (and others who would call the Traditional Text a fuller text) raised a theory called the expansion of piety. As stated in lesson three, modern versions often shorten the phrase to Christ, or Jesus Christ, or Lord, while the KJV more often uses the whole phrase, Lord Jesus Christ. It would seem from the writings of Ignatius that he had been influenced by the fuller text as it is found in our KJV.

POLYCARP (70 to 155 AD)

Polycarp was not only the Bishop of Smyrna but also, "had special opportunities to know the mind of the disciples because he had been a disciple of (St.) John." (Cairns, Christianity Through the Centuries, p.79). His martyrdom in 155 AD is recorded by both Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History and John Foxe in his Book of Martyrs. He was first placed at the stake to be burned, and he sang hymns waiting for the fire to consume him. However, the fire burned around him but did not burn Polycarp. He was then ordered to be stabbed until dead and his remains burned. The witness of Polycarp is important in the study of textual criticism for the following reasons. First of all, he cites about sixty New Testament quotations in his one letter, Polycarp to the Philippians. Over half of these are citations from Paul's epistles, showing his acquaintance with the Apostle and the acceptance of Paul's letters as scripture in the early Church. Second, he was a contemporary of the Apostles and would have had access to either the original writings of the Apostles or copies that were written shortly after the originals. Thirdly, like Ignatius, the Biblical citations do not differ with the Traditional Text in favor of the Alexandrian or Western readings. In fact, even more so than Ignatius, the citations of Polycarp reflect the readings found in the Traditional Text as it differs with the Alexandrian Text.

Most of what Polycarp writes deals with Christian living, yet he does state his profession of faith early in his letter: "knowing that by grace ye are saved; not by works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ" (Phili. 1:5), and, "he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also raise up us in like manner" (Phili. 1:8). He makes a good profession and stands against the dualism of the Gnostics in stating:

"For whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, he is Antichrist: and whoever does not confess his suffering upon the cross, is from the devil. And whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts; and say that there shall neither be any resurrection, nor judgment, he is the first-born of Satan. Wherefore leaving the vanity of many, and their false doctrines; let us return to the word that was delivered to us from the beginning" (Phili. 3:1-3).

1Jn 4:3 The Biblical quotation from Polycarp to confront Gnosticism is a citation from the Traditional Text. 1Jn 4:3 reads, "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." The Alexandrian line omits the phrase "is come in the flesh" in verse three. The verse deals with the lack of confession, not the Believer's profession that is found in verse two. As quoted above, Polycarp writes, "whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," matches what John wrote, "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." In fairness to the verse, some have suggested that

Polycarp is really citing 2Jn 1:7 and not 1Jn 4:3. This, however, does not seem to be the view of Dr. J. B. Lightfoot. In his book, *The Apostolic Father*, Lightfoot cites the quotation is from 1Jn 4:3 (Macmillan and Comp. Pub., p. 171), as does Archbishop Wake in his translation of Polycarp (*The Lost Books of the Bible*, World Pub., p. 194). Their observations are well taken as that the Greek of 1Jn 4:3 matches the Greek citation of Polycarp. However, the Greek of 2Jn 1:7 does not match Polycarp. The Greek phrase as it stands in the Traditional Text reads, "en sarke eleluthota" (in flesh come). Polycarp writes, "en sarke eleluthenai" (in flesh come). Both use the same tense of the Greek participle. 2 John reads, "epxomenon en sarki" (coming or is come in flesh). The Greek tense differs from that of Polycarp. 1 John and Polycarp use the perfect tense, 2 John uses the present tense. English does not have a perfect tense, but in Greek it means a present state resulting from a past action (i.e. because Christ came in the flesh, He is now in the flesh). It is therefore clear in both the Greek and English that Polycarp was citing 1Jn 4:3, and that his citation matches the KJV and opposes the modern versions which omit this phrase.

Rom 14:10

Polycarp writes, "and must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ; and shall every one give an account of himself." (Phili. 2:18) The allusion comes from Rom 14:10 which reads, "But why doest thou judge thy brother? or why doest thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." (KJV) This passage, therefore, confirms the Deity of Christ because verse twelve informs us that, "every one of us shall give account of himself to God." (KJV). The Alexandrian line changes "judgment seat of Christ" to "judgment seat of God." This not only leave out the cross- reference concerning the Deity of Christ, but it is obviously not the Greek text used by Polycarp in the very first few years of the second century. Both the KJV and Polycarp use the Greek word "Kristou" (of Christ). The Alexandrian line of manuscripts, which stand in the minority, use the Greek word "Theou" (of God). Since this passage is the only passage that speaks of the judgment seat of Christ, Polycarp must have received his reading from a text which read like the Traditional Text. This again shows that the older reading, closest to the original autographs, reads like that found in the majority of Greek and other manuscripts as translated in the KJV.

Gal 4:26

Here we find the phrase, "which is the mother of us all" in the KJV. The Alexandrian line of manuscripts simply reads, "and she is our mother." (NIV). The Greek word "panton" (of us all) is omitted from the Alexandrian manuscripts, while the majority of all Greek manuscripts has it in them. Polycarp writes, "which is the mother of us all" and uses the Greek word "panton." Geisler and Nix list Gal 4:26 as a citation by Polycarp (*A General Introduction to the Bible*, p.349), as does Lightfoot (*The Apostolic Fathers*, p. 169). Where did Polycarp get the phrase if not from the Traditional Text? Plainly, the disciple of St. John, and friend of St. Paul, was using a Greek text like the Traditional Text. *The Expansion of Piety*

Once again, the expansion of piety theory falls short in the light of Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians. In this short letter consisting of only four chapters, Polycarp uses the triune phrase, "Lord Jesus Christ" seven times (1:1, 2, 3, 6; 4:10, 11, 20). This seems rather amazing since the Apostle Paul in his letter to the Philippians used the phrase only three times (1:2; 3:20; 4:23). However, in his letter to the Ephesians, Paul uses "Lord Jesus Christ" the same number of times

as Polycarp. In this light, the thought that the multiple use of "Lord Jesus Christ" from a shorter version was added by the Byzantine monks around 1,000 AD seems rather far fetched. It is obvious from Polycarp that the expanded phrase was in common use at the time of the New Testament and shortly thereafter. Further, because of the expansion used by Polycarp, it seems more likely that this was the common expression used in reference to our Lord. Not only is the theory invalid, but the common text used by first century Christians reflected that which would be found in the Traditional Text throughout the centuries. Thus the admonition found in 1Th 2:13 remains intact.

EARLY TRANSLATIONS In addition to the Traditional Text, we have many early and old translations of the Bible which are either classified as Byzantine (i.e. Traditional Text) or have readings which differ from the Alexandrian Text in favor of the Traditional Text. After Kurt and Barbara Aland point to around 180 AD as the beginning of when these translations began, they state, "It must be emphasized that the value of the early versions for establishing the original Greek text and for the history of the text has frequently been misconceived, i.e., they have been considerably overrated." (*The Text of the New Testament*, Eerdmans Pub., 1987 p.182). Yet, one could say the same about copies of copies of copies of Greek manuscripts as well. Perhaps the concern stated by the Alands is because so many of the early translations have readings which match the KJV and its Majority Text in Greek. An early translation must have had a source. If the early translation has a certain reading, and later Greek manuscripts have the same reading, we can conclude that the source for the early translation had the reading as well, even if we no longer have that source.

Old Syrian

There are several old translations which are called Syrian because they are in the Aramaic language. The history of the Syrian versions is a rich history, much like the history of the Latin translations. Dr. Bruce Metzger writes, "Until the middle of the nineteenth century the Peshitta held the field as the earliest Syriac version of the New Testament." (*The Early Version of the New Testament*, Clarendon Press, 1977 p. 36). This is important because Antioch in Syria, the birth place of the word Christian, produced an early translation of the Bible which agreed with the Traditional Text. The Peshitta (which means clear or simple) is the standard Syriac version. Geisler and Nix state, "It is important to note at this point that the Peshitta was 'the authorized version' of the two main opposed branches of Syriac Christianity, the Nestorians and the Jacobites, indicating that it must have been firmly established by the time of their final cleavage, well before the fifth century." (*A General Introduction to the Bible*, p.318). In fact, the chart they give on page 265 of their book dates the Peshitta close to the year 200 AD. They also note that the Peshitta was, "brought into conformity with the Byzantine text type." (*Ibid.*, p.318). Thus the Peshitta bears testimony to the Traditional Text from which the KJV was translated. Aland justly states, "The Peshitta version as it is presented in the British and Foreign Bible Society edition is the most widely attested and most consistently transmitted of the Syriac New Testament versions. The Syriac church still preserves it and holds it in reverence in this form today." (*The Text of the New Testament*, p. 190). In fact, the tradition of the Syrian church is that the Peshitta was the work of St. Mark while others claim the Apostle Thaddeus (Jude) translated it. In 1901 textual scholar F. C. Burkitt questioned the early date of the Peshitta and assigned it as the work of the bishop of Edessa, Rabbula, in the fifth century. Metzger notes, "The hypothesis of the Rabbulan authorship

of the Peshitta New Testament soon came to be adopted by almost all scholars, being persuaded perhaps more by the confidence with which Burkitt propounded it than by any proof other than circumstantial evidence." (*The Early Versions of the New Testament*, pp. 55-56). The view of Burkitt has been attacked by other scholars such as Arthur Voobus who compared Rabbula's citations with the Peshitta and found several differences. It has also been argued by Edward Hills that Rabbula could not have been the translator because the division within the Syrian church took place during the time of Rabbula with Rabbula being the leader of one of these sects. Yet both sides claim the Peshitta as holy scripture. Hills writes, "It is impossible to suppose that the Peshitta was his (Rabbula's) handiwork, for if it had been produced under his auspices, his opponents would never have adopted it as their received New Testament text." (*The King James Version Defended*, p.174). To this Metzger adds: The question who it was that produced the Peshitta version of the New Testament will perhaps never be answered. That it was not Rabbula has been proved by Voobus's researches. . .In any case, however, in view of the adoption of the same version of the Scriptures by both the Eastern (Nestorian) and Western (Jacobite) branches of Syrian Christendom, we must conclude that it had attained a considerable degree of status before the division of the Syrian Church in AD 431. (Metzger, pp.59-60).

If the Peshitta does date to around 200 AD, or before, we have an answer to those who wonder about the text of the New Testament early in its transmission. James R. White asks, "If we were to transport ourselves to the year AD 200 and look at the text of the New Testament at that time, ignoring for the moment what was to come later, what would we find?" (*The King James Only Controversy*, p.152). According to the Peshitta translation, we would find a text like the Authorized Version produced in 1611. This is confirmed by Souter who writes, "Thus it happens that the Peshitta Syriac rarely witnesses to anything different from what we find in the great bulk of Greek manuscripts." (*The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p.60). And, based upon our lesson so far, we would find early Christians, like Ignatius and Polycarp, using a Bible with 1Ti 3:16, Rom 14:10; Gal 4:26, and 1Jn 4:3 reading just like the KJV, the Traditional Text, and the Peshitta.

Old Latin

Bruce Metzger writes, "At the close of the nineteenth century several scholars suggested that Antioch in Syria was the place where the Old Latin version(s) originated. . .scholars today are inclined to look to North Africa as the home of the first Latin version of the New Testament." (*The Early Versions of the New Testament*, p. 288). The Old Latin versions are divided into two camps, African and European. Within the Old Latin there are "variants among the manuscripts (which) make a coherent history of the text all but impossible to determine." (*A General Introduction to the Bible*, p.334). Today, the earliest manuscripts we have in the Old Latin date to the fourth century.

Regardless of the history of the varying Old Latin manuscripts, there are readings within the Old Latin which support the Traditional Text. For example, Mark 1:2 reads, "As it is written in the prophets," and then quotes two prophets, Malachi and Isaiah. The Alexandrian line reads, "As it is written in the Prophet Isaiah" and then quotes from two prophets. The first reading is found in the KJV and the Traditional Greek Text. It is also found in the Peshitta. Among the Old Latin manuscripts (which are classified with small Roman letters for the most part), we find the same reading as in the Traditional Text in the Old Latin manuscripts a (4th century), aur (7th cen.), b (5th cen.), c (12th cen.), d (5th cen.), f (6th cen.), ff2 (5th cen.), and q (7th cen.). The same is true of

the longer ending to Mark. While the Alexandrian line omits verses 9-20 of chapter sixteen, it is found in the majority of Greek manuscripts, the Peshitta, and almost all Old Latin manuscripts. In fact, the Old Latin manuscript k is the only one which has the shorter ending, and it was k which added the Gnostic reading about the resurrection which read like the Gospel of Peter (see lesson four). The same is also true to the passage in John 7:52-53; John 8:1-11 concerning the woman caught in the act of adultery. The majority of Old Latin witnesses contain this passage and read like the KJV and the Traditional Text.

Ethiopic Version This version dates to the beginning of the fourth century. While it does contain a mixed reading at times, it is classified as being basically Byzantine in origin. Thus the witness to Africa was also of the Traditional Text. Geisler and Nix state, "This translation adheres closely, almost literally, to the Greek text of the Byzantine type" (Ibid., p. 324). They also classify the Armenian Version, Georgian Version, and the Slavonic Version of the same textual family, that of the Traditional Text (Ibid., pp.323-328).

Gothic Version This early Germanic version dates to the first part of the fourth century. It was translated by Wulfilas who "made use of a manuscript of the early Byzantine text differing little from what we find in the Greek manuscripts." (Aland, The Text of the New Testament, p.206). Alexander Souter says of the Gothic Version, "The translation of the New Testament was made from Greek MSS. such as Chrysostom used, of the official Constantinopolitan (i.e. Traditional Text) type." (The Text and Canon of the New Testament, p.69). Thus the Gothic version reflects the Traditional Text and the English KJV.

Hence, we can see from the old early translations that they reflect the Traditional Text from which came the King James Version. The early translations which these believers received as the word of God, which effectually worked in them, was like our Authorized Version of today.

CHRYSOSTOM (345-407 AD)

John Chrysostom was both a great Biblical expositor and preacher. His parents were Christians and came from Antioch. Chrysostom began his career as a lawyer, until his conversion in 368 AD. He then began to preach to gospel of Jesus Christ. He was ordained in 386 AD and preached in Antioch until 398. It was then that he became Bishop of Constantinople. (The student should note that there is in the study of textual criticism a clear connection between Antioch and Constantinople, and that manuscripts coming from these two places bear a remarkable resemblance). The Bible he used was of the Traditional text.

Even though Cairns describes him as courteous, affectionate, and kindly natured (Christianity Through the Centuries, p.152); he was not ashamed to boldly proclaim the truth, no matter who was offended. While at Constantinople, one he offended was the wife of emperor Arcadius, empress Eudoxia. He had preached against her manner of dress and that she placed silver statues of herself throughout the city. And, like the preaching of John the Baptist, his sermon came at a personal cost. He was banished from the city in 404 AD, and while in exile, he died in 407.

Chrysostom left about 640 sermons which are still in existence. Church Historian Ross MacKenzie states that Chrysostom was, "A writer of pure, almost Attic style, John is one of the most attractive of the Greek preachers, and his eloquence gained him the name of Chrysostom (Golden Mouth)."

(The New Grolier Multimedia Encyclopedia, 1993 ed.) Cairns adds to this by simply stating, "It is little wonder that he was and still is hailed as the greatest pulpit orator the Eastern Church ever had." (Christianity Through the Centuries, p.152).

Because of the massive amount of homilies left by Chrysostom, and because of his expository style of preaching, it is very easy to see the text type used by him. Souter states that the type of text Chrysostom used is reflected by Codex K, which is of the Byzantine line. However, it should be noted that K dates to several hundred years after Chrysostom, thus showing its continued use through the centuries. Souter writes that Chrysostom Greek text, "is roughly that of the great bulk of our manuscripts." (The Text and Canon of the New Testament, p.85). Thus, the Greek text of John Chrysostom is the Traditional Text from which came the KJV. This is clearly seen in his writings, but for purpose of illustration I have chosen to compare his homilies on the Sermon on the Mount with the focus on Matthew chapter 6:1-15. There are, within this passage, two very notable differences between the two major lines of manuscripts. They are found in verses 1 and 13.

Verse 1

Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. (KJV).

Take heed that you do not your justice before men, to be seen by them: otherwise you shall not have a reward of your Father who is in heaven. (Douay-Rheims Version).

Be careful not to do you 'acts of righteousness' before men, to be seen by them. If you do, you will have no reward from your Father in heaven. (NIV).

The Authorized Version uses the word alms (Gk. eleemosunen), while the NIV uses the phrase acts of righteousness (Gk. dikaiosunen), and the DRV justice . As one can see from either the English or the Greek, these are two different words, with two different meanings. They are also reflective of the two textual lines, in that the Alexandrian reading uses righteousness while the Traditional line uses alms . There is no question as to which one Chrysostom uses. He comments on the text by saying, "And mark how Christ began, as though he were speaking of some wild beast, hard to catch, and crafty to deceive him who was not very watchful. Thus, 'take heed,' saith he, 'as to your alms.' So Paul also speaks to the Philippians, 'Beware of dogs.' " (Jaroslav Pelikan edition, The Preaching of Chrysostom, Fortress Press, p.130). He then quotes the passage "For which same cause he saith, 'Take heed that ye do not your alms before men,' for that which was before mentioned, is God's almsgiving." (Ibid., p.131).

Verse 13

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. (KJV).

And lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. (DRV)

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one. (NIV).

For years the omission of the phrase "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen." marked the difference between Protestant and Catholic versions of the Lord's prayer. However, today, even conservative translations such as the NIV and NASV have chosen the Alexandrian reading of Catholicism instead of the Traditional text which is supported by the majority of all Greek uncials and minuscules.

Chrysostom, in the late fourth century, plainly used the reading as it is found in the majority of all Greek and Syrian manuscripts. He writes, "Having then made us anxious as before conflict, by putting us in mind of the enemy, and having cut away from us all our remissness; he again encourages and raises our spirits, by bringing to our remembrance the King under whom we are arrayed, and signifying him to be more powerful than all. 'For thine,' saith he, 'is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory.' " (Ibid., p.145). He then expounds the phrases "the power" and "the glory," which would be rather hard to do if his Bible did not contain them. Once again we see the Bible of this great preacher was like the one translated into English in 1611. THE THREE CAPPADOCIAN FATHERS

John Chrysostom was not alone in his use of the Traditional text. Basil of Caesarea (329-379 AD); Gregory of Nazianzus (330-389 AD) and Gregory of Nyssa (330-395 AD, the brother of Basil) used the same text line. These three Church Fathers are called the Cappadocian Fathers. These three men are noted for their strength in doctrine and opposition to the heresy of Arianism (which denied the Trinity). All three strongly supported the doctrine of the Trinity and were noted as strong theologians. All are also associated with the Orthodox Church of Constantinople. All three had Christian parents, and Gregory of Nazianzus' father was a bishop. The Greek and Old Latin manuscripts used by these men reflect the text of the Traditional line. Souter states that their Greek text originated "probably in Constantinople" while the Latin "in North Italy." (The Text and Canon of the New Testament, p. 9). Souter lists the Gospel manuscripts of N, O, Sigma, and Phi, reflecting "the text used by the great Cappadocian Fathers. . .in the last third of the fourth century." (Ibid., p. 30). These manuscripts (N, O, Sigma, and Phi) are from the sixth century and reflect the readings found in the Traditional text.

It is little wonder then, that when we find differences between the Traditional text and the Alexandrian text, that the Cappadocian choose the readings as they are found in the KJV and not the ones reflected in the NIV or NRSV. The following are a few examples.

Mat 17:21 is omitted in the NIV and NASV, but is in the KJV and supported by the Traditional Text and the Cappodocian Fathers.

Mark 1:2 the KJV reads "prophets" as does the citations of the Cappodocian Fathers. Modern versions choose the Alexandrian reading of "Isaiah the prophet" and then quote from Malachi.

Mark 16:9-20. The longer ending, as it is found in the KJV, is also in the Greek Gospels of the Cappodocian Fathers.

Luk 2:14. While the Nestle Text of the Alexandrian line renders the phrase as, "men of goodwill," the KJV and the Cappodocian Fathers render it as, "good will toward men."

John 5:4 is omitted in the Alexandrian Text, but found in the Greek text of the Cappodocian Fathers. This siding with the Traditional Text is not just limited to the Gospels, although there are

several examples. It should also be noted that, like Ignatius, the Cappodocian Fathers used God (Gk. Theos) in 1Ti 3:16. THE CHURCH UNDER FIRE

Throughout the centuries there have been those strong in the faith who were willing to suffer and die for the cause of Christ. Their histories have been written with honor by men like John Foxe in his book of Martyrs; their names have been reduced to that of heretic by those who persecuted them. Among such groups of Bible-believers were the Paulicians, the Bogomiles, the Anabaptists, the Waldenses, and the Albigenses to name a few. They are mentioned here only because the scriptures they used were those of the Traditional Text or a translation which reflected the readings found in the Traditional Text. They received the word of God, as it is in truth the word of God, and it worked effectually within them (1Th 2:13).

Most of those mentioned above were and are labeled as heretics in order to justify their mass murders. A case in point would be the Albigenses, so named because they originated in southern France near the old city of Albiga. To this date they are listed in most histories of the Church as a heretical sect which practiced dualism. It has been claimed that the Albigenses believed in two gods, one good and one evil, much like the old Gnostic heresy. However, this is simply not the case. Historian for the American Baptist Convention, Henry C. Vedder, writes, "The (Roman) church was not at all careful to distinguish between them, and they were often included under the name of Albigenses in one sweeping general condemnation. That name, however, does not properly denote the evangelical heretics, who never confounded themselves with these dualistic heretics, and indeed sympathized with them as little as they did with Rome." (A Short History of the Baptist, Judson Press, 1907, p.103). The true "heresy" of these Bible-believing French folk was that they would not conform to Rome and its teachings. They believed each Christian had the right to read the Bible in their own language for themselves. Pope Innocent III declared war on them and began what was infamously known as the Inquisition. Edward Peter notes, "The severity and frequent brutality with which the northern French waged the Albigensian Crusade led to the killing of many heretics without formal trial or hearing." (Inquisition, The Free Press; 1988, p. 50). In this dark period of time, unnamed thousands died at the hand of Rome because they wished to place the Bible into the hands of the common man.

Catholic historians and theologians today argue that this simply is not so. The Right Reverend Henry Graham (Where We Got The Bible: Our Debt to the Catholic Church), Rev. Dr. L. Rumble, and Fr. Charles Carty (Bible Quizzes To A Street Preacher) state that most people in the Middle Ages could not read, so there was no need for the Bible in the language of the common man because he could not read it if he had it. They further state that since those who could read all read Latin, there was no need to have any other translation other than the Latin Vulgate by Jerome. This, however, by no means justifies the mass torture and murder of thousands of people. Additionally, it overlooks several simple truths. First, just because someone could not read for themselves would not stop them from wanting a Bible in their own language so someone else could read it to them. If there were only Latin Bibles, those who could not understand Latin were without hope of even hearing the word of God. Second, history has shown that once the Bible is translated into the language of the people, the people learn to read. Time and again the Bible has been the basic text book for individuals to learn their own language in written form.

Another example are the Waldenses, who are often linked in history with the Albigensians. Some have suggested that the name Waldenses came from Peter Waldo, around 1176 AD. Waldo was a Bible-believing merchant turned preacher. Others believe the name comes from the Italian or Spanish word for valley, thus stating they originated in the valley region of northern Italy. Regardless of where they derived their name, they strongly stood against many of the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church.

Catholic and Orthodox historians David Knowles and Dimitri Obolensky list for us the "heresies" of which the Waldenses were guilty: "[The Waldenses] became definitely heterodox, regarding the Bible as the supreme authority and denying the real presence in the Eucharist. . .the Waldenses, the 'proto-Protestants', continued to influence religious history throughout the middle ages and despite persecution remain in existence at the present day." *The Christian Centuries*, Vol. 2, Paulist Press, 1969, p. 369). What they did believe in was that the Bible was the final authority for the born-again believer. That any one who was called of God could preach the word without authority from Rome. That salvation was not by works, but by the grace of God alone, and that baptism should follow belief and not applied to infants. Thus, the principles of 1Th 2:13 were established in their lives.

Knowles and Obolensky further state, "Already in Milan and Lyons the Humiliati and the Waldenses were beginning to show the characteristics of their class: desire for associations of prayer and good works outside the liturgical framework; love of preaching and Bible-reading in the vernacular; dislike of . . .(the) sacramental aspects of religion; disputes about the Eucharist; praise of poverty; impatiences of hierarchical control." (Ibid., p.224.) In addition they "believed that every man should have the Bible in his own tongue and that it should be the final authority for faith and life." (Cairns, *Christianity Through the Centuries*, p.248). Thus, they copied and translated the Bible in the vernacular and freely published these manuscripts. Therefore, their aid in using the Traditional Text and providing vernacular translations of it must not go unnoticed in the Biblical study of textual criticism.

Because of Believers like the Albigenses, the Waldenses and others, the Bible was translated into Provencal or Old French, Old High German, Slavonic, Old and Middle English, and other languages as well as Old Latin and Gothic. Through them, and others, we can see the Traditional Text not only translated into the language of the people, but translated into the lives of those who read it.

One such translation is the West Saxon Gospels which date to this period of time. This is the oldest version of the Gospels in English (that is in Old English which differs from that which we use today). The following example comes from Luk 15:16 and shows that this version of the common man followed the Traditional Text which later produced the Authorized Version.

And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat: and no man gave unto him. (KJV).

And he would gladly have fed on the pods that the swine ate, and no one gave him anything. (RSV).

Da gewilnode he his wambe gefyllan of pam beancoddum be oa swyn aeton; and him man ne sealde. (West Saxon)

The subtle difference comes from the variance between the two line of manuscripts. The Greek Textus Receptus reads, "gemisai ten kailian autou apo" (to fill his belly with). The United Bible Societies' Text reads, "xortasthenai ek" (fed out of). This reading is supported by P75, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus. All the Byzantine manuscripts, most Old Latin manuscripts, the Peshitta, and the Armenian, support the Traditional Text. It is plan from the reading of the West Saxon Gospels which one they follow. The words "wambe gefyllan" mean "stomach filled" which matches the text of the KJV. THE MAJORITY TEXT By the Majority Text, we mean the Traditional Text which has been used by Bible-believing Christians throughout the centuries and is reflected in the majority of Greek manuscripts. This Text has also been called the Syrian Text, the Constantinople Text, and is usually referred to as the Byzantine Text. It is this text which produced what has commonly been called the Textus Receptus or Received Text. It was this type of Greek Text which underlined the Authorized King James Version. We have already seen that this text type was used by early Christians and was the basis for early translations. It is the text which has predominated the history of Bible based Christianity and, for that matter, the majority of Christendom throughout the ages. The main objection to the Majority Text is that it is a late text, of which most of the manuscripts within this textual family date after the ninth century. However, as we have already seen, the readings found within the Traditional Text date to manuscripts of the second century and some even to the first century. Additionally, the earliest citations made shortly after the completion of the New Testament reflect the readings found in the Traditional Text, and not the Alexandrian. The question may be asked, Why do we have so many copies which have such a late date? There are several reasons of which I shall name three. First, because it is the Traditional Text. It was the one received by the early Church and the body of believers. Naturally, it would be the one to endure throughout the centuries and be massively copied and translated. Second, the reason why we do not have as many old manuscripts of this type is simply because it was the one used. Those manuscripts which were corrupted would not be used by the early born-again believers. They would see the corruptions and reject them. However, the Bibles which they did use would reflect that use. Just as the Bible you use today is quickly worn by use, so would the early manuscripts used by Bible-believing Christians. Third, the climate where the Traditional Text was formed is not as conducive for maintaining manuscripts as the climate in Egypt. Nevertheless, on this point it must also be noted that the origin and keeping of the New Testament did not lay in Egypt but elsewhere. Places such as Asia Minor, Palestine, Greece, and Rome would be where the New Testament originated and was kept. Alexandria originated none of the autographs nor was it the caretaker of any New Testament book or epistle. It therefore lays with the majority of manuscripts which were received and used by born-again believers (1Th 2:13).

We now have over 5,000 manuscripts of the New Testament. A manuscript may be the whole New Testament, or it may only be a few books. At times it may even be a portion of a book or even a fragment. But all together we have well over 5,000 of these manuscripts. Dr. Zane Hodges, of Dallas Theological Seminary, has pointed out that "somewhere between 80-90 percent- -contain a Greek text which in most respects closely resembles the kind of text which was the basis of our King James Version." ("The Greek Text of the King James Version," found in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 124 (1968) p.335). Dr. Wilbur Pickering states, ". . . one may reasonably speak of up to 90% of the extant MSS belonging to the Majority text-type." (*The Identity of the New Testament Text*, Nelson Pub., 1980 ed., p.118). The agreement within this vast host of manuscripts is astounding. It becomes even more astounding as one recognizes that the Traditional Text has been with us

throughout the history of the New Testament Church, and that this text is represented in various locations throughout the world. Yet this text has few variances within the bulk of its witnesses. This is, of course, in direct opposition to the Alexandrian Text which is the minority text. The Alexandrian Text, with only a few Greek manuscripts "disagree as much (or more) among themselves as they do with the majority (text). For any two of them to agree so closely as do P75 and B is an oddity." (Ibid.) In the Biblical definition of things, this is itself evidence that the Alexandrian Text is not the instrument God used in preserving His word. Namely, because there is a higher degree of variance within its own family based upon a much smaller portion of manuscripts. Since God is not the Author of confusion (1Co 14:33), we can conclude that God is not responsible for this line.

It is from this wealth of manuscripts that men such as Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536), Robert Stephanus (1503-1559), Theodore Beza (1519-1605), and Bonaventure and Matthew Elzevirs (1624) produced Greek Texts which were greatly used by God and His Church. The Greek Text produced by Erasmus was the text which Martin Luther used to produce his German Bible. This text, along with those produced by Stephanus, were the basis for the Italian Bible of Giovanni Diodati (1576-1649) and the French Bible of Louis Second. They were also used by Casidoro de Reina (1520-1594) and Cipriano de Valera (1531-1602) and their Reina/Valera Spanish Bible. These texts and translations, along with earlier English translations and the Greek Text of Beza, formed the basis of our KJV.

These texts and their translations did not go unrewarded by God. The Greek text of the Reformers was that of the Traditional Text. Every Protestant Church which was formed during this period of Church history, used the Traditional Text or a translation based on it. The underground Church which did not need to leave Rome because it was never a part of it, used the Traditional Text as its Bible. The Traditional Text produced reform and revival. It has proven itself to have worked effectually within the community of believers who have received it as the very word of God. And, consequently, it has affected history and culture itself. Dr. Fred Craddock and Dr. Gene Tucker of Emory University have corrected stated, "Translations of the Bible, such as the Authorized Version (or King James Version, 1611) and Martin Luther's translation of the Bible into German (first completed in 1534) not only influenced literature, but also shaped the development of languages." (cited from Encarta by Microsoft, 1995 ed).

Thus we have briefly seen the history of the Traditional Text and how God has used it throughout the Church. In lessons to come we will explore this period of time which produced the KJV in order to better understand the history of the KJV itself. Also, we will be looking at the Greek Septuagint of the Old Testament and its citations in the New. Plus, we will study those missing verses listed in lesson three to find the textual and doctrinal support for them.

QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS

One student writes, "I would really enjoy seeing something about Psa 12:6-7. I have a copy of James White's book somewhere, and it would be nice to see a refutation of each supposed 'problem' passage of the KJB he lists. (Of course that may be a bit much. :-)" Not really. In fact, I plan to respond to many of the verses that Brother White raises in his book, *The King James Only Controversy*, simply because he does such a fine job of stating the point of view reflected by the supporters of modern versions, and because his book is popular and in use with many. However,

for now let us focus briefly on Psa 12:6-7. The verse reads, "The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." (KJV).

Brother White responds to this passage twice in his book. Once in a footnote on page 6, and then again on page 243. He writes, "Many KJV Only advocates prefer to speak of the "words of God" when they refer to the KJV, drawing from Psa 12:6." (p.6). To me, this is a very interesting footnote given by Brother White. Time and again, White says he believes the KJV is the word of God, as is the NIV, RSV, NASV and NRSV. If this is so, why would he footnote what he himself claims to believe? The difference here is that I do not believe the NIV, RSV, NASV, or the NRSV are the words of the LORD. I believe they are translations made by men which reflect a certain line of manuscripts. I believe that they contain God's word only when they agree with it. But containing God's word and being the word of God are two different things. I do not believe that God's word has error in it, and I believe that these translations have error. What I do believe is that God promised to keep and preserve His words. That is what the verse says. If I am to believe God, I must believe this verse. If I do not believe this verse, why should I believe anything else that God says? However, I do believe it and I have the assurance that God has not lied to me concerning the keeping of His words. Further, I believe that for those of us who speak English these preserved words are in the KJV. So I have a book I believe fulfills Psa 12:6-7 and it can be held and tested. Brother White does not. The question is asked by White, "Doesn't Psa 12:6-7 promise that God will preserve His WORDS?" To this White responds with, "My first question is, Where does Psa 12:1-8 say that the 'words of the LORD' refer to the King James Version of the Bible? Of course, it doesn't. Secondly, nowhere does this passage tell us how God will preserve His words. Does this mean He will do so by ensuring that no one can ever change the substance of those words, or does it mean that He will always make sure that there is one infallible version in one or more languages or translations? The passage does not even begin to address such things. And finally, noting the NIV translation, it is quite possible that verse 7 does not refer back to 'the words of the LORD' in verse 6, but instead to those in verse 5 of whom the Lord says, 'I will set him in the safety for which he yearns' (NKJV)." (pp. 243-244). The passage in Psa 12:6-7 in the NIV reads, "And the words of the LORD are flawless, like silver refined in a furnace of clay, purified seven times. O LORD, you will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever."

So, in his chapter on 'Questions and Answers' (chapter 10) his very first question, which is the one listed above, gives no answers at all. Instead, he raises more questions himself.

White's first question is, "Where does Psa 12:1-8 say that the words of the LORD refer to the KJV of the Bible?" This is not an answer, it is a question. However, the answer is that it does not. If it had, then there would be no word of God until 1611. If there was no word of God until 1611, then Psa 12:1-8 could not possibly be true because the claim is to keep the words of the LORD from THIS generation for ever. This generation predates 1611, however it also includes 1611. This is the difference between the Bible-believer and modern scholarship. Where is this preserved word today? Where was it at any time? Have we lost it or misplaced it? The modern scholar does not have an answer, at least not one that agrees with the verses found in Psa 12:1-8. The "KJV Only advocates" (to cite Brother White) do not advocate the KJV only for everyone throughout Church history. I think the above lesson is proof of this. We advocate the KJV as the preserved word of God, for the English-speaking people, without any proven error. His second question is what did

God mean by "preservation"? Well, the best answer is He meant what He said. He said He would keep and preserve His words from this generation for ever. Either He did this or He did not. If He did, the modern scholar is at a loss to find where these preserved words are. If He did not, then He lied, which is impossible for God to do. Please notice that the text does not say that God would preserve the substance of His words, as White suggests. He says He will preserve His W-O-R-D-S. Now, did He or didn't He? Once again, the Bible-believer says He did and not only see the evidence that He did, but has a copy he can hold and read for himself. The third question Brother White raises is one he plants in your mind. Is Psa 12:7 translated correctly? Does it refer back to verse 5 and not verse 6? This is the same argument Dr. John Durham of Southeastern Baptist Seminary raised. Durham writes, "Verse 6 interrupts the development of the Psalm with an aside on the purity of the utterances of Yahweh. . . It is. . . an interruption and could very well have been added at a period subsequent to the composition of the Psalm." (Boardman Bible Commentary, pp. 192-193) So now it becomes either a mistranslation, an interruption, or an addition. Anything except for what it is, the promise of God to keep and preserve His Words. The mark of the Holy Ghost is to assure the Believer concerning the word of God (1Jn 5:13). The mark of Satan is to question the word of God (Gen 3:1).

Dr. G. Campbell Morgan agreed with the rendering. He writes, "The psalmist breaks out into praise of the purity of His words, and declares that Jehovah will 'keep them' and 'preserve them.' The 'them' here refers to the words. There is no promise made of widespread revival or renewal. It is the salvation of a remnant and the preservation of His own words which Jehovah promises." (Notes on the Psalms, Revell Comp., p.32).

Brother White quoted the NKJV to support his view that verse 7 refers back to verse 5 and not to verse 6. However, this is not how the NKJV is versed. In the Psalms, the NKJV lends itself to poetic form and groups verses together. It is very plain to see that the editors of this translation have grouped verses 6 and 7 together and not verses 5-7. Brother White would have done better to have stayed with the NIV instead of switching to the NKJV.

It should also be noted that the KJV is not alone in its translation of verse 7 as "them" instead of "us." The ASV of 1901 reads, "Thou wilt keep them, O Jehovah, Thou wilt preserve them from this generation for ever." Well, I guess that this only proves the old saying that even a blind squirrel can find a nut. :-)

06 LESSON SIX

LESSON SIX: German, Spanish, and Early English Versions The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it. (Psa 68:11)

It has been argued that if the KJV is the word of God, what about the time before 1611? Were believers who spoke English without the preserved word of God until the KJV was published? Is the word of God limited only to the English-speaking people? Such argumentation is clearly either a misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the views of Bible believers who hold to the KJV as the preserved word of God for the English-speaking people. Our view, as has been stated before, is that there has always been the preserved word of God ever since God gave it. This has been demonstrated in lesson five. He inspired it through the original writers, and He keeps it through His promise to do so. When the translators of the KJV set forth to do their task, they had before them several texts and translations. In addition to the original languages, they also had various foreign translations based on the Traditional Texts of both the Old and New Testaments. In the original preface to the KJV, which was entitled *The Translators to the Reader*, Dr. Miles Smith wrote: "Neither did we think much to consult the translators or commentators, Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek, or Latin. No, nor the Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch." In the course of our studies of NT textual criticism, we have considered the manuscripts and texts of the Syrian, Greek, and Latin. The four foreign translations mentioned by Dr. Smith were the Spanish (Reina/Valera Version), the French (Louis Segond Version), the Italian (Giovanni Diodati Version), and the Dutch (Luther's German Version). All of these were based on the Traditional Text used by Bible-believing Christians throughout the history of the New Testament Church. For the purpose of our studies, we shall consider two of them; the German and the Spanish. THE GERMAN

Perhaps no other translation of the Bible, apart from the KJV, has had a greater impact upon its people and their culture than the German Bible of Martin Luther. As was stated in our last lesson by Dr. Fred Craddock and Dr. Gene Tucker of Emory University, "Translations of the Bible, such as the Authorized Version (or King James Version, 1611) and Martin Luther's translation of the Bible into German (first completed in 1534) not only influenced literature, but also shaped the development of languages." (cited from *Encarta* by Microsoft, 1995 ed). Not only has this version affected the history and language of Germany, but many immigrants and early settlers to the United States carried a copy of *Die Heilige Schrift* (the Holy Scriptures) by Martin Luther.

Students of Church History can not but recognize the great contribution made to the common Faith by Martin Luther (1483-1546). It was Luther who echoed the cry of justification by faith, and brought Reformation to Germany. He was born on November 10th, 1483. He began to study law in 1505, but after a narrow escape from a storm, he decided to become a monk. He was ordained in 1507 and in 1510 visited Rome. It was there he found corruption within the hierarchy of the Catholic Church and began to question its authority. After his study in Scripture on justification through faith and salvation by grace, Luther published his 95 theses and nailed it on the door of the church at Wittenberg in 1517. He spent the next few years defending his charges, only to be

excommunicated in 1521. In April of that same year, Luther was summoned before the Holy Roman Emperor at the Diet of Worms. There Luther refused to recant and was banished from the empire. He fled to Wartburg, and for the next eight months worked on his translation of the New Testament into German. The Greek text used by Luther was that of Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536). This text was based on the Traditional Text and later became known as the Textus Receptus. Church Historian Earle Cairns wrote,

Making use of Erasmus' edition of the Greek New Testament, he (Luther) completed his German translation of the New Testament in less than a year. The whole Bible was translated from the original into German by 1534. When it was published, it not only gave the German people the Bible in their own tongue, but it set the standard form of the German language. (Christianity Through the Centuries, Zondervan Pub., p. 318).

Thus, we see that this line of Text was used by God to provide the Bible in the language of the people and provided the basis for believers during the Reformation. It should be noted that the Bible of the Reformers was based on the Traditional Text, and not the Alexandrian or Western line of manuscripts. THE SPANISH The standard Spanish Bible is the Reina-Valera Version. The American Bible Society refers to it as "the King James Version of the Spanish-speaking world." ("Remembering Casiodoro De Reina" in the Bible Society Record, New York. 1969). Dr. Wilton Nelson writes, "(1969) marked the 400th anniversary of the Reina-Valera version of the Spanish Bible, which can be thought of as the Hispanic-American counterpart of the King James Version." ("New Light from the Old Lamp" in the Latin American Evangelist; published by the American Bible Society, Jan/Feb. 1970, p. 9). What the KJV is to the English-speaking world, the Reina-Valera is to the Spanish-speaking world. It is not the KJV translated into Spanish, for it was translated before 1611. It is the labor of two men, Casidoro de Reina and Cipriano de Valera, who used the Traditional Text to provide the Spanish-speaking world the word of God.

Casidoro de Reina (1520-1594) was the first to translate the Bible into Spanish. His work took twelve years to complete at the cost of much personal sacrifice. He was born in Seville and became a Roman Catholic monk. While at the San Isidro Monastery of Seville, he heard the lectures of the Superior of the monastery, Dr. Blanco Garcia Arias, who had been influenced by the preaching of the Albigenses. Being exposed to the writings of the Reformers and reading the Old Latin Bible of the Waldenses, Reina was converted to Protestantism.

Upon his conversion to the faith persecution fell on Reina, who had fled Spain never to return in order to escape the claws of the Inquisition. Along with ten of his friends, Reina arrived in Frankfurt, Germany in 1557. Two years later, he moved to London and became the pastor of a group of Spanish Protestants who also had escaped Spain and the Inquisition. Later, because of persecution found in England, Reina and his wife fled to Antwerp in the Netherlands. During this time, he worked on his Spanish Bible. In 1569 he published 2,600 copies of the entire Bible in Spanish. It was nicknamed the "Bear Bible" because it used as its symbol a bear retrieving honey from a tree. The Inquisition soon seized as many copies of this version as possible and had them destroyed, calling it the "most dangerous edition of the Bible." (The Cambridge History of the Bible by Dr. S.L. Greenslade. Cambridge University Press, 1983, p.126). The Roman Church had issued a decree stating "(The) Bible in Castilian (Spanish) romance or in any other vulgar tongue (is prohibited)" (Ibid. p.125). This order came from the Council of the Holy General Inquisition.

Consequently, few copies of Reina's Spanish Version ever made it into Spain. However, it was greatly used by Spanish-speaking refugees who fled Spain because of the persecution.

After the publication of his Bible, Reina organized a church which became noted for its zeal and street evangelistic outreach in Frankfurt. He remained the pastor of this church until his death on March 16th, 1594. To Spanish Christians, Casiodoro de Reina was more than a Bible translator. He was a hero in the Faith.

Cipriano de Valera (1531-1602) was one of Reina's friends who fled Spain in 1557. Like Reina, Valera had been a monk at the San Isidro Monastery in Seville. And, like Reina, it was there he first heard the gospel of redemption and was converted. Soon after he arrived in Frankfurt, Valera moved to Geneva where he became a follower of John Calvin. He became a street preacher and later moved to England to study at the University of Cambridge. Afterwards, he taught at the University of Oxford.

While in England, he translated Calvin's Institutes into Spanish and wrote a book entitled *El Papa y la Misa* (The Pope and the Mass). In it, he condemned the service of the mass calling it pagan in origin, and the authority of the Pope. While in England, he married and began a ministry to seamen as well as a ministry to those who were imprisoned. In 1582, Valera began to revise the work of Reina. His revision was very slight but thorough. At the age of 70, after 20 long years of working on his revision, Valera published what has become known as the Reina-Valera Version. Valera wrote, "The reason that has motivated me to make this edition was the same that motivated Casidoro de Reina. Who was motivated by the pious Person, the Lord himself, and wanted to spread the glory of God and make a clear service to his nation" (translated from *Versiones Castellanas De La Biblia*. Published in Mexico by Casa De Publicaciones. pp.38-39).

Valera believed his Bible was the perfect word of God for the Spanish-speaking people. This is reflected in the Spanish History of the Bible stating, "The authors(Reina and Valera) claim to have penetrated to the depths of Holy Scriptures and have translated with perfection the Greek and Hebrew languages." (Ibid. p.19).

Since 1602, however, this Spanish version has undergone a few major revisions. The two most noteworthy were done in 1909 and 1960.

Like Reina, Valera is a hero in the Faith. Because of his belief in personal salvation by grace alone through faith, and his desire to see the word of God published in Spanish, "Valera sufrió grande miseria" (Valera suffered great misery) (Ibid. p.39). This book further states, "El Señor recompense a sus siervos, Cipriano de Valera recibirá un muy grande galardón de manos de su Salvador. (When the Lord rewards his servants, Cipriano de Valera will receive a great prize from the hand of the Saviour.) (Ibid.). THE EARLY ENGLISH BIBLES In order to better understand the KJV, we must understand something about the translations which preceded it into English, and the times in which the translators of these versions lived.

There was no English Bible until 1382. In order to better understand this, we must clarify two points. First of all the study of our language is divided into three periods. They are Old English which dates from about 700 to 1100 AD. Next comes Middle English which dates from 1100 to 1500 AD. Finally, we have Modern English which dates from 1500 to the present (This is attested to by Dr. Marjorie Anderson and Dr. Blanche Williams, both from Hunter College in New York City,

in their book *Old English Handbook*, pp.6-7). This is important because some of these early versions date to Middle English. This leaves the date of the KJV clearly in the Modern English era. Thus, we can understand why there was a need for revision as the language changed in form, and we can also see that the KJV is in fact a modern English translation and not an Old English one as some have claimed.

Secondly, we must understand that during this time the right to translate the Bible into English was prohibited by the Roman Catholic Church. In fact, to have the Bible in any language other than Latin was forbidden. The belief of the Church was that men would misunderstand and mistranslate the scriptures, and they had the power of the state to enforce this belief. Their view was that those who could read, read Latin. Those who could not read would not need a Bible in their language. However, as stated in lesson five, simply because one could not read would not stop others from reading to him. It would do that person little good if all he heard was Latin and not the Bible in his own language. Also, history has proven that once the Bible is in the language of the people, they learn to read. For these and other reasons, there have been those who were willing to risk their lives in order to provide the common man the word of God.

WILLIAM TYNDALE (1494-1536) The name of William Tyndale has bore the slander of the Roman Catholic Church. Catholic historian Rev. Henry G. Graham refers to Tyndale as an inept rebellious priest who "was utterly unfitted for such a great work (i.e. translating the NT into English)...a mediocre scholar, and could not boast of anything above the average intellect." (*Where We Got the Bible: Our Debt to the Catholic Church*, Tan Books and Pub., p. 123) And yet despite the defamation of some, God saw fit to use William Tyndale to give us the first English Bible printed on the printing press. And to set the stage for the translations which followed.

John Foxe, in his *Book of Martyrs*, provides us with a differing picture of this saint of God. Foxe informs us of his early training at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and as the schoolmaster who taught the children of the Knight of Gloucestershire. Foxe also points out it was in this capacity that Tyndale earned himself a reputation for being contentious with local priests who would visit the Knight and his family. In reference to this, Foxe writes: And when they (i.e. Catholic priests) at any time did vary from Tyndale in opinions, he would show them in the book, and lay plainly before them the open and manifest places of the Scriptures, to confute their errors, and confirm his sayings. And thus continued they for a certain season, reasoning and contending together divers times, till at length they waxed weary, and bare a secret grudge in their hearts against him. (Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, p.136).

Despite his leanings towards Biblical debate, Foxe describes Tyndale as a gracious man who opened his heart and home to strangers and offered fellowship to all who wished it.

It was his openness and generosity that led to his demise. While in Antwerp, Tyndale befriended a fellow Englishman, Henry Philips. Tyndale showed Philips all his works, translations, plans, and personal theology. He trusted Philips as a good man and fellow believer. Philips was neither. Like Judas of old, Philips arranged with officers for the arrest of William Tyndale and then while in the public street, pointed to Tyndale so the officials knew who to arrest. His crime was the publishing of God's word in the language of the people. Tyndale was charged with heresy and sentenced to death by burning. While tied to the stake and awaiting his fiery death, William Tyndale offered his final prayer before being ushered into eternity; "Lord! Open the King of England's eyes." (Foxe,

p.15). Thus once again the English Bible was purchased with the blood of the saints.

Tyndale used the Traditional Text and laid the foundation for the KJV which followed in the years to come. Although Tyndale translated a few Old Testament books, his work was on the New Testament. The following passages are from Tyndale's New Testament and compared with the KJV. The spelling has been modified to match the spelling found in the KJV. It is evident the work of William Tyndale lives on, both in copies of his translations and in those who used his New Testament as a basis for their labors.

TYNDALE

KJV

Mat 6:9-13 O our father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Let thy kingdom come. Thy will be fulfilled, as well in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, even as we forgive our trespassers. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom and power, and the glory for ever. Amen.

Mat 6:9-13 Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

Mat 11:28-30 Come unto me all ye that labor and are laden and I will ease you. Take my yoke on you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.

Mat 11:28-30 Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.

Rom 12:1-2 I, beseech you therefore brethren, by the mercifulness of God, that ye make your bodies a quick sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God: which is your reasonable serving of God and fashion not yourselves like unto this world: but be ye changed in your shape, by the renewing of your wits that ye may feel what thing that good, that acceptable, and perfect will of God is.

Rom 12:1-2 I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

MILES COVERDALE (1488-1569)

William Tyndale had prayed that God would open the King of England's eyes. The King was Henry VIII. The prayer was answered in the work of Miles Coverdale. Coverdale had befriended Anne Boleyn, the second wife of King Henry. In addition, the chief minister to Henry was Thomas Cranmer the Archbishop of Canterbury who encouraged Coverdale in his translational work. Thus, the Lord was providing England and the English-speaking world with it first translation with the approval of the King.

Biblical historian, F.F. Bruce correctly stated, "Next to Tyndale, the man to whom lovers of the English Bible owe the greatest debt is Miles Coverdale." (The English Bible, p. 53). God used Miles Coverdale in a unique way because Coverdale labored with three early English translations. His own Coverdale's Bible (1535), the Great Bible (1539), and the Geneva Bible (1560). Indirectly he helped with the Matthew's Bible (1537), and the Bishops' Bible (1568), as these were revisions of his works. All of these early translations, along with Tyndale's Bible, were based on the Traditional Text and used by the translators of the KJV in their work. These were the translations referred to by the KJV translators when they wrote:

Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one,...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavour, that our mark. (The Translators to the Reader original Preface in the KJV by Dr. Miles Smith)

Miles Coverdale was born in Yorkshire, the birthplace of John Wycliffe, in 1488. He was educated at Cambridge and became an Augustinian friar. In 1528, after embracing the teachings of Martin Luther, Coverdale left the priesthood and was forced to leave England. Coverdale soon became a disciple of William Tyndale and took up his work of translating the Bible in the English language. His first translation of the Old Testament as it is found in the Coverdale's Bible was not translated from Hebrew, but from German and Latin. His New Testament was a revision of Tyndale's New Testament. When he published his Bible in 1535 it became the first complete Bible printed in English.

MATTHEW'S BIBLE (1537)

Thomas Matthew was the pseudonym of John Rogers (1500-1555). Rogers received his degree from Cambridge in 1525 and became a priest in London. In 1534 he went to Antwerp as chaplain to the Merchant Adventurers. There, he became associated with William Tyndale and was converted to Protestantism. Rogers then went to Wittenberg where he pastored a church with his wife and eight children. Under the reign of Queen Mary, Rogers was charged with heresy and was burned alive for the sake of the gospel. Once again the trail of the English Bible was covered with blood. His work is a mixture of Tyndale and Coverdale. The NT is that of William Tyndale's as are the first five books of the OT and a never before published copy of Tyndale's translation of Joshua to 2 Chronicles. The rest of the OT is the work of Coverdale. THE GREAT BIBLE (1539) This was the second major work done by Miles Coverdale. It was called the Great Bible because of its size. It is a very thick Bible with its pages measuring nine inches wide and fifteen inches long. It was produced for English Churches with full approval by the king, Henry VIII, in response to the prayer of William Tyndale. To some, this is considered the first "authorized" Bible, because the king approved it and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, oversaw it. This version was based on the Traditional Text of the NT, and was compared with the Old Latin Text. It never became great with the public and ceased publication within thirty years. The desire for an English Bible still remained, one the average Englishman could hold in his hands and read in his home. Not one that was the size of the Great Bible, which was chained to the alter of English churches. This need was met with the Geneva Bible which followed. THE GENEVA BIBLE (1560) In 1553, Mary became Queen of England and began a fiery persecution against Protestants. The Great

Bible was removed from churches, and many Christians fled the country in order to escape her religious wrath. Many of these found refuge in Geneva. Knowing the need of preserving God's word in English, many scholars who had either suffered persecution under Mary, or had fled because of the persecution she produced, translated the NT in 1557 and the whole Bible in 1560. This translation became known as the Geneva Bible. This version was produced in a handy size using Roman type which made it easier to carry and read. It also contained several notations which the Catholic Church found offensive. For example, the notation found in Rev 9:3, which describes the locust coming out of the pit, reads, "Locust are false teachers, heretics and worldly, subtle prelates, with monks, friars, cardinals, archbishops, bishops, doctors, bachelors, and masters, which forsake Christ to maintain false doctrine." The Geneva Bible made use of not only the Traditional Text in the NT, but also the Hebrew Masoretic Text in the OT. And, unlike the previous translations, it was the work of a committee and not the work of one man or a revision of one man's work. THE BISHOPS' BIBLE (1568)

Perhaps the loveliest Bible printed was the Bishops' Bible, being endowed with a plethora of woodcuttings throughout its edition. It was produced after the terror of Queen Mary by the Church of England with the aid of many English Bishops, hence its name. It had fewer notes than the Geneva Bible, and was given for the purpose of standardizing the British subjects with one standard Bible. However, it was not successful in this task. Because this version was issued under the authority of Queen Elizabeth, it is considered the second authorized Bible for the English-speaking world. A GOOD ONE BETTER

One line from the Preface to the KJV is often cited by supporters of modern versions. It has to do with the goal of the KJV translators in making a good translation better. In his tract entitled, Pick a Bible, Any Bible, Mr. Terry Alverson cites Dr. Miles Smith of the KJV translation committee and states, "Obviously Smith and his co-workers did not undertake the task of translating the KJV with the intent that it was to be the only Bible. Quite the contrary. It appears the 1611 KJV translators would be the first to applaud a modern day effort to 'make a good translation better.'"(p.2).

One wonders if the claim that the KJV translators would be the first to applaud a modern day effort is correct in light of their full statement. The context of Dr. Smith's citation is given below:

Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make a bad one a good one, (for then the imputation of Sixtus had been true in some sort, that our people had been fed with gall of dragons instead of wine, with whey instead of milk:) but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principle good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavour, that our mark. The history of all the "good ones" which predated the KJV shows that they were all based upon the same Greek line of manuscripts; the Traditional Text. Further, it should be noted that the translators said their goal was NOT to make a bad one good, else the accusation from the Pope that the translators were feeding their people with "gall of dragons" might have some basis. Their goal was to make "one principle one" from the good ones which predated the KJV. Clearly, this is not an affirmation to alter the text based on either the Alexandrian or Western line of manuscripts.

Likewise, the KJV translators spoke of the need for many translations. Some have used this to justify the use of modern versions based on a differing line of manuscripts. Jame R. White writes, "When the very preface to the KJV says, 'variety of Translations is profitable for the finding out of

the sense of the Scriptures,' it is obvious that the KJV Only position is proven utterly ahistorical thereby. The position requires the translator to be something its own authors never intended it to be." (The King James Only Controversy, pp. 76-77). The context of this statement was the use of marginal notes to explain the meaning of some Hebrew and Greek words which either carry several meanings or for rare animals. Please note the full context of the phrase in question:

There be many words in the Scriptures which be never found there but once, (having neither brother nor neighbour, as the Hebrews speak) so that we cannot be holpen by conference of places. Again, there be many rare names of certain birds, beasts, and precious stones, &c., concerning which the Hebrews themselves are so divided among themselves for judgement . . . Now in such a case, doth not a margin do well to admonish the reader to seek further, and not to conclude or dogmatize upon this or that peremptorily? For as it is a fault of incredulity, to doubt of those things that are evident, so to determine of such things as the Spirit of God hath left (even in the judgement of the judicious) questionable, can be no less than presumption. Therefore as S. Augustine saith, that variety of translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures: so diversity of signification and sense in the margin where the text is not so clear, must needs do good, yea, is necessary, as we are persuaded. With these thoughts in mind, let us consider for a moment the content of these early English versions as they compare with any one of the modern versions based on the theories of modern textual scholars.

Mat 6:13 And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. (KJV). And leade us not into temptation: but delyver us from evyll. For thyne is the kyngedome and the power, and the glorye for ever. Amen. (Tyndale) And leade us not into temptacyon: but delyver us from evyll. For thyne is the kyngdome and the power, and the glorye for ever. Amen. (Great Bible) And lead us not into tentation, but deliver us from evill: for thyne is the kyngdome, and the power, and the glory for ever. Amen. (Geneva) And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evill: for thine is the kingdome, and the power and the glory, for ever, Amen. (Bishops') And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one. (ASV) And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil. (RSV) And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one. (NIV) Did you notice something is missing? But I thought that all they were doing is following in the line of the KJV and making a good one better? Or perhaps, they are doing more than that. Consider some further examples.

John 1:18 No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. (KJV) No man hath sene God at any tyme. The only begotten sonne, which is in the bosome of the father, he hath declared him. (Tyndale) No man hath sene God at any tyme. The onely begotten sonne, whych is in the bosome of the father, he hath declared hym. (Great Bible) No man hathe sene God at any time: the onlely begotten Sonne, which is in the bosome of the Father, he hathe declared him. (Geneva) No man hath seene God at any time, the onely begotten Sonne, which is in the bosome of the Father, he hath declared him. (Bishop's) No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him. (NASV) No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only, who is at the Father's side, has made him known. (NIV) No man has seen God at any time; the only-begotten god who is in the bossom [position] with the Father is the one that has explained him. (NWT)

Luk 9:56 For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village. (KJV) The sonne of man is not come to destroye mennes lives, but to save them. And they went to another toun. (Tyndale: note in this version the verse is found in verses 55 and 56) For the sonne of man is not come to destroye mennes lyves, but to save them. And they went to another towne. (Great Bible) For the Sonne of man is not come to destroye mens lives, but to save them. Then they went to another towne. (Geneva) For the sonne of man is not come to destroy mens lives, but to save them. And they went to another village.(Bishop's) And they went on to another village. (RSV: Note the phrase missing is not found in verse 55, as it was in Tyndales. It is removed altogether.) and they went on to another village. (NEV) And they went on to another village. (NASV)

Col 1:14 in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: (KJV) in whom we have redempcion thorow his bloud, that is to saye the forgevens of synnes. (Tyndale) by whom we have redemcion thorowe his bloude even the forgevenes of sinnes. (Great Bible) In whom we have redemption through his bloode, (that is,) the forgiveness of sinnes. (Geneva) In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sinnes: (Bishop's) in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins. (NIV) by whom we are set free, that is, our sins are forgiven. (TEV) Through him we have redemption, the forgiveness of our sins. (NAV) in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins. (NRSV)

Rom 11:6 And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work. (KJV)

Yf it be of grace, then is it not of works. For then were grace no moare grace. Yf it be of works, then is it no moare grace. For then were deservinge no lenger deservinge. (Tyndale)

If it be of grace, then is it not now of workes. For then grace is no more grace. But If it be of workes, then is it now no grace. For then were deservynge nomore deservynge. (Great Bible) And if (it be) of grace, it is no more of workes; or els were grace no more grace: but if it be of workes, it is no more grace: or els were worke no more worke. (Geneva)

If it bee of grace, then is it not nowe of workes: for then grace is no more grace. But if it be of workes, then is it now no grace, for then worke is no more worke. (Bishop's) But if it is by grace, it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. (Revelation, 1881) And if by grace, then it is no longer by works; if it were, grace would no longer be grace. (NIV) But if it is by grace, it is no longer on the basis of works, otherwise grace would no longer be grace. (NRSV)

Mark 1:1-2 The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before they face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. (KJV) The beginnyng of the Gospell of Jesu Christ the sonne of God, as it is written in the Prophets: beholde I sende my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy waye before the. (Tyndale) The begynnyng of the Gospell of Jesu Chryst the sonne of God, as it is written in the Prophets, behold, I sende my messenger before thy face which shall prepare thy waye before the. (Great Bible) The begynnyng of the Gospell of Jesus Christe, the Sonne of God: As it is written in the Prophetes, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, whiche shal prepare thy way before thee. (Geneva) The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Sonne of God, As it hath bene written in the Prophets, Bholde, I sende my messenger before they face, which shall prepare thy

way before thee. (Bishops') The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. As it is written in Isaiah the prophet, Behold, I send My messenger before Your face, Who will prepare Your way; (NASV. The OT citation comes from Mal 3:1 in verse two of Mark. It is not until verse three that there is a citation from Isaiah) The beginning of the gospel about Jesus Christ, the Son of God. It is written in Isaiah the prophet: I will send my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way (NIV)

[The] beginning of the good news about Jesus Christ: Just as it is written in Isaiah the prophet: (Look! I am sending forth my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way;)<<(NWT)

These are but a few examples of the many changes made in modern versions. In each case the early English translations agreed with the KJV. To claim that what the KJV did in 1611 to the early English versions which predated it, is what modern versions are doing to the KJV simply is untrue. Dr. Miles Smith stated that their goal as translators in 1611 was NOT to make a BAD one good. Instead, from the many good ones based on the Traditional Text, to make one better. This they accomplished only by the good grace of God upon them. In our next lesson we will look deeper into the history and text of the greatest version the world has ever seen; the Authorized King James Version of 1611.

QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS

One student writes, "If the KJV is the only real Bible for Christians then why does it have errors in it? A book about different translations by Lewis points out more than quite a few. And I've found that in Rom 1:1 the word 'doulos' is translated as 'servant' when it should be 'slave.' And in Rom 1:3 the words 'Jesus Christ our Lord' appear when they should be at the end of verse 4." The question begins with two false assumptions. First that the KJV is the only real Bible for Christians. Second that it has error in it. As we have stated time and again throughout these lessons, my belief is that the KJV is the preserved word of God for the English-speaking people without any proven error. Lessons one, two, five, and this one all state that I have not claimed the KJV to be the Bible for all the world, or the only Bible ever given. There were Bibles before the KJV and in languages other than English which were the preserved word of God without any proven error. I simply believe the KJV is for the English-speaking people. I further believe it stands without any proven error, and have for several years now been looking to see if anyone could prove an error in it. To date, they have not. In lessons to come we will cover many of the so-called errors as given by James R. White, D. A. Carson, Jack Lewis, and others. In fact, a few lessons will be dedicated to the issues raised by these men. But for now, please allow me to address the issue at hand. In Rom 1:1 Paul uses the Greek word "doulos." The claim is made that the KJV is in error because it translates the word as servant instead of slave. However, the claim is without warrant because "doulos" means both. One of the standard texts for learning NT Greek is J. Gresham Machen's New Testament Greek For Beginners. It was my first year Greek book when I attended Cedarville College. In the building of vocabularies under Greek-English Vocabulary, Machen states, "doulos, o; a slave, a servant." (p. 258).

Machen is not alone. In Dr. Ray Summers' book, Essentials of New Testament Greek, he translates "doulos, o, slave, servant" (Broadman Press, p.157). Both Machen and Summers are first year Greek studies. Dr. Harold Moulton expands on this in his Analytical Greek Lexicon: "doulos; enslaved, enthralled, subservient, a male slave, or servant, of various degrees"

(Zondervan, p. 106). In *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, by W. E. Vine, he states "Doulos, an adjective, signifying 'in bondage,' . . . is used as a noun, and as the most common and general word for 'servant,' frequently indicating subjection without the idea of bondage" (Revell Company, p. 347). And finally, Dr. Jack Lewis in his book, *The English Bible: KJV to NIV*, states that the NASV translates "doulos" four different ways including both slave and servant (p. 343).

It would seem from this information that the objection is without substance. The second part of the question deals with Rom 1:3-4.

Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead: (KJV) concerning His Son, who was born of a descendant of David according to the flesh, who was declared the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead, according to the Spirit of holiness, Jesus Christ our Lord, (NASV) The student is correct in stating that in the Greek the phrase "Jesus Christ our Lord" appears at the end of verse four and not in verse three in the Greek text. This is not, however, an error. It is the form of translation. The question is a good one; why does the KJV read "his Son Jesus Christ our Lord" when the Greek has "tou uiou autou" (his Son) several words before "Iesou Cristou tou keriou emon" (Jesus Christ our Lord)? The answer has to do with the understanding of how Greeks worded sentences. In Greek the phrase "his Son" and "Jesus Christ our Lord" both have endings in "ou." Greeks tied word order together by the endings of Greek words. All of these stand in what is called the (masculine, singular) genitive case. They are the same endings, showing they are to be tied together. Again, citing from Machen, *The normal order of the sentence in Greek is like that in English--subject, verb, object. There is no special tendency, as in Latin, to put the verb at the end. But Greek can vary the order for purposes of emphasis or euphony much more freely than English. . . The English translation must be determined by observing the endings, not by observing the order.* (*New Testament Greek for Beginners*, pp.26-27).

It is a matter of choice, not an issue of mistranslation. The NASV is neither less correct nor more correct in translating the phrase at the end of verse four. It is a choice. As long as the reader understands that "Jesus Christ our Lord" has to do with "his Son" the translation is correct. The NASV, NIV, RSV, NRSV (and most all others) simply tie the thought together by having the phrase at the end. The KJV ties the thought together as a Greek reading it would. Both are correct translations.

There is one final thought. At least the whole phrase "Jesus Christ our Lord" appears in both translations in this passage. This is not true of either Acts 8:37 or Rom 16:24. In both of these passages the NASV, along with most modern versions, omit the verse and Jesus Christ our Lord altogether. In fact the NASV omits the name "Jesus" 58 times in the NT (such as in Mat 4:12; Mat 4:18; Mat 4:23; John 3:2; Acts 9:29; and 1Pe 5:10; 1Pe 5:14). "Christ" is removed from the NASV 38 times (such as in Mat 23:8; John 6:69; 1Co 16:22-23; 1Ti 2:7; and 1Jn 4:3). And "Lord" is missing 35 times from the NASV (such as in Mark 11:10; Luk 9:57; Luk 9:59; Rom 6:11; Gal 6:17; Col 1:2; and Rev 16:5). Even in Romans chapter one there is an omission. Notice verse sixteen states, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: . . ." (KJV). Modern versions omit "of Christ." I would think that the omission of "Jesus," "Christ," and "Lord," are of a greater impact than the

word order as it appears in the Greek NT; especially when that word order is in full agreement with the thinking, writing, and reading of Greek believers.

07 LESSON SEVEN

LESSON SEVEN: The Authorized Version Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou? (Ecc 8:4) The Authorized King James Version is the word of the King. It not only contains the name of the monarch who ruled England in 1611, but it speaks with royal majesty proclaiming the words of the King of Kings. No translation of the Bible has had a greater impact on the English-speaking people as has the KJV. This is not opinion, but fact. In literature, it stands immortal with the writings of Shakespeare and other great poets, even though its translators were not poets. In history, it has affected English-speaking nations as no other book has, and for many was the basis for learning to read and write. It has shaped our culture and thinking about ourselves and our God. In theology, it has stood as the very words of our God. Of late, it has fallen under attack. Not by the skeptic who has always doubted God and His word, but by the scholar. Because of this, many have built faulty argumentation in order to discredit the KJV as the preserved words of God. It is, therefore, essential for us to understand the history of the Authorized Version in order to disavow the contentions of those who wish to discredit the work and word of God among the English peoples.

JAMES I OF ENGLAND (1566-1625):

Some have falsely thought that the King James Bible was the translation of King James I of England. Others have tried to discredit the KJV because of the King himself. One has nothing to do with the other. James did not translate the Bible, and his character has little to do with the translation which bears his name. He was the King of England in 1611 when the Authorized Version was completed, and it was under his authority that the translators began their endeavor.

James was born in Scotland and was the only son of Mary, Queen of Scots. His famous mother was a strict Roman Catholic; however, James was raised a staunch Protestant. He had a love for sports as well as for scholarship. King Henry IV of France referred to James as "the wisest fool in Christendom" (King James VI of Scotland: I of England by Lady Antonia Fraser, 1974. p. 9). And yet, the Christian should keep in mind the words found in 1Co 1:25-29.

Dr. Charles Ryrie says of King James, "Now this was. . . an odd king. By eight, it was said, he could translate any chapter of the Bible from Latin to French to English. He knew Italian, Hebrew, Greek, and had learned large portions of the Word. He was apparently an effeminate man; so one writer has called him, 'Queen James who succeeded King Elizabeth'. He was undoubtedly a vain man, not really popular because he held to the absolute superiority of the king, and not the Parliament." ("Oddities of the King James Bible," cited from *The Christian Librarian* Vol. 18, No. 1 & 2 in Oct-Dec., 1974. p.14)

British author Caroline Bingham provides an interesting assessment of this English monarch. "At seventeen he was a remarkable youth who had already achieved an intellectual and political maturity; already he was recognizable as the canny and learned King who never achieved wisdom, who committed follies but was not a fool." (*The Making of a King*, Doubleday and Comp.,

1969. p.15).

Lady Antonia Fraser adds to our understanding of King James in the conclusion of her book. She writes, "Let us assess James by his own sonnet at the start of Basilikon Doron, when he laid down the precepts for a King: 'God gives not Kings the style of Gods in vain, For on his throne his Scepter do they sway: And as their subject ought them to obey, So Kings should fear and serve their God again.' Perhaps James did not have the style of a God, and erred in thinking that it had been granted to him. Nor did he create it for himself as Elizabeth had created the style of a Goddess. But he did fear God and attempt to serve Him by his own lights. As a result, his subject, even if they did not always obey him, were not so badly served by him after all." (Fraser, p. 214). Of his legacy, Sir Frederic Kenyon has written, "The Authorized Version may be put down as the best deed ever done by James I. . ." (The Story of the Bible, p. 40) THE TRANSLATION:

Shortly after James became King of England, he was approached by Dr. John Rainolds concerning various issues facing the English Church. Rainolds, a Puritan and later one of the translators, made the following proposal within his address to the king. He stated, "May your Majesty be pleased to direct that the Bible be now translated, such versions as are extant not answering to the original." This delighted James, who responded with, "I profess, I could never yet see a Bible well translated in English, but I think that of Geneva is the worst." This discourse occurred at Hampton Court on Monday, January 16th, 1604. Within a few short months Bishop Richard Bancroft was notified to appoint certain learned men, numbering about fifty-four for the purpose of translating the word of God. Although the actual number of translators who worked on the KJV remains a mystery (because some died before the work was completed), the following list of names survives as known translators. These men were divided into three groups located at Westminster, Oxford, and Cambridge. Each group was divided into two sections; one worked on the Old Testament, the other on the New Testament. Only the group at Cambridge had a team working on the Jewish Apocrypha.

WESTMINSTER OT (Genesis-Kings)

Dr. Lancelot Andrewes, Dean of Westminster. Mr. William Bedwell, St. John's College, Cambridge. Dr. Francis Burleigh, Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. Dr. Richard Clarke, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. Mr. Jeffrey King, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Dr. John Layfield, Fellow of Trinity College. Dr. John Overall, Dean of St. Paul's.

Dr. Hadrian Saravia, Canon of Canterbury. Dr. Robert Tigue, Archdeacon of Middlesex. Mr. Richard Thomson, Clare Hall, Cambridge.

NT (Romans-Jude) Dr. William Barlow, Dean of Chester.

Mr. William Dakins, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Dr. Roger Fenton, Fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. Dr. Ralph Hutchinson, Archbishop of St. Alban's. Mr. Michael Rabbett, Trinity College, Cambridge. Dr. Thomas Sanderson, Balliol College, Oxford. Dr. John Spenser, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

OXFORD OT (Isaiah-Malachi)

Dr. Richard Brett, Fellow of Lincoln College. Dr. Daniel Featley (also known as Daniel Fairclough), Fellow of New College. Dr. John Harding, President of Magdalen College. Dr. Thomas Holland (no

known relation), Rector of Exeter College. Mr. Richard Kilby, Rector of Lincoln College. Dr. John Rainolds, President of Corpus Christi College. Dr. Miles Smith, Canon of Hereford.

NT (Matt.-Acts and Revelation) Dr. George Abbot, Dean of Winchester.

Dr. John Aglionby, Rector of Blechindon.

Dr. John Harmer, Fellow of New College.

Dr. Leonard Hutton, Bishop of Gloucester. Dr. John Perin, Fellow of St. John's College. Dr. Thomas Ravis, Fellow of St. John's College. Sir Henry Savile, Provost of Eaton.

Dr. Giles Thomson, Dean of Windsor.

CAMBRIDGE OT (1 Chron.- Ecc.)

Mr. Roger Andrews, Master of Jesus College. Mr. Andrew Bing, Fellow of St. Peter's College. Mr. Laurence Chaderton, Master of Emmanuel College. Mr. Francis Dillingham, Fellow of Christ's College. Mr. Thomas Harrison, Vice-Master of Trinity College. Mr. Edward Lively, Fellow of Trinity College. Mr. John Richardson, Master of Trinity College. Mr. Robert Spalding, Fellow of St. John's College.

Apocrypha

Dr. John Bois, Fellow of St. John's College (later he edited Rom-Rev.). Dr. William Branthwaite, Master of Caius College. Mr. Andrew Downes, Fellow of St. John's College. Dr. John Duport, Master of Jesus College. Dr. Jeremy Radcliffe, Fellow of Trinity College. Dr. Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney College. Mr. Robert Ward, Fellow of King's College.

These translators were great scholars. Many laid the foundation for linguistical studies which followed. They spent most of their time in pursuit of knowledge and the development of Biblical languages. Some, while waxing eloquent in Latin or Greek, fared rather poorly with their native English. Gustavus S. Paine noted in his book, *The Men Behind the King James Version*, that these "men were minor writers, though great scholars, doing superb writing. Their task lifted them above themselves, while they learned firmly on their subject." (p. vii). Alexander Whyte also notes about Dr. Lancelot Andrewes, who was the chairman of the translation committee, "All his days Andrewes never could write the English language with any beauty or purity or good taste," (*Lancelot Andrewes and his Private Devotions*, p. 3). Yet, they were able to reach beyond themselves. Again Paine makes the following assessment:

Though we may challenge the idea of word-by-word inspiration, we surely must conclude that these were men able, in their profound moods, to transcend their human limits. In their own words, they spake as no other men spake because they were filled with the Holy Ghost. Or, in the clumsier language of our time, they so adjusted themselves to each other and to the work as to achieve a unique coordination and balance, functioning thereafter as an organic entity--no mere mechanism equal to the sum of its parts, but a whole greater than all of them. (p. 173). The translation went through a series of committees, all consisting of the translators themselves. Upon finishing the assigned portion given to him, a translator would meet with the first committee and read the work he translated. Those within the committee followed the reading from various

sources, such as the original languages, early English translations, and foreign translations including German, French, Italian, and Spanish. If there were no differences concerning the translation the reader read on. If there were differences, the committee would reach a consensus before proceeding. The findings were then presented to the other two companies for their committees to review in like fashion. If these committees differed at any given point, the differences were compounded and presented to a third committee consisting of twelve members. This committee (known as the General Meeting) reviewed what the previous committees had produced and agreed upon the finished translation before presenting the work to two final editors, Bishop Thomas Bilson and Dr. Miles Smith.

TRUE REWARDS:

Some have erroneously stated that the translators were paid for their efforts or rewarded with political advancements. This is, however, simply not the case. Dr. Jack Lewis has correctly stated that, "Though the king contributed no money to its production, and though no record of an official authorization of the finished product survives (if such were ever given), the Bible came to be known as the King James Bible." (The English Bible: From KJV to NIV, p.29). This is in direct opposition to those, such as James White, who have claimed that the King paid for the translation and offered political advancement for those who worked on it. "Technically the KJV belongs to the English crown, which authorized and paid for its translation nearly four hundred years ago." (The King James Only Controversy, p. 244). "Some, in fact, may have harbored less than perfect motivations for their work. Some hoped to gain favor with the king and advancement in their positions through their work on the translation itself. Some were far too enamored with the idea of royalty, a problem not too uncommon in that day." (Ibid. pp. 70-71). The only evidence offered is a misstating of G. S. Paine's book, *The Men Behind the King James Version*. At no time does Paine suggest the translators had any such motives. White tries to prove his claim with the example of William Barlow (White, p. 88) as one who sought the king's favor. However, this is not what Paine wrote. Instead Paine states, "About kings and queens, Barlow was always sound," and that "King James greatly approved of him." (Paine, p. 43). There is no hint in Paine's book that Barlow, or any of the translators, sought to be on the translational committee in order to gain favor with the King. The historical truth is that payment did not come from the crown, but from the Church. Funds were raised and received for the purpose of sustaining the translators during their work on the translation, but they were not given financial reward (John Dore, *Old Bibles: An Account of the Early Versions of the English Bible*, 1888, p. 325). It is true that several of the translators did advance within the Church after the translation was complete, but this was due to their ability, not as a reward for their effort. These advancements came from within the Church, not from the crown. Their greatest reward was in the fruit of their labor, the KJV itself. The translators wrote, "But among all our joys, there was no one that more filled our heart than the blessed continuance of the preaching of God's sacred Word among us, which is that inestimable treasure which excelleth all the riches of earth; because the fruit thereof extendeth itself, not only to the time spent in this transitory world, but directeth and disposeth men unto that eternal happiness which is above in heaven." (From the Dedicatory of the KJV). THE CUM PRIVILEGIO:

Another common myth concerning the KJV is that it was under the sole printing authority of the crown. There were no copyrights in those days, but some have suggested that the KJV was the Cum Privilegio (i.e. with privilege) of King James and the English crown, and that only the royal

printer could publish the KJV. In addressing the KJV Only advocates, James White states, "But we should point out that the KJV carries what is called the Cum Privilegio. Technically the KJV belongs to the English crown, . . .the KJV was first printed by the royal printer, and that for a hundred years no one else could print it. Does this not sound pretty much like a modern copyright? It would seem so. So again we find the KJV Only argument to be inconsistent, involving a double standard." (White, p. 244). This statement is totally in error. The Royal Printer was Robert Barker. However, we find that the KJV was printed both in England and outside the country by others, not counting Barker. Consider the following statements: In the year 1642, a folio edition of King James's Version was printed at Amsterdam by "Joost Broersz, dwelling in the Pijlsteegh, in the Druckerije". . . The notes of the King James's Bible are omitted, and the arguments and annotations of the "Breeches" Bible are inserted in their place. (John R. Dore, *Old Bibles: An Account of the Early Versions of the English Bible*, p. 345) In fact, Bibles with the KJV text but with Geneva notes were printed in Holland in 1642, 1672, 1683, 1708, 1715 and in England in 1649. (Jack Lewis, *The English Bible: From KJV to NIV*, p. 29). A small octavo Testament was issued at Edinburgh, by the Heirs of Hart, in 1628 (the Anfro Hart whose "Breeches" Bible were so highly esteemed). This is the first Testament printed in Scotland of King James's Version. (Dore, pp. 338-339).

Although the Universities always claimed the right to print the Bible, Cambridge had not exercised that right since the year 1589; but in 1628 a duodecimo Testament was published at Cambridge, by the printers to the University, and the following year Thomas and John Buck issued the first Cambridge Bible. (Dore, p. 339). The University of Oxford did not begin to print Bibles until the year 1675, when the first was issued in quarto size; the spelling was revised by Dr. John Fell, Dean of Oxford. (Dore, p. 346). In England, the printing of the Authorized or King James Version of the Bible (KJV) and the Book of Common Prayer (BCP) of 1662 is the monopoly of the Royal Printer, by virtue of a patent first granted to Christopher Barker in 1577. Only the University Presses of Cambridge and Oxford are permitted by royal charter to override this monopoly; one other publisher, originally Scottish, is an accepted interloper. (M. H. Black, *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, 1993, p. 617). By its royal charter of 1534, the University of Cambridge had acquired the perpetual right to appoint three printers, who could print "all manner of books." The right preexisted Barker's patent, and was taken to cover Bibles, so Cambridge printed a Geneva Bible in 1591 and its first KJV in 1629. Oxford acquired a similar charter in 1636, and in the 1670s printed Bibles. (Black, p.618).

Once again, the evidence shows that the attacks against the KJV are unwarranted. THE APOCRYPHA: An objection to the KJV which often arises today is that when first printed the KJV contained the Apocrypha. It was placed between the Old and New Testament, which was common for English Bibles in those days. However, they did not consider the Apocrypha inspired scripture. They placed it between the Testaments as historical record and Jewish poetry. This is noted in the Preface to the Geneva Bible:

These books that follow in order after the Prophets unto the New Testament, are called Apocrypha, that is books, which were not received by a common consent to be read and expounded publicly in the Church, neither yet served to prove any point of Christian religion, save in as much as they had the consent of the other Scriptures called Canonical to confirm the same, or rather whereon they were grounded: but as books preceding from godly men, were received to

be read for the advancement and furtherance of the knowledge of the history, and for the insurrection of godly manners: which books declare that at all times God had an especial care of his Church and left them not utterly destitute to teachers and means to confirm them in the hope of the promised Messiah, and also witness that those calamities that God sent to his Church, were according to his providence, who had both so threatened by his Prophets, and so brought it to pass for the destruction of their enemies, and for the trial of his children.

Likewise, the translators of the Authorized Version did not give the Apocrypha the respect they had given the Holy Scriptures. In addition to placing the Apocrypha between the testaments, the translators did not entitle it on the cover page as they had the Old and New Testaments. The cover page in the 1611 edition makes no mention of the Apocrypha whatever. The statement reads, "The Holy Bible, Conteyning the Old Testament, and the New." When the Apocrypha is introduced between the two testaments, the introduction simply reads, "Books called Apocrypha." Additionally, both the Old and New Testaments have elaborate engravings placed at the beginning of each testaments; the Apocrypha does not.

Furthermore, the translators of the Authorized Version did not malign the canonical books the way they did the Apocrypha. At 1 Esdras 5:5 the margin states, "This place is corrupt," a marginal reading nowhere found in either of the testaments. In the addition to the book of Esther they noted, "The rest of the Chapters of the Booke of Esther, which are found neither in the Hebrew, nor in the Calde."

REVISIONS: A popular argument used to oppose the KJV is to ask which edition of the KJV is the preserved word of God. The thought is to assume that the text of the Authorized Version has been changed. If changes in the text have occurred, then there would be justification for additional revisions such as we have today. The truth of this is that the text has not really been changed at all. The revisions of the KJV dealt with the correction of early printing errors, or the formation of the text to reflect today's style of writing and spelling. The verses, however, have remained the same.

There have been four major revisions of the Authorized Version. They took place in 1629, 1638, 1762, and 1769. Our current editions reflect the revision of 1769. The 1762 revision was the work of Dr. Paris of the University at Cambridge. The work of this revision laid the foundation for most modern editions of the text. He made extensive use of the italics and modernized most of the spelling. His edition also added several marginal references. The 1769 edition came from Oxford, and was the work of Dr. Balyney. In this edition several additional revisions were made in correcting earlier printing errors, spelling, and expanding marginal and introductory notes. This edition has become the standard by which modern texts are printed. This can be illustrated by the following example from Gal 1:1-5. However, some of the style of printing cannot be illustrated in the class as e-mail will not permit such changes in fonts.

King James Version 1612 edition

King James Version current edition

1. Paul an Apostle not of men, neither by man, but by Iesus Christ, and God the Father, who reised him from the dead,

1. Paul, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead;)

2. And all the brethren which are with me, vnto the Churches of Galatia: 3. Grace be to you and peace, from God the Father, and from our Lord Iesus Christ;

2. And all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia: 3. Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ,

4. Who gaue himself for our fins, that he might deliuer vs fro this present euil world, according to the will of God,&our Father. 5. To whom be glory for euer and euer, Amen.

4. Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father: 5. To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

The difference between the early editions of the King James Bible and current ones would reflect the differences in both spelling and the way a word was written, and minor adjustments to the text. Thus *fro* becomes *from,* and *God,&our Father* becomes *God and our Father.* *Iesus Christ* becomes *Jesus Christ,* and *deliuer vs* is changed to *deliver us*. There are also changes in certain words as to capitalization. *Apostle* or *apostle,* and *Churches* or *churches.* Likewise, some words are italicized that were not italicized before; such as *be* and *from* in verse 3. The text, however, has not been altered.

Other revisions sought to correct printing errors. Sometimes a word was omitted by the printer, or words were printed twice. These were corrected in order to produce the text as the translators gave it. One edition, for example, left out the word *not* in a few of the Ten Commandments, thus earning it the nickname of *The Wicked Bible.* Even today with computerized checking of the text, printing errors can occur. This does not mean that there is no preserved word of God, nor does this mean that the text of the KJV is corrupt. It does mean that sometimes printers have made mistakes, and the four major revisions of the KJV have sought to correct such errors.

Again, it must be asserted that the text of the KJV has come to us unaltered. What has changed is the correction of printing errors, changes in punctuation and italics, orthography and calligraphy. This was verified by the American Bible Society in a report published in 1852 (after the fourth major revision of the KJV took place) entitled Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers. An additional report was issued in 1858 by the ABS entitled, Report of the Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society. Apart from the changes just listed, the reports stated that, "The English Bible as left by the translators has come down to us unaltered in respect to its text." (1852, p.7. Also see the 1858 report, pp. 1-20). This is further attested to by scholar and collector of early English Bibles, John R. Dore. In a study published by the Royal Printers in 1888, Dore stated, "That pearl of great price, the English Bible of 1611, remained so long without alteration, that many of us had forgotten that it was only one of a series of versions." (Dore, p.iii). Notice that Dore stated that in all the revisions of the KJV, it has remained so long without alteration. It is with confidence that the Bible-believer can say that their Authorized Version is the same as it was in 1611. For almost four-hundred years now God has blessed the King James Bible. It taught many of our forefathers to read, and most how to live. It was the Bible that united God's people, regardless of their denomination. And, it has been responsible for sending more souls to heaven than any of its predecessors. Even though the NIV is reported to have

outsold the KJV for the past few years, the Authorized Version still remains the Bible of the people. A recent poll conducted by the American Bible Society stated that nearly all Americans own at least one version of the Bible. Even with the variety of modern versions available to the English reader, approximately two-thirds of those surveyed claim the Authorized Version as their Bible. The King James Version still remains the most reproduced translation for the purpose of evangelistic outreach.

I close this section of the lesson with a listing of a few testimonies concerning the richness and value of this, the preserved word of God. The Right Rev. Henry G. Graham (Catholic Historian): "Hence a large band of translators was appointed and in 1611 there was finished and published what has proved to be the best Protestant version that ever appeared--one which has exercised an enormous influence not only on the minds of its readers, but also on English literature throughout the world." (Where We Got The Bible: Our Debt to the Catholic Church ; Tan Books and Publishers, Inc.; Rockford, Ill.;1911; 22ed. 1987, ; p. 140)

Alexander Geddes (Catholic scholar; 1786): "If accuracy and strictest attention to the letter of the text be supposed to constitute an excellent version, this is of all versions the most excellent." (as quoted from the preface of the New King James Version; 1982; Thomas Nelson Publishers)

Sir Frederic Kenyon (Textual Scholar): "It is the simple truth that, as literature, the English Authorized Version is superior to the original Greek. It was the good fortune of the English nation that its Bible was produced at a time when the genius of the language for noble prose was at its height, and when a natural sense of style was not infected by self-conscious scholarship. The beauty of the language commended the teaching of the sacred books and make them dear to the heart of the people, while it made an indelible and enduring impression alike on literature and on popular speech." (The Story of the Bible, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; 1936; 1967 ed. pp. Matthew,42).

Dr. Andrew Graham (Theologian): In reference to the Revised Version of 1881 "...the Authorized Version has probably sent more souls to heaven than its more accurate successors. The Revised Version is undoubtedly of help in the interpretation of its predecessor, but it has never superseded it." ("The English Bible" from The Bible Companion, edited by William Neil; McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. New York; 1960; p. 430)

Dr. F. F. Bruce (Biblical Scholar): "In literary quality it surpasses all its successors; for this reason it has maintained its popularity for over 350 years. The translators had an instinctive appreciation of prose rhythm and general euphony, hence it has been excellent for reading aloud." ("Which Bible Is Best For You?" Eternity, April, 1974).

Dr. Charles C. Ryrie (Theologian): "Well, there are some odd things about what is still the greatest translation. And isn't it amazing, after 360 years with all the good new translations, really none has supplanted the King James. Someday, someone will, perhaps, but I wouldn't want to bet on which one, yet, because no one has really come to the fore. Still the work that these men did, started in the very peculiar way, by this rather peculiar king, has survived and became the cornerstone of our language, really. And it's a great, great book." ("Oddities of the King James Bible" in The Christian Librarian, Vol. 18, No. 1 & 2, October, December, 1974, p. 16).

Revised Version (1881): "...its simplicity, its dignity, its power, its happy turns of expression...the music of its cadences, and the felicities of its rhythm." (Preface)

American Standard Version: "We are not insensible to the justly lauded beauty and vigor of the style of the Authorized Version, nor do we forget that it has been no part of our task to modernize the diction of the Bible." (Preface) The Modern Language Bible (New Berkeley Version): "We are in turn with the 'Authorized Version' of 1611 in fidelity to the Messianic Promise,..." (Preface)

New King James Version: "For nearly four hundred years, and throughout several revisions of its English form, the King James Bible has been deeply revered among the English-speaking peoples of the world. The precision of translation for which it is historically renowned, and its majesty of style, have enabled that monumental version of the Word of God to become the mainspring of the religion, language, and legal foundations of our civilization." (Preface)

New Revised Standard Version: "In the course of time, the King James Version came to be regarded as 'The Authorized Version'. With good reason it has been termed 'the noblest monument of English prose', and it has entered, as no other book has, into the making of the personal character and the public institutions of the English-speaking peoples. We owe to it an incalculable debt." (Preface)

Dr. Bruce M. Metzger (Bible Scholar/Translator): "An outstanding merit of the King James Version is the music of its cadences. The translators were men experienced in the public reading of the Scriptures and in the conduct of public worship. Their choice of the final wording of a passage was often determined by a marvelously sure instinct for what would sound well when read aloud. Take as an example the...translation of Pro 3:17...The King James Version gives to the verse a perfect melody:..." ("English Versions of the Bible"; The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha; RSV, Oxford University Press, Inc.; 1962; p. 1553)

Bishop Benjamin Westcott (of Westcott and Hort): "From the middle of the seventeenth century, the King's Bible has been the acknowledged Bible of the English-speaking nations throughout the world simply because it is the best." ("English Versions of the Bible"; RSV)

Dr. Keith R. Crim (OT Translator for TEV): "Another point of excellence is the natural rhythm of the great prose passages, a feature that made the King James Version especially well-suited for public reading. Sound and sense were blended in a happy combination. And so when the Bible Societies were founded in the early years of the nineteenth century there was a great translation ready for them to distribute, a translation that had proved its value." ("Translating The Bible Into English: The First Thousand Years"; The Bible Translator; Vol. 25, No. 2; April 1974; p. 220) The New Grolier Multimedia Encyclopedia: "Early Jacobean prose is seen at its best in the Authorized Version of the Old and New Testaments (1611), the joint work of 47 scholars, which was not only the mainstay of the Protestant faith but a rich resource from which innumerable Englishmen have learned to use their native language." (Grolier Electronic Publishing, Inc., 1993 under English Literature, The 17th Century)

Compton's Encyclopedia: "One of the supreme achievements of the English Renaissance came at its close, in the King James Bible...It is rightly regarded as the most influential book in the history of English civilization...the King James Version combined homely, dignified phrases into a style of great richness and loveliness. It has been a model of writing for generations of English-speaking

people." (Compton's Encyclopedia, Online Edition. Downloaded from America Online, May 26, 1995)

Merit Students Encyclopedia: "The greatest English Bible is the Authorized, or King James, Version. Based on Tyndale's translation and original texts, it was produced in 1611 by six groups of churchmen at the command of King James I. The King James Bible became the traditional Bible of English-speaking Protestants. Its dignified and beautiful style strongly influenced the development of literature in the English language. The influence can be seen in the works of John Bunyan, John Milton, Herman Melville, and many other writers." (Merit Students Encyclopedia; Vol. 3; Crowell-Collier Educational Corporation; 1967, 1972 ed. p.p. 137, 138 Rev. Holt H. Graham; Rev. Joseph M. Petulla; Mr. Cecil Roth)

Ernest Sutherland Bates (Literary Editor): "As far as literary value is concerned, however, the King James Version, produced when the language was younger and more flexible, is unlikely ever to be superseded. Its position as a world classic seems to be as secure as that of Homer, Dante, or Shakespeare, and it is the only translation in all literature of which that can be said." (The Bible: Designed To Be Read As Living Literature; Simon and Schuster Publishing, New York, NY.; 1936; 21st ed. 1965; p. 1236)

George Bernard Shaw (Author): "The translation was extraordinarily well done because to the translators what they were translating was not merely a curious collection of ancient books written by different authors in different stages of culture, but the word of God divinely revealed through His chosen and expressly inspired scribes. In this conviction they carried out their work with boundless reverence and care and achieved a beautifully artistic result...they made a translation so magnificent that to this day the common human Britisher or citizen of the United States of North America accepts and worships it as a single book by a single author, the book being the Book of Books and the author being God." (The Men Behind the King James Version, by G. S. Paine; Baker Book House; Grand Rapids, Mich.; 1959, 1977ed., pp. 182-183).

Amy Clampitt (Poet): "If one lives to a sufficient age, the day is bound to arrive in discovering a kind of bedrock delight in the curmudgeonly I-told-you-so of the Hebrews prophets, when the rhetoric of the King James Version has the aspect not of a stumbling block but rather of a bulwark, and the ring of it becomes almost contemporary." (Essay "The Poetry of Isaiah" from Out of the Garden: Women Writers on the Bible, ed. by Christina Buchmann and Alima Celina Spiegel; New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1994)

Lew Sarett (Author): "I have studied the Bible, King James Version, carefully. I was interested in its literary beauty, in the factors that contribute to the nobility, power, and economy of its expression." (Our Roving Bible: Tracking Its Influence Through English and American Life, by Lawrence E. Nelson, Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, p. 262)

Maurice Hindus (Newsman of Russian-Jewish descent): "I have traveled far and wide over this earth, and I have never been without a King James Version of the Bible. Like thousands of men in my profession, I have found its lucid and majestic prose an inestimable help in my work." (Ibid. p. 227).

Dr. James W. Peebles (African-American Theologian): "Many slaves who learned to read and write did so by using the King James Version as a basic textbook. This held true even after the

slaves were freed. Most Blacks who were not able to attend school, which was the majority of the black population, especially in the South, learned to read by studying the words from the King James Version. . .Considering these momentous thoughts and occasions that have been for so long in the hearts and minds of black people is the reason why the King James Version was used for this translation. It is the most respected version among black people in the African diaspora. Regardless of its weaknesses and inadequacies, it is far more effective at addressing Africa than most of the newly revised modern editions." (The Original African Heritage Study Bible)

Eudoro Welty (Southern Author): "How many of us, the South's writers-to-be of my generation, were blessed in not having gone deprived of the King James Version of the Bible? Its cadence entered into our ears and our memories for good. The ghost of it lingers in all our books." (cited by Barbara Binswanger and Jim Charlton, "Songs of the South," from the July 1995 issue of Reader's Digest; p. 73)

Sir Winston Churchill: "The scholars who produced this masterpiece are mostly unknown and unremembered. But they forged an enduring link, literary and religious, between the English-speaking people of the world." (The King James Bible Translators; Olga S. Opfell; Jefferson and London: McFarland, 1982)

General Colin Powell (as cited by David Roth): " 'I'm a dyed-in-the wool, unreformed Episcopalian of the 1928 Prayer Book,' Powell told an interviewer recently. For Powell this statement packs a lot of meaning. His point is not that he likes his religion dusty and old, without feeling, and steeped in hollow ritual. Rather it is a nostalgic comment. Powell finds recent reforms in the ancient, deeply rooted church of his childhood troubling. Yes, he loves the cadence of the King James translation. He finds the seemingly timeless and transcendent worship and traditional hymns spiritually stirring." (Sacred Honor, pp. 132-133)

Charlton Heston (Actor; Moses in the 10 Commandments): "And of course there's the King James translation itself. It's been described as 'the monument of English prose' as well as 'the only great work of art ever created by a committee.' Both statements are true. Fifty-four scholars worked seven years to produce the work from the extant texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English. Such an undertaking can be expected to produce great scholarship, but hardly writing as spare and sublime as the King James. . .The authors of several boring translations that have followed over the last fifty years mumble that the K.J.V. is 'difficult,' filled with long words. Have a look at the difficult long words that begin the Old Testament, and end the Gospels: 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; darkness was upon the face of the deep.' and 'Now, of the other things which Jesus did, if they should be written every one, I suppose the world itself could not contain the books that would be written.' Shakespeare aside, there's no comparable writing in the language, as has been observed by wiser men than I. Over the past several centuries, it's been the single book in most households, an enormous force in shaping the development of the English language. Carried around the world by missionaries, it provided the base by which English is about to become the lingua franca of the world in the next century. Exploring it during this shoot was one of the most rewarding creative experiences of my life." (In the Arena: An Autobiography, pp. 554-555) QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS Dr. Holland, Could you please supply me with some information and verses about the New King James Versions?

During the course of these lessons I have received several questions from students, as the one listed above, concerning the NKJV. It would seem appropriate to make comments about that translation at this time. In 1979 the NKJV was released in the New Testament by Thomas Nelson Publishers. The whole Bible was published in 1982. Its goal was unique from other modern versions in that the NT was translated from the Textus Receptus, instead of the Critical Text as most modern versions are. Thus, many of the verses which have been omitted from modern versions can be found in the NKJV. Therefore, many who reject modern translations and favor the TR find the NKJV an acceptable modern version of the Bible. When first published, the translators claimed the NKJV was the fifth revision of the KJV of 1611. Even the name, New King James, shows an association with the Authorized Version. However, as we have seen in this lesson, the revisions of the KJV which predate the NKJV were proper revisions which did not change the text. This cannot be said of the NKJV. In fact, it is not a revision at all. Instead, it is a new translation of the OT Masoretic Hebrew Text and the NT Traditional Greek Text based on the findings of modern linguistical scholarship from a conservative theological basis. A few differences between the NKJV and its predecessor are listed below.

KJV

NKJV

Son or Servant

The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; . . . (Acts 3:13 KJV)

The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers, glorified His Servant Jesus, . . . (NKJV. Also in Acts 3:26; Acts 4:27; Acts 4:30)

Deity Changed

And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; ... (Rev 1:6 KJV)

and has made us kings and priests to His God and Father, . . . (NKJV)

God or Rock

Art thou not from everlasting, O LORD my God, mine Holy One? we shall not die. O LORD, thou hast ordained them for judgment; and, O mighty God, thou hast established them for correction. (Hab 1:12 KJV)

Are You not from everlasting, O LORD my God, my Holy One? We shall not die. O LORD, You have appointed them for judgment; O Rock, You have marked them for correction. (NKJV)

Godhead or Divine Nature

Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, . . . (Acts 17:29 KJV)

Therefore, since we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Divine Nature is like gold or silver or stone, . . . (NKJV. However in Rom 1:20 and Col 2:9 the NKJV switches back to Godhead)

Comforter or Helper

And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; (John 14:16 KJV)

And I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Helper, that He may abide with you forever, (NKJV. Also in John 14:26; John 15:26; John 16:7)

Corrupt or Peddle

For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: . . . (2Co 2:17 KJV)

For we are not, as so many, peddling the word of God; . . . (NKJV)

Satan or Accuser

Set thou a wicked man over him: and let Satan stand at his right hand. (Psa 109:6 KJV)

Set a wicked man over him, And let an accuser stand at his right hand. (NKJV)

Saved or Being Saved

For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God. (1Co 1:18 KJV)

For the message of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God. (NKJV. Also in 2Co 2:15)

Jesus or He

And it came to pass, that, as Jesus sat at meat in his house, . . . (Mark 2:15 KJV)

Now it happened, as He was dining in Levi's house, . . . <<(NKJV)

The NKJV is suppose to be easier to read than the KJV. Of the following verses, which do you find harder?

Numb. 21:14

Wherefore it is said in the book of the wars of the LORD, What he did in the Red sea, and in the brooks of Arnon,

Therefore it is said in the Book of the Wars of the LORD: Waheb in Suphah, The brooks of the Arnon.

Acts 17:22

Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious.

And Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus and said, Men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are very religious;

Mat 27:27

Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall, and gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers.

Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the Praetorium and gathered the whole garrison around Him.

Mat 20:2

And when he had agreed with the labourers for a penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard.

Now when he had agreed with the laborers for a denarius a day, he sent them into his vineyard.

1Ki 10:28

And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and linen yarn: the king's merchants received the linen yarn at a price.

And Solomon had horses imported from Egypt and Keveh; the king's merchants bought them in Keveh at the current price.

Psa 43:1

Judge me, O God, and plead my cause against an ungodly nation: O deliver me from the deceitful and unjust man.

Vindicate me, O God, And plead my cause against an ungodly nation: Oh, deliver me from the deceitful and unjust man!

Acts 27:17

Which when they had taken up, they used helps, undergirding the ship; and, fearing lest they should fall into the quicksands, strake sail, and so were driven.

When they had taken it on board, they used cables to undergird the ship; and fearing lest they should run aground on the Syrtis Sands, they struck sail and so were driven.

These are only a few examples of the differences between the KJV and NKJV. It should become clear that the NKJV is not truly the fifth revision of the Authorized Version, but is a retranslation of the texts.

08 LESSON EIGHT

LESSON EIGHT: The Hebrew Masoretic Text and Greek Septuagint

What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God. (Rom 3:1-2)

According to the Bible, the Hebrews were given charge of keeping and copying God's word. The word oracle means revelation, prophecy, canon, or edict. It was unto the Jew, that the Old Testament revelation and canon were committed. This is why twice in the Old Testament they were instructed not to add to or take from the word of God. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you." (Deu 4:2). "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." (Pro 30:6). The faithful Hebrew scribe took this task very seriously. Precise steps were taken by the scribes in preparing both the parchment upon which they wrote, and in preparing themselves in order to copy God's Holy word. According to the Hebrew Talmud, the rules of the scribe consisted of the following:

- 1) The skins of the parchments had to be prepared in a special way and dedicated to God so that they would be clean in order to have God's words written on them.
- 2) The ink which was used was black and made in accordance to a special recipe used only for writing scripture.
- 3) The words written could not be duplicated by memory but must be reproduced from an authentic copy which the scribe had before him. And, the scribe had to say each word aloud when he wrote them.
- 4) Each time the scribe came across the Hebrew word for God, he had to wipe his pen clean. And when he came across the name of God, Jehovah (YHWH), he had to wash his whole body before he could write it.
- 5) If a sheet of parchment had one mistake on it, the sheet was condemned. If there were three mistakes found on any page, the whole manuscript was condemned. Each scroll had to be checked within thirty days of its writing, or it was considered unholy.
- 6) Every word and every letter was counted. If a letter or word were omitted, the manuscript was condemned.
- 7) There were explicit rules for how many letters and words allowed on any given parchment. A column must have at least 48 lines and no more than 60. Letters and words had to be spaced at a certain distance and no word could touch another.

Commenting on these rules, Dr. H.S. Miller writes, "Some of these rules may appear extreme and absurd, yet they show how sacred the Holy Word of the Old Testament was to its custodians, the Jews (Rom 3:2), and they gave us strong encouragement to believe that we have the real Old

Testament, the same on which our Lord had and which was originally given by inspiration of God." (General Biblical Introduction, p. 185). In his book, *The Text of the Old Testament*, Dr. Ernst Würthwein writes, "This was the purpose of the scribes' meticulous work. They counted the verses, words, and letters of the Law and other parts of the Scriptures as a procedural aid in preparing manuscripts and in checking their accuracy." (Eerdmans Publishing, 1979, p. 19). The Jewish historian Josephus (37-95 AD) comments on the preciseness of the Jewish scribes and their faithfulness in copying the Old Testament scriptures. "...for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them; but it becomes natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem those books to contain divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them." (Flavius Josephus *Against Apion* 1:8). Some have taken Josephus' statement to mean the contents of the Old Testament. Other have understood it to mean the canon of the Old Testament. Either way, his statement affirms the sacredness the Hebrews have for Holy Scripture. For years it had been thought that the Bible which Christ used was the Greek Septuagint (also known as the LXX). The common thought was that the Jews at the time of Christ had all but lost their use of Hebrew. Since the international language of that day was Greek, the hypothesis was that Christ did not use the Hebrew scriptures, but read from the Greek LXX. However, with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (which will be discussed in greater detail in lesson nine) it has been established that the Jews did not lose their use of Hebrew. In fact, most of their writings (both sacred and otherwise) were written in Hebrew.

Alan Millard has written the following about the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) and their relation to ancient languages.

"Aramaic, Greek, Latin... was Hebrew spoken too? For years scholars believed not, or that it was restricted to religious circles, synagogue readings and prayers, and the Temple. Counting in favor of a wider knowledge is the presence of Hebrew inscriptions on the other side of Hasmonean coins. That might mean no more than Latin legends on coins of recent times--a grand style which the educated could understand. However, recent discoveries have thrown new light on the question. Books in a style of Hebrew imitating the Old Testament yet distinct from it, and some in Hebrew more like that of the Mishnah make up a larger section of the Dead Sea Scrolls." (Discoveries From the Time of Jesus, Lion Pub., Oxford; p. 35. Professor Millard has served with the British Museum in the Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities and is Rankin Reader in Hebrew and Ancient Semitic languages at the University of Liverpool). This discovery confirms what we find in the Gospels concerning the Hebrew Old Testament used by Christ. In Matthew, Jesus proclaims; "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." (Mat 5:18). It is interesting that He used the words jot and tittle. In the Wycliffe Bible Commentary, Dr. Homer Kent of Grace Theological Seminary writes, "Jot. Smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet (yodh). Tittle. Tiny projection on certain Hebrew letters." (p.937). The smallest part of the letters Jesus used to describe the fact that the law would not pass until all was fulfilled, were Hebrew. This would be odd if Christ were reading from a Greek Old Testament.

Further, Jesus says in Luk 11:51; "From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation." . This statement attests that Christ used the Hebrew canon of scripture. The order of

books found in our Old Testament run from Genesis to Malachi. The Greek LXX has the same order but adds additional books (the Apocrypha). The Hebrew canon, while containing the same books as our Old Testament, places the order of the books differently. The Hebrew Bible runs from Genesis to 2 Chronicles with the minor prophets in the middle and not the end as in our Old Testament. We know that Abel was killed by his brother according to Gen 4:8. Zacharias was killed in 2Ch 24:20-22. Thus showing the first and last to die according to the Jewish Bible. Dr. Merrill Tenney agrees by simply stating, "Able was the first martyr of the OT history. Zacharias was the last, according to the order of books in the Hebrew Bible, which, unlike the English Bible, ends with Chronicles." (Ibid. p. 1049). With these things in mind, we can safely say the Bible of our Lord was a Hebrew Bible. THE MASORETIC TEXT: The Masoretic Text is the traditional Hebrew Old Testament text of both Judaism and Protestantism (The Catholic Church, historically, used the Latin translation of Jerome based on the Greek LXX). Masoretic comes from the word Masora which usually refers to the notes printed beside the Hebrew text by Jewish scribes and scholars.

Until recently, the oldest manuscripts of the Hebrew Old Testament dated from the ninth century and onward. These Hebrew manuscripts of the middle ages are in general agreement. The Biblia Hebraica by Kittel is the basic Hebrew Old Testament used by scholars and translators and is based on the Masoretic Text from this time period. However, with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (which will be discussed in our next lesson) manuscripts which date from around 168 BC to about 68 AD. Thus providing us with Hebrew manuscripts which outdate the previous manuscripts by about 1,000 years. What is interesting to the student of textual criticism and the believer in Biblical preservation, is the fact that a large number of the DSS agree with the Masoretic Text. Although there are manuscripts within the findings of the DSS which agree with the LXX and also reflect a differing Hebrew Text with a number of variants, the fact remains that we now have manuscripts dating from the time of Christ or before which agree with the Masoretic Text. This give additional credence to the preciseness and integrity of the Hebrew scribes in their accuracy of reproducing the manuscripts throughout the ages. And, most importantly, it shows the preservation of the Old Testament Text in Hebrew by God.

Dr. Emanuel Tov of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and one of the editors of the DSS writes:

" Of similar importance are the new data about the context of the biblical scrolls, since different texts are recognizable. Some texts reflect precisely the consonantal framework of the medieval MT (Masoretic Text). Others reflect the basic framework of the MT, although their spelling is different. Still others differ in many details from the MT, while agreeing with the Septuagint or Samaritan Pentateuch. Some texts do not agree with any previously known text at all, and should be considered independent textual traditions. Thus, the textual picture presented by the Qumran scrolls represents a textual variety that was probably typical for the period." (The Oxford Companion to the Bible, edited by Bruce Metzger and Michael Coogan, 1993; p.160)

Norman Geisler and William Nix attest to most of the DSS reflecting the Masoretic Text. In their book, A General Introduction to the Bible, they write, " The (Dead Sea) scrolls give an overwhelming confirmation of the fidelity of the Masoretic text." (p. 261). They go on to cite Millar Burrows' work, The Dead Sea Scrolls, " It is a matter of wonder, " states Burrows, " that through something like a thousand years the text underwent so little alteration. As I said in my first article on the scroll, 'Herein lies its chief importance, supporting the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition.'"

(Ibid.). Ernst Wurthwein cites R. de Vaux as saying, " The script is more developed, the Biblical text is definitely that of the Masora, and it must be concluded from this that the documents from Qumran (i.e. DSS) are older, earlier than the second century." (Wurthwein, p. 31). Concerning the scrolls of Isaiah found in Cave 1 at Qumran, Wurthwein writes, " The scrolls (1QIsa. a.) has a popular type text which supports (the Masoretic Text) essentially, but which also offers a great number of variants. . .A second Isaiah manuscripts (1QIsa. b.) is fragmentary, but stands much closer to the Masoretic text." (Ibid. p. 32).

Fragments of Leviticus in Old Hebrew script (1QLev. a) add support to the antiquity of the Masoretic Text. These fragments cover Lev 19:31-34; Lev 20:20-23. Concerning these Wurthwein states, " These fragments are the earliest of the Old Hebrew script written on leather. . .(only) one variant from (MT) is found in 20:21" (Ibid. p.148). The one variant referred to by Wurthwein deals with one letter in a word, which does not change the meaning of the word. If the student has a Strong's Exhaustive Concordance they can see for themselves the minor difference in this word. Strong list the word as #1931 in his Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary. Both forms are listed together. The Masoretic Text uses the Hebrew word hoo while the DSS uses the Hebrew word he. It is the same Hebrew word and is a personal pronoun meaning he, she, or it. The two seem to be used interchangeably throughout the Hebrew Old Testament.

Additional manuscripts have also been found which support the Masoretic Text. Again Wurthwein informs us of the following: " Also important are the remains of fourteen scrolls with Biblical texts from the period before AD 73, discovered while excavating the rock fortress of Masada in the Judean desert in 1963-1965. These agree extensively with the traditional Biblical texts--only in the text of Ezekiel are there a few insignificant variants." (Ibid. p. 31). To these we can also add the Geniza Fragments which date from the fifth century AD. These manuscripts were discovered in 1890 at Cairo, Egypt. They were located in a type of storage room for worn or faulty manuscripts, which was called the Geniza. The fragments number around 200,000 and reflect Biblical texts in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic. The Biblical texts discovered support the Masoretic Text. In one sense, the Masoretic Text may be thought of as the Textus Receptus of the Old Testament. In fact, some scholars have referred to it as such. Like the Textus Receptus of the New Testament, the Masoretic Text is based on the majority of manuscripts and reflects the traditional text used. Although there are differences found in some Masoretic Texts, these differences are minor and usually deal with, orthography, vowel points, accents, and divisions of the text. In 1524/25, Daniel Bomberg published an edition of the Masoretic Text based on the tradition of Jacob ben Chayyim. Jacob ben Chayyim was a Jewish refugee who later became a Christian. It was his text which was used by the translators of the King James Bible for their work in the Old Testament, and it was the basis of Kittel's first two editions of his Hebrew text. Wurthwein notes that the text of ben Chayyim, " enjoyed an almost canonical authority up to our own time." (Ibid. p. 37). For about six generations the Masoretic Text was reproduced by the ben Asher family. Moses ben Asher produced a text in 895 AD known as Codex Cairensis containing the writing of the Prophets. Codex Leningradensis dates to 1008 AD and was based on the work of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher, the son of Moses ben Asher. This Codex is the oldest manuscript containing the complete Bible. Some of the differences found within this family of manuscripts are the basis of Kittel's third edition of his Biblia Hebraica and has been used by scholars in producing modern translations of the Bible, such as the New International Version (1978), the New King James Version (1982), and

the New Revised Standard Version (1989).

One example which shows the difference between the text of ben Chayyim and that of ben Asher, is found in Jer 3:7. The KJV reads, " And I said after she had done all these things, Turn thou unto me. But she returned not. And her treacherous sister Judah saw it." The phrase, " And I said" is also used by the ASV of 1901 and the LXX. However, modern versions such as the NIV use the textual variant and render the verse as, " I thought that after she had done all this she would return to me but she did not, and her unfaithful sister Judah saw it.". This is also the reading of the RSV and NRSV, changing the opening phrase to " I thought". Even though the NKJV is based on the text of ben Asher, they elected to keep the reading as it is found in the KJV and the Masoretic Text of ben Chayyim. Contextually, the reading of the KJV is unquestionably superior. It is one thing for God to claim that Israel should return to Him, as stated in the text. It is quite another for God to have thought something would happen which did not. The reading as it is found in most modern versions seems to question the omniscience of God. For the most part, scholarship agrees that the Masoretic Text became the standard authorized Hebrew text around 100 AD in connection with the completion of the New Testament. Thus we see that the Masoretic Text existed prior to the writings of the New Testament, was used as the official Hebrew Old Testament at the time of the establishing of the Biblical canon, and has been used since as the official representation of the Hebrew originals. Hence we can see in the Masoretic Text the preservation of Scripture in the Hebrew Old Testament, as we can in the Textus Receptus the preservation of Scripture in the Greek New Testament. THE GREEK SEPTUAGINT: The most noted Old Testament translated into Greek is the Septuagint (also known as the LXX). The conventional thought is that the LXX was translated from the Hebrew text by Hellenistic Jews during the period from 275 to 100 BC at Alexandria, Egypt. And, as pointed out by scholars such as Ralph W. Klein, the LXX used a differing Hebrew text and not that of the Masoretic Text type, as reflected in some of the findings among the DSS. The LXX was used by Jerome in producing his Old Testament of the Latin Vulgate used by the Roman Catholic Church, and the LXX remains the official Old Testament of the Greek Orthodox Church. This accounts for the additional books found in the Catholic and Orthodox Churches known as the Apocrypha, because they are contained in the text of the LXX. The association of the Latin numbers LXX (meaning 70) with the Septuagint comes from the legend concerning the origin of this Greek translation. According to the Letter of Aristeas seventy Jewish scholars were chosen to translate the Law of Moses into Greek so that it could be added to the great library of Ptolemy Philadelphus in Alexandria, Egypt. The letter states that the High Priest in Jerusalem sent 72 scholars to the Egyptian king. The High Priest writes, " In the presence of all the people I selected six elders from each tribe, good men and true, and I have sent them to you with a copy of our law. It will be a kindness, O righteous king, if you will give instruction that as soon as the translation of the law is completed, the men shall be restored again to us in safety." (Letter of Aristeas 2:34-35). Thus six scholars from the twelve tribes number seventy-two (it is to be assumed that the 70 is merely a rounding off of the 72).

One wide-spread myth concerning the LXX is an old story which states that the translators worked on their translation alone and compared their work each morning, only to find that each had translated the passage exactly the same. This, of course, has no historical foundation and some have falsely applied this story to the translators of the King James Bible. However, stories such as this one caused some to claim inspiration for the LXX. Dr. Karlfried Froehlich notes this and writes,

" Inspiration was also claimed for the Greek translation of the 'Seventy', which was endorsed by Alexandrian Jewish authorities. In Christian eyes, the legend of the Septuagint's miraculous origin, first told in the Letter of Aristeas, then elaborated by Philo, and further embellished by Christian authors such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyons, Tertullian, and Augustine, even rendered the Septuagint superior to the Hebrew original." (The Oxford Companion to the Bible, p. 310).

Even if the story given in the Letter of Aristeas were true, the Greek translation deals only with the first five books of the Old Testament. Most scholars note that there are differences in style and quality of translation within the LXX and assign a much greater time frame than the seventy-two days allotted in the Letter of Aristeas. In his book, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: The Septuagint after Qumran*, Ralph Klein notes, " the Letter of Aristeas is riddled with many historical improbabilities and errors. . . And yet, however legendary and improbable the details, many still believe that some accurate historical facts about the LXX can be distilled from Aristeas: (1) the translation began in the third century BC; (2) Egypt was the place of origin; and (3) the Pentateuch was done first." (p. 2).

Dr. F. F. Bruce correctly points out that, strictly speaking, the LXX deals only with the Law and not the whole Old Testament. Bruce writes, " The Jews might have gone on at a later time to authorize a standard text of the rest of the Septuagint, but . . . lost interest in the Septuagint altogether. With but few exceptions, every manuscript of the Septuagint which has come down to our day was copied and preserved in Christian, not Jewish, circles." (The Books and the Parchments, p.150). This is important to note because the manuscripts which consist of our LXX today date to the third century AD. Although there are fragments which pre-date Christianity and some of the Hebrew DSS agree with the LXX, the majority of manuscripts we have of the LXX date well into the Christian era. And, not all of these agree. The most noted copy of the LXX is that found in the Hexapla by Origen. Origen produced an Old Testament with six translations paralleled together, called the Hexapla which means sixfold. The fifth column was the LXX. (The columns of the Hexapla were as follows: 1. The Hebrew text. 2. The Hebrew transliterated into Greek. 3. The Greek translation of Aquila. 4. The Greek translation of Symmachus. 5. The LXX. 6. The Greek translation of Theodotion.) However, we do not have Origen's Hexapla (with the exception of a few limited fragments). Sir Frederic Kenyon wrote, " A considerable number of MSS. exist which give information as to Origen's Hexaplaric text and particular passages in the other columns, but these do not go far towards enabling us to recover the LXX text as it existed before Origen; and this remains the greatest problem which confronts the textual student of the Septuagint. Until we can do that, we are not in a position fully to utilize the evidence of the Greek for the recovery of the pre-Masoretic Hebrew." (The Text of the Greek Bible, p.35). In other words, we cannot fully reconstruct Origen's fifth column, let alone a pre-Origenian Septuagint.

Origen's LXX was revised and edited by two of his disciples, Pamphilus and Eusebius. There were additional Greek translations of the Old Testament during this time which were also contained in the Hexapla, such as the work by Aquila and Theodotion. Some scholars believe that the translation produced by Theodotion replaced the LXX in the book of Daniel so that the readings there are really that of Theodotion and not of the LXX. However, others have claimed that this is not the case. Therefore, concerning Origen's Hexapla and the LXX the best scholars can say is that cited by Ernst Wurthwein, " Although no authentic manuscript of the Hexaplaric Septuagint has survived, there are manuscripts which represent the text of Origen more or less closely." (The

Text of the Old Testament, p.57). Two such manuscripts which represent the text of Origen are Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, which the student will recall from our study of New Testament textual criticism. THE LXX AND THE KJV TRANSLATORS:

It is interesting to note in our study of manuscript evidence and the King James Bible, how the translators of the KJV viewed the LXX. This Greek work did not go unnoticed by these men as can be seen in the original preface to the KJV written by Dr. Miles Smith. The following are a few paragraphs from the KJV preface for the student to consider. Afterwards, comments will be made.

1) " Notwithstanding, though it was commended generally, yet it did not fully content the learned, no not of the Jews. For not long after Christ, Aquila fell in hand with a new Translation, and after him Theodotion, and after him Symmachus; yea, there was a fifth and a sixth edition, the Authors whereof were not known. (Epiphanius. de mensur. et ponderibus.) These with the Seventy made up the Hexapla and were worthily and to great purpose compiled together by Origen."

2) " Yet for all that, as the Egyptians are said of the Prophet to be men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit (Isa 31:3); so it is evident, (and Saint Jerome affirmeth as much) (S. Jerome. de optimo genere interpret.) that the Seventy were Interpreters, they were not Prophets; they did many things well, as learned men; but yet as men they stumbled and fell, one while through oversight, another while through ignorance, yea, sometimes they may be noted to add to the Original, and sometimes to take from it; which made the Apostles to leave them many times, when they left the Hebrew, and to deliver the sense thereof according to the truth of the word, as the spirit gave them utterance. This may suffice touching the Greek Translations of the Old Testament."

3) " Now to the latter we answer; that we do not deny, nay we affirm and avow, that the translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God. As the King's speech, which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is still the King's speech, though it be not interpreted by every Translator with the like graadventure so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sense, everywhere. . The Romanists therefore in refusing to hear, and daring to burn the Word translated, did no less than despite the spirit of grace, from whom originally it proceeded, and whose sense and meaning, as well as man's weakness would able, it did express. . .The like we are to think of Translations. The translation of the Seventy dissenteth from the Original in many places, neither doth it come near it, for perspicuity, gravity, majesty; yet which of the Apostles did condemn it? Condemn it? Nay, they used it, . . .To be short, Origen, and the whole Church of God for certain hundred years, were of another mind: for they were so far from treading under foot, (much more from burning) the Translation of Aquila a Proselyte, that is, one that had turned Jew; of Symmachus, and Theodotion, both Ebionites, that is, most vile heretics, that they joined together with the Hebrew Original, and the Translation of the Seventy (as hath been before signified out of Epiphanius) and set them forth openly to be considered of and perused by all. But we weary the unlearned, who need not know so much, and trouble the learned, who know it already." In the first paragraph we find that the KJV translators attest to Origen's Hexapla and early Greek translations of the Old Testament which post-date the birth of Christianity. These translations, along with the LXX, paralleled in the Hexapla. The second paragraph shows that the KJV translators saw some of the limitations of the LXX. They recognized

that the LXX was produced by Interpreters and not by inspired Prophets. Although the LXX translates many things well, it also failed many times and departed from the original Hebrew (i.e. Masoretic Text). Sometimes the LXX adds to the Hebrew, and at other times it omits. Which, according to the KJV translators, made the New Testament writers to, "leave them many times, when they left the Hebrew, and to deliver the sense thereof according to the truth of the word, as the spirit gave them utterance." This simply means that when a New Testament writer cites the LXX, they freely corrected the LXX when it differed from the Hebrew, or as they were moved by inspiration. The third paragraph is lengthy to show the context. The KJV translators promoted the use of translations. Not as we have come to understand it with a variety of versions differing from one another, but the importance of having the word of God translated into the language of those who cannot read Hebrew or Greek. Their argument was against the Catholic Church which at that time made it a practice of burning Bibles which were in any language other than Latin. The Catholic Church considered such translations as corrupt and worthy of burning. The KJV translators are arguing that the history of the Church demonstrates that even when a translation is poorly done, God can still use it and it should not be burned, as the Catholic Church had a practice of doing. They illustrate their point with the Greek translations of Aquila and Theodotion, which were translated by non-believers and yet their work was not burned by believers. They claim the same with the LXX. THE LXX AND THE NEW TESTAMENT:

There are several places where the New Testament quotations of the Old Testament are said to be citations of the LXX. Several of these passages will agree simply because there is a limited way of translating Hebrew into Greek.

Such would be the case in Gen 5:24 as compared with Heb 11:5. The writer of Hebrews and the LXX both use the phrase God translated him in reference to Enoch. The phrase in Greek is *metetheken auton o Theos* in both the NT and the LXX. The English translations are as follows:

"And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him." (Gen 5:24 KJV) "And Enoch was well-pleasing to God, and was not found, because God translated him." (Gen 5:24 LXX)

"By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he please God." (Heb 11:5) At first glance it would seem that the NT passage in Hebrews chapter eleven is closer to the LXX than the OT Hebrew of Genesis chapter five. As we know, the NT was written in Greek, the OT in Hebrew. However, the Hebrew word for took in this passage is *lawkakh* which means to take or move from one place to another. The Greek way of saying the Hebrew *lawkakh* is *methetheken* which means translated. Dr. Charles Ryrie seems to agree with this. He writes, "He (Enoch) walked (lit., walked about, i.e. lived) with God, and instead of letting him die, God took him (the same Hebrew word is used for the translation of Elijah, 2Ki 2:3; 2Ki 2:5; cf. Heb 11:5)." (Ryrie Study Bible, p.15). This is not a citation of the LXX, but a Greek translation of the Hebrew word for took. Further, the student should notice that this verse is a statement of EVENTS found in Genesis five, not a QUOTATION of Gen 5:24.

Another example is that of Heb 1:6, "And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." The problem here is that there is no passage in the Old Testament which reads as it is cited in Hebrews chapter one. However, the LXX does have the phrase, Let all the angels of God worship him, in Deu 32:43 as does one of the

Hebrew fragments found among the DSS. Therefore some claim that the writer of Hebrews is citing either the LXX, or the Hebrew variant found in the DSS.

There is, however, another explanation. Psa 97:7 reads, " Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols: worship him, all ye gods." The Hebrew word translated as gods is Elohim which is also translated as angels (the DSS fragment of Deu 32:43 also uses the Hebrew word Elohim). One way to translate Elohim into English is to use the word gods. One way to translate Elohim into Greek is to use the word angelos. This being the case, the Greek way of saying Psa 97:7 would be, *proskuneton auto pantes angeloï Theou*.

Additionally, Thomas Hewitt, writes, " There is no Hebrew equivalent for Let all the angles of God worship him in our existing text. It may be derived from Psalm xcvi. 7 'worship him, all ye gods' (Heb. elohim). The LXX has 'angels' instead of 'gods'. The quotation, however, is exactly found in Deuteronomy xxxii. 43 (LXX), though this may be an addition by a later hand." (Tyndale NT Commentaries in Hebrews, p. 55). It is interesting that Hewitt states that the passage found in Deu 32:43 of the LXX may have been added by a later hand. If this is true, there very well may be additional places where the LXX simply adds to the OT by citing the NT. The following is a list provided by the American Bible Society (ABS) of LXX readings in the NT. The OT passage is given first, followed by the NT citation of it in parentheses.

Gen 5:24 (Heb 11:5) Gen 46:27 (Acts 7:14) Gen 47:31 (Heb 11:21) Exo 9:16 (Rom 9:17) Deu 17:7 (1Co 5:13) Deu 18:15 (Acts 3:22) Deu 27:26 (Gal 3:10) Deu 29:18 (Heb 12:15) Deu 32:17 (1Co 10:20) Deu 32:43 (Heb 1:6) Psa 2:1-2 (Acts 4:25-26) Psa 2:9 (Rev 2:27) Psa 4:4 (Eph 4:26) Psa 5:9 (Rom 3:13) Psa 8:2 (Mat 21:16) Psa 8:5 (Heb 2:7) Psa 10:7 (Rom 3:14) Psa 14:3 or 53:3 (Rom 3:12) Psa 16:8-11 (Acts 2:25-28) Psa 19:4 (Rom 10:18) Psa 34:12 (1Pe 3:10) Psa 40:6 *thew:6 hew:6* (Heb 10:5) Psa 51:4 (Rom 3:4) Psa 69:22-23 (Rom 11:9-10) Psa 95:7-8 (Heb 3:15; Heb 4:7) Psa 102:25-27 (Heb 1:10-12) Psa 104:4 (Heb 1:7) Psa 116:10 (2Co 4:13) Psa 118:6 (Heb 13:6) Pro 3:4 (2Co 8:21) Pro 3:34 (Jas 4:6; 1Pe 5:5) Pro 3:11-12 (Heb 12:5-6) Pro 4:26 (Heb 12:13) Pro 11:31 (1Pe 4:18) Pro 25:21-22 (Rom 12:20) Isa 1:9 (Rom 9:29) Isa 6:9-10 (Mat 13:14-15; Mark 4:12; Luk 8:10; John 12:40) Acts 28:26-27 Isa 7:14 (Mat 1:23) Isa 10:22-23 (Rom 9:27-28) Isa 11:10 (Rom 15:12) Isa 26:11 (Heb 10:27) Isa 28:16 (Rom 9:33; Rom 10:11; 1Pe 2:6) Isa 29:13 (Mat 15:8-9; Mark 7:6-7) Isa 29:14 (1Co 1:19) Isa 40:3-5 *ew:3-5 w:3-5* (Mat 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luk 3:4-6) Isa 40:6-7 *ew:6-7 w:6-7* (Jas 1:10-11; 1Pe 1:24) Isa 40:13 *hew:13 ew:13* (Rom 11:34; 1Co 2:16) Isa 42:4 (Mat 12:21) Isa 43:20 (1Pe 2:9) Isa 45:23 (Rom 14:11; Php 2:11) Isa 52:5 (Rom 2:24) Isa 52:15 (Rom 15:21) Isa 53:1 (John 12:38; John 12:40) Rom 10:16 Isa 59:20-21 (Rom 11:26-27) Isa 61:1 (Luk 4:18) Isa 65:1-2 (Rom 10:20-21) Jer 31:32 (Heb 8:9) Eze 28:13 (Rev 2:7) Hos 13:14 (1Co 15:55) Joe 2:30-31 (Acts 2:19-20) Amo 5:25-27 (Acts 13:34) Amo 9:11-12 (Acts 15:16-18) Hab 1:5 (Acts 13:41) Hab 2:4 (Heb 10:38) Hag 2:5 (Heb 12:26) As one can see, the list is rather lengthy (and I might add incomplete). It would be rather tedious to compare all the verses in this list. I have, however, provided the student with a few examples which follow. There are many times when the Greek of the LXX and the NT match word perfectly. Such would be the case of Deu 17:7 with 1Co 5:13, for a short citation; and Psa 2:1-2 with Acts 4:25-26 for a much longer citation. Despite the verses which match, there are many places which do not. Sometimes these are translated the same, but they are not the same Greek words or word order. To explain this the ABS states, " The writers of the New Testament generally quoted or paraphrased the ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament, commonly known as the

Septuagint Version," (New Testament Passages Quoted or Paraphrased from the Septuagint, found in the TEV, Thomas Nelson Pub. 1976 ed. p. 367). The problem here is that once we open the possibility that many of the citations are not quotations but paraphrases of the LXX, we cannot be certain that it was in fact the LXX that was paraphrased. In addition, many of these citations reflect only a few words differing. This would not constitute a paraphrase. Consider the following examples.

Exo 9:16

" And in very deed for this cause have I raised thee up, for to shew in thee my power; and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth."

" And for this purpose hast thou been preserved, that I might display in thee my strength, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." (LXX)

" For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." (Rom 9:17) The last phrase, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth is a perfect match in between the NT and the LXX, as is the phrase that I might shew. . .in thee. However, there are differences at the very beginning and in the middle. The Greek NT begins with Oti eis auto touto exegeipa se opos (For this purpose have I raised out thee, so that). The LXX begins with Kai eneken toutou dietepethes, ina (And for this purpose hast thou been preserved, that). These are two differing readings in both Greek and English. Moreover, the NT uses the Greek word dunamin (power), while the LXX uses the Greek word isxun (strength).

Deu 18:15; Deu 18:19

" 15: The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; . . .19: And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him."

" 15: The Lord thy God shall raise up to thee a prophet of thy brethren, like me; him shall ye hear: . . .19: And whatever man shall not hearken to whatsoever words that prophet shall speak in my name, I will take vengeance on him." (LXX)

" For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people." (Acts 3:22-23)

Acts 3:22-23 quotes Deu 18:15; Deu 19:1-21. This is a lengthy portion of Scripture, but demonstrates that Luke was not citing the LXX word for word in Acts chapter 3. While the literal translations may be close, we are here examining the usage of the LXX in the Greek NT. The Greek of both is given below. If Luke were using the LXX we would expect the passage in Acts 3:22-23 to match the passage in Deu 18:15; Deu 18:19. One does not have to read Greek to see that the two passages are not a perfect match.

LXX (Deu 18:1-22 :)" 15: Propheten ek ton adelphon sou, os eme, anastnsei soi Kupios o Theos sou: autou akousesthe: . . .19:Kai o anthropos os ean me akouse osa an lalese o prophetes ekeivos epi to onomati mon, ego ekdiknso ek autou."

Greek NT (Acts 3:1-26 :)" 22: Oti propheten umin anastesei kupios o Theos umon ek ton adelphon umon, os eme: autou akousesthe kata panta osa an lalese pros umas. 23: estai de pasa psuxe etes an me akouse tou prophetou ekeinou exolothpeuthesetai ek tou laou." For those who wish a literal translation of each Greek word, the following is provided:

LXX (Deu 18:1-22 :)" 15: Propheten(Prophet) ek(out) ton adelphon sou(the brothern of you), os eme(like me), anastnsei soi(shall raise up) Kupios o Theos(the Lord God) sou(of you): autou(him) akousesthe(shall ye hear): . . .19:Kai(And) o anthropos(the man) os ean me akouse(if he shall not hear) osa an(whatsoever) lalese(he may say) o prophetes(the prophet) ekeivos(that person) epi to onomati mon(in the name of me), ego(I) ekdiknso(vengeance) ek autou(out of him)."

Greek NT (Acts 3:1-26 :)" 22: Oti propheten(A prophet) umin(to you) anastesei(will raise up) kupios o Theos(the Lord God) umon(your) ek(out of) ton adelphon(the brethren) umon(of you), os eme(like me): autou(him) akousesthe(shall ye hear) kata(in) panta(all things) osa an(whatsoever) lalese(he may say) pros(to) umas(you). 23: estai de(and it shall be) pasa(every) psuxe(soul) etes(which) an me akouse(may not hear) tou prophetou ekeinou (of that prophet) exolothpeuthesetai(shall be destoryed) ek(out) tou laou(of the people)."

Psa 69:22-23

" Let their table become a snare before them: and that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap. Let their eyes be darkened, that they see not; and make their loins continually to shake"

" Let their table before them be for a snare, and for a recompence, and for a stumbling-block. Let their eyes be darkened that they should not see; and bow down their back continually." (LXX)

" And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompence unto them: Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway." (Rom 11:9-10) The NT passage is close to the reading found in the LXX. Yet there are differences. The LXX adds the Greek phrase enopion auton (before them) in the first part of the phrase. Also, at the end of verse nine, the NT has the phrase kai eis antapodoma autois (and a recompence unto them). However, the LXX places the same phrase in the middle of the verse and not at the end.

Isa 6:9-10

" And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed."

" Ye shall hear indeed, but ye shall not understand; and ye shall see indeed, but ye shall not perceive. For the heart of this people has become gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and undersatnd with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them." (LXX)

" And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." (Mat 13:14-15) In the citation given by Matthew the passage is almost a perfect match. The only difference is that the LXX has the word auton (their) after ears while the NT has it after eyes. Again, one wonders why the switch. However, the same passage cited by Mark is quite different.

" That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them." (Mark 4:12) The citation is very free. Once we interject the usage of freely citing OT passages (as we find many times in the NT), we can no longer be dogmatic that the translation which was used as the base translation was in fact the LXX. It becomes an assumption.

Isa 7:14

" Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." (KJV).

" Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; behold, a virgin shall conceive in the womb, and shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Emmanuel." (LXX).

" Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." (Mat 1:23) The verse as it reads in the Greek NT is almost a match of the Greek LXX. The difference is that the LXX uses the word lepsetai (shall be) while Matthew uses the Greek word ekzie (shall be).

Isa 29:13

" Wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men:"

Mat 15:7-9

" Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." The LXX does have some alterations of the Greek NT in this passage. What is even more astounding here is that the Alexandrian Text of the NT has some omissions which are found in the LXX and TR. Both the TR

and LXX begin with Eggizie moi (Draw near to me), but it is omitted in the UBS Text. Also verse eight in the LXX and TR reads to stomati auton, kai (with their mouth, and), which is not in the UBS Text.

There are likewise some differences between the LXX and the Greek NT. The LXX adds en (in) before with their mouth. The NT uses the pharse me tima (honours me). The LXX reads, auton timosi me (they honour me). The NT has didaskalias (doctrines) after didaskontes (teaching). The LXX reads kai didaskalias (and doctrines) and places it after anthrpon (of men).

Mark 7:6-7

" He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." This has been covered in Mat 15:7-9. The literal translation of the LXX reads, " And the Lord has said, This people draw nigh to me with their mouth, and they honour me with their lips, but their heart is far from me: but in vain do they worship me, teaching the commandments and doctrines of men" (Isa 29:13 LXX). The citation is rather loose if coming from the LXX as we have it.

Isa 42:1-4

" Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law."

Mat 12:18-21

" Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust." The LXX reads, " Jacob is my servant, I will help him: Isarel is my chosen, my soul has accepted him; I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up (his voice), nor shall his voice be heard without. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench; but he shall bring forth judgment to truth. He shall shine out, and shall not be discouraged, until he have set judgment on the earth: and in his name shall the Gentiles trust." With the exception of a word here or there, the only part which matches is the last phrase And in his name shall the Gentiles trust. One must conclude that Matthew is either taking liberties with the LXX, or taking liberties with his translation of the Hebrew into Greek.

Since there are differences between the NT citations and both the LXX and the Masoretic Text, the question arises as to what translation the writers of the NT used. At times it seems as if they are using the traditional Hebrew text, at other times it seems as if they are taking great liberties with

the Hebrew text. Sometimes their quote matches the LXX, and at other times their citation differs from the LXX. As Bible believing Christians, how do we resolve this dilemma?

1). It should also be noted that not every passage cited as an Old Testament quotation is in fact a quotation. Many times they are allusions or simply a general reference, but not an excerpt from an OT passage. For example, in Acts 7:14 Stephen states, " Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls." The number which Stephen gives Isaiah 75. However, the passage in Gen 46:27 totals 70. There we read, " And the sons of Joseph, which were born him in Egypt, were two souls: all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten." The Greek LXX agrees with Stephen in Gen 46:27 and lists the number as 75 souls. This passage is often used as an example of a NT saint citing the LXX. The truth is that Stephen is not quoting anything, he is referring to something.

Dr. George Ladd writes, " These two texts reflect two ways of numbering Jacob's family." (The Wycliffe Bible Commentary, p.1136). Although Dr. Ladd was commenting on how the LXX and the Hebrew text derived their totals, the same may be said at how the passage in Gen 46:1-34 and Stephen derived theirs. In his book, Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible, Dr. John W. Haley lays out the differences without referencing the LXX. Haley writes, " Jacob's children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren amounted to sixty-six (Gen 46:8-26). Adding Jacob himself, and Joseph with his two sons, we have seventy. If to the sixty-six we add the nine wives of Jacob's sons (Judah's and simeon's wives were dead; Joseph could not be said to call himself, his own wife, or his two sons into Egypt; and Jacob is specified separately by Stephen), we have seventy-five persons, as in Acts." (Baker Book House, 1983 ed., p.389). Therefore the difference in number can be clarified by an examination of the Biblical texts and not referencing the citation to that of the LXX. Further, scrutiny of the passage in Acts clearly shows that Stephen was referring to events in Gen 46:1-34 and not quoting the passage.

2). Because one quotes from a source does not mean they are fully endorsing that source. We find, for example, Paul citing from the philosophies of the Greeks in order to reach the Greeks (Acts 17:23; Tit 1:12). This did not mean that he accepted their philosophies. The same is true today. In order to reach someone with the gospel we will use whatever translation the person has. Those who have ministered to Roman Catholics will cite the gospel from either the Douay-Rheims Version or the New American Version. Those laboring on various fields through out the world will use whatever translation is in use by the people they are ministering to in order to reach them. Therefore, it would not be unthinkable to realize that when reaching the Greek speaking world, the NT writer was moved to use a Greek version. However, this does not mean that they thought that source was inspired or infallible.

3). Finally, we must remember that the writers of the NT had a unique position which we are not allotted today. They wrote under inspiration. They had the right to change the text, for it was in reality God who was doing the changing in that it is His word. This was recognized by the translators of the KJV. They understood that the Biblical writers would sometimes use a certain text and alter it, " as the spirit gave them utterance". Thus the writers of the NT had a unique liberty, and an awesome responsibility.

CLEMENT AND THE LXX: In his Epistle to the Corinthians, Clement of Rome (30-100 AD) uses a multitude of citations from the Old Testament. From the following few examples, the student can

see some of the differences between the Greek of Clement and the LXX. In each of the following examples the student will find the following: 1) The OT reference allude to by Clement. 2) The English translation of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians (by Archbishop Wake). 3) The quote Greek in which Clement wrote. 4) The Greek of the LXX. Thus the student can compare for himself the Greek of both Clement and the LXX. 5) Last of all, the English translation of the LXX as provided by Sir Lancelot Brenton.

Deu 32:8-9

" When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. For the LORD's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance."

Clement writes:

"For so it is written, When the Most High divided the nations, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the nations, according to the number of his angels; his people Jacob became the portion of the Lord, and Israel the lot of his inheritance." (1 Clem. 13:7) The Greek Clement used:

"Ote diemerizen o upsistos ethne, os diespeiren uiou Adam, estesen oria ethnwn kata arithmon angelon Theou. Egenethe meris kuriou laos autou lakwb, sxoinisma kleronomias autou Isranl." The Greek of the LXX:

"Ote diemerizen o upsistos ethne, os diespeiren uiou Adam, estesen oria ethnwn kata arithmon angelon Theou. Kai egenethe meris kuriou laos autou lakwb, sxoinisma kleronomias autou Isranl." The English of the LXX:

"When the Most High divided the nations, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the nations according to the number of the angels of God. And his people Jacob became the portion of the Lord, Israel was the line of his inheritance." With the exception of the Greek word kai (and), the two are a perfect match. Yet notice that in verse 15 the match is not so perfect, as is so with the following examples.

Deu 32:15

"But Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked: thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness; then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation."

Clement writes:

"All honour and enlargement was given unto you; and so was fulfilled that which is written, my beloved did eat and drink, he was enlarged and waxed fat, and he kicked." (1 Clem. 2:1). The Greek that Clement used:

"Ethagen kai epien, kai eplatunte kai epaxunte, kai apelaxtisen o egapemenos." The Greek of the LXX:

"Ethagen Iakob kai eneplesthe, kai apelaktisen o egapemenos, elipanthē, epaxaunthē, eplatunthē " The English of the LXX:

"So Jacob ate and was filled, and the beloved one kicked; he grew fat, he became thick and broad."

Gen 15:5-6

" And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be. And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness."

Clement writes:

"And again he saith: and God brought forth Abraham, and said unto him; Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: so shall thy seed be. And Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." (1 Clem. 5:10-11). The Greek that Clement used:

"Eksegagen o Thos ton Abraam kai eipen, Anablepson eis ton ouranon kai arithmeson tous asteras, ei dunese eksarithmesai autous, outos estai to sperma sou. Episteusen de Abraam to Theo, kai elogisthe auto eis dikaiosunen." The Greek of the LXX:

"Eksegage de auton ekso, kai eipen auto anablepson de eis ton ouranon, kai arithmeson tous asteras, ei dunese eksarithmesai autous; kai eipen, outos estai to sperma sou. Kai episteusen Abram to Theo, kai elogisthe auto eis dikaiosunen." The English of the LXX:

"And he brought him out and said to him, Look up now to heaven, and count the stars, if thou shalt be able to number them fully, and he said, Thus shall thy seed be. And Abram believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness."

Psa 37:9 " For evildoers shall be cut off: but those that wait upon the LORD, they shall inherit the earth."

Clement writes:

"For it is written, The merciful shall inherit the earth; and they that are without evil shall be left upon it:" (1 Clem. 7:10). The Greek Clement used:

"Xrestoi esontai oiketopes ges, akakoi de upoleiphthesontai ep autes:" The Greek of the LXX:

"Oti oi ponereuomenoi eksolothreuthesontai, oi de upomenontes ton Kurion, autoi kleronomesousi ten gen." The English of the LXX:

"For evil-doers shall be destroyed: but they that wait on the Lord, they shall inherit the land."

Dan 7:10 with Isa 6:3

"A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened." (Dan 7:10)

"And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." (Isa 6:3)

Clement writes:

"As saith the scripture, thousands of thousands stood before him and ten thousand times ten thousand ministered unto him. And they cried, saying, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Sabaoth: The whole earth is full of his glory." (1 Clem. 16:6) The Greek Clement used:

"Muriai muriades pareitekeisan auto, kai xilia xiliades eleitourgoun auto, kai ekekragon; Agios, agios, agios kurios sabaoth, pleres pasa e ktisis tes doxes autou." The Greek of the LXX:

"xiliai xiliades eleitourgoun auto, kai muriai muriades pareistekeistekeisan auto;" (Dan 7:10)

"Kai ekekragen eteros pros ton eteron, kai elegon, agios agios agios Kurios sabaoth, pleres pasa e ge tes doxes autou." The English of the LXX:

>"thousands thousands ministered to him, and ten thousands of myriads attended upon him:" (Dan 7:10)

"And one cried to the other, and they said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory."

Isa 60:17

" For brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver, and for wood brass, and for stones iron: I will also make thy officers peace, and thine exactors righteousness."

Clement writes:

" For thus saith the Scripture, in a certain place: I will appoint their overseers in righteousness, and their ministers in faith." (1 Clem. 19:6) The Greek Clement used:

"Katasteso tous episkopous auton en dikaiosune kai tous diakonous auton en pistei." The Greek of the LXX:

"Kai doso tous arxontas sou en eirene, kai tous episkopous sou en dikaiosune." The English of the LXX:

"and I will make thy princes peacable, and thine overseers righteous."

One can point to Clement and say that his citations do not match the King James Version, nor do they always match the Masoretic Hebrew Text. This is to be expected since Clement was not

using the KJV. Further, whatever text he did use, if it was not already translated into Greek he had to do so himself. And yet, if we claim that Clement was not using the Masoretic Text because his citations do not match, how can we claim that he was using the LXX since they likewise do not match? The dogma that Clement and other early Church Father strictly used the LXX seems rather remote. In accordance with this same historical time frame, Sir Frederic Kenyon has pointed out that, " (The LXX) was not . . . accepted by the stricter Jews, who in controversy repudiated arguments based on Septuagint texts." (The Text of the Greek Bible p.29). This is also true of Josephus who rejected the LXX because of its additions to the Hebrew canon of scripture. Likewise, scholarship recongnize that the enhancement of the LXX in history came not from the Jewish scribes, but from sources within Christianity from around the third century. As to its value in the study of textual criticism, Dr. Ernst Wurthwein writes, "No other version has received as much attention for textual criticism as [the LXX]. Not only was it valued highly in antiquity, but in the nineteenth century many scholars practically preferred it over the Masoretic text. They believed that because of its pre-Christian origins it could assist in the recovery of an earlier, pre-Masoretic text that would be closer to the original than [the Masoretic Text]. But today we recognize that [the LXX] neither was nor was intended to be a precise scholarly translation." (The Text of the Old Testament, pp 63-64). Later, Wurthwein quotes Dr. G. Bertram as writing, "The Septuagint belongs to the history of Old Testament interpretation rather than to the history of the Old Testament text. It can be used as a textual witness only after its own understanding of the Old Testament text has been made clear." (Ibid. pp. 67-68).

Therefore we can see that the LXX does not shed light on the text of the original Hebrew, but only on how some interpreted the Hebrew text. Further, we also can see that the Biblical guardians of the Old Testament, the Jews, were not in favor of the readings found in the LXX, nor in the additions it made to the Hebrew canon of scripture. Therefore, we can see the wisdom and spiritual guidance provided for the translators of the KJV in using the Hebrew Masoretic Text for their work on the Old Testament, as well as their use of the Traditional Greek Text for the New Testament. Thus in both they were using the Text Received (Textus Receptus).

QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS:

"What is King James Onlyism?"

It often depends on who is asking the question and what they mean when they refer to those who believe the KJV to be the preserved word of God for the English-speaking people. I am called, for example, a KJV only advocate. I am told that KJV only advocates such as myself believe the KJV is inspired. I have been told that other KJV only advocates, such as Dr. Ruckman, believe the KJV is inspired. However, I have never read where Dr. Ruckman has stated such, and I know for a fact that I do not believe it. However, this does depend on what someone means by the term. To me, Biblical inspiration as given in scripture, is something given first hand. It was limited to Biblical writers and not copyist and translators. Inspiration has to do with what " is given" (2Ti 3:16), as holy men of God were moved by the Holy Ghost (2Pe 1:21). The problem in understanding what was said is because those who misconstrue it do not differ between inspiration and preservation. As has been stated in prior lessons, inspiration has to do with the producing of scripture. Preservation has to do with the keeping of scripture. It is God who inspired His words, and it is God who keeps them.

James White lists five different groups of these he refers to as KJV only advocates (The King James Only Controversy pp.1-4). I do not find myself in any of these groups listed. Since I cannot speak for others, I am left to speak only for myself in defining what I am. I believe that God gave His words without error by inspiration. I believe that God preserved these words and watched over them to keep them without error throughout all generations since their written inception. The KJV, I believe, is the preserved word of God for the English-speaking world since 1611 and stands without error. When I read the KJV I believe that I am reading the very words of God which He has provided for me through His care in keeping His words, so that they are in fact the very words of God. So if by King James Only one means that only the King James Version is the preserved words of God without error for those who speak English since 1611, I would have to say that I am of that group.

However, some have concluded that KJV Onlyism means that this is the only translation KJV advocates use or that there was no word of God before 1611. From this comes such false arguments as stating that Psa 12:6-7 does not refer to the KJV. Brother White is quick to point this out in stating, " My first question is, 'Where does Psa 12:1-8 say that the words of the LORD refer to the King James Version of the Bible?'" (Ibid. p. 243). Of course, it does not. It refers to the fact that God said He would preserve His words, of which the KJV is evidence that He has done so even to this day.

Anyone reading the lessons so far must admit that evidence has been provided of the preservation of God's words long before 1611. If not, I would suggest that the student reread lesson five. And, if one insists that being a KJV only advocate limits the Bible only to English-speaking people, I would again suggest that the student reread the same lesson. The simple fact is that the preserved word of God was here before 1611 and in other languages besides English. Any statement otherwise is a perversion of the facts given and a misrepresentation of those who support and believe the KJV. Nor does my belief in the KJV as the preserved word of God prohibit me from reading additional translations, both in English and other languages. I have freely used modern versions to support a reading in a text and I have often read from modern versions for one reason or another. If someone wishes to use a modern version, they are free to do so. I believe what the translators of the NIV said about their version, that it was made by imperfect men and would undoubtedly fall short of its goal. I think that the NIV, as all Bible translations, contain the word of God and can be used by God. This, however, does not free God from His obligation to keep and preserve his words, to keep them incorruptible, as He promised. I believe that the KJV is a fulfillment of that promise.

Yours in Christ Jesus,

Thomas Holland

Psa 118:8 To participate in Dr. Holland's class, click on Dr. Holland's e-mail address, which is: logos1611@aol.com <<mailto:logos1611@aol.com>> and tell Dr. Holland that you would like to participate in the class.

[Back to Index <classes.htm>](#)

09 LESSON NINE

Lesson Nine: THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.(Mat 23:13)

Jesus spoke many fiery words to the scribes and scholars of His day for not believing and practicing the things they wrote. They "shut up the kingdom of heaven" and thus shut themselves out of it. They wrote of the Messiah and yet they did not recognize Him when He was among them. They rejected their King, His Kingdom, and crucified the Lord of Glory. They copied the Law and the Prophets, the Old Testament with all of its books. They also copied other ancient writings which they considered either important or holy such as: Jewish history and philosophy, instructions in how to live a godly and righteous life, concerns of the day, and hopes for the future. They were ever writing, ever learning, but never coming to the knowledge of the truth.

West of the northern half of the Dead Sea lies the ruins of Qumran. A fantastic discovery was made in 1947 in the various caves throughout that region. Scrolls and fragments of scrolls were found. These ancient writings became the center of attention for both the media and students of the Bible and archaeology. Like sheep desiring water, a Bedouin shepherd had lead a thirsty world to the most acclaimed finding in the twentieth-century, the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Many claims have been made about the Scrolls. Some, while drinking at this newly found fountain of knowledge, have seen the scrolls as a pool of Bethesda offering spiritual or academic healing of some kind. Others have seen them as the waters of Marah, bitter and full of corruption. Perhaps the best way to view them is to see them for what they are--scrolls written by scribes. Like the many writings of men, they offer things which are both sweet and bitter. At least five hundred different scribes were responsible for writing the Dead Sea Scrolls (see *Who Wrote The Dead Sea Scrolls?* by Norman Golb. Scribner Publishers, 1995. p.154.). Most are dated before the time of Christ, while some are dated during and after Christ. One cannot but wonder if any of the writers of the scrolls heard the message of Jesus Christ and His condemnation for not practicing what they had copied. What is certain, however, is that those scribes who heard the Savior's message had access to what became known as the Dead Sea Scrolls. THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS IN KJV LITERATURE: The scrolls have found their way into the literature of those who support the Traditional Text and the Authorized Version. Dr. Edward F. Hills devotes three pages of his book, *The King James Version Defended*, to the Dead Sea Scrolls. After correctly stating that the scrolls do not always agree with themselves, he writes:

Thus we see that, despite the new discoveries, our confidence in the trustworthiness of the Old Testament text must rest on some more solid foundation than the opinions of naturalistic scholars. For as the Qumran studies demonstrate, these scholars disagree with one another. What one scholar grants another takes away. Instead of depending on such inconstant allies, Bible-believing Christians should develop their own type of Old Testament textual criticism, a textual criticism which takes its stand on the teachings of the Old Testament itself and views the evidence in the

light of these teachings. Such a believing textual criticism leads us to full confidence in the Masoretic (Traditional) Hebrew text which was preserved by the divinely appointed Old Testament priesthood and the scribes and scholars grouped around it. (p. 102).

Giving claim that the scrolls were produced by the Essenes, a strict Jewish sect, Dr. Donald A. Waite writes,

[The Essenes] left the Jewish beliefs their fathers had. They were an offshoot and a false, heretical cult. There are two reasons for questioning these Dead Sea Scrolls where they might differ with the Masoretic Hebrew text: (1) They might have had corrupt Hebrew texts that they began with, at least in some places; (2) They might have been careless in the transmission of these texts. These are both unknown, hence, they should never be used to replace the Masoretic Hebrew text. (Defending the King James Bible, p.30) When asked, "Do the Dead Sea Scrolls render the King James Bible obsolete?" Dr. Samuel C. Gipp responds with, "No, they support it." He then expands his response: Their text actually agrees with the King James Bible. This fact makes them unattractive to scholars desiring to overthrow the perfect Bible. So, other than commenting on the irony of the way in which they were found, they are largely ignored. The translators of the King James Bible did not need the Dead Sea Scrolls since they already had the Textus Receptus which they match. (The Answer Book: A Helpful Handbook for Christians. Shelbyville, TN: Bible and Literature Missionary Foundation. 1989. p.102) The fact that information about the scrolls is somewhat concise and limited is to be expected when examining the issue of the King James Bible. The same may be said of most studies provided by supporters of modern versions against the Traditional Text. The primary reason for this is that, for the most part, the Dead Sea Scrolls do not deal with the issue of New Testament textual criticism. The Bible believing scholars mentioned above are dealing with the issues of reconstructing the text of the New Testament as it affects the Biblical promise of preservation. However, supporters of the Traditional Text do mention the affects of the scrolls, as do the supporters of the Alexandrian Text. Since there is a general interest concerning the scrolls, and because a study of the scrolls can reveal both the method and motives of modern scholarship, it becomes appropriate to discuss these ancient manuscripts.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND The story tells of a shepherd boy, Muhammad adh-Dhib (which means Muhammad the wolf), out seeking his lost goat (or sheep according to some accounts). Thinking that the animal had wandered off into one of the many nearby caves, Muhammad threw a stone into one of them hoping to hear the sound of his lost goat scurrying off. Instead, he heard the sound of a jar braking. Calling one of his friends, he entered the cave and found ancient manuscripts laying in the cave, hidden in primitive jars. Thus was the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

However, this story is not written in stone. There are other versions concerning Muhammad adh-Dhib and his amazing discovery. Another account says the fifteen-year-old shepherd was simply herding some goats when he found the cave. Still other accounts say that Muhammad adh-Dhib and his friend were seeking shelter from a storm in the cave when they came across the manuscripts. There is also the story which says that the shepherd, along with a few of his friends, were smuggling goods from Jordan to Bethlehem when they happened to come upon the scrolls.

Regardless of which account of the story is true, the seven scrolls discovered in this cave are very significant findings. The scrolls found in what was later designated as Cave I were the two Isaiah

Scrolls (1QIsa. a. and 1QIsa b.), The Habakkuk Commentary, The Manual of Discipline, The Thanksgiving Scroll, The War Scroll, and the Genesis Apocryphon. Later, additional manuscripts were discovered revealing the vast majority of the Old Testament Books along with additional religious and secular writings. These scrolls and fragments are considered by scholars as the greatest manuscript discovery of modern times.

Cave I is located in the northwest corner of the Dead Sea, about a mile and a half from the shore line in what was then the Wilderness of Jordan. It also stands about a mile from the Khirbet Qumran, the old ruins believed to be the dwelling place of the Essene sect by the majority of scholars. However, at the time Qumran was thought of as an old fortress.

Three of the scrolls were taken to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem by Dr. Eliezer Sukenik. The other scrolls were sold to St. Mark's, a Syrian Orthodox Church in Jerusalem, where the church's head, called the Metropolitan, retained them. The Metropolitan, Mar Samuel, took the scrolls to the American School of Oriental Research, also in Jerusalem, for their examination. It was then that an announcement was made to the world. In London's, The Times, an article dated April 12, 1948 read as follows:

Yale University announced yesterday the discovery in Palestine of the earliest known manuscript of the Book of Isaiah. It was found in the Syrian monastery of St. Mark in Jerusalem, where it had been preserved in a scroll of parchment dating to about the first century BC. Recently it was identified by scholars of the American School of Oriental Research at Jerusalem.

There were also examined at the school three other ancient Hebrew scrolls. One was part of a commentary on the Book of Habakkuk; another seemed to be a manual of discipline of some comparatively little-known sect or monastic order, possibly the Essenes. The third scroll has not been identified. (The Dead Sea Scrolls Today, p.6)

Dr. Sukenik's son, Yigael Yadin (also noted as a Qumran expert), was in the United States in 1954. Mar Samuel was visiting the United States at that same time seeking to sell his scrolls. Yadin purchased the four scrolls from Mar Samuel for \$250,000 dollars, and gave them to the newly formed state of Israel. The seven scrolls were united and placed in a special museum, shaped like a lid of one of the jars in which the scrolls were kept. The museum is known as the Shrine of the Book.

It was difficult to excavate the caves in the late 1940's and early 1950's, a difficult chapter in Middle Eastern history. By the time the knowledge of the scrolls was known, the state of Israel was being formed, and war raged in the Middle East. Despite this unsettling interval, the Bedouins continued to search the region and discovered additional scrolls. Eventually, eleven caves were excavated and thousands of fragments were discovered. Throughout the years these scrolls and scroll fragments have been published and translated. Many of the manuscripts remained unpublished until the early 1990's.

Dating the scrolls has always been a problem. Not all scholars agree on the exact date. For the most part, the scrolls are dated from about the third century BC to around 68 AD. The method of dating rests on several factors. Findings among the scrolls or at Qumran, such as pots and coins, have helped fix the date of the scrolls. Paleography, the science of dating manuscripts by the shape of letters used in writing, also accounts for the dates of the scrolls. Carbon-14 dating was

used on the cloth which held one of the Isaiah scrolls, but until recently Carbon-14 dating could not be used on the scrolls themselves because it required a large section of the scrolls to be destroyed. However, Carbon-14 dating methods have improved and now only a small fragment is needed in this process. An article in the Biblical Archaeology Review has shown that the dates fixed by paleography have been confirmed by Carbon-14 dating (see BAR, November/December, 1991. p.72). For the most part, Carbon-14 dating was exactly the same as the paleography dates given to the manuscripts. It is interesting to note, however, that the Masada manuscript of Joshua, which is of the Masoretic Text, had been dated by scholars as being written somewhere around 30 AD, according to paleographic studies. However, Carbon-14 dating on the same manuscript gave it a range of 150 to 75 BC.

TEXTUAL VARIANCE AMONG THE SCROLLS

Some have mistakenly assumed that the Dead Sea Scrolls only contain Biblical writings. The truth is that the scrolls reflect a library scattered throughout eleven caves. Some are still in scroll form, but most are fragmentary after about two thousand years of aging. With the exceptions of Esther and Nehemiah, every book of the Old Testament is represented in the findings at Qumran. It should be noted, however, that representation and full representation are not the same thing. Some books are represented with only fragmentary evidence in very limited number, while other books are better and more fully represented among the findings. For example, in the most current published lists of manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls there are thirty-six manuscripts which represent the book of Psalms, making it the most represented Biblical book among the scrolls. It is followed by Deuteronomy with twenty-nine manuscripts and Isaiah with twenty-one. First and Second Chronicles are represented by only one manuscript, as is Ezra. Most of the others have under ten manuscripts which represent their writings. The exceptions are those previously listed; as well as Genesis (with fifteen manuscripts), Exodus (with seventeen), and Leviticus (with thirteen). There are about eight hundred manuscripts among the scrolls. Of these, slightly over two hundred represent Biblical books, which means only about one-fourth of the Qumran library contained copies of the scriptures.

It should also be pointed out that not all of these Biblical books represent the same textual history. The Biblical books found at Qumran are divided into three textual categories. 1) Manuscripts which represent the Masoretic-Traditional Text. 2) Manuscripts which represent the text of the Septuagint. 3) Manuscripts which represent the Samaritan text. However, according to Dr. Emanuel Tov (who became co-editor-in-chief of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1991) there are two additional groups. 4) Texts which demonstrate a unique style of writing, spelling, and grammar found only at Qumran. 5) Nonaligned texts which do not show any allegiance to the four other groups. About 25% of the Biblical manuscripts found at Qumran fall into the nonaligned category. (See, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, by James C. VanderKam. Eerdmans, 1994. pp.133-134). The Proto-Masoretic Text:

These manuscripts are called *Proto-Masoretic* because they agree with the Masoretic Text, yet date before the Masoretic Text became the official Hebrew Bible, as recognized by scholarship. It should be noted that the Dead Sea Scrolls were a great find in establishing the importance of the Masoretic Text as the authoritative text. Up until the finds at Qumran (as well as findings at Wadi Murabbaat) the oldest Masoretic Texts dated to the middle ages. With Qumran, we now have

manuscripts almost a thousand years older which are Masoretic. Most of the scrolls which came from Cave IV are of this textual type and represent Biblical books such as Isaiah, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, as well as some fragments of the Law and Historical books. Geisler and Nix state that the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls have

. . .dismiss(ed) any remaining doubts about the fidelity of the Masoretic text by providing scholars with hundreds of manuscripts including almost every book of the Old Testament, which antedate the extant Masoretic manuscripts by a thousand years. The results of scholarly comparison reveal that the Masoretic text and the various text types of the Dead Sea manuscripts are substantially identical. (A General Introduction to the Bible, p.266). The most noted is perhaps the Isaiah Scrolls. Two scrolls containing the book of Isaiah were found in Cave I. The first is sometimes called the St. Mark's Manuscript (1QIsa a.) because it was initially owned by St. Mark's Monastery. The second is sometimes called the Hebrew University manuscript of Isaiah (1QIsa b.) because it is owned by that University. Both represent the Masoretic Hebrew Text, and are considered a major victory for both the Masoretic Text and the King James Bible. Dr. James C. VanderKam has recently pointed out that,

Once scholars had had opportunity to study the great Isaiah scroll from Cave 1 (1QIs a, copied in approximately 100 BC) and to compare it with the Masoretic Text, they were impressed with the results. Despite the fact that the Isaiah scroll was about a thousand years older than the Masoretic version of Isaiah, the two were nearly identical except for small details that rarely affected the meaning of the text (The Dead Sea Scrolls Today, p. 126)

One of these minor variants referred to by VanderKam, and noted in his book, is found in Isa 6:3. The Masoretic Text and the King James Bible read, "Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." However, the St. Mark's Isaiah text reads, "Holy, holy is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory," thus omitting the word "holy." Nevertheless, with the exception of some places such as the one given, the Isaiah scroll is a major victory for the Masoretic Text, as stated by Dr. Mansoor, The text is by and large the same as that of the traditional Book of Isaiah. Most of the deviations from the Masoretic text are in details of spelling and grammar, but in some instances there are very definite variant readings. . . Some of the differences between the St. Mark's Isaiah scroll and the Masoretic text are merely mistakes in writing--omission or addition of one or more words, the confusion of words and letters, the substitution of one word for another, the transposition of words or of letters within a word, and various errors of other kinds. (The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 74-75)

And, as close as this scroll is to the Masoretic tradition, the Hebrew University's Isaiah scroll is still closer. Again, Mansoor writes, "Unlike the St. Mark's scroll, the Hebrew University scroll agrees closely with the Masoretic text." (Ibid., p. 79). Dr. Ernst Würthwein adds to this by writing,

. . . the agreement of the second Isaiah scroll (i.e. 1QIsa b.) with (the Masoretic text) is striking . . . it has been taken by some as evidence for the existence of the type of text we identify as Masoretic long before the Masoretic period. Although the text of this scroll presents very few problems in itself, it poses for us the basic and still unsolved problem of the age of the Masoretic text. (The Text of the Old Testament, p.144).

About 25% of the Biblical texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls are Masoretic. Further, the group of manuscripts listed by Dr. Tov as unique to Qumran also, "resemble the later Masoretic Text." (VanderKam, p.143) These texts account for 25% of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Thus, as one can see, among the Biblical books of Dead Sea Scrolls, 65% reflect the Traditional Text of the Old Testament.

Adding additional support to the Masoretic readings among the Dead Sea Scrolls we must also consider the findings at Wadi Murabbaat and Masada. In 1951 caves at Wadi Murabbaat, which is south of Qumran near the Dead Sea, were discovered which contained Biblical manuscripts. The difference here is that these Biblical texts reflect the Masoretic Text and exclude other textual types. Dr. Menahem Mansoor wrote, "The biblical manuscripts found at Wadi Murabbaat are important in that, unlike the Qumran manuscripts, they uniformly exhibit a text coinciding with the Masoretic text." (The Dead Sea Scrolls, Eerdmans, 1964. p.28). These manuscripts, however, are slightly younger and are believed to have been written between 132-135 AD. Concerning their content, Mansoor informs us that

Biblical fragments dating from the first and second centuries AD were found. The fragments from the Murabbaat caves provide a text identical with that of the Masoretes in the texts of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Minor Prophets, and Psalms, whereas this is not true of the biblical texts found at Qumran. (Ibid., p. 31).

Between 1963 and 1965 additional manuscripts were discovered while excavating Masada, the famous rock fortress where Jewish nationalists withheld the advances of the Roman army in 73 or 74 AD. Fourteen scrolls containing Biblical texts were found which, "agree extensively with the traditional (i.e. Masoretic) Biblical texts--only in the text of Ezekiel are there a few insignificant variants." (Ernst Würthwein, The Text of the Old Testament, Eerdmans; 1979. p.31). Masada is even further south of Qumran than Wadi Murabbaat along the western coast of the Dead Sea. These manuscripts must date before the fall of the fortress, which places them before 74 AD. Yet, they reflect the Masoretic Traditional Text of the Hebrew Old Testament. The Proto-Septuagint Text:

Only 5% of the Dead Sea Scrolls are Proto-Septuagint. These are texts written in Hebrew which reflect a reading more like the Greek Septuagint than they do the Traditional Text. For example, both the Greek Septuagint and the text of Jeremiah found at Qumran (4QJer b.) agree in omitting a healthy portion of the text. For example, in the passage from Jer 10:3-11, verses 6, 7, 8, and 10 are omitted in both the Septuagint and 4QJer b. Also, as we discussed in our last lesson, the Septuagint and Qumran text (4QExod a.) agree in stating the number of the descendants of Jacob as seventy-five instead of the seventy listed in the Masoretic Text. Thus, some have assumed that Stephen was citing either the Septuagint or the Proto-Septuagint text of Qumran in giving the number as seventy-five (Acts 7:14 and Exo 1:5). However, as we have already discussed, this can be explained by the way the family was numbered and not the text Stephen was citing. The same is true of the passages in Deu 32:43 and Heb 1:6 with the phrase, "let all the angels of God worship him." Again, both the Septuagint and the Qumran text (4QDeut q.) have the phrase, while the Traditional Text does not. Like the previous example, this has been discussed in our last lesson. It is interesting to note the comment made by Ralph Klein in his book, Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: The Septuagint after Qumran. In discussing the differences found in the

Qumran manuscripts, and their relation to both the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text of Exo 1:1-6, he asks, "Which reading is original, the MT or the Hebrew used by the LXX translators and at Qumran? No final answer is possible." (p. 15). The statement is true only if we concede that the original text can only be ascertained through the process of textual criticism and not maintained by the Author of Holy Writ through Biblical preservation. It is because of this truth, Biblical preservation, that we can see additional resolutions to textual problems which seem to allude the majority of modern scholarship. The Proto-Samaritan Text: As with the Proto-Septuagint Textual Type of the Dead Sea Scrolls, only 5% of the manuscripts found make up what is called the Proto-Samaritan Textual Type. The Samaritan Pentateuch, as indicated by the name, consisted only of the five books of Moses. The Hebrew text is often the same as the Masoretic Text with differences in spelling rather than textual variants. However, there are nineteen hundred variants which agree with the text of the Septuagint over that of the Masoretic. This text also has some additions to it. Like the Masoretic Text, the copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch we have date to the Middle Ages. The findings at Qumran show that this textual type existed before 68 AD. The Proto-Samaritan text found at Qumran did not have the special additions found in the Samaritan Pentateuch. The information concerning the various textual types found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, along with other findings in that area, should reveal something to the Bible-believing Christian. First, as in any library, the library at Qumran shows a diverse variation of material. Is this not to be expected? If a student were to visit my personal library, they would discover a wide variety of textual types and general information. Second, considering the wide use of the Masoretic Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and its exclusive use in other manuscript findings near the Dead Sea, the Traditional Hebrew Text must be unquestionably considered as authoritative. In it, we see both the handiwork and blessing of God. Third, as in the study of New Testament textual criticism, it should not surprise the Believer to see the subtle hand of the Enemy corrupting and questioning the very words of God (Gen 3:1). Thus we are to expect additional textual types, as we have seen in the study of New Testament textual criticism, with the endorsement of scholarship over Biblical preservation.

WITHIN THE LIBRARY AT QUMRAN As has been stated, only about one-fourth of the scrolls are Biblical books. In addition to various books of the Old Testament, there are also manuscripts which contain Jewish Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal texts as well as other texts. These manuscripts make up the greater bulk of the writings among the Dead Sea Scrolls, accounting for about three-fourth of all the manuscripts found at Qumran.

Apocryphal Books: As with the Septuagint, there are within the scrolls historical and non-historical books which make up the Jewish Apocrypha. These are books which are not recognized as canonical by Jews and Protestants. Instead they are considered historical or inspirational, but not inspired. However, the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Church consider the Apocrypha canonical.

Only four Apocryphal books are represented among the Dead Sea Scrolls. The book of Tabit is represented in both Aramaic and Hebrew manuscripts. Five copies of the book have been found in Cave IV (4Q196-200) and all but one of these is written in Aramaic. The book of Sirach (or Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira) is also represented at Qumran. Fragments of this book were found in Cave II and Cave XI. Cave VII yielded a chapter from the book of Baruch, the Letter of Jeremiah. All the manuscripts found in Cave VII which can be read are written in Greek. Psalms 151, which is found in the Septuagint, was included in the Psalm Scroll from Cave XI.

Pseudepigraphal Books:

Pseudepigraphal books are religious books which are not considered canonical by Protestants, Catholics, or Jews. Of these, only three which were previously known were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. They are the books of Enoch, Jubilees, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. In addition, new Pseudepigrapha books were discovered in the caves at Qumran. Dr. Robert Eisenman and Dr. Michael Wise have made several of these available in their book, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*.

One example would be the Joshua Apocryphon (4Q522). Although the first half of the book consists of names and places, the second half does tell of the Rock of Zion and the Davidic Kingdom in prophecy. The fragment consists of two columns and is translated as follows:

Column 1

Column 2

. . . and en Qeber and . . . Valley, and Bet Zippor, with . . . all the Valley of Mozza . . . and Heikhal Yezed and Yapur and . . . and Mini and En Kober . . . Garim and Hedita and Oshel . . . which . . . and Ashkalon . . . [G]alil, and the two . . . and the Sharon . . . Judah, and Beer Sheba, and Baalot . . . and Qeilah and Adullam and . . . Gezer and Thamni and Gamzon and . . . Hiqqar and Qittar and Ephronim and Shakkoth . . . Bet Horon, the lower and the upper, and . . . and the Upper and the Lower Gilat.

. . . to establish there the . . . the times, for a son is about to be born to Jesse, son of Perez, son of Ju[dah] . . . the rock of Zion, and he will dispose from there all the Amorites . . . to build the House of the Lord, the God of Israel. Gold and silver . . . cedars and cypress will he bring from Lebanon to build it, and the sons of Satan . . . he will do priestly service there and a man . . . your . . . from the . . . And the Lord will establish David securely . . . [He]aven will dwell with him forever. But now, the Amorites are there, and the Canaanites . . . dwell where the Hittites, none of whom have I sought . . . from you. And the Shilonite, and the . . . I have given him as a servant . . . And now, let us establish . . . far from . . . Eleazar . . . forever, from the House . . . army . . . (Ibid., pp.91-92)

Perhaps the most noted among the new Pseudepigrapha books is the Genesis Apocryphon. This was one of the seven original scrolls discovered in 1947 in Cave I. It consists of several stories, written in Aramaic, which are based on characters found in the book of Genesis. Included are expansions on the lives of Lamech, Enoch, Methuselah, Noah, Abraham, and Sarah. Each story is told in the first person giving their personal account of events in their lives. For example, it says of Noah that he was such a wondrous child that Lamech, Noah's father, thought his wife, Noah's mother, had an affair with one of the fallen angels of Genesis chapter six. Lamech seeks the advice of his father, Methuselah, who seeks the counsel of his father, Enoch. The following is this story as translated from the scrolls by Dr. Geza Vermes.

. . . Behold, I thought then within my heart that conception was (due) to the Watchers and the Holy Ones . . . and to the Giants . . . and my heart was troubled within me because of this child. Then I, Lamech, approached Bathenosh [my] wife in haste and said to her, ' . . . by the Most High, the Great Lord, the King of all the worlds and Ruler of the Sons of Heaven, until you tell me all things truthfully, if . . . Tell me [this truthfully] and not falsely . . . by the King of all the worlds until you tell

me truthfully and not falsely.'

Then Bathenosh my wife spoke to me with much heat [and] . . . and said, 'O my brother, O my lord, remember my pleasure . . . they lying together and my soul within its body. [And I tell you] all things truthfully.'

. . . Then she mastered her anger and spoke to me saying 'O my lord, O my [brother, remember] my pleasure! I swear to you by the Holy Great One, the King of [the heavens] . . . that this seed is yours and that [this] conception is from you. This fruit was planted by you . . . and by no stranger or Watcher or Son of Heaven . . . [Why] is your countenance thus changed and dismayed, and why is your spirit thus distressed . . . I speak to you truthfully.'

Then I, Lamech, ran to Methuselah my father, and [I told] him all these things. [And I asked him to go to Enoch] his father for he would surely learn all things from him. For he was beloved, and he shared the lot [of the angels], who taught him all things. And when Methuselah heard [my words . . . he went to] Enoch his father to learn all things truthfully from him . . . his will.

He went at once to Parwain and he found him there . . . [and] he said to Enoch his father, 'O my father, O my lord, to whom I . . . And I say to you, lest you be angry with me because I come here . . . (The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 1962. pp.216-216)

Other Texts:

There are other texts which should be considered. One of the original seven scrolls is the Habakkuk Commentary. Other Old Testament commentaries were discovered as well. These are called peshers, a Hebrew word meaning "interpretations." The verse is given, followed by the interpretation or commentary. The line is introduced, for the most part, with the phrase, "This refers to . . ." or "The meaning of this is . . ." The following is an example of such, as translated by Dr. Theodor H. Gaster. The pesher is based on Hab 1:12-13 :

'Him hast thou appointed, O Lord, to wreak the judgment: and him has thou established, O Rock, to proffer the charge--him who has kept his vision pure, that it could not look upon perverseness.' This refers to the fact that God will not exterminate His people by the hand of the heathen, but will place the execution of judgment on all the heathen in the hands of His elect. Moreover, it is through charges proffered by the latter that the wicked among His own people will stand condemned--that is, the people who kept His commandments only when they were in trouble. This is what the Scriptures means by the words, 'him who has kept his vision pure that it could not look upon evil.' The reference is to the fact that [God's elect] did not go a-whoring after (the lusts of) their eyes during the Era of Wickedness. (The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation, p.251) The Manual of Discipline was so named by Dr. Millar Burrows, who has written what has become the standard work on the Scrolls. His book is simply titled, The Dead Sea Scrolls. Dr. Burrows was one of the first to translate The Manual of Discipline. He named it such because it reminded him of a Methodist Discipline Manual. This manuscript is sometimes called The Community Rule. Dr. Geza Vermes comments on this manuscript in saying,

There are, to my knowledge, no writings in ancient Jewish sources parallel to the Community Rule, but a similar type of literature flourished among Christians between the second and fourth centuries, the so-called 'Church Orders' represented by the Didache, the Didascalia, the Apostolic

Constitution, etc. (The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, p. 71) The following comes from the Manual of Discipline as translated by Dr. Burrows. The passage is but a small section discussing the two spirits within man.

He created man to have dominion over the world and made for him two spirits, that he might walk by them until the appointed time of his visitation; they are the spirits of truth and of error. In the abode of light are the origins of truth, and from the source of darkness are the origins of error. In the hand of the prince of lights is dominion over all sons of righteousness; in the ways of light they walk. And in the hand of the angel of darkness is all dominion over the sons of error; and in the ways of darkness they walk. And by the angel of darkness is the straying of all the sons of righteousness, and all their sins and their iniquities and their guilt, and the transgressions of their works in his dominion, according to the mysteries of God, until his time, and all their afflictions and the appointed times of their distress in the dominion of his enmity. And all the spirits of his lot try to make the sons of light stumble; but the God of Israel and his angel of truth have helped all the sons of light. For he created the spirits of light and of darkness, and upon them he founded every work and upon their ways every service. One of the spirits God loves for all the ages of eternity, and with all its deeds he is pleased forever; as for the other, he abhors its company, and all its ways he hates forever. (The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 374)

It should be noted that the Manual of Discipline disregards the Old Testament teaching of one Messiah with two comings. Instead, it teaches there will be two Messiahs.

Until the coming of the Prophet and of both the priestly and the lay Messiah, these men are not to depart from the clear intent of the Law to walk in any way in the stubbornness of their own hearts. They shall judge by the original laws in which the members of the community were schooled from the beginning. (The Dead Sea Scriptures In English Translation, p.58)

Among the scrolls are praises and hymns to God, such as the Thanksgiving Scroll. This also was one of the original seven scrolls found in 1947. The following is an example of the reading found in this scroll.

Thou art long-suffering in Thy judgements and righteous in all Thy deeds. By Thy wisdom [all things exist from] eternity, and before creating them Thou knewest their works for ever and ever. [Nothing] is done [without Thee] and nothing is known unless Thou desire it. (The Dead Sea Scrolls, p.150) The War Scroll was originally entitled, The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness. The scroll contains both military and religious information. Dr. Mansoor writes, The scroll is important for several reasons. It provides the first comprehensive data on military regulations for the Jewish armies during the late period of the Second Temple. The material also includes military and technical terms hitherto unknown. Yigael Yadin of the Hebrew University, one of the foremost authorities on the War Scroll, says that it contains, "the oldest record of Hebrew military craft that we have extant, clearer and more precise than anything on the subject by the best classical historians."(The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 57). The writers of the scroll saw the physical world as an example of the spiritual. They believed that all humanity was divided into one of two groups, the Sons of Light or the Sons of Darkness. They saw themselves as the Sons of Light. They believed that if they, the Sons of Light, kept the commandments and laws of God as God gave them, they would be victorious over their enemies. They believed in a future battle, which some have mistakenly assumed was Armageddon, in which men and angels

would fight. The war would last for a total of forty years, with the Sabbatical years as years of rest from war. Thus, every seven years there would be a year of peace. The following is the opening to the War Scroll. At the beginning of the undertaking of the sons of light, they shall start against the lot of the sons of darkness, the army of Belial, against the troop of Edom and Moab and the sons of Ammon, against the people of Philistia, and against the troops of the Kittim of Assyria, and with them as helpers the violators of the covenant. The sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin, the exiles of the desert, shall fight against them and their forces with all their troops, when the exiles of the sons of light return from the desert of the peoples to encamp in the desert of Jerusalem. And after the battle they shall go up from there against the king of the Kittim in Egypt; and in his time he shall go forth with great wrath to fight against the kings of the north; and his wrath shall destroy and cut off the horn of their strength. That will be a time of salvation for the people of God, and a period of dominion for all the men of his lot, but eternal destruction for all the lot of Belial. And there shall be a great tumult against the sons of Japheth; and Assyria shall fall with none to help him. And the dominion of the Kittim shall come to an end, so that wickedness shall be laid low without any remnant; and there shall be no survivor of the sons of darkness. (The Dead Sea Scrolls, by Millar Burrows, p.390)

There are, of course, many other scrolls among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Some will be discussed later. However, this will provide the student with information about the original seven scrolls found in Cave I. WHO WROTE THE SCROLLS? The vast majority of scholars answer this question by stating that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written by a Jewish sect known as the Essenes. Like the Biblical groups of the Pharisees and Sadducees, the Essenes were both religious and political. Some have seen the Essenes as a strict splinter group of the Pharisees.

Historian Will Durant tells us that, The most extreme of the Jewish sects was that of the Essenes. They derived their piety from the Chasidim, their name probably from the Chaldaic *aschai* (bather), their doctrine and practice from the stream of ascetic theory and regimen circulating through the world of the last century before Christ; possibly they were influenced by Brahmanic, Buddhist, Paress, Pythagorean, and Cynic ideas that came to the crossroads of trade at Jerusalem. Numbering some 4000 in Palestine, they organized themselves into a distinct order, observed both the written and the oral Law with passionate exactitude, and lived together as almost monastic celibates tilling the soil in the oasis of Engadi amid the desert west of the Dead Sea. (The Story of Civilization: Part III, p. 537) The Jewish philosopher Philo wrote that a group of Essenes lived west of the Dead Sea in the wilderness. Some have used this information to assume that the ruins found at Qumran must have been the dwelling place of the Essenes because it fits the general location. Likewise, since John the Baptist dwelt in this same wilderness, some have concluded the John was part of the Essenes sect or influenced by the strict teachings of the Essenes. However, such conclusions about John the Baptist overstep the Biblical and historical facts.

Josephus provides us some additional information about the Essenes. In his Antiquities Of The Jews, he informs us that the Essenes lived in groups, having all things in common. They, "neither marry wives, nor are desirous to keep servants; as thinking the latter tempts men to be unjust, and the former gives the handle to domestic quarrels; but as they live by themselves, they minister one to another." (Book XVIII: 1:5) They believed in the immortality of the soul and that rewards awaited those who lived the righteous life.

Certainly many of the writings among the Dead Sea Scrolls reflect the views and teachings of the Essenes. And the ruins found a mile away from Cave I at Qumran most certainly could have been an Essenes community. Nevertheless, there are those who have come to different conclusions as to who wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls and about the community at Qumran.

One differing view is that of Dr. Norman Golb as shown in his book, *Who Wrote The Dead Sea Scrolls?* Dr. Golb is a recognized Qumran scholar who believes that the scrolls are the remains of the Jewish library located in Jerusalem. He believes that these scrolls were hidden in the wilderness to protect the Jerusalem library from the Romans when they destroyed the Second Temple and the city in 70 AD. He claims that the city of Qumran was not the dwelling place of the Essenes, but was a fortress against the Romans. He makes a comparison between the structures at Qumran and the military rock fortress at Masada. He points out that Josephus states that the Essenes were not limited to, "a single settlement, but rather that they were found in every city of the Jews of Palestine, the settlements within the cities formed cohesive, closed communities." (*Who Wrote The Dead Sea Scrolls?* p.5)

Dr. Golb also points to evidence within the Dead Sea Scrolls themselves. One of the scrolls found, which is unique from all other scrolls, is The Copper Scroll. As the name implies, it was not written on leather, but on flatten copper plates which were riveted together to form a scroll. The scroll speaks of treasure from the Temple which was hidden so that the Romans would not pillage it. Part of the Temple treasure includes its library. In accordance with this, Golb points to the Apocrypha book of 2 Maccabees as evidence that the Jews historically hid their books when enemies approached. The same things also were reported in the writings and commentaries of Neemias; and how he founding a library gathered together the acts of the kings, and the prophets, and of David, and the epistles of the kings concerning the holy gifts. In like manner also Judas gathered together all those things that were lost by reason of the war we had, and they remain with us. Wherefore if ye have need thereof, send some to fetch them unto you. (2 Maccabees 2:13-15)

Golb also points out that handwriting experts have detected that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written by over five hundred various scribes. He states,

I began to see that the growing number of scripts was starting to pose still another problem for the sectarian hypothesis (i.e. that the Essenes had lived together and were responsible for writing the scrolls): How many scribes, after all, could have lived together at Khirbet Qumran at any one time, or even over three or four generations? . . .Had the scrolls been written by fewer than two hundred scribes--a number that one might perhaps live with in defending the notion of a sectarian scriptorium at Qumran--or by a much greater number of copyists as I had begun to suspect? The matter was obviously of crucial importance. . . I did not know that two more decades would elapse before facsimiles of all the Cave 4 manuscripts would be published in the wake of an acute controversy, and that they would confirm that at least five hundred scribes had copied the scrolls. (*Ibid.*, pp.151,153, 154).

Dr. Golb points out that his view is strongly rejected by the majority of modern scholars, and that his hypothesis has caused him to be rejected by his colleagues as well. He is, nonetheless, not alone in his view. Back in the 1950's, Professor K. H. Rengstorf of the University of Munster in Germany had suggested that the Dead Sea Scrolls were the remains of the Jerusalem library.

Although Professor Rengstrof had arrived at his conclusion years before Golb and did so with different reasons, their views still have a common centrality; the scrolls must have come from Jerusalem and not the sectarian writings of the Essenes. According to Rengstrof and Golb, the Essenes would not have had such a variety of views within their writings, being as sectarian as they were. However the library at Jerusalem would. Golb cites Rengstrof in this manner, This would account for the mixture of leather and papyrus manuscripts; the presence of Greek and Aramaic biblical texts; . . . For if the Temple of Jerusalem had a large and important library--and this cannot be doubted--it will have contained the whole Jewish literature that existed, so far as it was obtainable, including, of course, heterodox writings. (Ibid., pp. 160-161).

I admit that I find Dr. Golb's Jerusalem Library Theory very compelling. Dr. Golb does a wonderful job in presenting his position. His views are logical and well documented. And like Dr. Golb who has been disparaged for his view, those of us who believe in the preservation of the word of God as found in the Authorized Version have often been on the outside and found ourselves the objects of ridicule from the scholastic world. In this, I can most certainly sympathize with Dr. Golb. Despite his argumentation, I find Dr. Golb's position intriguing because it is a point of view which stands in the face of self-assuring scholarship. However, the real truth is that we do not know who wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls and we may never know who did.

CONTROVERSIES The Dead Sea Scrolls have been plagued with a variety of theological, textual, and personal, controversies. Such controversies have kept the Scrolls in the forefront among archaeological discoveries and tabloid news.

Extreme Interpretations:

One example of an extreme interpretation concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls can be found in the teachings of Dr. Barbara Thiering of Sidney, Australia. In her book, Redating the Teacher of Righteousness, Dr. Thiering has developed a view regarding the Dead Sea Scrolls and their meaning which not only has attracted some limited support among liberal scholars, but is an excellent example of Biblical heresy. In short, Thiering's view is that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written by the Essenes and speak of both Jesus and John the Baptist. Further, she claims that there are hidden teachings found in the scrolls which, when applied to the New Testament, provide a completely differing interpretation than what they plainly state. The Manual of Discipline speaks of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest. Thiering believes that this scroll was written during the time of Christ and refers to John the Baptist and Jesus Christ. In her view, John was an Essene and is the Teacher of Righteousness. This teacher proclaimed the coming doom for the wicked generation if they did not repent and turn again to the God of Israel and a strict interpretation of the Law. His preaching was harsh and judgmental. The one called the Wicked Priest proclaimed a much easier view which differed with the staunch legalistic views of the Teacher of Righteousness. For Thiering, this Wicked Priest was Jesus Christ.

Thiering also believes that the Scrolls provide a means by which we can reinterpret the writings of the New Testament. Among the Scrolls we find Biblical commentaries, such as the one on Habakkuk. These commentaries are called peshers, or interpretations on Biblical writings. Dr. Thiering carries this to an extreme by using what she calls the peshier interpretation of the New Testament. She rereads events in the New Testament in light of the teachings of the Essenes at Qumran. Thus, the Dead Sea Scrolls with the Peshier-Method, ". . . help to demystify the colorful

stories and ancient rituals which still form an integral part of Christian worship (with us) still today." (The Riddle Of The Dead Sea Scrolls: Mysteries Of The Bible Unravalled, VHS, The Discovery Channel, Discovery Program Enterprises, 1990.) With this now in place, Thiering (and other scholars) dismiss the miracles of Jesus, his virgin birth, his death on the cross, and his resurrection.

Using her Peshar-Method the raising of Lazarus is reinterpreted this way. In the Essene community, when one was ostracized they were considered as dead. Some, according to Thiering, even went as far as wrapping themselves in burial cloths and laying in their own tombs, symbolically accepting their expulsion from the Qumran community. With this now in place, Thiering interprets the raising of Lazarus as an Essene who was so rejected. However, Jesus comes along and liberates his friend Lazarus by letting him know that he is not dead in the sight of God. Thus, with such scholastic heresy in place, Biblical miracles can be denied. Moreover, like most heresy, it fails to explain the facts of the passage in question. For one, there is no Biblical evidence that Lazarus was in any way part of the community of Qumran. Jesus was first informed that Lazarus was sick, and that his sickness was unto death (John 11:3; John 11:14-15). The disciples plainly understood the sickness of Lazarus to mean physical sickness because when Jesus informed them that Lazarus was sleeping (meaning dead) they said, "Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well" (vs. 12). They knew that sleep is good for those who are sick. However, Jesus referred to Lazarus being dead and so stated. Also, we must note that the sisters of Lazarus believed this death to be real and not symbolic of Qumranic rejection. When Jesus saw Mary, she said, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." (vs.32). And when Christ gave the command to remove the stone, Martha said, "Lord, by this time he stinketh: for he hath been dead four days." (vs. 39). Dr. Thiering's theory does not display the rejection of fallen souls from the Qumran community, but only her rejection of Biblical truths.

Other examples of her method of interpreting the scrolls to redefine the New Testament, are her attacks on the virgin birth, crucifixion, and resurrection of Christ. Claiming the scrolls teach that a holy man was considered divine, and that a woman was considered a virgin during her time of engagement, Thiering teaches that Joseph had intercourse with Mary during their engagement. Thus, her Peshar- Method teaches that Joseph is the Holy Spirit who had sex with Mary who would still be considered a virgin. At the crucifixion, she claims, that Christ was given poison and simply passed out. Later, while in the tomb, he was revived by the spices in the burial cloth and left the tomb. Thiering is not alone in her heresy here. This has long been called the "Swoon-Theory" and has been expressed by others such as Hugh Schonfield in his book, The Passover Plot, Donovan Joyce in The Jesus Scrolls, and Elaine Pagels in The Gnostic Gospels. In fact, Thiering makes use of one of the Gnostic gospels, The Gospel of Philip, which teaches that Christ did not die on the cross. In an interview for the Discovery Channel, Dr. Thiering reveals her prejudice concerning the Gospels and her views on the Dead Sea Scrolls:

I hadn't been at it long when I realized that there was something really very big here. Other people were realizing it at that time. It really did promise to throw new light on the origin of Christianity and that was something that always fascinated me. (The Riddle Of The Dead Sea Scrolls: Mysteries Of The Bible Unravalled.)

Therefore, Thiering reveals that she had approached her studies of the scrolls with an interpretation which she formed early in her studies based on a point of liberal theology which had always fascinated her--namely the disproving of revealed scripture and fundamental doctrines contained therein. Moreover, Thiering is a prime example of the Biblical heretics who are, "Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." (2Ti 3:7). And yet, she is considered by some Qumran scholars as a leading contemporary scholar of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Ibid.).

Other scholars associated with the Dead Sea Scrolls, or who are recognized for their scholastic abilities in regard to the study of textual criticism, have equally liberalistic views towards scripture. Speaking in support of Thiering, Dr. George Brooke of the Manchester University in England and recognized scholar in regard to the Dead Sea Scrolls, said of the virgin birth:

I think I myself side with those scholars and other Christians who would wish to assert that Jesus had a natural father. And that what is significant in the birth stories in Matthew and Luke is that the early Church believed very strongly that there was more to this birth than it just being a natural birth. And I would hold to the position that the more to this birth is very significant. Not that the human paternity of Jesus is denied, but that the divinity in all of us is encouraged. (Ibid.) Commenting on the virgin birth and miracles in general, Dr. Matthew Black (St. Andrews University in Scotland) stated,

We are now in the realm, not of history as we understand history, we are in the realm of belief. Of pious legend, pious myths. That I think is universally recognized by scholars in this connection. And pious myths which have formed a very important part of our Christian tradition for centuries. Of which we must have every respect.(Ibid.) The statement made by Dr. Black is extremely insightful. Not only because of our study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but because of our study of modern scholarship and textual criticism as a whole. Dr. Black refers to basic doctrines such as the virgin birth as "pious legend, pious myths." It is this same Dr. Matthew Black (along with Kurt Aland, Bruce Metzger, Allen Wikgren, and Carlo Martini) who produced the Greek New Testament text published by the United Bible Societies. The UBS Greek text is considered the standard critical Greek text and underlines a good percentage of modern translational work, as well as carries a great deal of influence in the study of modern textual criticism.

Differing Translations:

Another controversy, which may be found in almost all works of this nature, deals with differences in translation. Not everyone translates the findings at Qumran the same way. Perhaps the most noted example comes from 4Q285. Dr. Robert Eisenman (California State University) and Dr. Michael Wise (University of Chicago) translate this fragment showing the coming Messiah as one who is wounded. The passage reads as follows in their translation:

(1). . .Isaiah the Prophet, [‘The thickets of the forest] will be fell[ed with an ace] (2) [and Lebanon shall f]all [by a mighty one.] A staff shall rise from the root of Jesse, [and a Planting from his roots will bear fruit.’] (3) . . .the Branch of David. They will enter into Judgement with. . .(4) and they will put to death the Leader of the Community, the Bran[ch of David]. . .(5) and with woundings, and the (high) priest will command. . .(6) [the sl]ai[n of the] Kitti[m]. . . (The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered, Barnes & Noble Books, New York; 1992. p.29)

Both Eisenman and Wise note an alternate reading, one which shows not a wounded Messiah, but a Messiah who does the wounding. This translation is preferred by Dr. Geza Vermes (Oxford University) in his translation of the same passage:

(1)] Isaiah the prophet: [The thickets of the forest] will be cut [down (2) with an axe and Bebanon by a majestic one will f]all. And there shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse [] (3) the Branch of David and they will enter into judgement with [] (4) and the Prince of the Congregation, the Bran[ch of David] will kill him [by stroke]s and by wounds. And a Priest [of renown (?)] will command [(6) the s] lai[n] of the Kittim. (Downloaded from The War Rule of the Dead Sea Scrolls Exhibit <<<http://sunsite.unc.edu/expo/deadsea.scrolls.exhibit/Library/warrule.html>>>, on 4/27/96. [<<http://sunsite.unc.edu/expo/deadsea.scrolls.exhibit/Library/warrule.html>>])

Another example of differing translations of the scrolls can be found in the study of the Teacher of Righteousness. We have already seen the extreme view, as set forth by Dr. Barbara Thiering. However the standard view among Qumran scholars is that this Teacher of Righteousness was Jonathan Maccabees, the second Maccabean brother (a theory invented by Dr. Geza Vermes). Or, perhaps, he was some other Jewish priest who was in line to become the High Priest. However, failing to become the High Priest the one who became High Priest became the Wicked Priest. Thus it is a point of politics and not theology. Dr. Theodor H. Gaster offers a different translation. In referring to the community living among the Essenes, Dr. Gaster states, The community's main purpose was to exemplify and promulgate the true interpretation. It based that interpretation on a kind of 'apostolic succession,' begun by the prophets and continued by a series of inspired leaders each of whom was known as 'the correct expositor' or 'right- teacher' (not 'Teacher of Righteousness,' as many scholars have rendered it)--that is, the orthodox expounder of the Word. (The Dead Sea Scriptures In English Translation. New York: Doubleday, 1956. p. 5)

He further explains that, "It may be observed that the Hebrew word for 'teacher' derives from the same verbal root as the word 'Torah.' The 'right-teacher' is therefore, in this context, 'the man who expounds the Torah aright.'" (Ibid., p. 29.)

Hence, these two translations of the same Hebrew word can be reflected in deferring translations of the Scrolls. This can be seen in Dr. Gaster's translation of the Commentary on Habakkuk and Dr. Vermes' translation of the same passage in the Scrolls. The passage from Hab 1:5 reads, "Behold ye among the heathen, and regard, and wonder marvelously: for I will work a work in your days, which ye will not believe, though it be told you." The two translations are as follows:

This refers to the traitors who have aligned themselves with the man of lies. For they did not believe what he who expounded the Law aright told them on the authority of God. It refers also to those who betrayed the new covenant, for they have not kept faith with the Covenant of God, but have profaned His holy name. (Gaster, p. 249)

[Interpreted, this concerns] those who were unfaithful together with the Liar, in that they [did] not [listen to the word received by] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God. And it concerns the unfaithful of the New [Covenant] in that they have not believed in the Covenant of God [and have profaned] His holy Name. (The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, p.236)

Releasing Unpublished Scrolls: By the late 1980's it was widely known that there were still a healthy portion of manuscripts among the scrolls which had not been published and hence

remained untranslated. The concern was that those who were in charge of the publication of the scrolls (John Strugnell, Frank M. Cross, J. T. Milik, and Amir Drori) had been slow about releasing the unpublished manuscripts. In 1992, Dr. Emanuel Tov published a list of scroll fragments which had not before been published (see *Biblical Archaeologist*, June, 1992. pp. 94-104). This followed the continued beseeching to release the unpublished scrolls by Hershel Shanks (editor of the *Biblical Archaeology Review*). The September 21 issue of *Time* magazine (pp. 56-57) also covered the concern among scholars in regard to the unpublished scrolls, thus setting into motion a vocal concern for the publication of unpublished manuscripts so that the remaining scrolls would be forthcoming. In 1992 Dr. Robert Eisenman and Dr. Michael Wise translated and published several of the fragments from Cave IV (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*).

Believing there had been a major conspiracy by the Vatican, Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh published a book entitled, *The Dead Sea Scroll Deception* (New York: Summit Books, 1991). The book asserts that the Vatican, or at the very least some Catholic scholars, suppressed the unpublished manuscripts because their teachings undermine the teachings of major Christian doctrine. For the authors, the evidence for this rests in the delay of publishing the remaining scrolls, and that the small group of editors who controlled the unpublished manuscripts keep careful guard over their prized possession. At the time of Baigent's and Leigh's book, these editors were for the most part Roman Catholic. The book claims that Roland de Vaux, a Catholic priest who assembled the editorial team which reviewed the findings in Cave IV, masterminded the conspiracy. De Vaux is said to have joined forces with Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger who also headed the Doctrine of the Faith for the Catholic Church. At one time in history, the Doctrine of the Faith was known as the office of the Holy Inquisition. To add to this conspiracy theory came the charges of John Allegro, who was one of the original team members assigned to examine the texts of Cave IV in 1953. The majority of Allegro's team either were Roman Catholic (J. T. Milik, Jean Starcky, and Patrick Skehan), or became Roman Catholic (John Strugnell) with the exception of Frank Cross (Presbyterian), Claus-Hunno Hunzinger (Lutheran), and Allegro himself (agnostic). This left Allegro the only member who was not part of organized Christendom. Allegro claimed there was evidence within the fragments of Cave IV which was damaging to Christianity and thus covered-up by the Catholic Church.

However, charges that the scrolls contain damning evidence against historic Christianity stand without merit, totally lacking any supporting documentation. So far no verification from the fragments, which have now been published, indicate such an outlandish claim. Hershel Shanks justly labeled this conspiracy theory as, "hogwash" (*Biblical Archaeology Review*, November/December issue, 1991. p.68). Dr. James C. VanderKam refers to the claims of Baigent and Leigh as, "a disgraceful display of yellow journalism." (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, p.198). As for the delay in publishing the remaining scrolls, when one considers the turmoil in the Middle East, the lack of funds to have the fragments published, the lack of manpower to undertake the project, and the delicate conditions of the fragments themselves, we can begin to understand why it has taken so long. Regardless of the reasons which delayed the publication of the remaining scrolls, VanderKam has corrected stated, "Now that all the scrolls are available for consultation, no one has been able to find anything damaging to Christianity or anything that the Vatican would be interested in suppressing." (*Ibid.*) With the release of the unpublished texts new charges were raised. Not from those seeking to find a conspiracy theory, but from the editors of the Dead Sea

Scrolls. Their charge was that of simple thievery. Dr. John Strugnell, who was the chief editor of the Dead Sea Scrolls publication team, claimed that Hershel Shanks, editor of the Biblical Archaeology Review, and president of the Biblical Archaeology Society, pilfered the unpublished texts and published them. Thus Strugnell asks, "What else would you call it but stealing?" (Biblical Archaeology Review, November/December, 1991. p.62).

However, Shanks defends himself by stating, The men who were entrusted with these documents were not given title to them, although they act as if they own them. In fact, several of them have died and bequeathed their 'publication rights' to faithful colleagues. . . It is they who are the lawbreakers. It is they who are stealing from all of us, not we from them. (Ibid.)

These unpublished texts were "liberated" due to modern technology. In 1988 a concordance was published of all the texts of the scrolls found in Cave IV by the editors of the scrolls. Using a computer, Professors Ben-Zion Wacholder and Martin Abegg, of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati Ohio, recreated the text of the unpublished scrolls. This happened on September 4, 1991. Later that same month in California the director of the San Marino Huntington Library, William Moffett, provided a complete set of photographs of all the scrolls from Cave IV. These photographs had been furnished by Elizabeth Bechtel years before and had simply been laying around the Huntington Library for anyone to review.

John Strugnell:

Among the ups and downs which seem to have besieged the publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls, one low point concerns Dr. John Strugnell (Harvard University). Dr. Strugnell was editor-in-chief for the Dead Sea Scrolls, and one of the original editing team members appointed in 1953. In an interview with Avi Katzman, of the Hebrew newspaper Ha-Aretz, Strugnell revealed his anti-Semitic views along with several other points of character which may be questioned by someone in such a high position. The article appeared in the Ha-Aretz on November

10 LESSON TEN

Lesson 10: TEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

Then he answered and spake unto me, saying, This is the word of the LORD unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the LORD of hosts. Zec 4:6

Contextually the above citation concerns the strengthening of Zerubbabel with regard to building the Temple. The Almighty God informed his servant that the accomplishment of this deed would not be fulfilled by the potency and purpose of human authorities, but by His Spirit. For us, there is a deeper and continuous meaning. Successful endeavors for God can auspiciously be completed without the might and power of human ingenuity. It is the Spirit of God which brings such things to fruition. The Believer lives his or her life with the undeniable assurance that the unseen hand of the Lord gently intervenes in their daily affairs. The Apostle Paul reminds us of this in writing, "For we walk by faith, not by sight." (2Co 5:7). Therefore, assurance in the promises and abilities of God outweigh the evidences and efforts of man. In regard to the study of textual criticism, Dr. Edward F. Hills referred to the intervention of God and the preservation of His words as the common faith. Hills writes:

It was out of this common faith, therefore, that the printed Textus Receptus was born through the editorial labors of Erasmus and his successors under the guiding hand of God. Hence during the Reformation Period the approach to the New Testament text was theological and governed by the common faith in holy Scripture, and for this reason even in those early days the textual criticism of the New Testament was different from the textual criticism of other ancient books. (Edward F. Hills, *The King James Version Defended* [1956; reprint, Des Moines: The Christian Research Press, 1984], 62-63.) In expounding the guiding hand of God in the efforts of Erasmus and his posterity, Hills presents the three-fold foundation to this common faith. When we believe in Christ, the logic of faith leads us first, to a belief in the infallible inspiration of the original Scriptures, second, to a belief in the providential preservation of this original text down through the ages, and third, to a belief in the Bible text current among believers as the providentially preserved original text. This is the common faith which has always been present among Christians. For Christ and His Words are inseparable, and faith in Him and in the holy Scriptures has been the common characteristic of all true believers from the beginning. (Ibid., 193.) In today's age of human enlightenment, this position is rejected and even belittled. In reference to John Burgon and F. H. Scrivener, both defenders of the Textus Receptus, Dr. Alexander Souter states that, "These writers appear to have left few, if any, successors." (Alexander Souter, *The Text And Canon Of The New Testament* [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917], 102.) And yet, over seventy years after Souter's remark Kurt Aland had to address Burgon and the supporters of the Traditional Text.

Despite their clamorous rhetoric, the champions of the Textus Receptus (led primarily by Dean John William Burgon) were defending deserted ramparts. But their battle was not conclusively lost until the *Novum Testamentum Graece* of Eberhard Nestle (1815-1913) was published in 1893 . .

.This signaled the retreat of the Textus Receptus from both church and school. (Kurt and Barbara Aland, *The Text Of The New Testament*, "trans." Erroll F. Rhodes [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989], 19.)

Apparently the followers of the Traditional Text have in fact survived the onslaught of textual critics. Otherwise James R. White would have had no need to have written his book, *The King James Only Controversy*. In referencing those who generally hold to the preservation of the words of God through the Traditional Text, and Edward Hills specifically, White states:

Anyone who believes the TR to be infallible must believe that Erasmus, and the other men who later edited the same text in their own editions (Stephanus and Beza), were somehow "inspired," or at the very least "providentially guided" in their work. Yet, none of these men ever claimed such inspiration. (James R. White, *The King James Only Controversy: Can You Trust the Modern Translations?* [Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1995], 58.)

White is correct in stating that men such as Erasmus and his successors never claimed to be inspired. However, one would be at a loss to find any who claim that they were. Inspiration and providential guidance are not the same things; confusing the two simply ignores the real arguments raised.

Support for the Traditional Text has not, as Souter and Aland had hoped, disappeared. Nor, contrary to White and others, is it limited to independent groups such as many Baptists and the King James Only movement. Recently the Greek Orthodox Church released a Study Bible based on the text of the New King James Version. In their preface they state:

Since the 1880s most contemporary translations of the New Testament have relied upon a relatively few manuscripts discovered chiefly in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Such translations depend primarily on two manuscripts, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, because of their greater age. The Greek text obtained by using these sources and the related papyri (our most ancient manuscripts) is known as the Alexandrian Text. However, some scholars have grounds for doubting the faithfulness of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, since they often disagree with one another, and Sinaiticus exhibits excessive omission.

Another viewpoint of New Testament scholarship holds that the best text is based on the consensus of the majority of existing Greek manuscripts. This text is called the Majority Text. Most of these manuscripts are in substantial agreement. Even though many are late, and none is earlier than the fifth century, usually their readings are verified by papyri, ancient versions, quotations from the early Church Fathers, or a combination of these. The Majority Text is similar to the Textus Receptus, but it corrects those readings which have little or no support in the Greek manuscript tradition.

Today, scholars agree that the science of New Testament textual criticism is in a state of flux. Very few scholars still favor the Textus Receptus as such, and then often for its historical prestige. For about a century most have followed a Critical Text which depends heavily upon the Alexandrian type of text, and more recently many have abandoned this Critical Text for one that is more eclectic. A small but growing number of scholars prefer the Majority Text, which is closer to the traditional text except in the Revelation. . . (The Orthodox Study Bible, 1993 ed., s.v. "How to Use The Orthodox Study Bible," xi.)

We must further acknowledge that arguments raised by naturalistic textual scholars do not lead to, nor are they based on, a solid Bibliology. They have failed to lay a Biblical basis for their approach to the subject, and one is not likely to be forth coming. In our first lesson we compared the foundational approach of modern scholarship with that of the holy scriptures. The naturalistic approach tends to lead to Biblical uncertainty even in regard to the original autographs. Note, for example, the following comment: Not only are there many manuscripts, and fragments thereof, of the NT, but the various manuscripts have many differences among themselves. Presumably if we could ever recover the original manuscript of a NT book it would be very close to what its author intended. Even here, however, the text might not be completely correct. If the author wrote it himself, he could have made mistakes; if he dictated it to a scribe, the latter could have made mistakes. Even prior to the actual writing on papyrus or parchment, error can enter. A scribe can hear incorrectly. Particularly in Greek, the difference between a long vowel and a short vowel can make a difference in the meaning of a word, and the difference between the two when spoken can be difficult to catch. (Jack Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974], 54.)

Therefore, the trustworthiness, preservation, and even inspiration of scripture can become ambiguous when solely approached in such fashion. This has not been the focus of these studies. Instead we have sought to fortify the Biblical foundation of scriptural preservation and therefore have complete confidence in its accuracy not based on the power and might of modern scholarship, but by the Spirit of the Living God.

There are, of course, several places in the Traditional Text that modern scholarship considers non-authoritative and not part of the original. Additionally, there are places which are considered mistranslated in the King James Version. Since variance within textual considerations is enormous and personal interpretation and translation is even more vastly defined, we cannot look at every passage which has been questioned by textual scholars or inspect every passage which someone claims to have been translated incorrectly. However, we shall consider several passages which opponents of the Traditional Text have denied as to their authenticity. Later, in our next lesson, we will consider what some have deemed mistranslations. But for now, we will limit ourselves to the textual considerations of the following passages. Mat 6:13; Mark 1:2; Mark 16:9-20; Luk 2:22; John 5:4; John 7:53; John 8:1-11; Acts 8:37; Rom 8:1; Eph 3:9; Eph 3:14; 1Jn 5:7; Rev 5:14; Rev 16:5; and Rev 22:19.

Additionally, we will also consider various texts and translations which agree with the Authorized Version. The KJV translators wrote, "Neither did we think much to consult the translators or commentators, Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek, or Latin, no, nor the Spanish, French, Italian, or Douch;" (Miles Smith, *The Translators To The Readers* [1611; reprint, London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1970], 31.) The first grouping refer to manuscripts and texts based on manuscripts. The second group refers to foreign language translations which pre-date the Authorized Version, namely the Spanish Reina-Valera Version, the French Louis Segond Version, the Italian Giovanni Diodati Version, and the German translation of Martin Luther. All four of these translations, based on the Traditional Greek Text, became the authoritative/standard version for their people. Also, it is known that the translators of the Authorized Version considered early English translations such as Tyndale's New Testament (1525), the Great Bible (1539), the Geneva Bible (1560) and the Bishops' Bible (1568). In any case, such texts and translations will demonstrate that the passages

we are to consider are not unique to the King James Bible only.

Mat 6:13--And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. The argument raised concerning this text centers around the last half of the verse, "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen." It has been omitted from the Greek texts of the United Bible Societies and Eberhard Nestle. And, since most modern translations of the New Testament are based on these Greek texts, it is not part of the English text in most contemporary versions. Modern scholarship argues the passage is not genuine because it exists in various forms and is not harmonized in all of its citations. White states, "This kind of 'variant cluster' is a sure sign of a later addition." (White, 252.) Bruce Metzger, as does White, argues the passage is a harmonistic corruption by scribes to unify the text with Luk 11:2-4 (Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text Of The New Testament*, 2nd ed. [Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1973], 197.).

Neither argument is substantive. To argue "variant clusters" is a lack of authenticity is to argue against the critical texts supported by modern scholarship. A review of either the United Bible Societies text or the Nestle-Aland text reveal a vast host of variant readings which modern scholarship supports. As was cited by the Greek Orthodox Study Bible, critical texts depend greatly on Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus which, "often disagree with one another." (The Orthodox Study Bible, xi.) The argument for harmonization of Mat 6:1-34 with Luk 11:1-54 is conjectural. This is revealed by Kurt Aland in his comment on the passage by asking, ". . . if the doxology originally stood in the gospel of Matthew, who would have deleted it?" (Aland, 306.) Questions and speculations do not alter the textual facts on this passage. While it is omitted in Alexandrian manuscripts such as Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Cantabrigiensis, it is found in a host of other sources.

Among the Greek uncials it is found in K (ninth century), L (eighth century), W (fifth century), DELTA (ninth century), THETA (ninth century), and PI (ninth century). It is found in the following Greek minuscules: 28, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1009, 1010, 1071, 1079, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1241, 1242, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2174 (dating from the ninth to the twelfth century). However, it is not without early witness. It is found in the Old Latin, the Old Syrian, and some Coptic versions (such as Coptic Bohairic). Old Latin texts, such as Codices Monacensis (q-seventh century) and Brixianus (f-sixth century), read, "et ne nos inducas in temptationem. sed libera nos a malo. quoniam tuum est regnum. et uirtus. et gloria in saecula. amen." The Syriac Peshitto (second to third century) reads, "And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever: Amen." (James Murdock, *The Syriac New Testament from the Peshitto Version* [Boston: H.L. Hastings, 1896], 9.)

John Chrysostom cites the verse in the fourth century. In his Homilies this blessed Saint writes, ". . . by bringing to our remembrance the King under whom we are arrayed, and signifying him to be more powerful than all. 'For thine,' saith he, 'is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory.'" (St. Chrysostom, "Homily XIX," in *The Preaching of Chrysostom*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan [Philadelphia: Fortress Press], 145.) The oldest witness, which outdates all Greek manuscripts on this passage, is the Didache. Otherwise known as the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, this ancient catechism dates to the early second century, some dating it shortly after 100 AD. In it we have a form of the Lord's Prayer which supports the reading found in the Traditional Text. Do not let your fasts be with

the hypocrites. They fast on Monday and Thursday; but you shall fast on Wednesday and Friday. Do not pray as the hypocrites do, but as the Lord commanded in His gospel, you shall pray thus: 'Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the power and the glory forever.' Pray thus three times a day. (W. A. Jurgens, *The Faith of the Early Fathers* [Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1970], 3.)

It is also interesting to note that in his studies on old papyri, Dr. George Milligan includes a sixth century prayer which incorporates the Lord's prayer from Mat 6:1-34. Despite the fact that this papyri is badly worn, it clearly contains the phrase in question. Milligan notes, "a passage which some may be tempted to quote in support of the A.V. rendering of Mt. vi 13." (George Milligan, *Selections From The Greek Papyri* [Cambridge: University Press, 1912], 132-134.) He is correct, for the papyri shows that the verse as it stands in the Traditional Text was commonly used by Christians. The passage stands in the authoritative/standard foreign versions (Spanish, French, Italian, and German) which pre-date the King James. For example, we read in the Reina-Valera Version, "Y no nos metas en tentacion, mas libranos del mal: porque tuyo es el reino, y el poder, y la gloria, por todos los siglos. Amen." While one who does not read Spanish may not recognize "reino" for kingdom, or "poder" for power, the word "gloria" is easily recognized as glory. Additionally, the verse stands in all the early English versions which the KJV translators used such as the New Testament of William Tyndale (1525). "And leade us not into temptation: but delyver us from evyll. For thyne is the kingdome and the power, and the glorye for ever. Amen."

Mark 1:2-3--As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

Modern scholarship declares that the passage should read, "en to Isaia to profete" (in the Isaiah the Prophet). This is supported by uncials Vaticanus (fourth century), Sinaiticus (fourth century), along with L and DELTA. The same reading is found in the minuscules 33, 565, 892, and 1241. There is a slight variant to this reading found in uncials D and THETA, and minuscules 700, 1071, 2174. In these the text reads, "en Isaia to profete." (in Isaiah the Prophet). If we were to impose White's variant cluster rule to this passage, we would have to excuse the reading which is supported by modern scholarship. Not only is there a variant in the readings of the Alexandrian texts (Isaiah the Prophet or the Isaiah the Prophet), but there is also a variant reading in verse one. Sinaiticus simply reads, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ" and omits the phrase, "the Son of God" which is found in Codex Vaticanus. In support of the Traditional Text, "Os gegraptoi en tois profetais" (as it is written in the prophets) we have uncials A, K, P, W, PI and minuscules 28, 1009, 1010, 1079, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1242, 1252, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2148. Thus the Greek support dates from the fourth century onward. Additionally we also find the same reading in the Syriac Harclean version (616 AD), the Armenian version (fourth to fifth century) and the Ethiopic versions of the sixth century.

It also receives Patristic citations from Church Fathers such as Irenaeus (202 AD), Photius (895 AD), and Theophylact (1077 AD). In *Against Heresies*, Irenaeus writes:

Wherefore also Mark, the interpreter and follower of Peter, does thus commence his Gospel narrative: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send My messenger before Thy face, which shall prepare Thy way". . . Plainly does the commencement of the Gospel quote the words of the holy prophets, and point out Him at once, whom they confessed as God and Lord; (Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson [trans.], *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 1926 ed., s.v. "Irenaeus Against Heresies 3:10:5," 425-426.)

All the early English versions agree with the King James as do the authoritative/standard foreign versions. Luther's German version reads, "Als geschrieben stehet in den Propheten:" (as it is written in the Prophets). However, this has been revised in modern German editions to match the views of modern textual criticism. Thus we have the new German reading, "Wie geschrieben steht im Propheten Jesaja:". The same thing is true of the Spanish Reina-Valera Version. The 1960 revision reads, "Como esta escrito en Isaias el profeta:". Yet, the original 1602 edition read, "Como esta escripto en los prophetas."

Contextually there arises a problem with the reading as found in the Alexandrian Text and modern versions. The passage cites both the Prophet Malachi (3:1), and the Prophet Isaiah (Matthew:3). The reading, "As it is written in Isaiah the Prophet" seems inconsistent. Yet, it is justified by modern scholarship in claiming that even though both prophets are quoted, Isaiah was the major prophet and therefore he takes prominence. To illustrate their point, modern scholars will reference the student to Mat 27:9, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value." The passage, they claim, is not really a citation of Jeremiah, but comes from Zachariah 11:12. Thus, Jeremiah being the major prophet receives prominence as well.

However, this point can be argued. First, the text in Mat 27:1-66 does not read, "As it is written in Jeremy the Prophet" but merely states, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy." God, being the Author of Scripture, is quite aware of who writes what and who speaks what. Simply because Zachariah writes the passage does not mean Jeremiah did not speak it. Secondly, this fact was not overlooked by Zachariah who warned Israel to pay attention to what the former prophets had spoken. "Should ye not hear the words which the LORD hath cried by the former prophets, . . .?" (Zachariah 7:7). Matthew Henry points out that the Jews had a saying, "The spirit of Jeremiah was in Zechariah." Therefore, much of what Zechariah received, he did so from both the Lord and the former prophet, Jeremiah. Thirdly, while the passage in Zachariah does speak of thirty pieces of silver and the potter (verse 13), it is somewhat different from the Matthew passage. "And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my price; and if no, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the LORD said unto me Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prised at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the LORD." (Zachariah 11:12-13). Lastly, the passage in Mat 27:1-66 connects of the children of Isarel with the potter's field (verses 9-10). In Jer 18:1-8, the house of Israel is connected with the potter's house.

However, none of this addresses the real issue here in Mark 1:2. The passage does not claim, "what was spoken by . . ." as we have it in Mat 27:1-66. Instead, it is much more emphatic in stating, "As it is written in . . ." It is more truthful to say, "As it is written in the prophets" when citing

two prophets, then to say, "As it is written in Isaiah the Prophet," when citing two prophets. Further, the weight of the textual support favors the reading as it stands in the Authorized Version as does the weight of the endurance of the reading throughout the centuries. Therefore the reading as we have it in the Traditional Text not only is textually but also contextually correct.

Although the translators of the King James Version did not have access to many of the Greek texts which seek to usurp the authority of the Traditional Text, they were very much aware of the reading. The phrase, "Isaiah the Prophet" is found in the Latin Vulgate and thus was translated into English in 1582 by the Catholic Rheims Version. "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the sonne of God. As it is written in Esay the Prophet." However, early Protestant versions all upheld the reading of the Traditional Text as reflected in the 1539 translation of the Great Bible, "The begynnyng of the Gospell of Jesu Chryst the sonne of God, as it is written in the Prophetes." Such variants between the Catholic and Protestant versions caused the KJV translators to declare, ". . . and all is sound for substance in one or other of our editions, and the worst of ours far better than their authentic vulgar." (Smith, 22.)

Mark 16:9-20--Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not. After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen. This passage is referred to as the longer ending to Mark. Textual critics delight in proclaiming this passage as questionable and therefore either remove it from the text or separate the passage with brackets. Objecting to the passage, Kurt and Barbara Aland proclaim, "At least the shorter ending of Mark (as well as the longer ending of Mark 16:9-20) was not a part of the gospel in its original form, although both may well be from the beginning of the second century." (Aland and Aland, 232.) Although admitting that he did not consider the passage original, Dr. Bruce Metzger leaves the maxim of modern textual critics, "Brevior lectio potior" (the shorter reading is preferable), and supported the reading. In a 1994 interview with Christian History, Metzger stated: The earliest Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Latin manuscripts end the Gospel of Mark at 16:8: "The women said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid." That does not sound like an appropriate ending for a book of good news, so some early scribes, undertaking their own research, added what they thought would be appropriate endings. . . Many translators, including myself, consider verses 9 through 20 to be a legitimate part of the New Testament. (Christian History, Interview with Dr. Bruce Metzger downloaded from Christian History Magazine on 9/17/96.) The passage is missing from the Alexandrian texts of both Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

Also, the passage is omitted in minuscule 2386 (an obscure manuscript), the Syrian Sinaitic Version, and a few other translations such as some of the Georgian Versions of the fifth century. However, it is in the following uncials: A, C, D, K, X, DELTA, THETA, and PI, all of which date from between the fifth and ninth centuries. It is also contained in the later dated minuscules such as 137, 138, 1110, 1210, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1221, and 1582. Further it is the reading found in the majority of Old Latin texts as well as the Coptic Versions and other early translations. The passage, additionally, receives enthusiastic support from many of the early Church Fathers. Irenaeus (202 AD) cites Mark 16:19 in his book, *Against Heresies*. He writes:

Also, towards the conclusion of his Gospel, Mark says: "So then, after the Lord Jesus had spoken to them, He was received up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God;" confirming what had been spoken by the prophet. (Saint Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 3:10:5.) Ambrose (397 AD) cites Mark 16:17-18 :

Therefore, it was with good reason that the Lord became a stage, so that the word of the Lord might prepare such stages for Himself; of these He says, "In my name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak in new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them." Indeed they took up serpents, when His holy Apostle cast out the spiritual forces of wickedness from their hiding places in the body by breathing on them and did not feel deadly poisons. When the viper came forth from the bundle of sticks and bit Paul, the natives, seeing the viper hanging from his hand, thought he would suddenly die. But he stood unafraid; he was unaffected by the wound, and the poison was not infused into him. (Saint Ambrose, *The Prayer of Job and David*, 4:1:4.)

Augustine (430 AD) cites Mark 16:15 and then refers to verses 17-18. "Ye heard while the Gospel was read, Go preach the Gospel to the whole creation which is under heaven. Consequently the disciples were sent everywhere with signs and wonders to attest that what they spake, they had seen." (Saint Augustine, *Homilies On The Epistle of John To The Parthians*, IV:2).

If the early Fathers did not believe in the authenticity of this passage, they would not have cited it. However, we see that it is cited in the end of the second century, the end of the fourth century, and the beginning of the fifth century by orthodox Church Fathers. This, coupled with the massive support of both Greek and other manuscripts which include the passage and the limited support for removing the passage, demonstrate the dedication modern scholarship has for the Alexandrian Codices of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

Luk 2:22--And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord;

Here the variant is small, but the difference is profuse. The Authorized Version uses the phrase, "of her purification" (Greek: kathapismou autēs). Modern versions, for the most part, read, "of their purification" (Greek: kathapismou auton). Contextually, the reading must stand as we have it in the King James Version. Under the Levitical Law a woman was considered unclean after giving birth and needed purification. The passage in Lev 12:2-4 reads:

Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a woman have conceived seed, and born a man child: then she shall be unclean seven days; according to the days of the separation for her infirmity shall she be unclean. And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised. And she

shall then continue in the blood of her purifying three and thirty days; she shall touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the sanctuary, until the days of her purifying be fulfilled. The citation is quite clear: this was "her purifying" and not the purifying of both mother and child. Therefore, the Authorized Version agrees with the Levitical Law. To offset this point, some have suggested that the "them" in the passage referred not to Mary and Jesus, but to Mary and Joseph. The argument is that since Joseph and Mary are mentioned in verse 16 and referred to in the second half of verse 22, the "them" referred to the married couple. Agreeing with this we have the reading of the Catholic New American Bible, "When the day came to purify them according to the law of Moses, the couple brought him up to Jerusalem so that he could be presented to the Lord." The obvious doctrinal problem with this is that under the Law of Moses, as set forth in Lev 12:1-8, the woman, not the husband, needed purification after giving birth. Therefore, the best contextual reading would agree with the Authorized Version, as it would support both the Old Testament Law and the actions presented in Luke's Gospel. In an Online debate between James White and myself, Brother White claimed Luk 2:22 was an error in the text of the King James Version. His reasoning is as follows:

First, the VAST MAJORITY of Byzantine manuscripts read "their" (autou). The Majority Text reads "their." 99.5% of all manuscripts of this passage read "their." There are a very small number that read "autou" (not noted by Dr. Holland, though having more support than the KJV reading), and there may be a grand total of 3 very late manuscripts that have the KJV reading, the only one we know of being 76, a minuscule text from the 14th century! That means the KJV's reading cannot be traced anywhere earlier than the 14th century, and most feel that this is actually a conjectural emendation made by Beza as he wouldn't have known of minuscule 76. (Downloaded from America OnLine/ Christianity Today/ King James Bible Only/ Subj: Luk 2:22/ Date: 95-08-21 22:09:17 EDT/From: Orthopodeo.) In addition, White repeats this on his Web Site in a open letter concerning Dr. Peter S. Ruckman. The first passage Ruckman chose to address was my citation of Luk 2:22. This passage is mentioned only twice in my book, once in a table, once in an endnote. Yet it is an excellent example of the textual problems in the Textus Receptus (TR). It also allows us to see just how much KJV Only advocates are really dedicated to the "truth" or to their own traditions. . .99.9% of all Greek manuscripts of Luke read "their"! This includes the entire Byzantine manuscript tradition, which is always called upon by KJV Only advocates as the "pure" form of the text. As Hills admits, he knows of only a few Greek minuscules and manuscript 76 that support the TR reading. Indeed, Beza was probably unaware of those sources, and simply made a "conjectural emendation," which is a nice way of saying, "He didn't like the way it read in all the manuscripts, so he changed it without evidence." Let's think about what this means. The earliest we can trace the specific reading "her" in the Greek manuscripts is to the 14th century-almost a millennium and a half after Luke wrote the passage. (James R. White, James White Responds To Dr. Ruckman, downloaded on 9/10/96 from <<http://net387.texas.net/ao.html>>.) The statements are factually and textually incorrect. While White is accurate in stating that most of the Greek manuscripts read "of their purification," he is incorrect in assuming that the passage was a conjectural emendation made by Beza in the late 1500s. He is incorrect in the dating of his manuscript evidence. He is incorrect in omitting evidence which supports the reading "of her." One also cannot help but notice that his statistical data has changed from 99.5% to 99.9% which causes us to wonder if he is simply making up the statistics or if he has any data to support the number given and if he can explain the 0.4% increase. He claims that Beza was making a

conjectural emendation in his Greek text in Luk 2:22. A conjectural emendation is when a text is adjusted for one reason or another, thereby emending it. The new reading produced, which is a conjecture to replace the old reading, will therefore lack textual evidence. White is claiming the reading, "of her purification," was simply an educated guess made by Beza without textual support. However, White has made a fundamental error. To state, "the KJV's reading cannot be traced anywhere earlier than the 14th century," shows a lack of understanding in the field of textual criticism and causes one to wonder how such absurd accusations can be made by one who is considered an expert in upholding the views of modern translations and their Greek texts. The only textual support cited by White is minuscule 76 which he claims is from the fourteenth century. According to Kurt and Barbara Aland, and the United Bible Societies Greek Text, 76 comes from the twelfth century. (Aland and Aland, 141. United Bible Societies Greek Text, 2nd edition, 1968, xviii.) He also omits the textual support of 2174 which does date to the fourteenth century.

While the text is lacking Greek support, it is not lacking other textual support. The Latin Vulgate (fourth century) and later the Latin Codex Brixianus read, "et postquam impleti sunt dies purgationis eius secundum legem mosi" (And after the days of her purification, according to the law of Moses). The Latin word "eius," or more commonly "ejus," stands in the feminine genitive singular, thus "of her." If the Latin texts had used "eorum" (of them) the reading would have supported modern versions and White's contention. In fact, almost all of the Old Latin Codices support the reading, with the exception of Codex Monacensis (seventh century). It is found in the Old Latin Codex Vercellensis of the fourth century, and Latin texts of the fifth century such as Codex Curiensis, Codex Veronensis, and Codex Corbeiensis II. Plus, it is found in later Latin manuscripts such as Codex Usserianus I (seventh century) and Codex Rhedigeranus (eighth century). Therefore, we see that this reading stands throughout time in the Old Latin manuscripts. This reading is not without Greek manuscript endorsement either. Beza's Codex D (sixth century), which is highly acclaimed among textual scholars, has the reading "autou" (of it). While the reading "autns" (of her) is preferred and is written thus in minuscules 76 and 2174, both readings stand in the genitive singular and not the plural as "auton" (of them) does. Additionally, we find the reading, "of her purification," in the Old Syriac version (Sinaitic, second century) and the Sahidic Coptic version (third century).

White states that Beza interjected a conjectural emendation. Metzger defines a conjectural emendation as when, "the only reading, or each of several variant readings, which the documents of a text supply is impossible or incomprehensible, the editor's only remaining resource is to conjecture what the original reading must have been." (Metzger, *The Text Of The New Testament*, 182.) Beza was not making a conjectural emendation in his Greek text. He was making a textual decision for he had Latin, Greek, and other translations which read "of her."

There was, however, a conjectural emendation by Beza in his Latin text. Beza's New Testament had three running columns side by side. The first was his Greek text, the second his Latin translation, and the third the Latin Vulgate. Additionally, at the bottom of each page he made textual and doctrinal notes. His Latin translation reads, "Et quum impleti fuissent dies purgationis Mariae" (And when the days of Mary's purification were fulfilled). Beza states that his conjectural emendation of "Mary" instead of "her" is proper based on the Levitical Law. He further states in a footnote that the reading "of them" is improper and distorts the sense of scripture. Beza notes,

Most of the (Greek) Codices read "of them" and likewise so does Origen, and unfortunately so does Erasmus. However, they have not considered what the actual Law says about the purification of the mother. And so consequently the old editions (of the Greek) are unfavorable . . . because they have distorted the truth of scripture and in some degree have lessened the image of Mary's purity. (Theodore Beza, *Nouum Sive Nouum Foedus Iesu Christi*, 1589. Translated into English from the Latin footnote.)

Both Tyndale and the Great Bible have the reading as we find it in the majority of Greek manuscripts. Tyndale reads, "And when the tyme of their purificacion (after the lawe of Moyses) was come." However, the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles read "her purification." Of course, the Catholic Rheims Version would also read the same, being based on the Latin Vulgate which we have already shown to support the reading of the Traditional Text here. Thus it reads, "And after the daies were fully ended of her purification according to the law of Moyses, they caried him into Hierusalem, to present him to our Lord."

James White wrote, "Let's think about what this means." It means that some textual critics are willing to present partial evidence, distort information, redefine terminology, and simply make up statistical data in order to hold "to their own traditions."

John 5:4--For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had. The whole verse is retained in all the early English versions as well as the Spanish, French, Italian, and German Bibles. However, it has been omitted in modern versions by either bracketing the verse or confining it to a footnote. The passage is explanatory and sets forth the reason as to why there were those waiting near the healing waters of Bethesda.

Dr. Donald A. Carson addresses this text and offers his reason for rejecting the authenticity of the passage. ". . . when I turn to John 5:3 b-4 and discover it is missing from the earliest witnesses, which constitute a wide geographical distribution indeed, I conclude it was not in the original." (D. A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism* [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979], 70). Kurt and Barbara Aland resort to the "Brevior lectio potior" adage and claim that the passage was inserted later by way of a legendary account. But in John 5:3 b-4 we meet another category: expansions of the original text by various later legendary supplements developed from the account itself. From the attestation for the "shorter text" it should be clear that the expansion of the ending of verse 3 and the whole of verse 4 represents a later insertion. (Aland and Aland, 303.) The verse is omitted in P66 (second or early third century) and P75 (third century). These Egyptian papyrus manuscripts are extremely old and therefore carry considerable weight among textual critics. However, as we have seen in past lessons and will again consider later, such papyrus are not strictly Alexandrian and often reflect independent readings, sometimes even supporting the Traditional Text. Age is not the final consideration for we must not only consider where the manuscripts have been discovered, but why they were preserved. After all, manuscripts which were greatly used would not be expected to last as long as those which were seldomly used. Further, we can expect those which were greatly used to be represented in greater number as they were copied and recopied throughout the centuries.

Additional textual support against the verse is in Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Codex C, D (which does contain 3b), and W (although added in the text later by a different scribe). There are also about

three other Greek manuscripts which do not contain the verse as well as a few Latin manuscripts, including the Vulgate, and some other translations.

If we were to take Dr. Carson's statement at face value and consider the authenticity of a verse or passage because of the amount of witnesses and the various locations of these witnesses, as well as the age of these witnesses, we would be forced to attest to the authenticity of the passage because all of these factors support the reading as found in the Traditional Text and the Authorized Version of 1611. The passage is found in Codices A, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, DELTA, THETA, PSI and the third corrector of C. Thus the uncial evidence throughout the old world dating from the fourth to the ninth century support the verse. The Greek minuscules overwhelming support the verse as it is found in 28, 565, 700, 892, 1009, 1010, 1071, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1241, 1242, 1253, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, and 2148. It is also contained in the majority of Old Latin manuscripts and early translations throughout the old world. The verse is found in the Old Coptic Version as edited from the Coptic manuscript Huntington 17 and is translated into English as follows: "There was an angel (who) came down every hour in the pool, and moved the water. And any one (who) shall come down first after the moving of the water shall be healed of every sickness which (may) be his." (The Coptic Version Of The New Testament: In The Northern Dialect, vol. II [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898], 377-379.) The same is true of the Old Syriac. James Murdock translated the passage from the Peshitto as follows: "For an angel, from time to time, descended into the baptistery, and moved the waters; and he who first went in, after the moving of the waters, was cured of whatever disease he had." (Murdock, 172). Nor is the passage without Patristic citations. The Orthodox Study Bible informs us that This passage, explaining the presence of the sick around the pool, is often omitted from modern English translations because it appears in none of the oldest extant Greek manuscripts. Tertullian (c. A.D. 200) is the first Latin writer, and St. John Chrysostom (c. A.D. 400) the first Greek writer, to refer to it. (The Orthodox Study Bible, 224).

Therefore we have witnesses which date to the time of P66 and P75, such as Tertullian and the Peshitto Syriac Version, as well as wide geographical and translational support, which favor the passage. Further, we see that this is the reading which is used by Bible believing Christians throughout the history of the Church.

Spanish:

Porque un angel descendia a cierto tiempo al estanque, y revolvía el agua; y el que primero descendia en el setanque despues del movimiento del aqua, era sano de cualquier enfermedad que tuviese.

French: car un ange descendait de temps en temps dans la piscine, et agitait l'eau; et celui qui y descendait le premier apres que l'eau avait ete agitee etait gueri, quelle que fut sa maladie.

Italian:

Perciocche di temo in tempo un angelo scendeva nella pescina, ed intorbidava l'acqua; e il primo che vi entrava, dopo l'intorbidamento dell' acqua, era santo, di qualunque malattia egli fosse tenuto.

German:

Denn ein Engel suhr herab zu seiner Zeit in den Ziech, und bewegte das Wasser. Welcher nun der erste, nachdem das Wasser beweget war, hineinstieg, der ward gesund, mit welcherlei Leuche er behastet war.

English (Geneva Bible): For an Angel went downe at a certeine season into the poole, and troubled the water, whosoever then first, after the stirring of the water, stepped in, was made whole of what soever disease he had.

John 7:53;John 8:1-11--And every man went unto his own house. Jesus went unto the mount of Olives. And early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto him; and he sat down, and taught them. And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst, They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not. So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her. And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.

Among textual critics, this passage is designated "Pericope De Adultera" and refers to the woman caught in the act of adultery. The passage has long been questioned as genuine and is omitted in a great number of manuscripts. It is, of course, removed from Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, as well as L, N, T, W, X, Y DELTA, THETA, PSI, 053, and 0141 among the uncial manuscripts. It is also missing from several of the minuscules manuscripts; 22, 33, 157, 209, 565, 1230, 1241, 1242, 1253, and 2193.

However, the passage is in numerous uncials, including Codex D (Bazae Cantabrigiensis), G, H, K, M, U, and GAMMA. Among the minuscule/cursive manuscripts it is in 28, 700, 892, 1009, 1010, 1071, 1079, 1195, 1216, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2148, and 2174. It also is in early translations such as the Bohairic Coptic Version, the Syriac Palestinian Version and the Ethiopic Version, all of which date from the second to the sixth centuries, as well as in the majority of the Old Latin manuscripts and the Latin Vulgate by Jerome.

Further, the passage is cited by a number of Church Fathers. Among them are Didascalia (third century), Ambrosiaster (fourth century), Ambrose (fourth century), and is in the Apostolic Constitutions, which are the largest liturgical collections of writings from Antioch Syria in about 380 AD. Saint Augustine (430 AD) makes an astounding statement concerning the authenticity of this passage. After citing the forgiving phrase from Christ, "Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more," Augustine writes: This proceeding, however, shocks the minds of some weak believers, or rather unbelievers and enemies of the Christian faith: inasmuch that, after (I suppose) of its giving their wives impunity of sinning, they struck out from their copies of the Gospel this that our Lord did in pardoning the woman taken in adultery: as if He granted leave of sinning, Who said, Go and sin no more! (Saint Augustine, De Conjug. Adult., II:6.). This passage is found in all the early English

versions and the major translations of the Reformation.

Acts 8:37--And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

Here the testimony of this Ethiopian eunuch has been removed in modern versions and their Greek texts. The verse is omitted by the standard Alexandrian codices, as well as P45 (third century), and P74 (seventh century). It is also omitted from several of the cursive manuscripts and early versions.

However, the passage is found in Codex E (eighth century) and in several other manuscripts. Also, it is in the Old Latin manuscripts (second to fourth century) and the Vulgate of Jerome (fourth century). Still further, the passage is cited by Irenaeus (202 AD) and Cyprian (258 AD). Thus, while not in the majority of the Greek witness, it does have both early and wide range support.

James White objects to the passage by claiming that it was introduced by Erasmus taking the reading from Jerome's Vulgate.

Acts chapters 8 and 9 are also rather expanded in the TR due to material brought over from the Vulgate. If one looks up Acts 8:37 . . . in the NIV, one will not find such a verse (outside of the textual footnote, that is). The reason is the verse is found in only a very few Greek manuscripts, none earlier than the sixth century, and Erasmus inserted it due to its presence in the Vulgate and in the margin of one Greek manuscript in his possession. (White, *The King James Only Controversy*, 66.)

True, the passage in question appears in the Latin Vulgate of Jerome. However, it also appears in all the Old Latin manuscripts which pre-date the Vulgate. And, as already stated, Irenaeus cites it in his thesis *Against Heresies* (3:12:8). Dr. Bruce Metzger sees the citation by Erasmus in a different light and cites Erasmus himself on this issue.

Although the passage does not appear in the late medieval manuscript on which Erasmus chiefly depended for his edition (ms. 2), it stands in the margin of another (ms. 4), from which he inserted it into his text because he, "judged that it had been omitted by the carelessness of scribes (arbitror omissum librariorum incuria)." (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary On The Greek New Testament*, 360.) It appears in all the early English Versions and all the authoritative/standard versions of the Reformation.

Rom 8:1--There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. This verse is called into question because of the phrase, "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." The same phrase appears in verse 4. Scholarship has labeled this a scribal error. Scribal errors fall into a variety of categories, such as omissions, false recollection, confusion of letters, and insertions. Some others are a little more technical, such as the following. Haplography: The omission of one of a pair of letters or group of letters. Homoeoteleuton: Sometimes a text has the some phrase or words. Homoeoteleuton is when a scribe skips over a portion of the text and omits what is between the two like phrases. Dittography: The repetition of a letter, syllable, word, or phrase. The passage in Rom 8:1 is listed as a dittography scribal error by naturalistic Biblical scholars.

Scribal errors do occur as seen in the large amount of variances within the textual witnesses. There is, however, another perspective which modern scholarship fails to reconcile. While we live in the natural world, there is also a spiritual world which rages an ongoing battle around us (Eph 6:10-12). There is a spiritual force which seeks perversion and brings corruption to the texts. Advantageously, there is also a Spiritual Force which seeks purity and brings preservation to His Holy words. While we can expect natural corruption of the text because of human error, we can also expect corruption of the text because of the powers of darkness. And yet, we have the promise of God to keep and preserve His words and therefore we are assured of His success. The passage in Rom 8:1 is by no means a scribal error (unless one inadvertently omitted the Biblical phrase). Instead, we must conclude upon both the textual promise of God concerning preservation and the contextual passage itself that the passage is genuine and has only been omitted by those forces which seek to pervert and not preserve. Having said this, let us look at both the textual evidence for the passage and the contextual importance of the phrase. The Greek phrase, "ue kata sarka peripatousin alla kata pneuma" (who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.) is supported by a number of minuscules. Among them are 33, 88, 104, 181, 326, 330, 451, 614, 630, 1241, 1877, 1962, 1984, 1985, 2492, and 2495. These date from the eleventh to the fifteenth century. In fact, according to the United Bible Societies Greek Text, among the minuscule witness, only minuscules 1739 (tenth century) and 1881 (fourteenth century) support the reading which omits the phrase. The standard Alexandrian uncials also omit the phrase from verse one. But it is included in Codex K (ninth century), Codex P (ninth century), and stands in the corrected margin of both Codex Sinaiticus (fourth century) and Codex Claromontanus (sixth century). Also, it is included in the Latin Vulgate (fourth century), "nihil ergo nunc damnationis est his qui sunt in christo iesu qui non secundum carnem ambulant", and the Old Syriac Peshitto (second century). The whole verse is cited, with the phrase in question, by Theodoret (466 AD), Ps-Oecumenius (tenth century), and Theophylact (1077 AD). We also have partial citation of the verse by Basil (379 AD). He writes, And after he has developed more fully the idea that it is impossible for one who is in the power of sin to serve the Lord, he plainly states who it is that redeems us from such a tyrannical dominion in the words: "Unhappily man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I give thanks to God through Jesus Christ, our Lord." Further on, he adds: "There is now, therefore, no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not according to the flesh." (Saint Basil, "Concerning Baptism," in *The Fathers Of The Church: Saint Basil Ascetical Works*, "trans." Sister M. Monica Wagner, vol. 9 [New York: Fathers Of The Church, Inc., 1950], 343.)

It therefore comes as no surprise that the whole verse is found in the authoritative/standard foreign versions which underlined the Authorized Version in 1611. Nor is it a surprise to find it in all early English versions. The Bishops' Bible reads, "There is then no damnation to them which are in Christ Jesu, which walke not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Likewise, Tyndale's New Testament, and the Great Bible use the word "damnation." However, the Geneva Bible agrees with the King James and uses the English word "condemnation."

Theologically, the omission of the last half of the verse carries a doctrinal error. To say that there is no condemnation whatsoever of any who are in Christ Jesus is to overlook the whole of scripture. In fact, we are told that it is very possible for those who are in Christ to suffer condemnation. If the Believer is walking, not after the Spirit but after the flesh, his or her works are nothing but wood,

hay, and stubble. If the Believer is walking after the Spirit, and not after the flesh, his or her works are gold, silver, and precious stones. (1Co 3:12). Everyone's works will be tried by fire. Fleshly works will be burned and Spiritual works will endure. We are told, "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." (1Co 3:15). The context of Romans chapter 8, verses 4-10, also teaches us that faithful Christians are to walk after the Spirit and not after the flesh. This has to do with our Christian living. The Christian is in a constant battle between the Spirit and the flesh (Gal 5:16-18). There is no condemnation for the Believer who is following the Holy Spirit. However, there is condemnation for those who do not follow the leading of the Spirit, but seek to follow their own flesh.

We must remember that the word condemnation not only carries the meaning of judgment, but also of disapproval. John informs his "little children" that the heart of the Believer is able to pass such condemnation or disapproval on our Christian living. "For if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight." (1Jn 3:20-21). Not only is there a judgment for Believers who stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ (2Co 5:9-10) where their works will either be approved or disapproved (1Co 3:12-15). But there also can be a judgment on the Believer here which may cost them their very life if they continue in sin (Acts 5:1-10; 1Jn 5:16). So, Biblically speaking, there is condemnation to those who walk after the flesh and not after the Spirit. The use of this verse among the Reformers, as it stands in the Traditional Text, may be illustrated by citing John Calvin. In his commentary on Romans, Calvin writes of verse one:

"There is then, &c." After having described the contest which the godly have perpetually with their won flesh, he returns to the consolation, which was very needful for them, and which he had before mentioned; and it was this,--That though they were still beset by sin, they were yet exempt from the power of death, and from every curse, provided they lived not in the flesh but in the Spirit . . . "After the Spirit." Those who walk after the Spirit are not such as have wholly put off all the emotions of the flesh, so that their whole life is redolent with nothing but celestial perfection; but they are those who sedulously labour to subdue and mortify the flesh, so that the love of true religion seems to reign in them. (John Calvin, Commentaries On The Epistle Of Paul The Apostle To The Romans, "trans." John Owen [1536; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947], 275-276.)

Eph 3:9--And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: The Textus Receptus uses the Greek word, "koinonia" (fellowship). However, almost all Greek manuscripts of this passage use the Greek word, "oikonomia" (dispensation or stewardship). To this, James White states,

We have already noted the fact that the TR has a very unusual reading of "fellowship," found only in the margin of minuscule manuscript 31 and a few other very late manuscripts, rather than the reading of all uncials, 99% of the minuscules, and all the early Fathers, which have "administration." (White, King James Only Controversy, 179.)

Although we may have cause to question the statistical information provided, White is correct in stating that almost all of the Greek manuscripts and Church Fathers used the word "oikonomia" (administration). However, in addition to the minuscule manuscript 31, we may also add minuscule

57 (twelfth century) as using the word "koinonia" (fellowship). Additionally, Metzger notes that, "a few other minuscules," contain the Greek word "koinonia." (Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary On The Greek New Testament* [New York: United Bible Societies, 1968], 603.). Thus there are at least three or four Greek manuscripts which have the Greek word "koinonia." In favor of the Greek word "oikonomia," we have P46, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, and the correctors of Codices D, G, K, L, and P. Among the minuscules 17, 37, and 47 support the use of "oikonomia" instead of "koinonia."

Early English versions, being based on the Textus Receptus of the Reformation, used the Greek word "koinonia" and thus the English word "fellowship." The much beloved Geneva Bible reads, "And to make cleare unto all men what the felowship of the mysterie is, which from the beginning of the worlde hathe bene hid in God, who hathe created all things by Jesus Christ."

"Oikonomia" is translated as "stewardship," "administration," and "dispensation" in various modern versions in Eph 3:9. On the other hand the word, "koinonia" is translated as "fellowship" (Acts 2:42), "communion" (2Co 6:14), *contribution* (Rom 15:26), and *distribution* (2Co 9:13) in the Authorized Version. There is a community here among these English words, and even among the two Greek words, for all of them reflect one who gives what he is a part of.

Dr. A. W. Thorold (Lord Bishop of Rochester) noted this in 1882. Commenting on Eph 3:9 he writes, " 'Fellowship.' or, dispensation, in making Gentiles fellow-heirs with the Jews." (A. W. Thorold, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," in *Commentary On The New Testament*, vol. 2 [London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1882].) John Locke tied "fellowship," "communication," and "dispensation" together in 1707. Locke cites the Authorized Version's reading of "fellowship" and then uses the meaning of "communicated" in his own paraphrase.

Tis h koinonia, What is the Communication, i.e. that they may have light from me, to see and look into the Reason and Ground of the Discovery or Communication of this Mystery to them now by Jesus Christ, who is now exhibited to the World, into whose hands God has put the Management of this whole Dispensation. (John Locke, *A Paraphrase And Notes On The Epistles Of St. Paul To TheGal 1:1-24And 2 Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians*, Arthur W. Wainwright ed., vol. 2 [1707; reprint, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1987], 640-641.)

Further, Dr. G. W. H. Lampe demonstrates that among the writings of the early Church Fathers, such as Justin Martyr and Clement, "koinonia" carried the meaning of distribution and imparting. (G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* [Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961], 764.) Still further, the English word "fellowship" carries this same meaning which demonstrates a mutual sharing. Thus, the Greek words and all the English words reflect the meaning of giving what we are partakers of, which is the meaning of the passage in Eph 3:9. In light of the definition, the use of the words, and the textual support, it seems rather ridiculous to cite this passage as an example of errata in the King James Bible. This passage can hardly be compared to places in modern editions where the Traditional Text is rejected and whole verses are missing or the context is completely changed.

Eph 3:14--For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, The Authorized Version is criticized on this verse by textual critics because the phrase, "of our Lord Jesus Christ" lacks Greek support among the early manuscripts. It is true that the phrase is missing from P46

(200 AD), Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Codices A, B, C and P. It is also missing from the cursives 33, 81, 1739, 1962, 2127, and 2492. Oddly, it does appear in the corrector (c) of Codex Sinaiticus, which contains many additions and corrections in its margins. It is also in D, G, K, and PSI. Among the cursives it is found in 88, 104, 181, 326, 330, 436, 451, 614, 629, 630, 1241, 1877, 1881, 1984, 1985, and 2495.

It is also found in the Old Latin and other early translations. The Syriac Peshitto Version (which has been dated as early as the second century and as late as the fifth century) reads, "And I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus the Messiah." The reading is also found in the Old Gothic Version of the fourth century and the Old Armenian Version of about the same time.

It is cited by Ambrosiaster (fourth century), Victorinus of Rome (362 AD), Ephraem (373 AD), Chrysostom (407 AD), Theodore (428 AD), Theodoret (466 AD), John of Damascus (749 AD), and Photius (895 AD), showing that the reading has survived the onslaught of time.

Saint Basil (379 AD) founded the monastic system, put his faith into practice by beginning what was an early form of hospice care for terminally ill patients, and firmly believed that water baptism should follow only after conversion. In his thesis on the subject of baptism, he cites Eph 3:14 : In these and other passages of the kind, then, the Lord says that they who are born of the Spirit become spirit. The Apostle again testifies to the same truth when he says: "For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory,

11 LESSON ELEVEN

Lesson Eleven: TRANSLATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

"As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction."-- 2Pe 3:16 The majority of objections to the King James Bible can be placed in one of two categories. The first deals with the text. In regard to this, we have not only considered the underlining Greek text of the Authorized Version, but also the Greek text which underlines the vast majority of modern versions. Additionally, we have also considered several places where opponents of the KJV have claimed corruption in the text. Each time, we have found support for God's word and the doctrine of preservation. The second category deals not with the underlining Greek text of the King James Bible, but the translation of it. The claim is often made that since 1611 our language has so drastically changed that we can no longer make sense of the archaic Elizabethan English found in the pages of this antiquated version. Although we will deal with this issue in greater detail in our next lesson, we must pause to say that according to Holy Scripture, the Bible was never intended to be easily read or understood. In fact, the Holy Spirit claims that much of God's word is "hard to understand" (2Pe 3:16). For this, and other reasons, men have sought to challenge it by simply changing it. The following are a few examples of where claims are made against the King James in regard to its English translation. In each case, as with all the others which are not mentioned, the answer provided by man is scholarship. However, we find that in each case this man-centered scholarship falls short and never at any time provides the Believer with the preserved word of God. Therefore, the final authority becomes scholarship and not Scripture. Nonetheless, the Bible-believing Christian places their faith in the promises of God and is rewarded with the assurance that God has in fact kept and preserved His words as He has promised.

Jer 34:16--But ye turned and polluted my name, and caused every man his servant, and every man his handmaid, whom ye had set at liberty at their pleasure, to return, and brought them into subjection, to be unto you for servants and for handmaids. The problem found in this verse deals with the little word "ye." Some editions of the KJV read, "whom he had set at liberty at their pleasure," instead of as it appears in the above text. James R. White asks, "The question for the KJV Only advocate is, 'How do you determine which one is right?' " (The King James Only Controversy, Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1995, p. 80). He then mistakenly states that this dilemma cannot be determined by going back to the original edition of the KJV printed in 1611 since it, "has undergone changes of similar nature over the years." (Ibid., p. 81).

These type of arguments have nothing to do with either the Hebrew text, the translation found in the KJV, or the doctrine of preservation. It has to do with what has already been addressed in lesson seven. This is simply a printing error which some printers still maintain. Mr. White's objection is absurd, as correcting a printing mistake is not changing the text.

Another example of such a printing error can be found in Acts 6:3. The original edition of 1611 had the correct reading:

Wherefore brethren, looke ye out among you seuen men of honest report, full of the holy Ghost, and wifedome, whom we may appoint ouer this businesse.

However, a printed edition in 1638 read, "whom he may appoint over this businesse." Yet, current editions have again corrected this printing error so that it again reads, "whom we may appoint over this business." As to Jer 34:16, the original edition of 1611 read, "whome yee had set at libertie at their pleasure." James White notes that it is the edition printed by Oxford which reads "he" while the edition printed by Cambridge reads "ye." (Ibid., p.80). John R. Dore has correctly stated that, "The University of Oxford did not begin to print Bibles until the year 1675, when the first was issued in quarto size; the spelling was revised by Dr. John Fell, Dean of Oxford." (John R. Dore, *Old Bibles: An Account of the Early Versions of the English Bible*, London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1888, p. 346). Cambridge, agreeing with the edition of 1611, first began printing KJV Bibles in 1629 by Thomas and John Buck.

Although I cannot prove that the error falls to Dr. John Fell in his 1675 Oxford edition, I can state that considerable time passed before the error was introduced, with the error limited to the editions published by Oxford or based on the Oxford edition. This has absolutely nothing to do with the issue of Biblical preservation, for the reading is found in the original edition, the Cambridge edition, and current editions based on either the original 1611 or Cambridge editions. This has everything to do with what Bible-believers have claimed about the so-called four revisions of the KJV. These revisions deal with orthography (spelling), calligraphy (style of writing), or printing errors (as we find here).

Dan 3:25--He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.

Newer versions read, "and the fourth looks like a son of the gods" (NIV), or "and the fourth has the appearance of a god" (NRSV). Dr. Jack Lewis addresses this and explains, " 'The Son of God' (Dan 3:25) can only be taken by the reader as implying that Jesus was in the furnace, but Nebuchadnezzar says he saw an 'angel' (Dan 3:28); hence 'a son of god' or 'of the gods' --that is, an angelic being--must be understood." (The English Bible: From KJV to NIV, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981, pp. 45-46). This is ridiculous. First, we need not interpret the Bible in light of what Nebuchadnezzar proclaims. Second, the explanation of the fourth man being "an angel" would not exclude a pre-incarnation of Jesus Christ since He is, in the Old Testament, referred to as the "Angel of the Lord." Dr. Emery Bancroft writes, " 'The Angel of the Lord' is clearly a manifestation of Deity in the Old Testament, and is identified with the Second Person of the Trinity, the Lord Jesus Christ. 'The Angel of the Lord' was God the Son before His permanent incarnation." (Elemental Theology, Zondervan Publishing House, 1960, p. 26). He offers Jdg 13:18; Isa 9:6; Mal 3:1 and John 8:56 as proof of his statement. Nor would King Nebuchadnezzar be ignorant of the prophecy concerning the Son of God (Psa 2:7; Psa 2:12 and Pro 30:4), since he read the Hebrew Scriptures and had the insights of not only these three Hebrew children, but of the Prophet Daniel as well. Most of all, modern versions and interpreters such as Jack Lewis, ignore the truth of the passage. It was not "a god," or "a son of the gods," which was in the fiery furnace with Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. It was the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

This was also the understanding of the early Church Fathers, again something that modern translators forget in their endeavor to correct the Word of God. Athanasius (373 AD) wrote: Who is this "Well-beloved" but the Only-begotten Son? As also in the hundred and ninth, "From the womb I begat Thee before the morning star," concerning which I shall speak afterwards; and in the Proverbs, "Before the hills He begat me;" and in Daniel, "And the form of the Fourth is like the Son of God;" and many others. If then from the Old be ancientness, ancient must be the Son, who is clearly described in the Old Testament in many places. (Four Discourses Against The Arians, IV:24)

Further, the Hebrew word used in the passage, "elahh," is the very same word used in verses 15, 17, 26, 28, and 29 of the same chapter (as well as many other places). In these verses "elahh" is translated as "God."

George Lamsa's translation, based on the Syrian texts, indicates that the Old Syrian manuscripts agree with the translation of the KJV. Lamsa's version reads, "The king answered and said, Behold I see men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they are not hurt: and the appearance of the fourth is like that of the Son of God." It is also interesting that the Greek Septuagint agrees with the KJV, something modern scholarship seems to overlook here. The LXX uses the Greek word "Theou" (of God) which stands in the singular and not the plural. It is the reading of the Old Latin translations and the reading found in the Douay-Rheims Version (although in this version it is found in verse 92). Therefore, the verse is hardly limited to the KJV only. The Authorized Version of 1611 gives the correct reading in accordance with the historic interpretation of the passage, the uses of the Hebrew word, and the context of the passage.

Mark 6:20--For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly.

James White writes, Did Herod 'observe' John, as the KJV says, or 'keep him safe,' as the NASB says? The Greek term simply does not mean 'observe,' but instead means 'to protect.' One might possibly suggest that 'observe' once meant 'to protect,' but such seems a long stretch, especially since the KJV renders the same word 'preserve' at Mat 9:17 and Luk 5:38. (The King James Only Controversy, pp. 224-225). The problem is not with the translation, but with modern scholarship's lack of comprehension concerning the English language. According to the Webster's Third New International Dictionary, the word "observe" comes from the Latin word "observare" which means to watch, guard, and observe. (Philip Babcock Gove, editor. Springfield Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster Inc., 1981, p. 1558). This agrees with Dr. John C. Traupman's Latin Dictionary which defines "observare" as >>to watch, watch out for, take careful note of; to guard; to observe, keep, obey, comply with; to pay attention to, pay respect to. (New York: Amsco School Publications, 1966, p.200). Further, the Oxford English Dictionary offers this definition of "observe" as well: "6. To regard with attention; to watch; to watch over, look after." (The Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd edition, J.A.Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, editors. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989, p. 1196). For the most part, we think of the word "observe" as meaning to watch, study, or take notice of. However, it also means to keep, protect, or preserve. For example, we speak of "observing the speed limit." We do not mean that we are watching how fast we travel down the road, we mean we are obeying or keeping the law of the land. Some observe the Sabbath, or a religious holiday. Again, this means they keep or respect the day. When the Coast Guard speaks

of "observing our shores," they mean they are protecting them. So it is with Forest Rangers who set up "observation posts" for the purpose of protecting the wilderness. Both "observe" and "preserve" mean to keep something. This is why this very same Greek word is used in Luk 2:19 and is translated as "kept," "Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart." The basic Greek word is "suntereo." According to the 1978 revision of *The Analytical Greek Lexicon* it is defined as, "to observe strictly, or to secure from harm, protect." (Harold K. Moulton, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 392.) James H. Moulton and George Milligan note that one of the uses of this word in ancient non-literary writings is when, "a veteran claims that in view of his long military service, exemption from public burdens ought to be 'strictly observed' in his case." (*The Vocabulary Of The Greek Testament*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949, p.614). These definitions stand in direct contrast with White's statement that, "the Greek term simply does not mean 'observe,' but instead means 'to protect.'" Clearly, it means both. The problem is not with the King James Bible, but with those who do not fully understand either Greek or their own language. In one sense, this is a good argument for the KJV. When we limit our understanding, we limit ourselves and our growth as Christians and humans. Modern versions, in trying to simplify our language, have limited our understanding of English and many of our great historical and literary writings outside the Scriptures. In this way, they have done us a great disservice.

Notice how the word "observed" is used in the following writings. In each case, the word is taken to mean "kept" and not "watch."

Now, therefore, be it known that I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, have caused the said Convention to be made public, to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof, may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof. (Convention Between The United States And The Republic Of Panama, 1904, Article XXVI: 130.

Whoever can there bring sufficient proof that he has strictly observed the laws of his country for seventy-three moons, has a claim to certain privileges, according to his quality and condition of life, with a proportionable sum of money out of a fund appropriated for that use: (Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, Part 1: Chapter 6, paragraph 5)

FIRST SAILOR. Sir, your queen must overboard: the sea works high, the wind is loud, and will not lie till the ship be clear'd of the dead.

PERICLES. That's your superstition.

FIRST SAILOR. Pardon us, sir; with us at sea it hath been still observed, and we are strong in custom. Therefore briefly yield 'er; for she must overboard straight. (William Shakespeare, *Pericles*, Acts 3:1-26, Scene 1, line 60)

White also makes an additional statement concerning this text and the translation produced by the Authorized Version in a footnote to his book.

We note in passing how inferior even this rendering by the KJV is. 'He was a just man and an holy' makes little sense; what is 'an holy'? Instead, the Greek phrase is quite easily translated as the NASB, 'he was a righteous and holy man,' both terms 'righteous' and 'holy' plainly describing John. (*The King James Only Controversy*, p. 238). This is a very strange statement, coming from a

professor of New Testament Greek. The student of Greek knows that often a Greek adjective can be used for a Greek noun. For example, the Greek word for good is "agathos." The Greek phrase "o agathos" can mean "the good" or it can mean "the good man." The noun is understood in the adjective. This being the case, it is hard to understand how Mr. White cannot apply the same to his understanding of English. The phrase, "an holy" obviously means "a holy man" as the context reveals.

Thomas Hubeart, one of the students in our class, has justly made the following observation as it relates to the above interpretation by James White. He writes,

One cannot help but call Mr. White's attention to the fact that the New American Standard's rendering of the phrase means the same things as the KJV's rendering! 'A just man and an holy' plainly means a just and holy man, since 'man' is obviously implied by the construction of the English phrase.

Brother Hubeart then does a wonderful job of illustrating this by citing Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's, *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*. But you have told us nothing!" cried the doctor. "Oh, there can be no doubt as to the sequence of events," said Holmes. "There were three of them in it: the young man, the old man, and a third, to whose identity I have no clue. . . .< --*The Resident Patient.* (see Thomas Hubeart's Web Site <<<http://members.aol.com/basfawlty>>>; <<<http://members.aol.com/basfawlty>>>)

John 1:18--No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. The phrase in question is "the only begotten Son." There are two variants here: one with the Greek text and the other with the translation. The Greek of the Traditional Text reads, "o monogenes eos" (the only begotten Son). The Greek of the Alexandrian Text reads, "o monogenes theos" (the only begotten God). Additionally, the Greek word "monogenes" is no longer looked upon as being translated as "only begotten" but is now considered better translated as "unique" or "one and only."

Dr. Edwin H. Palmer, who served as the executive secretary of the Committee on Bible Translation for the New International Version, had this to say concerning this passage. A striking case of where the KJV, following bad Greek copies of the original text, changed the original is (sic) John 1:18. The KJV says, 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' John 1:18, as inspired by the Holy Spirit, is one of those few clear and decisive texts that declare that Jesus is God. But, scripts, altered what the Holy Spirit said through John, calling Jesus 'Son.' Using the archaic language of the KJV, the verse should read: 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten God, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' Or to say it in a modern and elegant way: 'No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only [Son], who is at the Father's side, has made him known' [NIV]. (The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation, Kenneth L. Barker editor, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986, p. 143). The statement by Dr. Palmer is interesting on several levels. First there is the question on the textual level. The phrase "monogenes theos" is found in P66 and P75, as well as Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus (and a few other manuscripts). The reading, "monogenes eos" is found in the vast majority of Greek witnesses and ancient translations. This is a classic example illustrating the two lines of manuscripts. What is interesting is that Dr. Palmer refers to the line of manuscripts which support the reading found in the NIV and

NASV as being "inspired." If those of us who support the Greek text of the Authorized Version referred to it as being the correct text because this was, "A striking case of where the NIV, following bad Greek copies of the original text, changed the original in John 1:18," or, "John 1:18, as inspired by the Holy Spirit, is one of those clear and decisive texts that declare that Jesus is the only begotten Son of God," we would be ridiculed by men such as Palmer and White for calling the Greek text of the KJV inspired and original. However, when they do the very things they accuse us of doing, it is considered "scholarship."

Secondly, it is interesting that Dr. Palmer attacks the KJV for using "archaic language" and yet does not cite any archaisms for this verse. Is there anything in the passage which one cannot understand because of the antiquated language of 1611?

Finally, in relation to Dr. Palmer's quote, while he accuses the KJV of using "archaic language" he then offers a reading from the NIV which the NIV no longer contains. Within the first five years of the translation, the NIV changed the passage "No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only [Son], who is at the Father's side, has made him known." It now reads, "No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only, who is at the Father's side, has made him known." Thus, the NIV has revised itself and omitted [Son].

Placing Dr. Palmer's comments aside, we are still left with the change of "only begotten" to "One and Only." Dr. Jack Finegan, in *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts: A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism*, cites Dr. Dale Moody as evidence for the change of English words. This English translation (i.e. "Only begotten God") corresponds literally to the Greek, but may not bring out the full meaning of the sentence. Note that "monogenes" ("only begotten") may also be translated "only" or "unique" (cf. Dale Moody in *JBL* 72 [1953], pp. 213-219), and that the following word "Theos" ("God") is without the article. (*Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, p. 125*).

Dr. Moody argues that the word is better translated as "unique" and thus the passage in John 1:1-51 is simply claiming Christ as a unique God and not a created god. Moody explains, The word translated 'only' . . . is monogenes, from monos (single) and genos (kind). Since Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (1886) students have known that monogenes meant 'single of its kind, only' and that the term denotes 'the only son of God' in the Johannine writings. (Dale Moody, "God's Only Son: The Translation of John 3:16 In the Revised Standard Version" *Journal Of Biblical Literature*, Vol 72, 1953, p213.) To begin with, there have been many translations since 1886 which translated monogenes in John 1:18 as "only begotten." All one need do is consult the American Standard Version (1901), The Revised Berkely Version (1959), The New American Standard Version (1960), and The New King James Version (1979) to see that "only begotten" is still in vogue. Secondly, all one need do is consult the Greek text of the King James Version to see that the translators were not unaware that monogenes can be translated as "only" for they did so in Luk 7:12; Luk 8:42; Luk 9:38. However, none of these verses deals with the person of Jesus Christ. Therefore, we see that the Greek word can mean "only" when dealing with humans, but when dealing with Christ it means "only begotten."

Further, this is not only Biblical, but it is also clearly the historical understanding of both the passage and the translation of the Greek word "monogenes." The Old Latin manuscripts read, "deum nemo uidit umquam. unigenitus filius. qui est in sinu patris. ipse narravit." The Latin word "unigenitus" means more than unique or only. My Latin dictionary from back in public school

renders it as, "only begotten, only; of the same parentage." (Dr. John C. Traupman, Latin Dictionary, p. 323). And Martin Luther translated the phrase in German as "der eingeborene Sohn." Even without a knowledge of German, one can see that "eingeborene" means "only begotten." As does the Spanish Reina-Valera in using, "el unigenito Hijo" (only begotten Son). The reading is older than either the German or the Spanish. In 202 AD, Irenaeus wrote, For "no man," he says, "hath seen God at any time," unless "the only-begotten Son of God, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared [Him]." For He, the Son who is in His bosom, declares to all the Father who is invisible.<<(Against Heresies, 3:11:6 ---Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, The Ante-Nicene Fathers, p. 427. "Irenaeus Against Heresies", New York: Scribner's Sons, 1926 vol. 1. also in 4:20:6, p.489) In 324 AD, Alexander of Alexandria wrote in his letter to the Bishop of Alexandria the following:

Moreover, that the Son of God was not produced out of what did not exist, and that there never was a time when He did not exist, is taught expressly by John the Evangelist, who writes this of Him: 'The only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father.' The divine teacher, because he intended to show that the Father and the Son are two and inseparable from each other, does in fact specify that He is in the bosom of the Father. (W.A. Jurgens, The Faith Of The Early Fathers, Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, p. 300) The context of the 5th Confession of the Nicene Creed (344 AD) shows that monogenes meant more than only, it means only begotten.

We believe in one God the Father Almighty, . . . And in His Only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who before all ages was begotten from the Father, God from God, Light from Light, by whom all things were made, in heaven and on the earth, visible and invisible . . . (as cited from Athanasius: De Synodis, II:26).

Athanasius (373 AD) states,

If then He is Only-begotten, as indeed He is, "First-born" needs some explanation; but if He be really First-born, then He is not Only-begotten and First-born, except in different relations; that is, Only-begotten, because of His generation from the Father, as has been said; and First-born, because of His condescension to the creation and His making the many His brethren. (Discourse II, XXI:62) Athanasius also cites John 1:18 with Gen 1:1; Psa 110:3; Psa 2:7; Pro 8:25; and John 1:3.

Plainly, divine Scripture, which knows better than any the nature of everything, says through Moses, of the creatures, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" but of the Son it introduces not another, but the Father Himself saying, "I have begotten Thee from the womb from the womb before the morning star;" and again, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee." And the Lord says of Himself in the Proverbs, "Before all the hills He begets me;" and concerning things originated and created John speaks, "All things were made by Him;" but preaching of the Lord, he says, "The Only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He declared Him." If then son, therefore not creature; if creature, not son; for great is the difference between them, and son and creature cannot be the same, unless His essence be considered to be at once from God, and external to God.<< (De Decretis [Defence of the Nicene Definition], III:13).

Ambrose (397 AD) writes, For this reason also the evangelist says, "No one has at any time seen God, except the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has revealed him." "The

bosom of the Father," then, is to be understood in a spiritual sense, as a kind of innermost dwelling of the Father's love and of His nature, in which the Son always dwells. Even so, the Father's womb is the spiritual womb of an inner sanctuary, from which the Son has proceeded just as from a generative womb. (St. Ambrose: The Patrices, 11:51).

Finally, Augustine (430 AD) wrote: For Himself hath said: No man hath seen God at any time, but the Only-Begotten Son, Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him. Therefore we know the Father by Him, being they to whom He hath declared Him. (Homilies On The Gospel According To St. John, XLVII:3) The list could go on. The point is that most of the early Theologians in the Church not only recognized that monogenes means "only begotten," and defined it as such, but that the popular reading was "only begotten Son."

Acts 5:30--The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. The objection to this verse deals with the phrase, "whom ye slew and hanged on a tree." Modern translations, such as the New King James Version, reads: The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom you murdered by hanging on a tree.

James White comments on this by stating,

Peter did not say that the Jews had slain Jesus and then hung him on a tree. Instead, they put the Lord to death by hanging Him upon the tree. It is difficult to see exactly where the KJV derived its translation, as there is no 'and' in the text to separate 'slew' and 'hanged on a tree.' (The King James Only Controversy, pp. 225-226)

White's suggestion is faulty in two aspects. First, because he misreads the text of the Authorized Version, making it read "whom ye slew and THEN hanged on a tree." Second, because he condemns the Authorized Version for inserting the word "and," yet White himself agrees with the insertion of the word "by." In English, the word "and" does not usually mean a time frame, as White has interpreted it (however the phrase "and then" does refer to time). Therefore, the text is not saying that the Jews murdered Christ and then placed him on the cross. The word "and" is a conjunction which simply links two thoughts together. As such, it is used as the word "further." We understand the text to mean that the Jews were responsible for killing their Messiah. Further, they were responsible for having him placed on the cross. This is a proper use of English. When one assumes that the text is stating that the Jews murdered the Lord and THEN crucified him, he is reading his own thoughts into the text making it say something it does not say. In so doing, one simply shows their lack of understanding the English language. This can be seen in Miguel de Cervantes', Don Quixote. The barber tells Sancho Panza that "we suspect already, that you have murdered and robbed him, for here you are mounted on his horse." However, Sancho defends himself by stating, "for I am not a man to rob or murder anybody; let his own fate, or God who made him, kill each one." (Translated by John Ormsby, Pt. 1, Chapter 26:40.) Sancho places the word order as "rob or murder," while the barber places the order "murdered and robbed." Both statements are grammatically correct because "and" means "further" and not in regard to time. The barber is saying of Sancho that he was a murderer and further, that he was a robber. The same construction is seen in 1Sa 17:50-51. David had already killed Goliath with the stone from his sling-shot. He then takes the Giant's sword and cuts off his head. The Revised Standard Version translates this as follows: So David prevailed over the Philistine with a sling and a stone, and struck the Philistine, and killed him; there was no sword in the hand of David. Then David ran

and stood over the Philistine; and took his sword and drew it out of its sheath, and killed him; and cut off his head with it. The word "and" is used in this translation as it is in the Authorized Version. The Giant died from a strike to his head with a stone coming from David's sling. The text then says David ran over to the body of the dead Giant, "and took his sword and drew it out of its sheath, and killed him." David kills a dead man. How? By removing his sword, "and cut off his head with it." Again, the word "and" in this text does not mean "and then" but it means "further." That is to say David killed Goliath with a stone from his sling. Further, David cut off the Giant's head with his own sword. In a footnote to support his claim against the KJV, James White quotes Dana and Mantey, two Greek grammarians. The participle 'hanging' is a circumstantial instrumental (or modal), expressing the means by which death was inflicted. Dana and Mantey list a syntactical category that would give us the KJV rendering; however, they indicate that this category should be utilized only when the participle does not 'present in a distinct way any of the above functions' (H.E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (Macmillan: 1955), p. 228). Since the participle clearly fits into one of those preceding categories, there is no reason to choose the category that would give us the KJV rendering. (*The King James Only Controversy*, p. 239). The full quote from Dana and Mantey reads as follows: A participle may not present in a distinct way any of the above functions, but may merely express an attendant circumstance--an additional fact or thought which is best rendered in English by the conjunction 'and' with a finite construction. Here the English participle fails to extend its use sufficiently to take care of the entire force of the Greek participle, and at the same time it is doubtful if a separate clause is an exact translation. It is one of those idioms which have no exact parallel in English...'They went forth and preached everywhere. (Mark 16:20; See also Luk 4:15; 2Ti 4:11)<< (Dana and Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, Toronto: Macmillan, 1927, pp. 228-229).

It should be noted that the entire subject of the classification of the participle is introduced with, "This matter has occasioned great diversity of opinion among Greek grammarians." (Ibid., p. 223). All this means is this; the verses which are called "error" are really a matter of opinion. The verses can be translated exactly as the KJV translators did. It is not an error, but simply a matter of diversity of opinion among Greek grammarians. When faced with the above statement, White responded with what can only be considered classic White-washing. In our Christianity Today debate, James White retorted with: Of course, that is untrue. 1) Dana and Mantey do not list Acts 5:30 or 10:29 (sic.) as fitting this category. 2) They say the final category should only be used when the previous categories do not fit; a previous category *did* fit, and that without question. 3) You have failed to deal with the real issue: did the Jews kill Jesus and THEN hang Him upon a tree, Dr. Holland? Yes or no? (Subj: Acts 5:30 Date: 95-08-21 22:10:20 EDT From: Orthopodeo)

It is true that Dana and Mantey did not use Acts 5:30 or 10:39 "as fitting this category." But for that matter, why should they? All that is needed is to state the rule and give an example or two, not list every example. And, if Mr. White does not approve of citing Dana and Mantey for this passage, then why does he do so in his own footnote? After all, Dana and Mantey were not citing Acts 5:30 or 10:39 on page 228 of their book either. And yet, White cites them as authorities for his point of view. As to the final question, the answer is, of course, no. The Jews did not kill Jesus and THEN hanged Him upon a tree. The word "then" is found only in the mind of James White and not in the text of Scripture.

Acts 12:4--And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people. The objection deals with the word "Easter." The Greek word "pascha" is translated as "Passover" in the KJV with this one exception. Earlier English translations also translated "pascha" as Easter in this verse, showing that the understanding here dealt with something other than Passover. Notice the following translations from several early English versions, thus removing the idea that this is a "King James Onlyism."

Tyndale (1525): And when he had caught him, he put him in preson, and delivered him to. iiii. quaternions of soudiers to be kepte, entendinge after ester to bringe him forth to the people.

Great Bible (1539): And when he had caught hym, he put him in preson also, and delyvered him to. iiii. quaternions of soudiers to be kepte, entendinge after Ester to bringe him forth to the people.

Bishop's Bible (1568): And when he had caught him, he put him in prison also, and delivered him to foure quaternions of souldiers to be kept, intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people. The Geneva Bible of 1560 does not use "Easter." Instead it reads: And when he had caught hym, he put hym in prison, and delivered hym to foure quaternions of souldiers to be kept, intending after the Passover to brying hym forthe to the people.

Therefore we see that by 1611 the Bible reading public had both translations of the word "pascha" in English. The use of the word "pascha" in early Christian writings dealt with the celebration of Easter, and not just simply the Jewish Passover (see Dr. Walter Bauer's, *A Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament And Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957, p. 633). Dr. G.W.H. Lampe notes that "pascha" came to mean "Easter" in the early Church. The early Christians did not keep the Jewish Passover. Instead they kept as holy a day to celebrate the resurrection of Christ near the time of both Passover and the pagan festival celebrating the goddess Ostara. Dr. Lampe lists several rules and observances by Christians in celebration of their "pascha" or "Easter." Lampe also points out that Greek words such as "paschazw" and "paschalua" meant "celebrate Easter" and "Eastertide" in the early Christian writings. (see *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961. pp. 1048-1049). And, Dr. Gerhard Kittel notes that "pascha" came to be called "Easter" in the celebration of the resurrection within the primitive Church (see *Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament*, Vol. II. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965, pp. 901-904). As stated, there was also a connection between the Christian "Easter" as we have it, and the pagan celebration of Ostara. Early Christians in Rome could not openly celebrate the resurrection of Christ, so they held their celebration at the time the pagans did in worship of Ostara. Dr. William C. Martin writes:

Modern observance of Easter represents a convergence of three traditions: (1) The Hebrew Passover, celebrated during Nisan, the first month of the Hebrew lunar calendar; (2) The Christian commemoration of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, which took place at the feast of the Passover; and (3) the Norse "Ostara" or "Eostra" (from which the name "Easter" is derived), a pagan festival of spring which fell at the vernal equinox, March 21. Prominent symbols in this celebration of the resurrection of nature after the winter were rabbits, signifying fecundity, and eggs, colored like the ray of the returning sun and the northern lights, or aurora borealis. (*The Layman's Bible Encyclopedia*, Nashville: The Southwestern Company, 1964, p. 204). In view of all

of this, it seems that "pascha" can mean more than the Jewish holy day of Passover. Additionally, the context would confirm such a conclusion. Verse three of this chapter states that Peter was taken during, "the days of unleavened bread." The next verse then speaks of "Easter" in the King James Version. If the word is translated as "Passover," we have a problem because the Days of Unleavened Bread come before the Passover. In the Biblical use of the term, Passover came before the Days of Unleavened Bread (Exo 12:1-8; Exo 12:15; Exo 12:19; Exo 13:7; Lev 2:11; and Deu 16:4). We have a problem with these verses if Passover follows the Days of Unleavened Bread. However, the problem is solved when we see that "pascha" means more than "Passover" as has been shown above. Peter was held under Roman guard by a king who was appointed by Roman law and influenced by Roman customs. Contextually, it would seem that this "pascha" which followed the Days of Unleavened Bread was not the "pascha" (Passover) which preceded the capture of Peter. Instead, it is likely to refer to the Roman celebration of Ostara, hence called "Easter." In response to this, James White writes the following: The problem, of course, is that (1) the term Easter would still be a misleading translation, since the celebration the English reader thinks of is far removed from the pagan worship of Astarte; (2) Herod Agrippa, according to the Jewish historian Josephus, was a conspicuous observer of the Jewish customs and rituals, and since he was attempting to please the Jews (Acts 12:3), it is obvious that Luke is referring to the Jewish Passover, not a pagan celebration; (3) the argument depends upon making the "days of unleavened bread" a completely separate period of time from "the Passover." Unfortunately for the KJV Only position, the term "the Passover" is used of the entire celebration, including the days of unleavened bread after the actual sacrifice of the Passover, in other places in Scripture (note the wrapping up of the entire celebration under the term the "feast of the Jews" in John 2:13; John 2:23; John 6:4; John 11:55). Therefore, this ingenious attempt at saving the KJV from a simple mistake fails under examination.<< (The King James Only Controversy, pp. 233-234).

None of this deals with the fact that in Scripture Passover came before the Days of Unleavened Bread. In Mark 14:1 we read, "After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread." Passover precedes the Days of Unleavened Bread even in the New Testament. None of the verses cited by White change this. In fact, three of them simply state that Passover was near (John 2:13; John 6:4; John 11:55). John 2:23 speaks of many making a surface pretense of believing in Christ at the feast of the Passover. None of these verses show the two events as being called "Passover" as White states. As for Herod observing the Jewish feasts, this means little because as a politician he obeyed whatever was convenient for him while in political power, including both Jewish and Roman holidays. And, it should be remembered, that this "conspicuous observer of the Jewish customs and rituals" had just put James to death and was himself about to die by the hand of God for setting himself up as a god (Acts 12:21-23; Exo 20:2-6).

Acts 19:2--He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. As with so many other examples in this lesson, this verse is objected to by James R. White in his book, The King James Only Controversy. Brother White states,

One of the well-known problems in the AV is found in Acts 19:2 . . . The King James Version has Paul asking the disciples in Ephesus if they received the Holy Ghost "since" they believed, that is, subsequent to the act of believing. All modern translations, however, translate the passage, 'when you believed.' The difference is not a slight one. Entire theologies of a second reception of the

Holy Spirit have been based upon this one rendering by the KJV. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is materially impacted by how one translates this passage. . . This author has been extremely frustrated in attempting to get KJV Only advocates to seriously interact with passages such as this one. (p. 230).

Those of us who have personally had ongoing exchanges of information and correspondence with Brother White, find the last phrase of utmost interest. In a series of online debates with James White and in writing a published critique of his book, I can say with all confidence that THIS author has been extremely frustrated in attempting to get James R. White to seriously interact with passages, textual data, and historical information where he has clearly provided information which lacks veracity. However, let us address the issue he claims KJV advocates ignore.

None of the Greek words used for "since" or "when" are in this verse. Instead, we must look at the construction of the Greek. The phrase, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed," reads in Greek as, "Ei pneuma agion elabete pisteusantes." A literal translation would be, "[The] Spirit/Ghost Holy did ye receive, having believed?" The phrase in question stands in the Greek aorist. This refers to past time; thus, we have the past tense with the words "received" and "believed." Therefore, the translation put forth by White and others is quite correct as it relates to the Greek itself. However, the English word "since" also reflects past tense and is correct as it relates to the Greek text. Dana and Mantey address the use of the aorist. They write, "The fundamental significance of the aorist is to denote action simply as occurring, without reference to its progress." (A Manual Grammar Of The Greek New Testament, Toronto: Macmillan, 1927, p.193) Therefore, the words "since" or "when" both reflect the proper use of the aorist. In reference to what is called the "Culminative Aorist," Dana and Mantey add, The aorist is employed in this meaning when it is wished to view an event in its entirety, but to regard it from the viewpoint of its existing results. Here we usually find verbs which signify effort or process, the aorist denoting the attainment of the end of such effort or process. (Ibid., pp. 196-197). In this regard, the translation of "since" is proper as it relates to the aorist tense. For it can indicate a past action, but one which was attained through a process. Dr. George Ladd (Fuller Theological Seminary) recognizes this and states, "The Greek participle is 'having believed,' and it is capable of being translated either 'since ye believed' (AV) or 'when you believed' (RSV)." (The Wycliffe Bible Commentary, Nashville: The Southwest Company, 1962, p. 1160). Although Dr. Ladd prefers the word "when," he does not claim that "since" is a translational error which will lead to doctrinal error, as claimed by White. In fact, Dr. Ladd plainly states that both translations are possible. Since Mr. White received his M.A. from Fuller Theological Seminary (where Dr. Ladd taught), it is a shame that he did not make himself aware of Dr. Ladd's comments concerning Acts 19:2. In White's noted objection, he indicates that the doctrine which teaches the Holy Spirit is bestowed upon the believer after salvation and not at the time of salvation, is the result of the King James Version. Among many Charismatic and Pentecostal Christians, the doctrine is taught that a person who is saved must later receive the Holy Ghost (usually with "evidences" such as speaking in tongues). And, it is true that some have used this passage as a proof text for that doctrine. However, to credit the translators of the KJV for providing this doctrine is somewhat ridiculous. First of all, the translators of the KJV were Anglican and Puritan, neither of which are proponents of such a doctrine. Secondly, we would have to ask ourselves why many Charismatics and Pentecostals have embraced modern versions which have removed the word "since" and replaced it with

"when." In fact, the NIV had translators who support the very doctrine to which Brother White is objecting.

Regardless of our personal interpretation of the doctrine concerning the receiving of the Holy Ghost, we cannot allow such doctrine to affect the translation of the word of God. James White, in allowing his doctrine to translate for him, is faced with a paradox. If we reject the translation "since" in verse two and replace it with "when" because we believe that the Holy Ghost is received instantly at the very time of salvation, what do we do with the context of the passage? After all, context does count. As we consider the text, we find that Paul confronts a group of "believers" who never heard of the Holy Ghost, nor of personal salvation in Jesus Christ. These were believers in the teaching of John the Baptist and were still looking for the coming Messiah. Paul, in turn, then preaches to these Jews the person of Christ. After which, we read, When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the LORD Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied. (vs. 5-6). The context teaches that these former followers of John first believe, then are baptized, and THEN receive the Holy Ghost with the laying on of hands by the Apostle Paul. The text shows that they received the Holy Ghost "since" they believed. Those who have historically and contextually recognized this, have not all taught that the Holy Ghost is received following salvation as a second blessing. Instead, they teach that the Holy Ghost comes to believers at the time of salvation. This passage is looked upon as transitional, and that these followers of John needed the laying on of hands by Paul in order to show Apostolic authority, not a need for a second blessing. Therefore, this act became their Pentecost.

Rom 9:5--Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.

It has become common to use this verse as a "proof" text that the NIV better represents the Biblical doctrine of the Deity of Christ because it translates the verse as,

Theirs are the patriarchs, and from them is traced the human ancestry of Christ, who is God over all, forever praised! Amen. In this regard we find Dr. D.A. Carson listing this verse as proof that modern versions are better translations (The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism, p. 64). The response to this is quite simple. First of all, as far as we know, there were no commas in the original manuscripts. It is certain that there are no commas in the majority of old Greek manuscripts which we do have. So one cannot dogmatically say the KJV is a poorer reading simply because translations like the NASV and NIV place the commas differently.

Secondly, the proof text for the Deity of Jesus Christ does not lay with a text which can so easily be questioned because of the placement of commas. The real proof texts for the Deity of Christ may be found in verses such as John 1:1; John 20:28. Further, passages which prove the Deity of Christ in the KJV are omitted or changed in modern versions in such places as 1Ti 3:16 and 1Jn 5:7.

Thirdly, the passage should not be translated as we have it in modern versions because it would remove the teaching of the submission of Jesus Christ to the Father. If we have Christ as "God over all," than we have Christ as God over the Father. The Biblical truth is that within the Trinity there is not only equality (John 5:18 and Php 2:6) but there is also submission by Christ to the

Father (1Co 11:3 and Php 2:7-8). Thus the phrase, "Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever" is not only a correct translation, but is more consistent with the Biblical teaching of divine submission.

Finally, we find within the writings of early Christians that the understanding of this passage is not that which is reflected by modern versions, but is consistent with that of the King James Bible.

Hippolytus (235 AD):

Let us look next at the apostle's word: "Whose are the fathers, of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." This word declares that mystery of the truth rightly and clearly. He who is over all is God; for thus He speaks boldly, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father." He who is over all, God blessed, has been born; and having been made man, He is (yet) God for ever. (Against The Heresy Of One Noetus, I:6) Novatian (Third Century):

And, "My Lord and my God." And, "Whose are the fathers, and of whom according to the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for evermore." What, then, shall we say? Does Scripture set before us two Gods? How, then, does it say that "God is one?" Or is not Christ God also? . . . let them understand that, from the fact that God is one, no obstruction arises to the truth that Christ also is declared to be God. (Treatise Concerning The Trinity, XXX.)

2Co 2:17--For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ. The Executive Secretary of the NIV Committee on Bible Translation, the late Dr. Edwin H. Palmer, lists 2Co 2:17 as an obscurity in the King James Version (The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation, Kenneth Barker, editor. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986, p.149). The "obscurity" is the English word "corrupt." Most modern versions use the word "peddle." Thus we have the reading as found in the NIV:

Unlike so many, we do not peddle the word of God for profit. On the contrary, in Christ we speak before God with sincerity, like men sent from God. This becomes a strange translation because it not only removes the idea of Biblical corruption, but it is printed in a version published by Zondervan Publishing House which owns the copyright to the New International Version. And, as far as I know, Zondervan does peddle (via retail sales) the NIV for a profit. I am not suggesting that it is wrong to sell the Bible for a profit, but if the translation of this verse claims it is wrong to do so it seems disingenuous unless Zondervan does not consider the NIV "the word of God." The Greek word in question is "kapeleuontes," and does mean a peddler or retailer. However, it connotes one who sells with deceit, a corrupter. Dr. Walter Bauer points out that the word came to mean "to adulterate" (A Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament And Other Early Christian Literature, p.403). Dr. Joseph Thayer agrees and states, "But as peddlers were in the habit of adulterating their commodities for the sake of gain . . . (the word) was also used as synonymous with 'to corrupt, to adulterate.' " (Joseph Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament, Grand Rapids: Baker Book, 1977 edition, pp. 324-325). And Dr. Gerhard Kittel states concerning "kapeleuontes;" "It also means 2. to falsify the word (as the 'kapelos' purchases pure wine and then adulterates it with water) by making additions . . . This refers to the false Gospel of the Judaizers." (Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. III., p. 605). The early Church Fathers understood the verse to refer to those who corrupt God's word. Athanasius (373 AD) wrote, "Let them therefore be anathema to you, because they have, 'corrupted the word of truth.' It

is an Apostolic injunction, 'If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.' " (Apologia Contra Arianos [Defence Against The Arians], III:49.) Gregory-Nazianzus (390) alludes to 2Co 2:17, Isa 1:22 and Psalms 54:15, using the word "corrupt:" And who is sufficient for these things? For we are not as the many, able to corrupt the word of truth, and mix the wine, which maketh glad the heart of man, with water, mix, that is, our doctrine with what is common and cheap, and debased, and stale, and tasteless, in order to turn the adulteration . . . (In Defence Of His Flight To Pontus, II:46)

James R. White makes an interesting claim concerning this verse. "Surely," writes White, "if the KJV translators were alive today they would gladly admit that 'peddle' is a better translation than 'corrupt,' and would adopt it themselves." (The King James Only Controversy, p.114). In my critique of White's book, I refer to such argumentation as "speaking for the dead." It is one thing to cite those who have died and present what they themselves believed about a certain subject. It is quite another to draw conclusions for those who have died and insist that this would be their view if they were alive today. For the most part one cannot justly refute such invalid argumentation because those who have died cannot speak for themselves. However, this is not the case in this instance. One of the treasures left behind from the translators of the KJV are a few notes by Dr. John Bois, who helped in the translation of the KJV Old Testament Apocrypha and assisted in the final revision of the KJV New Testament (Romans through Revelation). In his note for 2Co 2:17 he wrote:

Ibid. v. 17. kapeleuontes] [being a retail dealer, playing tricks, corrupting] i.e. notheuonetes [adulterating]. kapelos is derived apo tou kallunein ton pelon [from glossing over lees] by corrupting and adulterating wine. (the full note was written in Latin and Greek. Translating For King James, trans. and ed. by Ward Allen. Vanderbilt University Press, 1969, p. 51)

Apparently, the translators of the KJV were more aware of the meaning of the word than what James White and others give them credit. If we are indeed going to speak for the dead, we best learn to do so correctly.

2Ti 2:15--Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. The word "study" is challenged in this passage by supporters of modern versions. First, they claim the word is archaic and difficult to understand. Second, they claim that the Greek word, "spoudason" should be translated as "diligence." In reference to the New King James Version, Dr. Jack Lewis writes: "In 2Ti 2:15 'study' correctly becomes 'Be diligent' . . ." (The English Bible, p. 349). James White likewise considers "Be diligent" to be a better translation than either the KJV's "study" or the NIV's "do your best." The NIV's 'do your best' seems to miss some of the force of the term, and the KJV's 'study' limits the meaning of the word far too much for the modern reader who might not understand 'study' to refer to a concerted effort at diligence and effort. Paul is exhorting Timothy to have an attitude that is marked by zeal, enthusiasm, and determination in his ministry. This attitude may well include the aspect of study, but in no way is Paul's admonishment to be limited solely to that activity. (The King James Only Controversy, pp. 140-141).

Later, White seems to refer to 2 Timothy as meaning to be diligent in one's studies. He writes, "Allow the readers of Scripture to 'be diligent' (2Ti 2:15) in their own studies and come to their own conclusions." (Ibid., p. 257). The English word "study" not only refers to one's endeavor to become

educated, but also refers to being diligent. The 1828 Noah Webster Dictionary of the English Language lists one of the definitions of "study" as, "3. To endeavor diligently." A more current edition defines the word "studious" as, "1. diligent in study." (The New American Webster Handy College Dictionary, New York: Signet Books, 1981, p. 517). We can see from this, and even from the first citation from James White, that the English word "study" means diligence. As to the Greek word "spoudason" the KJV translators knew the word meant more than book studies. The same Greek word is elsewhere translated as "diligence" in such places as 2Ti 4:9; 2Ti 4:21 : as "endeavor" in 1Th 2:17 and 2Pe 1:15, as "forward" in Gal 2:10 and 2Co 8:17, and as "labour" in Heb 4:11. Of course, this is no new information for students who must labor diligently in their endeavor to go forward as they study. And, again we are faced with the context itself. Our "diligence" in "rightly dividing the word of truth" comes from our "study" of Scripture, not our spiritual endeavors. Thus, only in the King James Bible is the Christian instructed to study in knowing how to rightly divide God's word. As for the readability of this passage in the KJV, there is an interesting finding as established by the Flesch-Kincaid grading level. Although more about readability will be discussed in our next lesson, the following information may be helpful. According to my WordPerfect Grammatik (6.0 version from Main Street) 2Ti 2:15 in the King James Version has a 9.5 Grade Reading Level. Its Sentence Complexity (from 1 to 100) is listed as a 37; and its Vocabulary Complexity (also 1 to 100) is listed as a 26. The New International Version reads, "Do your best to present yourself to God as one approved, a workman who does not need to be ashamed and who correctly handles the word of truth." Grammatik gave this an 11.54 Grade Reading Level, with a Sentence Complexity rating of 47. Only in Vocabulary Complexity did the NIV receive a lower rating than the KJV in this verse with a level of 10. The New American Standard Version reads, "Be diligent to present yourself approved to God as a workman who does not need to be ashamed, handling accurately the word of truth." It received an 11.71 Grade Reading Level, with a Sentence Complexity Level of 43 and a Vocabulary Complexity Level of 35.

One final note in regard to this verse. Reformer John Calvin, reading among other things French, Latin, and Greek, understood the word to mean "study" in regard to teachings from the Bible. Long before the KJV was translated into English Calvin wrote:

Now when S. Paul hath thus spoken he addeth, 'Studie to present thyself to God an approved workman, that needeth not be ashamed, dividing the word of truth aright.' . . . So then, how shall they (those charged to preach the word of God) have the office of teaching the people of God, keepe themselves from vaine and unprofitable questions? And how may they resist them, which as busie bodies trouble the Church? Surely if they present themselves to God, and studie to do so. (John Calvin, Sermons on the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, The Banner of Truth Trust, University Press, Oxford, 1983 reprint 1579 edition, p. 799).

Heb 10:23--Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;) The common word for "faith" is the Greek word "pistis." However, the word used here is "elpidos" which is translated as "hope."

"The KJV translation of Heb 10:23 leaves most people wondering as well. The KJV has the phrase 'the profession of our faith.' Literally the first term should be translated 'confession,' but it is the KJV's very unusual translation of the Greek term 'hope' as 'faith' that is difficult to understand. The Greek term appears thirteen times in the TR, and each time it is translated 'hope' with this one

exception." (The King James Only Controversy, p. 226). This does not mean that it is a mistranslation. In fact, the KJV translators stated that they were not bound by strict word counts and that sometimes the context demands that the same Greek word be translated differently. The English words "faith" and "hope" carry the idea of trust, assurance that what has been told will occur. The Thesaurus for my Microsoft Works has for the word "hope," "confidence: faith, reliance, trust, belief, assurance." Further, there is within Scripture a clear connection between faith and hope. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for" (Heb 11:1) Notice the clear Biblical connection of faith with hope. The Scripture states, "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Rom 5:2). And in reference to Abraham, the word of God says, Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be. And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sara's womb. (Rom 4:18-19)

We are saved by hope (Rom 8:24) and yet we are saved by grace through faith (Eph 2:8). We are told to place our faith and hope in God (1Pe 1:21). The context of Hebrews chapter ten informs us that we are to have full assurance of faith (vs.22) and the One we are trusting is "faithful" (vs. 23). The context of the Greek word "elpis" in this verse can be expressed by the English words faith, hope, or trust. The Wycliffe Bible Commentary, even though it cites the American Standard Version, says of this verse:

"Confession of our hope" (ASV). And unwavering confession of faith in the living Christ. God undergirds our hope by his own promises, for he is faithful who promised. This then speaks of further affirmation based upon faith in the faithfulness of God. (Nashville: The Southwestern Company, 1962, p. 1420).

Kittle notes the comparison of faith and hope when defining the Greek word "elpis" (hope). He even notes that in the Greek LXX there is an "interrelating" of the two Greek words for faith and hope.

If hope is fixed on God, it embraces at once the three elements of expectation of the future, trust, and the patience of waiting. Any one of these aspects may be emphasized. The definition of "pistis" as "elpizomenon upostasis" in H[e]b[rews] 11:1 is quite in keeping with the OT interrelating of "pisteuein" and "elpizein" and the usage of the LXX, which has "upostasis" as well as "elpis." (Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. II. p.531).

Faith, trust, and hope are used interchangeably. A related word of "elpis" (hope) is "elpizo." It is translated as "hope" in places such as Luk 6:34 and Rom 8:25. However, it is mostly translated as "trust" in places such as Mat 12:21 and Rom 15:24. A related word of "pistis" (faith) is "pistuo." It is translated as "believe" in places such as Mat 8:13 and John 3:16. However, it is also translated as "trust" in 1Ti 1:11 (as is another form of it in 1Th 2:4 which is translated as "trust"). The context of Hebrews chapters ten and eleven, demands that this type of trust be translated as "faith" instead of its normal translation of "hope." Also, since we are told to "hold fast the profession" we must compare the Scriptures to know that our profession deals with "faith" (1Ti 6:12).

2Pe 2:7--And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked: This verse, along with a handful of others verses where the same objection is raised, is questioned because of the

word "conversation." The objection is that today "conversation" means talk, but the verses in question refer to lifestyle. I recall one pastor objecting to the KJV in 1Pe 3:1 where we are told that an unsaved husband may be won to Christ by a godly wife's "conversation." He stated, "You mean to tell me that the unsaved husband can be won by the Christian wife's talking and not by her godly living?" I am always amazed by such argumentation which reflects both a lack of Biblical understanding as well as knowledge of the English language. Of course, the unsaved are in fact won by our words and our lifestyle. We must witness to them in both word and deed. As has been said, our walk must match our talk. However, the English word "conversation" does refer to lifestyle. I asked this pastor, "When someone is born-again and lives the Christian life, what are they called?" He looked at me and said, "they are called a new convert . . ." Strange how our own speech will sometimes betray us.

Consequently, we have seen in a few examples how modern scholars will distort God's word with meaningless objections in order to replace it with themselves as the final authority. Accordingly, while objecting to misprints in some KJV Bible ("he" instead of "ye" in Jer 34:16), they will remove Jesus Christ from the fiery furnace and replace Him with "a god" (Dan 3:25). While they reject the reading in the King James

12 LESSON TWELVE

Lesson Twelve: DELIBERATING THE ARGUMENTS

"Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." (John 5:39) The foundations of mankind are philosophies, traditions (Col 2:8), and science (1Ti 6:20). The reality, however, is that our very bedrock lies with the blessed Hope and His bountiful word (Heb 11:1-3). What and how we think is not as important as what God says. How we view our world is not how God views it (Isa 55:8). Therefore, if we are to know the truth of a matter, we must consider the words of God. Our duty, as pronounced by Christ, is to "search the scriptures." The believers of Berea searched "the scriptures daily" to see if what was told them was so (Acts 17:11). It is with this duty in mind that we conclude our study regarding Biblical preservation and the Authorized Version. These are the closing arguments placed before us. However, in the final conclusion it will not be us who judge the word of God; but the word of God which judges us (Heb 4:12-13). The arguments for the Authorized Version as the preserved word of God for the English-speaking people will be considered later in this lesson. First, however, let us consider the arguments favoring modern textual criticism and weigh the attestations in light of the evidence and sacred Scripture itself. The majority of the arguments fall under the heading of textual evidences, or rationalizations concerning the manuscripts. Secondly, we find the arguments concerning translational simplicity and accuracy and the need, so it is avowed, for an easier or clearer translation. The criteria for choosing which reading is original can be found in Burce Metzger's book *The Text of the New Testament*. Metzger categorizes them as 1) External Evidence, and 2) Internal Evidence (Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text Of The New Testament*, 2nd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968, pp. 209-210). External evidences relate to the date of the manuscript, its geographical distribution, and its relationship with other textual families. Internal evidences consider what the original writer was most likely to have written while taking into account his style and vocabulary, the context, and the passage's harmony with other passages by the same writer. Additionally, textual critics will also consider, as internal evidences, the Aramaic background of the time of Christ, the emphasis placed on Mark's gospel believing it to be the first, and the influence of the Church regarding the transmission of a certain passage. To consider every argument would be exhaustive. Nevertheless, we shall consider those which are more commonly used in the promotion of modern translations.

Sadly, none of what is proclaimed by textual critics considers the Sovereign hand of the Almighty God preserving His inerrant word or the sinister influence of a literal Devil seeking to pervert sacred Scripture. Without these considerations, we are doomed to view the word of God naturalistically and thus remove Divine influence upon the Holy Bible. We must also realize that the roots of higher criticism have their foundations in lower criticism.

OLDER AND BETTER MANUSCRIPTS

These two arguments often run together in the footnotes of many modern versions. They are not the same thing. Older is not always better, and the better are not the older. This must be the case

for the modern textual critic or else once a text is determined to be the oldest his task of reconstructing the New Testament would cease. Further, as will be seen by example later, some of the older manuscripts reflect a mixed reading of textual families, consequently diminishing the overall emphasis placed on the Alexandrian textual line. For these and other reasons, scholarship must not claim that older is always better. Still, we find that the two do go hand-in-hand in justifying the rejection of the Traditional Text and the English Authorized Version.

Older Manuscripts

Often the supporters of modern translations will point to the very old papyrus manuscripts. Defiantly as one reads Kurt Aland or Bruce Metzger the patronage for the readings found in the papyrus is apparent. Aland notes that since the 1930's with the number of papyrus manuscripts found they have, "held an almost magical charm, not only for the general public but for New Testament scholars as well, though with no real justification." (Kurt and Barbara Aland, *The Text Of The New Testament*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987, p. 84.) The early papyrus were discovered in Egypt, south of the Delta region, from such places as Oxyrhynchos, Atfih (Aphroditopolis), and Heracleopolis, off the Nile River. It is also rather ironic that these great papyrus were located in rubbish heaps. (Eldon Jay Epp, "A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission," in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, eds. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, p. 279.) This causes us to wonder if they were discarded because they were worn by use, or because they were considered corrupted. In either case, these are the oldest known manuscripts we have to date.

Although most of these papyri are fragmentary, others contain large sections of Scripture and have been given very early dates by paleographers. For example, p75 (containing part of Luke and John) dates from 175 to 225 AD, p66 (containing part of John) dates to about 200 AD, p46 (containing part of Romans and the Pauline epistles) likewise dates to about 200 AD, and p52 (a small fragment containing only John 18:31-33 and 37-38) is considered the oldest manuscript dating to 125 AD. Added to this are Alexandrian uncials of the late third and early fourth centuries (such as Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Alexandrinus). Further, modern textual critics will point out that Byzantine manuscripts (or the Traditional Greek Text) are not found until about the fourth century with the vast majority of their manuscripts not dating until the ninth century and onward. (*Ibid.*, 82. Also, this chart of Aland's has been reproduced in James White's book, *The King James Only Controversy*, Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1995, p. 188.) The argument seems to be a very good one. After all, if we have manuscripts which date closer to the original writings it would seem logical that they are closer in content as well. There is, however, more to be considered. The four papyri mentioned above are very old indeed. The fact that these manuscripts seem to have originated in Egypt, or at least survived there, and as with other Alexandrian manuscripts were not used by the majority of believers throughout the existence of the Church does not carry much weight with textual scholars. Nor does the fact that these manuscripts are not in agreement. In fact, the early papyrus although considered Alexandrian in nature, really reflect a mixed text with many Byzantine and Western readings within them. Consequently, Aland has labeled p46 and p66 as "free," (Aland, p. 99-100.) and Metzger simply calls p66 "mixed." (Metzger, p. 254.) In his introduction to the Chester Beatty Papyri (which contains p46), Sir Frederic Kenyon likewise observes the mixed nature of the early papyri. Speaking of them, Kenyon notes, "On the one hand, it is not an out-and-out supporter of the 'Neutral' or Vatican type of text; but neither is it, on

the other hand, an out-and-out supporter of the 'Western' type." (Sir. Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Fasciculus I*, London: Emory Walker, 1933, p. 16.) In fact, Dr. Eldon Epp has said the study of the papyri, "is largely an exercise in historical-critical imagination." (Epp, p. 274.) Notwithstanding, while debating the originality of this or that text, modern scholars will often cite these papyri manuscripts and their age as proof of their arguments when these papyri support their point of view. This is illustrated by Professor James White in his support of the Alexandrian reading found in John 1:18. As the reader recalls from lesson eleven, this verse concerns the differences in the phrases, "only begotten Son" (Gk: monogenes huios), and "only begotten God" (Gk: monogenes theos). White argues:

Suffice it to say that the most ancient texts, including the oldest existing copies of the book of John, p66 and p75, as well as a number of the early fathers of the church, refer to Christ as the "only-begotten God," or more accurately, the "unique God." (White, pp. 199-200.) In truth, the majority of the early Church Fathers used the phrase "only begotten Son" in regard to John 1:18. Our point here, however, is that White supports his preference for the reading "monogenes theos" because "the oldest existing copies of the book of John" have this reading. Yet, their age gives way when these papyri manuscripts agree with the Traditional Text against those found in the Alexandrian Text. For example, in John 4:1 the Alexandrian manuscripts of Sinaiticus (4th century), Bezae (Codex D, 6th century) and Q (9th century) have the reading "Iesous" (Jesus) while the Traditional Text reads, "kurios" (Lord). The vast majority of all Greek manuscripts agree with the reading found in the Authorized Version. Further, we find the reading "kurios" in Vaticanus (4th century), Alexandrinus (5th century), Codex C (5th century), and the majority of uncial manuscripts. Thus it is no surprise to find both p66 and p75 with the reading "kurios." Nevertheless, this reading is rejected in the United Bible Societies Greek Text in favor of the reading found in Sinaiticus. Consequently, modern translations such as the NIV and NRSV forsake the early manuscripts in favor of Sinaiticus. There are, of course, many other examples of this sort.

There are also many places where p66 and p75 differ with each other. In such cases, p66 is sometimes chosen, while at other times p75 is cited. The point being that there are several places where these papyri manuscripts agree with the Traditional Text as presented in our English King James Bible over the readings found in the Alexandrian Text and its reflective modern English versions.

Dr. Wilbur Pickering cites the studies of textual scholars Ernest Colwell, Eldon Epp, and Albertus Klijn noting where the papyri agree with the Textus Receptus (TR) against the Alexandrian Text. By using portions in John 10:1-42; John 11:1-57 where p45, p66 and p75 agree and where Vaticanus and Sinaiticus differ (a total of 43 places), Klijn found the following: 32 times p45 agrees with the TR, 24 times it agrees with Vaticanus, and only 19 does it agree with Sinaiticus. 33 times p66 agrees with the TR, 29 times with Vaticanus, and only 14 times does it agree with Sinaiticus. While p75 agrees with the TR 29 times, Vaticanus 33 times, and Sinaiticus 9 times. (Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1977, pp. 54-56.) It should therefore become painfully clear that those who resort to the age of a manuscript to correct the King James Bible are not consistent in using the older manuscripts. To the above, we may add the study completed by Dr. Gordon D. Fee concerning Codex Sinaiticus and how it relates to other manuscripts and Greek texts. (Gordon D. Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A

contribution to methodology in establishing textual relationships," in *Studies In The Theory And Method Of New Testament Textual Criticism*, pp. 221- 243.) In his study, Dr. Fee notes several passages in the Gospel of John where Codex Sinaiticus agrees or disagrees with p66, p75, the TR, and some other witnesses. In John chapter four, for example, Fee notes that out of 61 possible textual variations, the TR agrees with p66 a total of 37 times, or 60.6% of the time. Interestingly, p66 agrees with Codex Sinaiticus only 21 times or 34.4% of the time, illustrating that the TR is closer to p66 in this chapter than is Sinaiticus. It is also interesting to note that p75 showed a stronger relationship with the Traditional Text than it did with Codex Sinaiticus; however, its strongest relationship is clearly with Codex Vaticanus. The agreement with p75 among these texts is as follows: TR=32 times or 52.5%. Sinaiticus=19 times or 31.05%. Vaticanus=52 times or 85.2%. (Ibid., p. 228.)

Dr. Fee then broadens the study to cover John chapters 1 through 8, with a total of 320 possible textual variations. The statistics show a strong relation between the Traditional Text and the very old manuscripts of p66. In fact, the TR and p66 agree 50.9% of the time when there are textual variations. Comparing p66 with Sinaiticus we find they agree only 43.7% of the time. (Ibid., p. 233.)

All of this information shows that within the very old manuscripts we find variants which occur in the Traditional Text long before the establishing of the Byzantine Text in the fourth century. Dr. Fee, who supports modern textual criticism, has in fact stated that in the oldest manuscripts we have Byzantine readings. He admits to this in a different article refuting Dr. Wilbur Pickering:

Pickering regularly talks about Byzantine readings as being earlier than Chrysostom--and he is right. That is, readings that eventually become the text of the majority can often be shown to have existed as early as the second century. . . p66, for example, is said to have Byzantine readings. In a sense this is correct in that p66 --and even p75 on rare occasions--is now the earliest evidence for a variant away from the Egyptian text-type that is later to be found in the Majority text. But in comparison with places where p66 reads with the Egyptians against the Byzantines, these "Byzantine" readings are of little consequence; and above all else they do not render p66 a Majority text MS." (Ibid., "The Majority Text and the Original Text of the NT", p. 201.) Our point here is not that the papyri manuscripts are Majority texts manuscripts, but only that one can find textual support for variant readings within these very old manuscripts which support the readings found in the Traditional Text. Further, this allows the student to cite these manuscripts with just as much fervor when these manuscripts support the readings found in the King James Bible. Finally, we can also see that these old papyri manuscripts are not hard-line support for the Alexandrian text, because we find them varying from that family in a number of places. Therefore, when one argues from the perspective of "older manuscripts" the consistency is often lacking.

Before moving on, one additional note should be made at this juncture. Dr. Pickering has made a marvelous observation concerning the prejudice of modern textual scholars regarding their views of textual criticism. He writes:

Whenever an early witness surfaces it is declared to be "Alexandrian" or "Western" or "Caesarean" and thereupon those "Syrian" (i.e. Byzantine) readings which it contains cease to be "pure Syrian" and are no longer allowed as evidence. Such a procedure is evidently useful to defenders of Hort's theory, but is it right?" (Pickering, p. 71.) The "logic" of modern textual scholars is this: There are no Byzantine manuscripts before the fourth century when Lucian of Syria

conflated the various readings and produced what became the Byzantine or Traditional Text. We know this is true because we have no Byzantine readings before the middle of the fourth century, but we do have Alexandrian and Western readings. Therefore, any second century reading which supports the third or fourth century readings of the Alexandrian line are considered important and are offered as proof that these textual lines are more original than the Byzantine line. However, if a reading is found in these very same manuscripts which agrees with the fourth century Byzantine reading, it is considered unimportant and unsequential. The bigotry against the Traditional Text is clearly seen.

Better Manuscripts The student of textual criticism will notice that there is a unanimous disregard for the Byzantine text. This is noted by supporters of modern translations and their related Greek texts. Dr. Frederik Wisse writes: "(Kurt) Aland also is not interested in the Byzantine text as such, but only in MSS which significantly diverge from the Byzantine text." (Frederik Wisse, *The Profile Method For Classifying And Evaluating Manuscript Evidence*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, p. 21.) The point is that among such textual scholars the Alexandrian family of manuscripts is considered closer to the original and therefore better. The Byzantine or Traditional Text is considered a conflation (i.e. a mixing or joining) of the Alexandrian and Western texts in the fourth century by Lucian at Antioch in Syria. This Lucian Recension is considered as much of a fact as evolution is among humanists. However, both are nothing more than theories. The truth is, apart from the promise of Scripture, we simply do not know which text is original and which one is corrupt. Theoretically, it is just as scholastically valid to argue that despite the absence of early Byzantine manuscripts it still reflects the original autographs much better than the Alexandrian line does. Since the Scriptures were meant to be used and read, we would expect these texts to wear out sooner than texts which were considered corrupt and therefore not used by the majority of Christians during the first three hundred years of the existence of the Church. Further, considering the arid conditions of Egypt we would expect these not as often used manuscripts to last longer. Arguing against this, Dr. Donald A. Carson states: This ingenious theory is quite untenable for at least the following reasons: (1) Although it may explain why the autographs disappeared, it cannot explain why there are no extant copies of manuscripts with Byzantine text-type from before the fourth century. If such manuscripts were handled and copied so much that they wore out, then many copies must have been made. Why have none of them survived? (2) The ante-Nicene father unambiguously cited every text-type except the Byzantine. Therefore defenders of the "worn-out manuscripts" hypothesis must not only base this hypothesis on an argument from silence (there are no early manuscripts with Byzantine text-type), but also pit it against the hard data that the early fathers never unambiguously cited from it. Is it not eminently more reasonable to conclude that manuscripts with Byzantine text simply did not exist for the first 250-300 years of the church's life? (3) If they did exist, who was wearing them out? If the fathers did not cite the Byzantine text-type, who then was handling these alleged manuscripts so frequently and thoughtlessly that they wore out? (D. A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979, p. 47.) Dr. Carson's arguments reflect the thoughts of modern textual scholars. His arguments, however, are mistaken.

Carson's first point is that the Traditional Text could not have existed before the fourth century because we have none, and that if there were a great many produced by the Church why have none survived instead of being worn out? To begin with, we have citations from the Church

Fathers and from other early translations which contain Byzantine readings. Further, we have already seen where the early papyri reflect a mixed line themselves with Byzantine readings in them. There is also something else to consider. Carson asks, "If such manuscripts were handled and copied so much that they wore out, then many copies must have been made. Why have none of them survived?" Of course, the opposite would also be true, would it not? If the Alexandrian text is original, or closer to the original, and it were multiplied greatly among the early Church, why is it that only a few copies have survived? Where are the abundance of second century manuscripts supporting the Alexandrian line found outside of Egypt? Or, as we have already noted, why is it that the second century papyri of Egypt are not pure Alexandrian?

Carson's second point that the ante-Nicene fathers did not cite the Byzantine text but did every other text is ambiguous and somewhat absurd. Early in our studies we showed that Ignatius (d. 107 AD) cited 1Ti 3:16 as it stands in the Traditional Text. Polycarp (d. 155 AD) cites 1Jn 4:3 as we have it in the Byzantine line and the Authorized Version. Also, his citations of Rom 14:10 and Gal 4:26 do not reflect the Alexandrian readings, but the readings found in the Byzantine manuscripts of the ninth century and onward. Additionally, the early Church Father's preferred the reading "only begotten Son" instead of "only begotten God" in John 1:18, again agreeing with the Traditional Text.

Consider the following examples from the four gospels. In each case the reading is Byzantine and is not found in the early Greek texts before the fourth century nor in the reading used in the critical Greek texts. Yet, each reading has its support in either Apostolic or ante-Nicene times with more than one early church source.

Mat 27:34 "They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink." (KJV) "They gave him wine to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted it, he would not drink." (ASV)

"Pierces all round; and to the tree Himself Is fixed; wine drugged with myrrh, is drunk, and gall Is mixt with vinegar; parted His robe, And in it lots are cast; what for himself Each one hath seized he keeps; in murky gloom," (Tertullian--220 AD, General Reply To Sundry of Marcion's Heresies, p. 230. Likewise, this is so cited by Irenaeus, Celsus, Origen, Eusebius, the Gospel of Peter and the Epistle of Barnabas.)

Mark 1:2

"As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee." (KJV)

"Even as it is written in Isaiah the prophet, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, Who shall prepare thy way." (ASV)

"Wherefore also Mark, the interpreter and follower of Peter, does thus commence his Gospel narrative: 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets, . . .' Plainly does the commencement of the Gospel quote the words of the holy prophets, and point out Him at once, whom they confessed as God and Lord; " (Irenaeus --202 AD, Irenaeus Against Heresies, Book III: Chapt. 10:5. This is likewise cited by Origen, Porphyry, Eusebius, and Titus of Bostra.)

Luk 1:28

"And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women." (KJV) "And he came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee." (ASV)

"I recognize, too, the angel Gabriel as having been sent to 'a virgin.' But when he is blessing her, it is 'among women,' not among virgins, that he ranks her: 'Blessed (be) thou among women.' The angel withal knew that even a virgin is called a woman." (Tertullian--220 AD, On The Veiling of Virgins, Chapter 6. Also cited by Africanus, Eusebius, Ephraem, and in the Diatessaron).

John 5:4

"For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had." (KJV) This verse is omitted in modern versions.

"And there were laid in them much people of the sick, and blind, and lame, and paralysed, waiting for the moving of the water. And the angel from time to time went down into the place of bathing, and moved the water; and the first that went down after the moving of the water, every pain that he had was healed. And a man was there who had a disease for thirty-eight years." (Tatian's Diatessaron, Section 22: 12-14. 2nd century. Additionally, this is also cited by Tertullian, Ambrose, Didymus, and Chrysostom). When confronted with such evidence, there are usually two responses. First, it will be noted that the readings which agree with the Traditional Text are not purely Byzantine. However, it is hard to find a Church Father who was purely Western or Alexandrian. Origen, for example, has been shown to use Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine texts throughout his writings. Dr. Edward Hills has noted this in reference to the first fourteen chapters of St. John:

Hence, contrary to the assertions of the naturalistic critics, the distinctive readings of the Traditional (Byzantine) Text were known to Origen, who sometimes adopted them, though perhaps not usually. Anyone can verify this by scanning the apparatus of Tischendorf . . . out of 52 instances in which the Traditional Text stands alone Origen agrees with the Traditional Text 20 times and disagrees with it 32 times. These results make the position of the critics that Origen knew nothing of the Traditional Text difficult indeed to maintain. (Edward F. Hills, The King James Version Defended, 1956; reprint, Des Moines: The Christian Research Press, 1984, pp. 171-172.)

Secondly, the response by textual critics will often state that the editions of the Church Fathers has been altered throughout time in order to correspond with the Traditional Text. In regard to Patristic quotations, Sir Frederic Kenyon wrote:

. . . even when the earliest manuscripts of an author have been consulted, we cannot always be sure that we have his Scriptural quotations in their original form. In no part of his text is corruption so likely to creep in as here. A scribe who recognized a quotation from its first words would be only too likely to write it down from memory, without looking too closely at the MS. before him, and so would give it in the form in which it was current in his own day, instead of in that which his author actually used. Or, supposing he noticed that the form of the quotation was unfamiliar, he might very probably alter it into what he believed to be the true form. (Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, Handbook

To The Textual Criticism Of The New Testament, London: Macmillan and Colossians, 1926, p. 244.)

Thus, with such argumentation built on supposition, citations of the early Church Fathers which match the Traditional Text are dismissed. However, the argument does not stand in the light of evidence. Again, referring to Origen's use of the Traditional Text, Hills notes: In these chapters (John 1:1-51; John 2:1-25; John 3:1-36; John 4:1-54; John 5:1-47; John 6:1-71; John 7:1-53; John 8:1-59; John 9:1-41; John 10:1-42; John 11:1-57; John 12:1-50; John 13:1-38; John 14:1-31) 7 out of 20 "distinctively" Traditional readings which occur in Origen occur also in Papyrus 66 and/or in Papyrus 75. These 7 readings at least must have been Origen's own readings, not those of the scribes who copied Origen's works, and what is true of these 7 readings is probably true of the other 13, or at least of most of them. Thus it can hardly be denied that the Traditional Text was known to Origen and that it influenced the wording of his New Testament quotations. (Hills, p. 172.) Nor does Kenyon's prejudice against the Traditional Text explain the following example. Saint Hippolytus (235 AD) quotes all of 2Th 2:1-12. His citation shows a mixture of both Alexandrian and Byzantine readings. We find Hippolytus using Alexandrian phrases such as, "the day of the Lord is at hand" instead of the Traditional Text, "the day of Christ is at hand." We also find the reading, "so that he sitteth in the temple of God" instead of "so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God" (KJV). These readings would cause one to claim that Hippolytus was citing the Alexandrian Text. However, we also have Byzantine readings. For example, he speaks of, "the son of perdition" (Gk: amartias) instead of the Alexandrian, "man of lawlessness" (Gk: anomias). He also uses the future tense in stating, "God shall send" (Gk: pemyei) instead of the present, "God sends" (Gk: pempei). What is even more interesting is a mixture of both lines in one phrase. The Alexandrian Text reads, "whom the Lord Jesus will slay." The Traditional Text reads, "whom the Lord shall consume." Hippolytus writes, "whom the Lord Jesus shall consume." If a scribe were changing the text, why did he use such a mixed reading?

Finally, Dr. Carson's third point loses much of his argument. He asks, "If they (i.e. Byzantine Texts before the fourth century) did exist, who was wearing them out?" The answer is apparent; the believers who used them wore them out. Carson further asks, "If the fathers did not cite the Byzantine text-type, who then was handling these alleged manuscripts so frequently and thoughtlessly that they wore out?" The fathers were using them as were the early believers. However, simply because they wore out does not reflect thoughtlessness. I personally have worn out leather bound Bibles printed on high quality paper. When you use something, it tends to wear faster than things not used.

Immediately before stating his three objections to the idea that used manuscripts tend to wear out faster than unused manuscripts, Carson argues against the use of a Byzantine exemplar before the fourth century. An exemplar was the master copy used by scribes to reproduce the text they are working on. However, our study of Old Testament textual criticism shows that it is not at all hard to believe. In fact, it is not only possible but is very likely. The Jewish scribes who copied the Masoretic Text used an exemplar and then destroyed the exemplar once it had served its purpose. He did this out of respect for the text, much as a dedicated serviceman would bury an old and worn flag.

Further, with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, we see that it is possible for a textual line to have no evidence of existence for almost one-thousand years and yet remain faithful to its textual family. After all, until we discovered the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947 and the manuscripts found at Wadi Murabbaat in 1951, all we had of the Masoretic family came from the middle ages. Even if we did not have citations from the early Church Fathers or early translations of Scripture reflecting the Traditional Text, it is not impossible to believe in a two-hundred-fifty year gap in light of a thousand-year one. The Need For Simplicity The objection which is often proclaimed is that the King James Bible is difficult to read. Therefore, we must have a translation written for today's reader in order to expound the Word of God to our generation. In fact, this objection is so well established that it is hardly questioned; and those who do question it are ridiculed for even suggesting that the Authorized Version is not as difficult as some would have us believe. This is illustrated by James White and his comments concerning the changes in the English language. He writes: The fact that languages change over time is one of the strongest arguments for either the revision of older translations of the Bible, or for completely new translations. It is difficult to understand how KJV Only advocates can resist the logic of the reality that the KJV is written in a form of English that is not readily understandable to people today. It is amazing to listen to people honestly asserting that they think the KJV is "easier to read" than the modern versions. Surely they must realize that this is so for them only because of their familiarity with the AV, not because it is, in fact, easier to read! But no, it is actually asserted that the KJV is the simplest, easiest to read version of the Bible. (White, p. 234.)

Brother White is correct in stating that languages change. However, this does not give us the right to change the text of Scripture or ignore the foundation of our own language in the name of revision. The same goal could be easily reached, and has been, in the number of King James Study Bibles which have footnotes or marginal notes to explain antiquated words or theological terms. Nor is the claim that the KJV is not "readily understandable to people today" entirely truthful. Just as one could point to examples of where an individual has difficulty with the English of the KJV, one could also point to examples where individuals with little or no formal education took to reading the KJV and understood it. After all, although language does change, our English language has not so drastically changed since the 1860's that we could not understand the literature and communication of that day. Yet it was during this time that the newly freed slaves who had no formal education taught themselves how to read from the pages of the King James Bible. Finally, the point raised by those of us who believe the Authorized Version to be the preserved word of God for the English-speaking people is not that it is easier to read than modern versions, but that it is a spiritual book and cannot be fully understood without the help of the Author. To illustrate his point, White borrows from Dr. Jack Lewis and provides several examples of difficult readings in the King James Bible. (Ibid., p. 237. Jack P. Lewis, *The English Bible From KJV to NIV: A History and Evaluation*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981, pp. 53-54.) Although Lewis has several other examples, the following are the ones Professor White provides for us as evidence of the difficult readings in the Authorized Version.

"And Mt. Sinai was altogether on a smoke"-- Exo 19:18 "Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing"-- Psa 5:6 "Nevertheless even him [Solomon] did outlandish women cause to sin"-- Neh 13:26 "Solomon loved many strange women"-- 1Ki 11:1 "The ships of Tarshish did sing of thee in thy market"-- Eze 27:25 "We do you to wit of the grace of God"-- 2Co 8:1

These are good examples and do show the change in our English language. However, each case could be explained with footnotes or a good English dictionary. Further, there is something else which should be considered - namely the difficult readings in modern versions. Consider the following from the NIV:

"Waheb in Suphah and the ravines,"--Numb. 21:14 "The Nephilim were on the earth in those days"-- Gen 6:4 "Fearing that they would run aground on the sandbars of Syrtis"-- Acts 27:17 "The meeting of the Areopagus"-- Acts 17:22 "Then the governor's soldiers took Jesus into the Praetorium"-- Mat 27:27 "He agreed to pay them a denarius"-- Mat 20:2

Although these examples display names, places, and Greek currency, they are more difficult to understand than their English counterpart found in the Authorized Version. However, in either list there needs to be a greater overview of the translations as a whole and not isolated examples. Once we do this, we find the King James is more difficult than modern translations in its usage of the English language, but it is not so difficult as that it has lost all meaning or comprehension. This is proven, not by supporters of the KJV but by advocates of modern translations themselves. Dr. John R. Kohlenberger III has provided for us a chart posting the reading level of several English translations. The chart reflects the work of Dr. Linda H. Parrish and Dr. Donna Norton of Texas A & M University. The chart grants the TEV with a 7.29 reading grade level. The NIV received a 7.80 reading grade level, while the NASV received an 11.55 reading grade level. The highest reading grade level was 12.00 and given to the KJV. (John R. Kohlenberger III, All About Bibles, New York: Oxford University Press, 1985, p. 12.) This would mean that anyone who graduated from high school should be able to read this "outdated" version.

We must also pause and ask ourselves where we are to draw the line. Do we reject the readability of the KJV and embrace the NASV as easier to read because it is half-grade lower? Do we stop with the NIV's 7.80 grade readability level? What if someone cannot read at the seventh grade level? Do we lower the standard even more? Do we take the approach which modern educators have been faced with and "dumb-down" our language or do we seek to raise the standard higher? Are we, for example, ready to produce an Ebonics Version of the Bible? If so, do we then produce a version of the Bible for other groups which misuse the English language? These are important questions when it comes to readability. After all, historically the Church has always sought to raise the educational level of the masses, not lower it. To further this we have a problem with modern means for establishing grade reading levels such as the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level formula. Such a method provides the KJV with a lower readability score than that of 12.00. Using this method, let us put the six chapters provided by White to the test. Although White supplies a portion of a verse from these chapters, we will use the whole chapter in order to provide an overall reading. My computer is fitted with "Grammatik" by WordPerfect. All one need do is insert any passage of literature or writing and Grammatik using the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level formula will provide a grade level of readability. When this is done, we find the following:

Exo 19:1-25 produced a 3.89 readability level with a complexity level of 52%.

Psa 5:1-12 produced a 5.92 readability level with a complexity level of 55%.

Neh 13:1-31 produced a 6.89 readability level with a complexity level of 58%.

1Ki 11:1-43 produced a 6.59 readability level with a complexity level of 57%.

Eze 27:1-36 produced a 5.90 readability level with a complexity level of 55%.

2Co 8:1-24 produced a 6.29 readability level with a complexity level of 56%.

While modern versions still have a lower readability level on these passages, it is clear that the KJV is very readable, at least according to this method. At any rate, it should be noted that rather the grade reading level is based on vocabulary (Drs. Perrish and Norton) or word count (Flesch-Kincaid) the Authorized Version is not as difficult for the reading public as supporters of modern versions would have us believe. THE KING JAMES AUTHORIZED VERSION

We must now take up the question as to why we believe the King James Bible is the promised and preserved word of God for the English-speaking world. Although this question has been addressed many times throughout the discourse of our study of the issue, some specifics should be noted as we face the conclusion of our study.

Biblical Preservation The fundamental reason deals with the pledge of Biblical preservation. Scripture, as we have seen, promises us that God will keep and preserve His words from generation to generation (Psa 12:6-7). Although the Psalm does not state that the King James Bible is this preserved word, it does provide us the scriptural basis for which we make our claim for Biblical preservation.

Sadly, those of us who believe in the literal fulfillment regarding Biblical preservation are often misstated or misrepresented. Hence allowing the opponents of Biblical preservation to ridicule our stated position. Questions such as, "what about those who do not speak English?", or "what about Bibles before 1611?", or "did our knowledge of Biblical languages freeze in the 17th century?" all show either a gross misunderstanding or a deliberate perversion of Biblical preservation. The very definition of this term demands the existence of the perfect word of God long before 1611. Further, it permits any language at any time to have the preserved words without error, for Biblical preservation does not demand the Scriptures remain in the original languages. In fact, it would permit the preserved words of God to be translated into many languages throughout the history of the Church as God raised up those who proclaimed His word. It calls for a belief in the Biblical declaration found in Psa 12:1-8, and sees this promise fulfilled through the ages. Thus it gives to the Church of God the Holy Scriptures as our final authority. By this doctrine, we proclaim God has kept His words from generation to generation. This statement can be made with full Scriptural authority because this is the proclamation of the Scriptures themselves (Mat 24:35; 1Pe 1:23; Psa 12:6-7). For those who speak English, the only candidate which presents itself as the fulfillment of these Scriptural promises is the Authorized Version. Further, as we shall see, this was the position of the KJV translators which has been vindicated by history. Nevertheless, anyone is free to believe another translation or text is the fulfillment of this Biblical promise concerning preservation. But their candidate would also need to have the witness of time showing the blessings of the Lord in order to substantiate the claim.

We cannot compromise the doctrine of Biblical preservation by generalizing its truth in stating that this was accomplished by the Bible itself, in that it has existed throughout the history of the Church despite those who would seek to destroy it. Such a statement does not fulfill the promise of Psa 12:1-8, for it is not the "word" which is to be preserved, but the "words", thereby keeping the Bible as a whole.

Neither can we accept the theory espoused by modern conservatives that the words have been preserved, but are in a variety of manuscripts for scholarship to reconstruct as best as possible. Although this makes the reader of such a proclamation feel secure that they have the best available translation in one or more editions, when tested its fallacy is seen. How can we honestly proclaim that the words have been preserved, even when the manuscripts differ, because the true reading is in one of them and at the same time note examples of where there is no reading at all because the manuscripts have decayed? We have, for example, already noted that in 1Sa 13:1 conservative scholars write, "the original numbers in this verse have apparently been lost in transmission." (Charles C. Ryrie, *The Ryrie Study Bible*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1976, p. 432.) Does this not contradict the conservative point of view concerning Biblical preservation? How can the reading be truly preserved in one or more manuscripts, when no known manuscript has the reading? Nor is the example found in 1Sa 13:1-23 an isolated incident (however, we would only need one example to disprove this misconception of Biblical preservation). In 1Sa 6:19 we are told "fifty thousand and threescore and ten men" which were slain. Dr. Charles Ryrie notes, "The number 50,070 is doubted by conservative scholars and is probably a copyist's error. The number in the LXX and writings of Josephus Isaiah 70." (Ibid., p. 423.) So do we support the reading by the LXX? If so, we have a problem because Dr. Ryrie is mistaken here. The LXX reads, "and the Lord smote among them seventy men, and fifty thousand men:" which equals 50,070 as we find in the KJV. It is extremely common in Old Testament passages where there is a problem with locations, names, or numbers to find conservative scholars blaming the faulty Hebrew manuscript on copyist error. If in any given place, all Hebrew texts have the same copyist error, does this not remove the false presentation of Biblical preservation promoted by conservative scholarship?

No, the promise of Biblical preservation must stand firm. If we are to be Biblical, we must avow that God has kept His words free from error throughout the generations even as He has promised. Since, "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1Co 5:6) and we are, "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" (1Pe 1:23), we must believe that God's words remain error free. Is it too much to believe that God is able to keep and preserve His words without error from the time He gave them until now? If we are to believe this, then we must also be willing to produce a Bible which fulfills the Biblical promise. The supporters of the Authorized Version can do so, but the supporters of modern translations are sadly lacking. *The Fullness Of Time And The Witness Of History The Scriptures* teach that God does things at just the right time. Concerning Jesus Christ, we are told that when, "the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman," (Gal 4:4). Also, the Scriptures teach all things will be accomplished by Christ, "in the dispensation of the fulness of times" (Eph 1:10). God does things right on time. There are no coincidences in regard to Christ. He fulfills things according to His purpose and in regard to His timing. What is true of the Living Word is reflected in the written word. The Authorized Version came into being at just the right time. If we are to believe in the Sovereignty of God, we must also believe His hand was in it by providing the world's most loved translation of the Bible.

Before the late 16th century and the early 17th century, the church in power was the Roman Catholic Church. Catholicism forbid the reading of the Bible in any other language but Latin. However, by the late 16th and early 17th century the Protestant Church was a force and the major religious basis in the English-speaking world. At this time, when the King James Bible was

translated, the printing press was being refined, England was on the threshold of becoming an Empire to reach to whole world, and the Protestant Reformation was in full force. Additionally, the English language was being developed of which the KJV was to play a major part.

About a hundred and fifty years before the King James Bible was printed, Bibles were all written by hand. The only copies of God's word available were handwritten. One can begin to imagine the impossible task of reaching out to the world when all Scripture had to be copied in such a fashion. By the 17th century printed books were common and the desire of individual Christians to have their own copy of Scripture was rapidly growing. This is one of the reasons why the Geneva Bible was so popular. It allowed the common Englishman to have a copy of God's word in his language. However, modern English was just being established and England had yet to gain world power. At the time of the King James Bible, the English language was moving from Middle English to Modern English. This is something most people do not consider but should. Our English language is divided into three periods. Old English, which dates from about 700 to 1100 AD; Middle English, dating from 1100 to 1500 AD; and Modern English which dates from 1500 to the present. (Marjorie Anderson and Blanche C. Williams, *Old English Handbook*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1935, pp. 6-7.) Dr. James H. Murray of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* dates the English language in this fashion: Old English 1100-1200; Early Middle English 1200- 1300; Late Middle English 1300-1400; Transition Middle English 1400-1485; Early Modern English or "Tudor English" 1485-1611; and Modern English 1611 onward.(cited from William Rosenau, *Hebraisms In The Authorized Version*, Baltimore: The Friedenwald Company, 1903, p. 28.) This would bring the beginning of our modern language at the very time of the King James Bible. Not only is the KJV by definition a modern English Bible, but it is the only one which helped develop the language we currently speak! It should be noted that all other versions are shaped by our language; however, our language was shaped by the King James Bible. Drs. Fred Craddock and Gene Tucker have noted, ". . . the Authorized Version. . . not only influenced literature, but also shaped the development of (our) language." (Encrate, Microsoft 1995 ed.) The *Compton's Encyclopedia* states, "it is rightly regarded as the most influential book in the history of English civilization. . ." (*Compton's Encyclopedia*, Online Edition. Downloaded form America Online, May 26, 1996.) Dr. William Rosenau has written of the KJV that:

It was the most remarkable undertaking in the history of English language. Produced by royal decree, and soon after accepted by the English church, it was bound to make itself felt. It molded new forms and phrases, which, while foreign to the English, became with it flesh and bone." (Rosenau, p. 31.)

Although its beauty has been compared to the writings of Shakespeare, it is vastly more easily read than Shakespeare and has had equal influence upon our native tongue. The King James Bible was published in the year Shakespeare began work on his last play, *The Tempest*. Both the play and the Bible are masterpieces of English, but there is one crucial difference between them. Whereas Shakespeare ransacked the lexicon, the King James Bible employs a bare 8000 words--God's teaching in homely English for everyman. From that day to this, the Shakespearian cornucopia and the biblical iron rations represent, as it were, the North and South Poles of the language, reference points for writers and speakers throughout the world, from the Sakespearian splendor of a Joyce or a Dickens to the biblical rigor of a Bunyan, or a Hemingway." (Robert McCrum, William Cran, and Robert MacNeil, *The Story Of English*, New York: Viking Penguin Inc,

1986, p. 113. This book is a companion to the PBS television series on the history of the English language.) For the Believer, this truth of the history and effect the KJV has had on our language not only speaks of its great literary value, but of the Divine hand upon it which shaped not just our language, but our culture and thought. Nor should it be overlooked that King James himself was used by God not only to permit the work of translation to proceed, but in his own arrogance helped in sending the Pilgrims to the New World. The Mayflower Compact is addressed to King James I of England as these Protestant came to what became the United States of America because of their desire for religious freedom. Although the Puritans loved the Geneva Bible and brought it with them, by 1637 the King James Bible had replaced it throughout the Massachusetts Bay Colony. (Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll (editors), *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*, New York: Oxford University Press: 1982, pp. 27-33.) In fact, the KJV was "universally accepted" in the New World "as the word of God and no question was raised as to its infallibility." (Oliver Perry Chitwood, *A History of Colonial America*, New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1961 ed., p. 441.) The world was ruled by England, and with them the English took the King James Bible. The Greek text of the Protestant Reformation was now placed in the English tongue. Once this was established, history reveals one of the greatest evangelical periods known to the Church. Momentous revivals such as the ones in Wells, Ireland, Scotland, England, and the Great Awakening in the United States were preached by English-speaking pulpiteers proclaiming Biblical truths from the Authorized Version. Various denominations were formed and united in the preaching which derived from this one English translation, something no other translation has ever done. In order to reject the King James Bible as the preserved word of God for the English-speaking people, one would have to divorce the Sovereignty of God and the blessings of the Authorized Version. Truly, all this occurred in the fullness of time. *The Testimony Of The Translators*

Next, we should consider the testimony of the translators themselves. Although their testimony is often ignored and even twisted at times, it stands as a unique tribute to their enterprise. Contrary to the thoughts of others, consider for yourself the affirmation of the KJV translators. In the second paragraph in the original preface, which was entitled *The Translators To The Reader*, the King James translators make an interesting comparison. In addressing the criticism raised by the Roman Catholic Church for translating the Bible into the native tongue of the people, the translators compare their work to David bringing the ark of the Lord into Jerusalem, and Solomon building the temple of God, both of whom received criticism for their efforts. The preface reads:

David was a worthy prince, and no man to be compared to him for his first deeds, and yet for as worthy an act as ever he did (even for bringing back the ark of God in solemnity) he was scorned and scoffed at by his own wife. Solomon was greater than David, though not in virtue, yet in power: and by his power and wisdom he built a temple to the Lord, such a one as was the glory of the land of Israel, and the wonder of the whole world. But was that his magnificence liked of by all? We doubt of it. Otherwise, why do thy lay it in his son's dish, and call unto him for easing of the burden? . . . So hard a thing it is to please all, even when we please God best, and do seek to approve ourselves to everyone's conscience. (Miles Smith, *The Translators To The Reader*, 1611; reprint, London: The Trinitarian Bible Society, 1911, p. 7.) This is followed in the third paragraph by comparing the criticism for their work on the Authorized Version with the criticism raised against Moses of the Old Testament and Stephen of the New Testament. They state:

. . . that whosoever attempteth anything for the public (specially if it pertain to religion, and to the opening and clearing of the word of God) the same setteth himself upon a stage to be glouted upon by every evil eye, yea, he casteth himself headlong upon pikes, to be gored by every sharp tongue. (Ibid., p. 9.)

Although they realized that their efforts would suffer ridicule as they provided the world with the word of God in English, they also made some very interesting and very strong correlation between their labors and the labors of those individuals found in the Holy Scriptures. This monumental comparison should not be overlooked, nor should the lack of any such comparisons by the translators of modern versions. For this reveals to us the mind of the translators and just how spiritual and important they considered their labor to be. The preface then moves on to make a case for the need of providing individuals with the Holy Scriptures in their native tongues and not for the Scriptures to remain only in Latin as the Catholic Church of that day desired. The objections raised by the Catholic Church included questions such as "Was their (i.e. Protestant) translation good before? Why do they now mend it? Was it not good? Why then was it obtruded to the people?" (Ibid., p. 20.) Therefore, in speaking of the earlier English versions, which preceded the Authorized Version, the KJV translators state:

Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfected at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavour to make that better which they left so good, no man, we are sure, hath cause sure to mislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us. . . . And this is the Word of God, which we translate. . . . For by this means it cometh to pass, that whatsoever is sound already (and all is sound for substance, in one or other of our editions, and the worst of ours far better than their authentic vulgar) the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished; . . . (Ibid., pp. 21-22.) From this we see that the translators saw their work on the King James Bible as a completion of the works provided by earlier English translations, such as the Tyndale Bible, Great Bible, Geneva Bible and Bishops' Bible. To them, the King James Authorized Version was the perfecting of these earlier works. Thus the phrase, "nothing is begun and perfected at the same time." Further, they believed that what they translated was the very "Word of God." Finally, they state here that even the worst of their early English versions (King James I considered the Geneva Bible a poor translation because of the many notes against the English crown) was far better than the Latin Roman Catholic Bible. To these translators, theirs was the work of polishing the work of their forerunner and thus perfecting the Word of God. This last statement is amplified in the following paragraph: Now to the latter we answer, that we do not deny, nay, we affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the Word of God, nay, is the Word of God. (Ibid., p. 23.) The question then rises, if all the early English versions based on the Traditional Text were considered the Word of God by the KJV translators, why did they alter these early works? This was the question raised by the Catholic Church, one which had already been addressed for they saw their efforts as the perfecting of the earlier English translations. Nonetheless, the translators write:

Yet before we end, we must answer a third cavil and objection of theirs against us, for altering and amending our translations so oft; wherein truly they deal hardly, and strangely with us. For to whom ever was it imputed for a fault (by such as were wise) to go over that which he had done,

and to amend it where he saw cause? . . . If we will be sons of the Truth we must consider what it speaketh, and trample upon our own credit, yea, and upon other men's too. (Ibid., p. 25.)

Again, we see in their response what they considered their task. As sons of Truth, they were more concerned with presenting the pure word of God than establishing their own theological beliefs. The next paragraph establishes for all to see what their goal was in producing the Authorized Version, a goal which history bears testimony to as being accomplished.

Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one, (for then the imputation of Sixtus had been true in some sort, that our people had been fed with gall of dragons instead of wine, with whey instead of milk:) but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavour, that our mark. (Ibid., p. 29.)

Thus, their goal was to produce from the Early English versions, all based on the Traditional Text, one principal English translation. The paragraph ends with their statement of belief as to how such an effort was able to be established. It was done so, "through the good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to that pass that you see." (Ibid., p. 31.) Their final consideration is expressed in their concern for the reader. To them, the Bible was a spiritual book which took God the Holy Spirit as the empowering force in producing the work and His grace in revealing it to the reader.

Many other things we might give thee warning of, gentle reader, if we had not exceeded the measure of the Preface already. It remaineth that we commend thee to God, and to the Spirit of His grace, which is able to build further than we can ask or think. He removeth the scales from our eyes, the vail from our hearts, opening our wits that we may understand His Word, enlarging our hearts, yea, correcting our affections, that we may love it above gold and silver, yea, that we may love it to the end. . . . It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God; but a blessed thing it is, and will bring us to everlasting blessedness in the end, when God speaketh unto us, to hearken; when He setteth His Word before us, to read it; when He stretcheth out His hand and calleth, to answer, Here am I; here we are to do thy will, O God. The Lord work a care and conscience in us to know Him and serve Him, that we may be acknowledged of Him at the appearing of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, to whom with the Holy Ghost, be all praise and thanksgiving. Amen. (Ibid., pp. 35-36.) The Jewish Book The Bible is a Jewish book; we must never forget this. The Apostle Paul states of the Jews that, ". . . unto them were committed the oracles of God" (Rom 3:2). Every writer in the Old Testament was Jewish. The Old Testament was written for Jews. If a Gentile wanted to know the truth and live for God he had to come to Israel and become a Jew. Likewise, every writer in the New Testament, with the possible exception of Luke, was Jewish. The central person of the New Testament, the Lord Jesus Christ, was born a Jew. And, much concerning the New Testament is based upon that which is Jewish. The Bible most certainly is a Jewish book. As a Jewish book the Bible uses Jewish terms and expressions. These are called Hebraisms. For a translation to be truly a proper and correct translation, it must reflect its Jewish heritage. This must be accomplished not only in recording the history of the people of Israel, but also by reflecting their thoughts and words as inspired by the Holy Spirit and given to the original writers. English translations which weaken or remove these Jewish Hebraisms weaken our understanding of the people of God and the meaning of Scripture.

More than any other English translation, the King James Bible retains these Hebraisms. In fact, because of the popularity of the King James Bible, many of these Jewish expressions have become our expressions. Dr. William Rosenau has correctly noted,

It (i.e. the King James Bible) molded new forms and phrases, which, while foreign to the English, became with it flesh and bone. The origin of most of these forms and phrases is not difficult to trace. They are like the equivalents of which they were translations---Hebrew in character." (Rosenau, p, 31.)

Thus we have many common expressions, taken from the Authorized Version, which have their basic understanding in Hebrew expressions. The following are a few examples of what Rosenau calls "Proverbial Biblical" Jewish expressions:

"In the sweat of thy face,"-- Gen 3:19 "Am I my brother's keeper"-- Gen 4:9 "Unstable as water"-- Gen 49:4 "A stranger in a strange land"-- Exo 2:22 "A land flowing with milk and honey,"-- Exo 3:8 "Sheep which have no shepherd,"-- Numb. 27:17 "Man doth not live by bread alone,"-- Deu 8:3 "Whatsoever is right in his own eyes,"-- Deu 12:8 "The apple of his eye,"-- Deu 32:10 "The people arose as one man,"-- Jdg 20:8 "A man after his own heart,"-- 1Sa 13:14 "How are the mighty fallen,"-- 2Sa 1:25 "Thou art the man,"-- 2Sa 12:7 "From the sole of his foot to the crown of his head,"-- 2Sa 14:25 "Steal the heart"-- 2Sa 15:6 "Horn of my salvation,"-- 2Sa 22:3 "The sweet psalmist of Israel,"-- 2Sa 23:1 "How long halt ye between two opinions?"-- 1Ki 18:21 "A still small voice,"-- 1Ki 19:2 "The shadow of death,"-- Job 10:21 "With the skin of my teeth,"-- Job 19:20 "The land of the living,"-- Job 28:13 "My cup runneth over,"-- Psa 23:5 "The pen of a ready writer,"-- Psa 45:1 "Wings like a dove,"-- Psa 55:6 "From strength to strength,"-- Psa 84:7 "As a tale that is told,"-- Psa 90:9 "At their wit's end,"-- Psa 107:27 "To dwell together in unity,"-- Psa 133:1 "The way of the transgressor is hard,"-- Pro 13:15 "Heap coals of fire upon his head,"-- Pro 25:22 "Answer a fool according to his folly,"-- Pro 26:5 "Boast not thyself of to-morrow,"-- Pro 27:1 "Iron sharpeneth iron,"-- Pro 27:17 "There is no new thing under the sun,"-- Ecc 1:9 "To every thing there is a season,"-- Ecc 3:1 "The race is not to the swift,"-- Ecc 9:11 "A weariness of the flesh,"-- Ecc 12:12 "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we shall die,"-- Isa 22:13 "As a drop of a bucket,"-- Isa 40:15 hew:15 ew:15

Many of these have found their way into modern versions simply because they have become so common in our English expressions. We owe this to the Jewish flavor of the King James Bible. However, there is more. There are certain expressions which are most certainly Jewish and in the KJV, but fail to be reproduced in modern versions such as the NIV. The following are just a few examples from the "a,b,c's" of the thousands of Jewish Hebraisms noted by Dr. Rosenau. (see Rosenau, pp. 169-283.)

Verse

KJV Hebraisms

NIV English expression

1Ki 5:10

"according to all his desire"

"he wanted"

Exo 8:10

"according to thy word".

"It will be as you say"

Lev 11:16

"after his kind"

"any kind"

Gen 45:23

"after this manner"

"this is what"

Exo 14:13

"again no more forever"

"will never see again"

Exo 2:23

"and it came to pass"

"During that long period"

2Sa 1:9

"anguish is come upon me"

"I am in the throes of death"

Pro 14:14

"backslider in heart"

"The faithless"

Psa 90:17

"beauty of the Lord"

"favor of the Lord"

2Sa 12:12

"before the sun"

"in broad daylight"

Exo 32:18

"being overcome"

"defeat"

Gen 43:33

"birthright"

"ages"

2Ki 25:26

"both small and great"

"least to the greatest"

Pro 2:7

"buckler to them"

"a shield to those"

Numb. 9:23

"by the hand of Moses"

"through Moses"

Jer 7:10

"called by my name"

"bears my Name"

Gen 6:4

"came in unto"

"went to"

1Sa 2:26

"child Samuel"

"boy Samuel"

Ezr 6:16

"children of the captivity"

"the rest of the exiles"

2Sa 7:10

"children of wickedness"

"Wicked people"

Hag 1:7

"consider your ways"

"Give careful thought"

Psa 2:2

"counsel together"

"gather together"

Psa 30:2

"cried"

"called"

Jon 1:2.

"cry against"

"preach against"

Exo 23:23

"cut them off"

"wipe them out"

Again, these are but a very few of the thousands of Hebrew expressions found in the King James Authorized Version which have been modernized by contemporary versions, consequently losing some of t

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
 - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net