

The King James Bible and the Modern Versions

BY VANCE FERRELL

**One of the biggest religious frauds
which occurred in church history**

**The most complete explanation
of how it was done**

**The largest in-depth defense
of the King James Bible**



Harvestime Books

PB-402

***The King James Bible
and the Modern Versions***

by Vance Ferrell

Published by Harvestime Books

Beersheba Springs, TN 37305 USA

Printed in the United States of America

Cover and Text Copyright © 2003

by Harvestime Books

The starry firmament on high,
 And all the glories of the sky,
Yet shine not to thy praise, O Lord,
 So brightly as thy written Word.
The hopes that holy Word supplies,
 Its truths divine and precepts wise,
In each a heavenly beam I see,
 And every beam conducts to Thee.
Almighty Lord, the sun shall fail,
 The moon her borrowed glory veil,
And deepest reverence hush on high
 The joyful chorus of the sky.
But fixed for everlasting years,
 Unmoved amid the wreck of spheres,
Thy Word shall shine in cloudless day,
 When heaven and earth have passed away.

Contents

Something to Think About 6
 Our Precious King James Version 8
 How it all Began 10
 Bible Abbreviations 11
 Glossary of Terms 12
 Glossary of Proper Names 18

— 1 —

THE ATTACK INTENSIFIES

*19th-Century Efforts
 to Destroy the Bible*

Introduction 23
 Continental Higher Criticism 24
 British Textual Criticism 25
 Westcott and Hort 27
Picture: Wescott and Hort 29

— 2 —

THE EARLY CENTURIES

*The Best Manuscripts
 Support the KJV*

The Warning Was Given 33
 The Early Manuscript Evidence 33
 1 - Manuscripts 34
 (1) The Uncials (Majuscules) 34
 (2) The Cursives (Minuscuals) 34
 (3) The Papyri 34
 2 - Quotations 34
 3 - Lectionaries 36
 4 - Translations 36
 The Westcott-Hort Theory 36
 The Sinaiticus 36
 Monastery of St. Catherine 35
 Sinaiticus 39
 The Vaticanus 41
 Vaticanus 40

A Problem Deeper than the Sinaiticus
 and Vaticanus 42
 Sinaiticus and Vaticanus Both
 Severely Flawed 43
 Origin of the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus
 43
 The Lucian Recension Theory 46
 The Manuscript Family Theory 54
 Most Sources Support the KJV 55
 1 - Greek Manuscripts 55
 Chester Beatty Papyri 48
 Codex Alexandrinus 49
 Codex Bezae 50
 Codex Ephraemi 51
 Aquila's Version 52
 Codex Washington / Koridethi 53
 2 - Lectionaries 56
 3 - Quotations 56
 4 - Papyri 57
 5 - Translations into other
 Languages 58
 (1) Syrian Translations 58
 (2) Gothic Translation 58
 (3) Armenian Translation 64
 (4) Georgian Translation 64
 (5) Coptic Translations 64
 [1] Sahidic Translation 64
 [2] Bohairic Translation 64
 (6) Ethiopian Translation 64
 (7) Latin Translations 64
 [1] The Italia (Old Latin) 64
 [2] The Latin Vulgate 65
 Codex Argenteus and Coptic 59
 Syriac Peshitta / Armenian 60
 Ethiopic 61
 Samaritan Pentateuch / Old Syriac 62
 Jerome's Latin Vulgate / Codex
 Amiatinus 63
 The Majority Text Is the Earliest 66

90% of the Manuscripts Support the KJV	67
Only a 1% Minority Supports the Modern Versions	68
This 1% Represents Only One Small, and Most Corrupt, Locality	70
Errors Were Introduced Early	70
The Pseudopigrapha	73
The True Church Flees with the Manuscripts into the Wilderness	73
God's Guidance in the Selection of the Majority Text	74
Additional Statements on this Controversy	75

— 3 —

THE CENTURIES BETWEEN

Pre-King James Bibles Are Made

The Waldensian Bible	77
The Wycliffe Bible (1384)	80
<i>John Wycliffe / Wycliffe's Bible</i>	82
<i>Wycliffe's Bible (larger view)</i>	83
The 15th-Century Greek Texts	85
The Reformation Translations	86
Translations from the Vulgate to Counter Protestant Bibles	88
The Tyndale Bible (1526)	89
<i>William Tyndale / Tyndale's New Testament</i>	90
<i>Tyndale's New Testament (larger view)</i>	91
Rome Ruined by Printed Bibles	94
Henry VIII Breaks with Rome	94
The Coverdale Bible (1535)	97
The Matthew Bible (1537)	97
<i>Miles Coverdale / Coverdale Bible</i>	95
<i>Great Bible / Geneva Bible / Bishops' Bible</i>	96
The Great Bible (1539)	97
The Taverner Bible (1539)	98
The Catholic Reaction of 1543-1547	98
Edward VI (1547-1553)	99
Bloody Mary (1553-1559)	99
The Geneva Bible (1560)	99
Queen Elizabeth I (1553-1603)	100
The Bishops' Bible (1568)	100

— 4 —

THE KING JAMES BIBLE

The Crowning Result of Tyndale's Sacrifice

James 1 (1566-1625)	101
Authorization of the King James Bible	102
Preparation of the King James Bible	104
The Completed Book	106
<i>The King James Bible</i>	105
Later Revisions	107
Answering the Critics' Complaints about the King James Bible	107
Effects of the King James Bible	110

— 5 —

THE COUNTER REFORMATION

The Threefold Effort to Destroy Protestant Bibles

The Jesuits (1534)	111
The Council of Trent (1545-1563)	113
The Rheims-Douai (Douay) Bible (1582-1610)	115
<i>The Rheims-Douai Bible</i>	114
The Jesuit Effort to Regain England	117

— 6 —

TEXTUAL CRITICISM BEGINS

The Manuscript Sources Are Attacked

Textual Criticism	120
19th-Century Catholic-British Penetration	121
The Secret Lives of Wescott and Hort	121
The Westcott-Hort Theory	124
The Revision Committee Is Appointed	126
The Revision Committee Conducts Its Work	126
The English Revised Version (1881, 1885)	130
The Modern Critical Greek Texts	132
Another Look at the Manuscript Evidence	132
An Analogy to Explain a Ridiculous	

Theory	133
The Nestle-Aland Greek Text	134
The United Bible Societies Greek Text	135
Joint Protestant-Catholic Translation Teams	135
Kittel's Greek Dictionary	136
The Majority Greek Text	136
The Manuscript Codes and Assigned Dates	137
How Many Changes in a Critical Greek Text?	138
<i>United Bible Societies Critical Greek Text</i>	140
<i>Nestle-Aland Critical Greek Text</i>	141
<i>Septuagint Critical Greek (OT) Text / Biblia Hebraica Critical Hebrew (OT) Text</i>	142
Ellen White and Bible Inerrancy	143
Ellen White and the Modern Versions	144

— 7 —

**MOST FREQUENTLY USED
MODERN VERSIONS**

*The Translators Follow
the New Greek Texts*

Inferior Translations	150
Based on Westcott and Hort	150
The Men Appointed to the Translation Committees	151
The Four Types of Modern Bibles	152
The English Revised Version (ERV) [RV] (1881, 1885) and American Standard Version (ASV) [ARV] (1901)	152
Two Modern Versions	153
The Conservative Bibles	153
Revised Standard Version (RSV)	153
Changes in Later RSV Editions	155
New American Standard Version (NASV)	155
New King James Version (NKJV)	156
The Paraphrase Bibles	157
Phillips	157
The Living Bible (LB) (Taylor)	158
New English Bible (NEB)	160

New International Version (NIV)	162
<i>The Watchtower Bibles</i>	164
New World Translation (NWT)	164
Bible in Living English (BLE)	167
<i>Joint Catholic-Protestant Bibles</i>	168
Revised Standard Version: The Apocrypha	168
Revised Standard Version: Catholic Edition	168
The Common Bible	169
<i>The Roman Catholic Bibles</i>	170
Knox Bible	170
Jerusalem Bible	170
New American Bible	171
The Present Situation	172

— 8 —

APPENDIX

A Variety

of Additional Information

200 Special Errors in the Modern Versions	174
1 - Old Testament	174
2 - New Testament	175
The Truth about Mark 16:9-20	179
Doctrinal Factors in the King James	183
A List of Archaic Words in the King James	186
The Lord's Prayer in Three English Translations	188
Adventist Approval of Modern Versions	189
The Old Testament Apocrypha	190
Special Report on the Apocrypha	191
From the ERV to the NIV: A List of 134 Bible Translations	195

— 9 —

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTS

Scripture Index	201-208
Topical Index	209-220
Battle Over the KJV (221-232)	[WM-1175-1177]
NIV vs. KJV (233-240)	[WM-1178-119]

Something to Think About

In this book, you are going to witness centuries of conflict as humble souls, with the help of God, preserved the Inspired Word while men who were moved by a power from beneath sought to burn it, hide it, or corrupt it.

Before beginning, here are words from Heaven which will better help you understand what you are about to witness.

“Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the Word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightiest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.”—*Luke 1:1-4*.

“For we are not as many, which corrupt the Word of God.”—*2 Corinthians 2:17*.

“Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?”—*Ecclesiastes 8:4*.

“I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty (but thou art rich), and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.”—*Revelation 2:9*.

“The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the Word of our God shall stand for ever.”—*Isaiah 40:8*.

“But found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At the last came two false witnesses.” “But neither so did their witness agree together.”—*Matthew 26:60, Mark 14:59*.

“He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision.”—*Psalms 2:4*.

“For ever, O LORD, thy Word is settled in heaven. Thy faithfulness is unto all generations.”—*Psalms 119:89-90*.

“Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first.”—*2 Thessalonians 2:3*.

“The mystery of iniquity doth already work.”—*2 Thessalonians 2:7*.

“Of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.”—*Acts 20:30-31*.

“God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.”—*Romans 3:4*.

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.”—*Colossians 2:8*.

“No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”—*Matthew 6:24*.

“Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.”—*2 Timothy 3:5*.

“For he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.”—*Matthew 7:29*.

“But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate . . . So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate.”—*Revelation 2:6, 15*.

“Yea, hath God said . . . ?”—*Genesis 3:1*.

“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.”—*Psalm 12:6-7*.

“The LORD of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand . . . For the LORD of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and His hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?”—*Isaiah 14:24, 27*.

“My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee.”—*Hosea 4:6*.

“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, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

“I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom; Preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine.

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears. And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.”—*2 Timothy 3:15-4:4*.

“And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.”—*2 Timothy 2:2*.

“And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming [including protecting] the Word.”—*Mark 16:20*.

“And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.”—*Daniel 12:3*.

“I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars.”—*Revelation 2:2*.

“Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron.”—*1 Timothy 4:1-2*.

“But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.”—*2 Peter 2:22*.

“Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for My sake.”—*Matthew 5:11*.

“And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.”—*2 Timothy 4:4*.

“A false balance is abomination to the Lord.”—*Proverbs 11:1*.

“Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee. Because thou hast kept the word of My patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth. Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown.”—*Revelation 3:9-11*.

“But He said, Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the Word of God, and keep it.”

—*Luke 11:28*

Our Precious King James Bible

The King James Bible is universally acknowledged as the most wonderful literary work and the most life-changing power in the history of the English-speaking peoples.

Here is what others have said about this hallowed book and its influence in history:

“For nearly four hundred years and throughout several revisions of its English form [changes in spelling and punctuation], the King James Bible has been deeply revered among the English-speaking people of the world.”—*Samuel C. Gipp, The Answer Book, p. 26.*

“The Elizabethan period—a term loosely applied to the years between 1558 and 1642—is generally regarded as the most important era in English literature. Shakespeare and his mighty contemporaries brought the drama to the highest point in the world’s history; lyrical poetry found supreme expression; Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* was an unique performance; Bacon’s *Essays* have never been surpassed. But the crowning achievement of those spacious days was the Authorized Translation of the Bible, which appeared in 1611.

“Three centuries of English literature followed; but, although they have been crowded with poets and novelists and essayists, and although the teaching of the English language and literature now gives employment to many earnest men and women, the art of English composition reached its climax in the pages of the Bible.

“Now, as the English-speaking people have the best Bible in the world, and as it is the most beautiful monument erected with the English alphabet, we ought to make the most of it, for it is an incomparably rich inheritance, free to all who can read. This means that we ought invariably in the church and on public occasions to use

the Authorized Version; all others are inferior.”—*Ladies Home Journal, November 1921 [statement made twenty years after the American Standard Version was published].*

“Priests, atheists, skeptics, devotees, agnostics, and evangelists, are generally agreed that the Authorized Version of the English Bible is the best example of English literature that the world has ever seen . . .

“Every one who has a thorough knowledge of the Bible may truly be called educated; and no other learning or culture, no matter how extensive or elegant, can, among Europeans and Americans, form a proper substitute. Western civilization is founded upon the Bible . . . I thoroughly believe in a university education for both men and women; but I believe a knowledge of the Bible without a college course is more valuable than a college course without the Bible.”—*Ibid.*

“The birth of the King James Bible was a death stroke to the supremacy of Roman Catholicism. The translators little foresaw the wide extent of circulation and the tremendous influence to be won by their book. They little dreamed that for three hundred years it would form the bond of English Protestantism in all parts of the world.”—*Benjamin Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, p. 88.*

“Who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvelous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country?”—*Faber, quoted in Eadie, The English Bible, Vol. 2, p. 158. [Faber, of the Church of England, was a secret Catholic who was anxious to bring England back to subservience to Rome.]*

“The printing of the English Bible has proved

to be by far the mightiest barrier ever reared to repel the advance of Popery, and to damage all the resources of the Papacy.”—*McClure, The Translators Revived, p. 71.*

“It [the King James Bible] has not only been the stronghold of Protestantism in Great Britain, but it has built a gigantic wall as a barrier against the spread of Romanism.”—*B.G. Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, p. 88.*

“Small wonder then that for three hundred years incessant warfare has been waged upon this instrument created by God to mold all constitutions and laws of the British Empire, and of the great American Republic, while at the same time comforting, blessing, and instructing the lives of the millions who inhabit these territories.

“Behold what it has given to the world! The machinery of the Catholic Church can never begin to compare with the splendid machinery of Protestantism. The Sabbath School, the Bible printing houses, the foreign missionary societies, the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, the Protestant denominational organizations—these all were the offspring of Protestantism. Their benefits have gone to all lands and been adopted by practically all nations. Shall we throw away the Bible from which such splendid organizations have sprung?”—*Benjamin G. Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, pp. 88-89.*

“For almost three centuries the Authorized, or King James, Version has been the Bible of the English-speaking world. Its simple, majestic Anglo-Saxon tongue, its clear, sparkling style, its directness and force of utterance have made it

the model in language, style, and dignity of some of the choicest writers of the last two centuries. Its phrasing is woven into much of our noblest literature; and its style, which to an astonishing degree is merely the style of the original authors of the Bible, has exerted very great influence in molding that ideal of simplicity, directness, and clarity which now dominates the writing of English. It has endeared itself to the hearts and lives of millions of Christians and has molded the characters of leaders in every walk of life. During all these centuries the King James Version has become a vital part of the English-speaking world, socially, morally, religiously, and politically.”—*Ira Maurice Price, The Ancestry of Our English Bible, pp. 276-277.*

“What is needed is a school that teaches the whole English Bible. What is needed is a school that will take men from the engine cab, from between the plowshares and teach them the Bible. What is needed is a school that is free from modernism. What is needed is a school that will teach a man how to go out with the Bible under his arms, faith in his heart, and in the power of the Holy Spirit begin in a vacant lot and build a church for the glory of God.”—*J. Frank Norris.*

When Sir Walter Scott, the great author and literary expert, lay dying, he asked his son-in-law to bring him “the Book.” With astonishment the young man replied, “Father, your library contains thousands of volumes, including your own works. To which book are you referring?” The veteran author immediately replied, “There is only one book which we all call ‘the Book.’ Bring me the Bible.”

“Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.”

—*Matthew 22:29*

“Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.”

—*1 Peter 1:23*

How it All Began

He sat there in the summer heat, and was thankful it was not worse. He had heard stories from passing merchant caravans about the chilling cold farther north. Few people were living up there, north of the headwaters of the Euphrates, not far south of the Ararat Mountains.

Besides, down here it was spring and everything was greener than usual. His wife was inside the tent complex, preparing foodstuffs with other women in her parents' family. His own helpers were out with the sheep today, and he had time to get started on what he had been told to do.

As he sat there, he thought over the past.

It surely had been a disappointment. His people were ground down by an oppressive government, and here he was where he could not help them. Oh, it seemed bitter. But he knew it was his fault. They must continue to suffer because he had not clung to God's hand.

As he sat there and thought, he realized he never could have helped them, not the way he was trying to do it. God needed his help and he had let Him down, by trusting more to his own youthful strength instead of hourly crying to God for help and counsel.

Yes, he was learning the lesson. Only God could do what needed to be done, and He does it through His earthly children—when they are genuinely yielded to His will. Only then can He fully direct their paths.

Reviewing the past and thinking upon his present situation, how very thankful he was for the forgiving mercies of God!

On his knees now, he prayed once again and renewed his vows of consecration; and, once again, he received the assurance of forgiveness and help. Whatever God wanted him to do, he was going to do it.

The man had learned to pray a lot. Oh, why hadn't he done it back then!

How he wanted to return and help his people! But here he was, and he must learn the lesson of following God's leading, right where he was,

while he waited for opening providences to take him further along the path of duty.

God had another work for him just now. Gladly would he do anything to please His heavenly Father, even though it be tedious and slow! His rough, calloused hands were not used to what he had to do now. But he must carry it through to completion, working on it gradually, even though it were to take many years.

Reaching over, he took a piece of sheepskin from the pile he had been preparing. Laboriously he had spent days scrapping off the remaining wool from each piece. He now had just enough to get started. If Father told him to do something, he was going to do it; and he was going to do it *with Him*, praying his way through it at each step.

With the piece of sheepskin now in his lap, once again he sat there for a long moment and looked out at the horizon beyond. If he could only have known that what he was now beginning to do would affect nations and races for the next four thousand years!

Men would toil and struggle, be opposed and slain. Families would flee and fathers would be burned at the stake. Wars would be fought, kingdoms would rise and fall. Men would journey across oceans and start settlements. Some would be hunted to the death; others would be tricked into yielding the faith. All the powers of hell would be set on their track, determined to destroy or corrupt them and what they had in their possession.

And all because of what they did with what he was just now getting started.

Well, it was time to forget the horizon and return to the present. Dipping the quill into the ink twice in order to make every letter legible on the rough surface of the sheepskin, he began writing in proto-sinaitic Hebrew:

In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth . .

Bible Abbreviations

Here are the abbreviations used in this book for Bibles. With the exception of the King James Bible, none of the Bibles listed below are based on the Majority Text. With the exception of the KJV, Bibles published prior to 1870 are not listed below, since we did not abbreviate their names.

AV Authorized Version 1611

Authorized by King James I of England, it is thus called the King James Version. In this book, we will generally speak of it as the "King James Bible" or "the King James."

ARV American Revised Version

(See under ASV, American Standard Version.)

ASV American Standard Version 1901

From its inception in 1901, down to the early 1960s, this Bible was called the American Revised Version (ARV). But, since the early 1960s, it has been referred to as the American Standard Version (ASV). In this book, we will generally refer to it by its current name.

BLE Bible in Living English 1972

Translated by Steven Byington, this Bible is published by the Jehovah's Witnesses.

ERV English Revised Version 1881, 1885

This translation was initially called the Revised Version (RV); but, by the 1940s, it came to be known as the English Revised Version (ERV). We will generally refer to it by its current name.

JB Jerusalem Bible 1966

This is a Roman Catholic Bible, but more moderate than most of them.

KJV King James Bible 1611

This Bible is also known as the King

James Version or Authorized Version (AV). We will always refer to it as KJV.

LB Living Bible 1971

This is the heavily paraphrased Bible by Kenneth Taylor. It is even more doctrinally prejudiced than the Phillips.

NAB New American Bible 1970

This is a Roman Catholic Bible.

NASB New American Standard Bible 1971

This is sometimes called the New American Standard Version. We will refer to it as the NASB.

NEB New English Bible 1970

This is a partial paraphrase Bible.

NIV New International Bible 1973

This is the most popular modern Bible.

NWT New World Translation 1961

This is a Jehovah's Witness Bible.

Phillips Translation 1958-1973

This is the heavily paraphrased version by J.B. Phillips, published under various titles.

RSV Revised Standard Version 1946, 1952

RV Revised Version, 1881, 1885

(See under ERV, English Revised Version.)

TEV Today's English Version 1966

Good News for Modern man. This is the American Bible Society edition.

Glossary of Terms

THE MAJORITY TEXT FAMILY

The Greek manuscripts which the King James Bible is based have several names, *but they all mean the same thing*. Lest there be confusion, here they are:

Majority Text — Kurt Aland, the editor of the Nestle Greek Text, correctly calls it by this name.

Traditional Text — Dean Burgon, who found and collated nearly all the manuscripts and other sources late in the last century, called it by this name.

Received Text — That is English for *Textus Receptus*. This is the name for the Greek text used by Erasmus and Stephenus. Only the Majority Text witnesses were used. The King James Bible was translated from this Greek Text.

Syrian Text — This is the name given to the Majority Text by Westcott and Hort. They sought to identify it as merely a local text in Syria and Asia Minor.

Antiochan Text — This is another localized name for the Majority Text, which is assumed to have come only from Antioch.

Byzantine Text — This is the name applied in the earlier editions of the Nestle Text. It implies that the manuscripts in the Majority Family are all very late in origin and were produced during the Byzantine Greek period in Asia Minor.

Koine Text — Also called the **K, Kappa, or Common Text**. This is a 20th-century term which means that it was the majority text of the common people. We agree.

In the present book, we shall generally refer to the above eight synonyms as the Majority Text.

THE MODERN CRITICAL GREEK TEXTS

The Westcott-Hort Text — This text was prepared by Westcott and Hort. Hort prepared

the explanatory section which discussed the theory underlying it.

The Nestle-Aland Text — This text is very similar to the Westcott-Hort Text.

The United Bible Societies Text — Also called the UBS Text, this critical text is very similar to the Nestle-Aland Text. The UBS Text was prepared by the same three-man staff which updated the Nestle-Aland Text.

There are other critical texts, including Tischendorf, Von Soden, etc.; but we will primarily refer to the Nestle-Aland and UBS Texts, which all modern translations are based upon.

However, we should also mention the Scrivener Greek Text, which is in accordance with the Majority Text (which the KJV is based on). Although excellent, it is never used today and probably is not obtainable.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Alexandrian Text — The corrupt manuscript tradition which can be traced to the Alexandrian “father,” Origen Adamantius (c. 185-254). Codices Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (Aleph) are the standard-bearers for this text type.

allegorical — The liberal method of hermeneutics, pioneered by Philo and Origen, which would assign a mystical or subjective meaning to Scripture in favor of the normally intended literal interpretation.

amanuensis — Akin to a scribe, but more specifically, one who takes dictation, as Tertius did in Romans 16:22. Paul had poor eyesight and he dictated most everything he wrote. See “scribe” for broader definitions.

anacoluthon — A phenomenon of Greek syntax which allows for a switch from one grammatical construction to another within the same sentence as a rhetorical device.

ante-Nicene — The era of church history

which predates the watershed Council of Nicea in A.D. 325.

Apocrypha — From the Greek *apokryphos*, meaning “obscure”; those writings of dubious authenticity belonging to the pre-Christian era, yet excluded from the Old Testament text. Although declared inspired and canonical by the Roman Catholic Council of Trent in 1546, the Apocrypha has remained unacceptable to Bible-believing Christians. Significantly, these dozen plus books can be found scattered throughout the text of codices Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (Aleph).

apparatus — This is the technical name, given by scholars, to the extensive footnotes at the bottom of each page of some critical Greek Texts. Those footnotes show the variants and tell which manuscripts, lectionaries, church “fathers,” and translations support them.

autographs — The original manuscripts of Scripture that were produced by either the Divinely appointed writer himself or his amanuenses. Bible scholars refer to the originals as the “autographs.”

canon — The books of the Bible which are officially accepted as inspired of God.

canonicity — The Spirit-led process by which God’s people were able to differentiate non-inspired writings (pseudepigrapha) from those of Divine authority.

catechetical school of Alexandria — The mysterious “Christian” school of Alexandria, founded by Philo, an apostate Platonic Jew and eventually superintended by the self-emasculated Origen Adamantius, who taught, among other things, that the stars were living creatures. Hailed by modern scholars as the pioneer of textual criticism, Origen was a rabid allegorist and is credited with the majority of textual corruptions associated with the “Alexandrian text type,” specifically codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

chirography — The style of handwriting or penmanship of an individual scribe or manuscript era. It is frequently possible to identify when a certain scribe copied different manuscripts.

codex (majuscule) — A manuscript, in traditional book form (as opposed to one composed of cumbersome scrolls), produced by 1st-century soul winners to facilitate their Gospel out-

reach.

colophon — A collection of scribal notes placed at the end of a manuscript containing pertinent information regarding the transcription.

copyist — A person who makes a copy of an existing manuscript, whether in the Greek or in another language.

cursive manuscript (cursive, or minuscule) — From the Medieval Latin *cursiuus*, literally “running,” the form of manuscript written (as opposed to printed) in a free or “running hand style” employing lowercase letters (prompting the additional designation of minuscule from the Latin *minusculus*, meaning “small”). Developed by the scribes of Charlemagne, this format was utilized from the 9th to the 16th century.

Dead Sea Scrolls — Manuscripts, mostly Biblical, discovered in caves near the Dead Sea.

diaspora — The dispersion or scattering of the Jews, beginning about 300 B.C.

Rheims-Douay (Douai) Bible — Jesuit translation of the Latin Vulgate, constituting Rome’s first official “Bible” for English-speaking Catholics. Unleashed as a major stratagem of the Vatican’s Counter Reformation, the New Testament was published in Rheims (1582), with the Old Testament completed in Douay (1610).

eclecticism — The liberal method of textual criticism which enjoins its adherents to select one manuscript reading over another solely on the basis of the highly subjective criteria of internal evidence. This unscholarly rejection of the more conclusive body of external evidence—*i.e.*, multiplied manuscripts, lectionaries, versions, and patristic testimony—was the *modus operandi* behind the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament. The eclectic method is to textual criticism what the allegorical school is to hermeneutics.

English Revision of the Authorized Version, 1881-1885 — The project sanctioned by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1870, to revise the Authorized Version which produced the Revised New Testament in 1881 with the Old Testament following in 1885. With Drs. Westcott and Hort at the helm, the “esteemed” committee completely ignored the convocation’s directive to “introduce as few alterations into the text of the A.V. as possible . . .” The result was that the En-

14 The King James and the Modern Versions

glish Revised Version (ERV) had over 30,000 changes from the KJV.

extant — In a state of current existence as opposed to that which is lost or perished.

“fathers” — The venerated leaders of ancient Christendom whose extant writings containing numerous Scriptural citations provide an invaluable witness to the prevailing text of their day.

Gunpowder Plot — Jesuit-inspired assassination attempt against England’s James I. The plot was foiled by royal agents on November 5, 1605, less than 24 hours before the convening of Parliament, when Guy Fawkes was caught superintending 36 barrels of gunpowder in that assembly’s basement.

Hampton Court Conference — The historic gathering, in 1604, of Puritan and high church leaders convened by James I; this provided the impetus for the A.D. 1611 Authorized Version.

hermeneutics — From the Greek *hermeneuein*, “to interpret.” The principles or methodology one follows when attempting to interpret Scripture; the two major schools being the literal (conservative) and the allegorical (liberal).

Hexapla — Origen’s highly overrated manuscript consisting of six parallel columns displaying as many Greek and Hebrew translations of the Old Testament.

higher criticism — Biblical analysis made in an effort to disprove the Bible and its authors. See *textual criticism*.

idiom — From the Latin *idioma*, for “individual peculiarity of language”; a phrase that is exclusive either syntactically or in possessing a definition that cannot be extracted from the combined meanings of its word parts.

Inspiration — From the Greek, *theopneustos*, and literally means “God breathed.” More specifically with application to the Bible, that supernatural influence upon the sacred writers which enabled them to receive and record, with preciseness, the Divine revelation.

Interpolation — An unauthorized insertion of a word or words into the text of any document.

Itacism — The misspelling of a word in an ancient manuscript, especially by an interchang-

ing of vowels.

Italia Bible — A 2nd-century version of the Bible in Latin, translated by Waldenses. These readings frequently agree with the King James Bible against those of the modern versions based on codices Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (Aleph), which are dated mid-4th century.

Italicized words — Those necessary English words (without an equivalent in the Hebrew or Greek manuscripts) inserted by the King James translators for clarity’s sake (*i.e.*, as in the case of idioms—“step on the gas,” etc.). Although this practice is common to all modern translators, the Authorized Version is unique in its usage of italics, to indicate the extent of such activity.

Jesuits — See *Jesus, Society of*.

Jesus, Society of — The Roman Catholic order known as the Jesuits, established by Ignatius de Loyola between 1534-1539 for the sole purpose of reintroducing papal authority and regaining control of Europe for the pope.

lectionaries — Books containing selected passages of Scripture, employed by the ancient assemblies for congregational reading. Those which provided a weekly lesson were called *Synaxaria* while those consisting of readings for special days such as Easter, Christmas, etc., were called *Menologion*.

lithographic errors — Pertaining to printing errors within the earliest editions of the King James Bible.

Latin Vulgate — Jerome’s 4th-century “revision” of the Itala Bible (Old Latin) using the Vaticanus readings as his standard. Responsible for ushering in the Dark Ages, the Latin Vulgate became Rome’s official Bible throughout this benighted period.

Lollards — Followers of John Wycliffe, known as the “poor priests” who suffered great persecution for their Bible distribution and street preaching.

Lucianic Recension (Antiochian) — Dr. Hort’s desperate conjecture that the Textus Receptus readings received an official, empire-wide sanction at two church councils between A.D. 250-350 at Antioch. Despite speculation that one Lucian (d. 312) led in this venture, the theory remains destitute of any historical corroboration.

Majority Text — This the great majority of Greek manuscripts, variously estimated at 90%-95%, which are read essentially the same way. The Erasmus Greek Text (the *Textus Receptus*), which the King James Bible was translated from, was based on them. Also see *Textus Receptus*.

manuscript — Any portion of a literary work that has been handwritten as opposed to a copy printed from moveable type.

manuscript evidences — The true, or conservative, mode of textual criticism which would seek to establish the correct text on the basis of all available data, such as the whole body of cursive manuscripts, lectionaries, ancient versions, and the writings of the church "fathers."

Mariolatry — An excessive and unnatural veneration of the Virgin Mary. Drs. Westcott and Hort were guilty of this.

Massoretic Text — Hebrew text of the Old Testament edited by Jewish scribes of the Middle Ages, A.D. 775-925. They, for the first time, placed vowels in the Hebrew text (but, of course, they did not know the ancient pronunciation).

mental reservation — Jesuit doctrine of deceit that allows a person to profess one thing while secretly believing something different.

Millenary Petition — Religious petition containing nearly one thousand ministerial signatures which was presented to James I, in 1603, by a Puritan delegation incensed with increased Catholic-inspired formalism within the Church of England. It resulted in the translation of the King James Version of the Bible.

Majuscule — Another name for a *codex*. It means a document with all capital letters.

Minuscule — Greek manuscripts of the New Testament written in the 9th to 15th centuries. Also see *cursive manuscript*.

Nestle-Aland Greek Text — Named after the German scholar Eberhard Nestle, this Text represents the major adversary of the *Textus Receptus* in our day, being used in most colleges and seminaries. Despite a periodic fluctuation throughout its twenty-six editions, the Nestles' Greek Text is basically the Westcott and Hort Text of 1881. The committee for the 26th edition comprised several unbelievers, including Rev. Carlo M. Martini, a Roman Catholic cardi-

nal. The UBS Greek Text is similar and under the primary editorial staff of the same three men.

orthographic discrepancies — Pertaining to spelling discrepancies within the various editions of the 1611 Authorized Version. These are neither conceptual nor doctrinal errors.

Oxford Movement — A fruition of the earlier Tractarian controversy (1833-1841) which aimed at restoring subtle Catholic principles within the Church of England. Orchestrated by secret Vatican sympathizers, this effort exerted considerable influence on Drs. Westcott and Hort.

papyrus — A primitive paper fashioned by cross-weaving the dried, flattened stems of the reed-like papyrus plant. This ancient "paper" was used as writing material at the time of Christ and for several centuries thereafter. Due to its dry climate, copies written in Egypt have been found.

parchment — An ancient writing material prepared from the skins of sheep or goats.

patristic — Of or pertaining to the church "fathers" or their extant writings.

Pentateuch — The first five books of the Bible, the Mosaic books.

Peshitta — This is the Syriac translation, an ancient version of the Scriptures. The translation from the Greek to the Syriac was made about A.D. 145 (antedating Vaticanus and Sinaiticus by over two centuries). Most of its extant readings agree with the King James Bible against those of the modern versions.

plenary Inspiration — The doctrine which attributes Inspiration to all parts of Scripture, thus holding the Bible's declarations on science as being equally authoritative and infallible with those of a theological nature.

post-Nicene — The period of church history which commences with the landmark Council of Nicea in A.D. 325.

probabilism — A Jesuit doctrine that regards an opinion as probable even if only one theologian can be found in support of its acceptance. Thus, any single Jesuit allied with the Pope can make a majority.

pseudopigrapha — From the Greek word, *pseudopigraphos*, for "falsely ascribed"; the non-

canonical books of spurious authorship were composed between 200 B.C. to A.D. 200. Whereas the Old Testament Apocrypha gained a limited acceptance, the pseudopigrapha writings have been rejected by everyone. Eusebius spoke of them as “totally absurd and impious.”

Puritans — The “purifying” element within the Church of England, occasioned by the political laxity of Elizabeth I, which committed itself to restoring an intolerance of Catholic encroachments, particularly in the areas of formalism and ritual.

Reading — A specific phrase, verse, or passage of Scripture.

Recension — (1) An editorial revision of a literary work, especially on the basis of critical examination of the text and the sources used. (2) A version of a text resulting from such revision.

scribe — One who transcribes manuscripts in a professional or official capacity. A copyist makes copies of an existing manuscript. A scribe may make copies or he may take dictation in the preparation of a manuscript with new content. An amanuensis only takes dictation.

scriptorium — A special room set aside for scribes to use when copying their manuscripts.

Septuagint — The earliest Greek translation of the Old Testament, made about 250-150 B.C.

Sinaiticus (or “Aleph”) — The 4th-century manuscript rescued by Count Tischendorf from eventually being burned, at St. Catherine’s monastery (situated at the base of Mt. Sinai). It is second only to the famed Codex Vaticanus as a cited witness against the Authorized Version. This pair of “ancient authorities” disagree with each other in over 3,000 places in the Gospels alone. Also see *Vaticanus*.

targums — Aramaic paraphrases of the Old Testament.

Text and text — Text is capitalized in this book, when referring to (1) a manuscript family or (2) a prepared Greek Text. Text is not capitalized when referring to a reading; *i.e.*, a specific phrase or verse of Scripture. In this book, we will generally refer to Text and a reading.

textual criticism — Theoretically, the scholastic discipline that would employ manuscript evidences to determine the correct Scriptural

text. But it has degenerated into a method used by liberals to change the Bible. Also see “higher criticism.” Properly done, textual analysis would work with external evidence (manuscripts, lectionaries, patristic testimony, and ancient versions) to determine the original readings. Instead, we find an emphasis on so-called “internal testimony,” but which is actually liberal conjectures.

Textus Receptus — The predominant Greek tradition of the manuscript era and underlying text for most of the Authorized Version. The honored designation of Textus Receptus (for “received text”) was first used by the Elzevir brothers in the introduction to their second edition of 1633, but it is generally agreed that the third edition of Erasmus’ Greek Text is the standard Textus Receptus. Nearly all Reformation-European-Protestant Bibles and all English Protestant Bibles (with the exception of 9th-century Alfred’s and 14th-century Wycliffe’s) were translated from the Textus Receptus. Although some technical disagreements exist among scholars, other accepted names for this text would include Majority, Traditional, Byzantine and Antiochian. (It should be mentioned that, not until the mid-20th century was any Catholic translation made from anything other than the Latin Vulgate.) Also see “*Elzevir*” under *Glossary of Names*.

Tractarianism — See *Oxford Movement*.

translation — The rendering of a literary work from one language into another; for example, the Peshitta translation from Greek to Syriac or the Rheims-Douai translation of Latin into English. Poor Bible translations result when they are not made from Old Testament Hebrew and New Testament Greek. Also see *version*.

transmission — The providentially guarded process by which the Scriptures have been reproduced down through the ages.

UBS — The United Bible Societies consists of all Bible societies in the world (including the American Bible Society). They produce a UBS Greek Text which is essentially the same as the Nestle-Aland Text and is produced under the direction of the same three men. All Bible Society translations, including those of the Wycliffe Bible Translators, use the UBS Text.

uncial manuscript (majuscule) — Derived from the Latin *uncia*, for “twelfth part” (indicating that such characters occupied roughly one-

twelfth of a line of print). The word, “uncials,” has come to depict the style of ancient printing employing “inch high” (one twelfth) letters. Majuscule (which means “small major,” from the Latin *majusculus*, “large”) refers to the exclusive usage of “uppercase” type. These block capital letters of such manuscripts as Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were positioned together with no break between the words. In English, this would be comparable to **GODISNOWHERE** or perhaps **INTHEBEGINNINGWASTHEWORD**.

universalism — The theological position, that all men will eventually be saved. Espoused by liberals, such as Origen, Westcott, Peale, etc., it denies a future punishment of the wicked. A final restoration of Lucifer himself is also maintained by some.

Vaticanus (B) — The 4th-century Greek codex named after the library in Rome, where it was kept for several centuries, down to the present time. It is the primary ancient manuscript used as the basis of the Nestle-Aland and UBS Greek Texts which, in turn, are the basis for all modern Bible translations. Both the Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus were produced in Alexandria, Egypt, and contain errors in com-

mon which originate in that locality that had the most early Christian heretics. Also see *Sinaiticus*.

vellum — The finest, most expensive parchment material. It was made from antelope or calf skin.

version — Anciently, Bible translations (from one language to another) were always called translations. Modern Bible translations are sometimes called “translations” and, sometimes, “versions.” We will generally use the terms interchangeably in this book, when referring to 20th-century Bibles. However, among scholars, in regard to modern Bibles there is an actual difference: A “version” tries to remain closer to the King James and be more literal (ERV, ASV, and RSV). Producers of a “translation” are very willing to veer further away and interject paraphrase far more often (Phillips, LB, NEB, etc.). Also see *translation*.

Vulgate — Latin translation of the Bible made in the 4th century by Jerome—a Catholic monk, on assignment by a pope.

Uncials — Greek manuscripts of the New Testament written in the 4th to 9th centuries. Also see *codex*.

“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.”

—2 Timothy 3:15

“Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures.”

—Luke 24:45

Glossary of Proper Names

Andrews, Lancelot (1555-1626) — Chairman of the Old Testament committee at Westminster who was conversant in fifteen languages. It was said that whenever the godly Lancelot was near, King James “desisted from mirth and frivolity in his presence.”

Astruc, Jean (1684-1766) — Roman Catholic physician and textual critic who developed the theory that the Pentateuch was authored by at least two different men, neither of whom was Moses.

Bede, the Venerable (673-735) — British scholar known as “The Father of English Church History,” who crowned his literary career with a deathbed translation of the Gospel of John into Middle English.

Beza, Theodore (1519-1605) — Swiss Reformer, Greek scholar, and successor to John Calvin. He produced ten editions of his *Textus Receptus* Greek New Testament. He was also a major contributor to the translation committee for the *Geneva Bible* in 1560.

Bois, John (1560-1643) — One of the final editors for the King James translation who may have been the most accomplished scholar of them all. As a child, he was reading Hebrew at age five and writing the same at six. As a student, he corresponded with his teachers in Greek. As a professor, he taught and studied sixteen hours a day. During his career, he mastered sixty Greek grammars.

Burgon, Dean John William (1813-1888) — Outstanding conservative scholar of 19th-century Anglicanism, whose literary works in defense of the A.D. 1611 Authorized Version have never been refuted. They include: *The Revision Revised*, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established*, *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, and *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*. Burgon’s and Scrivener’s writings provide a wealth of data in favor of the Greek manuscripts

underlying the King James and opposing the Greek Text the modern ones are based on. Also see *Scrivener* and *Miller*.

Caniplon, Priest Edmund (1540-1581) — Former Protestant who turned Jesuit agent; he was arrested in England for conspiracy and executed in 1581.

Chrysostom, John (347-407) — Bishop of Constantinople recognized as the first historical personality to refer to Scripture as “the Bible.” Name means “golden-mouthed.”

Clement of Alexandria (150-215) — Successor to Pantaenus as headmaster of Alexandria’s catechetical school of theology and philosophy. Among his many doctrinal heresies, Clement believed that Plato’s writings were inspired and that the stars should be worshiped. Origen succeeded him in 202.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor (1772-1834) — Pro-Vatican poet-philosopher who composed numbers of his works under the “inspiration” of a lingering opium habit. F.J.A. Hort deeply valued Coleridge’s writings.

Constantine the Great (d. 337) — First of the so-called “Christian” emperors, he commissioned Eusebius of Caesarea to transcribe fifty new Bibles in the aftermath of the Diocletian-Galerius persecution. Most scholars believe codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are two of the fifty copies.

Coverdale, Miles (1488-1568) — Cambridge scholar who produced the first complete English Bible printed in 1535, called *The Coverdale Bible*. Four years later, he completed the *Great Bible* (1539). This good man was also a part of the translation committee that issued the *Geneva Bible* in 1560.

Diocletian, Emperor Valerius (245-313) — Roman emperor who initiated the tenth and worst of the Imperial persecutions against organized Christianity (303-313). After only two years

of bloodletting, Diocletian went insane and abdicated his throne. Moving to Dalmatia, he planted cabbages. The widespread incineration of Holy Scripture carried on by Diocletian's successor-nephew, Galerius, prompted Constantine to later procure fifty new Bibles for his realm.

Edward VI, King (1537-1553) — Pious son of England's Henry VIII (by the Protestant Jane Seymour), whose brief reign of six years was characterized by an unprecedented proliferation of Bibles throughout the land.

Ellicott, Bishop Charles John (1819-1905) — Chairman of the British New Testament Revision Committee (1871-1881), he sided with Westcott and Hort in their undermining of the King James Bible.

Elzevir, Bonaventure (c.1546-1617) — Dutch printer, whose Leiden publishing house produced seven editions of the Greek New Testament between 1624-1787. His 1633 second edition introduced the term, *Textus Receptus*, in the preface with the words, "*Textum Ab Omnibus receptum*"—meaning "You have therefore the text now received by all."

Erasmus, Desiderius (1469-1536) — Dutch intellectual known as the "journalist of scholarship" credited with producing the world's first printed Greek New Testament. His decided preference for the readings of the *Textus Receptus* over those of *Codex Vaticanus* (as supplied to him by the Catholic Sepúlveda) produced an outstanding Greek Text. Unfortunately, he later later rejected the Reformers and remained with Catholicism.

Eusebius of Caesarea (260-340) — Catholic churchman and close friend of Emperor Constantine, who told him to procure fifty new Bibles in the wake of Diocletian's decade-long persecution. Many believe codices *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus* are two of these fifty copies.

Fawkes, Guy (1570-1606) — Catholic soldier of fortune caught superintending thirty-six barrels of gunpowder in the basement of Parliament only hours before the convening of that assembly. Executed in 1606, the would-be assassin of James I continues to be burned in effigy each *Guy Fawkes Day* in Britain.

Garnet, Priest Henry (1555-1606) — Superior general of the Jesuit House in England who was hanged, drawn, and quartered for his

role in the foiled *Gunpowder Plot* of 1605.

Hort, Fenton John Anthony (1828-1892) — Pro-Catholic, pro-atheist, and demon-guided Cambridge professor who joined Brooke Westcott in producing a Greek New Testament built upon the *Codex Vaticanus*. During the ensuing Revision Committee of 1871-1881, Dr. Hort took the lead in cramming this corrupt text down the throats of his fellow committee members. The end result was the Revised Version New Testament of 1881.

Ignatius de Loyola (1491-1556) — Fanatical founder of *The Society of Jesus* (more commonly known as the Jesuits) in 1534. The avowed purpose of his mission was to recapture Europe for the pope.

Irenaeus (130-200) — Bishop of Lyons and one of several Ante-Nicene "fathers" whose extant writings contain quotations from Mark 16:9-20. He cites Mark 16:19 in his polemical treatise entitled *Irenaeus Against Heresies*, penned in approximately A.D. 177. (over a century and a half before *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus*).

James I, King (1566-1625) — Formerly James VI of Scotland (through the Catholic, Mary, Queen of Scots), his English reign was distinguished by the authorized translation of the Bible which bears his name.

Jerome (342-420) — Catholic scholar who produced the Latin Vulgate, by "revising" the Itala version (Old Latin) according to the readings of *Codex Vaticanus*.

Keble, John (1792-1866) — Professor of Poetry at Oxford and co-laborer with E.B. Pusey in the pro-Vatican Oxford Movement. This pro-Catholic exercised a strong influence on Dr. Westcott.

Lucian of Antioch (250-312) — The purported catalyst behind Dr. Hort's unfounded conjecture regarding an empire-wide sanction of the *Textus Receptus* readings at two church councils between A.D. 250-350 at Antioch. Hort contended that all the Majority Text readings were merely many copies later made of Lucian's copy. But there was no evidence of this.

Luther, Martin (1483-1546) — Father of the European Reformation who employed Erasmus' second edition Greek text for his epochal German translation of the Bible (1522-1534). He also provided the protection and encouragement

for the exiled William Tyndale to print and smuggle into England his first 3,000 English New Testaments in 1525.

Mabillon, Priest Jean (1632-1707) — Benedictine priest whose work, *Latin Paleography in Official Documents*, helped lay the earliest foundations of modern textual criticism.

Marcion, the Heretic (d. 160) — Ancient enemy of the church known for his repeated verbal attacks on the New Testament Scriptures.

Mary, Queen (1516-1558) — Also known as Bloody Mary. Fanatical Catholic daughter of Henry VIII (by Catherine of Aragon), whose five-year reign of terror caused the deaths of over three hundred English Christians—including John Rogers, John Hooper, Hugh Latimer, Nicholas Ridley, and Thomas Cranmer.

Matthew, Thomas — see *Rogers, John*.

Miller, Edward (19th century) — Faithful friend and editorial assistant to Dean John William Burgon. His own literary works include *A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Also see *Burgon*.

Nestle, Eberhard (1851-1913) — German scholar whose initial Greek New Testament of 1898 has undergone twenty-six editions to date. Used in the majority of modern Bible colleges and seminaries, the Nestle's text is basically identical to the text of Westcott and Hort.

Newman, Cardinal John Henry (1801-1890) — Early leader within the Oxford Movement whose *Tract 90* (written in 1841) evoked a major controversy for attempting to interpret the Church of England's 39 Articles as consistent with Catholicism. This apostate Anglican revealed his true pro-Vatican sympathies by converting to Rome in 1845. Seven years later, Dr. Westcott wrote: "and him I all but worship." Newman was rewarded with a Cardinal's hat in 1879.

Origen, Adamantius (185-254) — Onetime headmaster of Alexandria's catechetical school of theology and philosophy. Hailed as the church's first textual critic, this apostate denied many Christian beliefs and believed the stars were living creatures in possession of souls for which Christ died. After his Alexandrian excommunication for castrating himself, Origen took his mutilated manuscripts and migrated to Caesarea, where he set up another school. At the time

of his death in A.D. 254, he bequeathed his library to his favorite pupil, Pamphilus. Upon his own death in 309, Pamphilus passed the corrupted readings of Origen on to Eusebius, a close friend of Constantine.

Pamphilus (240-309) — Little-known personality representing the central link between the corrupting hand of Origen and modern English Bibles. Before his death in 254, Origen passed his contaminated manuscripts and leadership of his catechetical school on to his favored pupil, Pamphilus. Upon his own death in 309, Pamphilus did the same with the church historian, Eusebius. With his charge from Constantine to produce fifty new Bibles, Eusebius would have naturally directed his scribes to employ the readings of Origen as their exemplar. See *Origen*.

Pantaenus (d. 190) — The first supposedly Christian headmaster of Alexandria's catechetical school of theology and philosophy, referred to by Clement as "the deepest Gnostic."

Philo (20 B.C.-A.D. 50) — Apostate Jewish intellectual who founded Alexandria's infamous catechetical school of science, theology, and philosophy. He is also credited with pioneering the allegorical mode of hermeneutics.

Plato (c. 428-348) — Pagan Greek philosopher who was revered by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Westcott, and Hort.

Pusey, Edward Bouverie (1800-1882) — Apostate leader of the pro-Vatican Oxford Movement; he exerted considerable influence over Westcott.

Rainolds, John (1549-1607) — Leader of the four-man Puritan delegation, at Hampton Court, who specifically asked King James for a new English Bible. On the translation committee, he died before the project was completed.

Rogers, John (1500-1555) — Tyndale's faithful assistant who incorporated his master's "dungeon works" of Joshua through 2 Chronicles (translated while in prison) into his own translation under the pseudonym of Thomas Matthew. Rogers was the first of Bloody Mary's victims, being burned at the stake in the presence of his wife and eleven children.

Schaff, Philip (1819-1893) — Ecumenical church historian and professor at the apostate Union Theological Seminary, selected by the

English Revision Committee to chair their American advisory board.

Scofield, Cyrus Ingerson (1843-1921) — Civil War veteran and accomplished attorney led to Christ by Y.M.C.A. soul winner, Thomas McPheeters. With the financial backing of John T. Pirie, Scofield published his famous reference Bible in 1909, which is heavily slanted toward wrong doctrines. The New Scofield Reference Bible, released in 1967 while claiming to be based on the Majority Text, was translated from the Nestle-Aland Text.

Scrivener, Prebendary Frederick H.A. (1813-1891) — Conservative Anglican scholar who continually opposed Hort throughout the decade of work done by the Revision Committee of 1871-1881, in preparation for the English Revised Version. Scrivener, an earnest Greek scholar, believed only the Textus Receptus readings should be used. His literary works include *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament for the Use of the Biblical Student* and *The Authorized Edition of the Bible (1611): Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*. Also see “Burgon.”

Semler, Johann Salomo (1725-1791) — One of the earliest of the German theologians to apply the liberal critico-historical method of “scientific” Bible study to Scripture.

Sepúlveda (16th century) — Catholic scholar cited by Tregelles for his correspondence with Erasmus over the purported merits of Codex Vaticanus. Erasmus rejected the counsel and only used the Majority Text, in the preparation of His Greek Text.

Simon, Priest Richard (1638-1712) — Catholic priest credited with being the founder of Old Testament criticism. Simon rejected the traditional Mosaic authorship of Genesis through Deuteronomy.

Smith, Miles (1554-1624) — King James translator who was selected to be on the final review board. He was appointed to write the new Bible’s preface, entitled *The Translators to the Reader*.

Smith, Vance (19th century) — Pastor of St. Saviour’s Gate Unitarian Church. His participation in the Revision Committee of 1871-1881 evoked bitter controversy, especially with regard to the role he played in removing the word,

God, from 1 Timothy 3:16. This apostate worked closely with Westcott and Hort, in controlling the translation of the *English Revised Version*.

Stanley, Dean Arthur Penrhyn (1815-1881) — Ecumenical Dean of Westminster who created a stir by inviting the Unitarian Vance Smith to the Revision Committee Communion service of 1871. He also made an unsuccessful bid to convert the Abbey into a national shrine for all faiths. As early as 1848, Westcott wrote admiringly of him.

Stephenus, Robert (1503-1559) — Also known as Robert Estienne or Robert Stephen. French scholar and printer who, after the death of Erasmus, published four editions of the Greek New Testament in 1546, 1549, 1550, and 1551.

Tertullian (160-225) — Ante-Nicene “father” whose treatise *On Persecution Against Heretics* (A.D. 208) makes reference to the Apostles’ autographs (original writings) as being extant in his day.

Tischendorf, Count Constantin (1815-1874) — German textual critic who discovered the Codex Sinaiticus at St. Catherine’s Monastery in 1844.

Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux (1813-1875) — English scholar who spent forty-two hours examining the Codex Vaticanus. His own Greek New Testament, published in 1870, was decidedly *anti-Receptus*.

Tyndale, William (1494-1536) — British scholar who had a fabulous grasp of foreign languages and gave his beloved countrymen their first printed English New Testament in 1525. Betrayed by a Catholic agent, named Henry Phillips, Tyndale was thrown into a dungeon and was strangled and burned at Vilvorde, Belgium. His last words were the prayer, “Open the King of England’s eyes.” With 90 percent of the Tyndale New Testament preserved in our Authorized Version, the pioneer translator has been duly honored as the “Father of the English Bible.” As this book will reveal, Tyndale was the most important English translator in all history!

Westcott, Brooke Foss (1825-1901) — Liberal Anglican scholar who conspired with Fenton Hort from 1853-1871, to produce a radical Greek New Testament that is primarily based on the Codex Vaticanus. Their corrupt Greek

2 2 The King James and the Modern Versions

Text was used by the English Revision Committee of 1871-1881; this produced the English Revised Version New Testament of 1881.

Wiseman, Cardinal Nicholas Patrick Stephen (1802-1865) — Rector of the Vatican's English College at Rome from 1828-1840. He returned to England, to become Archbishop of Westminster and a cardinal in 1850. Among the hundreds of English Protestants who were secretly weaned back to Catholicism by this persuasive papist were Prime Minister William

Gladstone, Archbishop Richard Chevenix Trench, and John Henry Newman.

Wycliffe, John (1330-1384) — English Patriot and Reformer, known as “The Morning Star of the Reformation” for producing the first entire Bible in English (although translated from the Latin Vulgate, since he had no other sources to work from). The one-hour rental fee for a hand-copied Wycliffe Bible was an entire load of hay. Despised by the Pope, Wycliffe's body was eventually unearthed and burned.

“For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.”

—*Romans 15:4*

“Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.”

—*Psalms 119:105*

“And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself.”

—*Luke 24:27*

“Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth.”

—*John 17:17*

The Attack Intensifies

19th-Century Efforts to Destroy the Bible

INTRODUCTION

The 19th century was considered very important by Satan. The impending climax of the great controversy in our world, watched as it is by unfallen beings throughout the universe, was about to begin. Knowing this, Satan aroused his angels to still more feverish activity—to destroy the basis of the Christian's faith, the holy Bible.

“Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! For the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.”—*Revelation 12:12*.

As the century opened, he and his demons knew that the prophecy of *Daniel 8:14* was slated for its final fulfillment within less than half a century.

Another prophecy, *Revelation 11:19*, clearly stated that, within a few years, the Ten Commandments would once again be discovered.

Revelation 14:6-12 disclosed that a worldwide movement was soon to start, which would proclaim the special truth about obedience by faith in Christ to the law of God.

The concluding verse of *Revelation 12* clearly stated that, in the final years before Christ's return, there would be a small group which fearlessly chose to obey God's commandments—in spite of heavy persecution.

Desperate to ward off these closing events of human history and, hopefully, to quench them entirely, Satan began turning loose on the world a flood of error, apostasy, and perversion.

Here are a few of these things; each one either began or alarmed a resurgent attack on the Bible in the 19th century:

- German higher criticism, a basic attack on the integrity of the Bible.
- British textual criticism, a focused attack

on the text, especially of the New Testament.

- Modern Bible versions, based on a few low-quality—and even corrupt—Bible manuscripts.

All of the above constituted a direct attack on the Bible. This present book will concern itself with each of the above three items.

Yet, before doing so, let us briefly list some other aspects of the satanic onslaught which exploded in the 19th century:

- Charles Darwin's theory of evolution, although extremely defective from a scientific standpoint, was overwhelmingly received by atheists and skeptics worldwide.

- Atheistic totalitarianism, masking as communism, was let loose by Karl Marx and his associates.

- False religions and prophets began evangelizing the Western nations. Satan knew, in advance, that the Spirit of Prophecy would be revived. So Mormonism, Christian Science, and the Watchtower Society, plus many other strange cults, were initiated.

- The theories of sociology and progressive education were founded; both of these had a devastating effect on our world.

- Sigmund Freud's theories and modern so-called psychology were slated to affect great damage on people.

- Modern spiritualism experienced a powerful revival and continues today in old forms with new names.

- A dramatic increase in modern armaments and methods of warfare took place.

Every one of the above seven things began within decades of 1844, but more was to come. As the 20th century unrolled before our eyes, the overwhelming intensity of what has developed—clearly showed that Satan was determined to introduce every possible form of delusion in order to so corrupt the planet, its books,

24 The King James and the Modern Versions

entertainment, morals—and even the atmosphere and soil—that few would be able to withstand the devastating effects.

Here is a list of but a few things which have exploded onto the stage of action within just the last half of the 20th century:

- Entertainment craze
- Abortion
- Euthanasia
- Gambling
- Major crime
- City riots
- Organized street gangs
- Terrorism
- Pornography
- Skeptical and agnostic philosophies
- Poisonous chemicals
- Narcotics
- Gigantic corporations
- Bribery of public officials
- Corrupt courts
- Mass migrations
- Extermination of large populations
- Heavy persecution of Christians
- Overpopulation crisis
- New forms of disease
- Upsurge of old diseases
- Sports craze
- Massive enlargement of cities
- People locked into those cities
- Dangerous technologies
- Weapons able to destroy all life
- Destruction of animals
- Deforestation of trees
- Elimination of the old-fashioned family
- Invasion of Eastern spiritualism
- Poisoning of wells and groundwater
- Pollution of the air we breathe
- Major overextension of credit
- Immense financial panics

If Christ does not return soon, there will be few to return for! We truly are nearing the end.

In this present study, we will only consider the attack on the Bible. First, we will briefly overview German higher criticism; and then, in far greater depth, we will view the effort to eradicate that most accurate and reliable English Bible translation ever produced: The King James Version (also known as the Authorized Version).

CONTINENTAL HIGHER CRITICISM

Higher criticism consists of vicious speculative theories by liberals, in an attempt to undermine the authorship of Scripture.

Modern theology was seriously affected by the so-called *Enlightenment* and its aftereffects, which declared that man and human reason were more important than God and divine revelation.

18th-century philosophers and theologians, especially in Germany and France, carried that concept further. **Immanuel Kant** stressed the importance of reason and the rejection of everything else. **Friedrich Schleiermacher** rejected creeds and doctrines, declaring that all that mattered in religion was feeling. **Georg Hegel** saw religion as a constant evolution with the synthesizing of two opposing views. These three men deeply affected later theological thought, down to our own time.

Every theology student today who is trained in outside universities is subjected to this kind of thinking. Few graduate from those worldly institutions who do not accept it.

In Old Testament criticism, the concept of *documentary hypothesis* won the thinking of the liberals. Regarding the Pentateuch, it taught that the first five books of the Bible were a compilation of different documents, written over a span of five centuries by various authors. And Moses was not one of them.

Jean Astruc (1684-1766) started it off by suggesting that Moses copied from two different documents. His idea became the foundation of documentary hypothesis. **Johann Eichhorn** (1752-1827) expanded the concept by dividing up Genesis and part of Exodus. **Wilhelm DeWette** (1780-1849) applied it to Deuteronomy. Others made further atheistic contributions; and, then, **Julius Wellhausen** (1844-1918) put it all together in a unified theory of multiple authors of the Pentateuch, over several centuries.

This higher-critical approach did much to destroy the historically held views concerning the authorship of the Biblical books. The way was prepared for dissecting all the books of the Bible and generally assigning late dates to their writings. In the New Testament, for example, Paul was rejected as the author of anything.

Closer to our own time, **Rudolf Bultmann** (1884-1976) developed a radical criticism of the Biblical text, known as *form criticism*. This was

an attempt to discover the literary forms and sources used by the writer of each book. He concluded that the Gospel records are nothing more than a collection of myths “which portrayed truths about man’s existence rather than telling about actual historical events.” In order to understand the New Testament, according to Bultmann, it is necessary to *demythologize* them.

BRITISH TEXTUAL CRITICISM

As we have observed, continental (German and French) higher criticism was primarily concerned with destroying the value of the content of the Bible.

In Britain, a different approach was taken by men who also chose to think themselves smarter than God’s Word. They set to work to switch manuscript sources for the Bible. This is called *textual criticism*.

It is of interest that Richard Simon (1638-1712), a Roman Catholic priest, was the first to delve into Biblical criticism.

“A French priest, Richard Simon (1638-1712), was the first who subjected the general questions concerning the Bible to a treatment which was at once comprehensive in scope and scientific in method. Simon is the forerunner of modern Biblical criticism.”—*Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 4, p. 492.*

“Biblical scholar. From 1662 to 1678, he was a member of the French Oratory. His *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (1678), arguing from the existence of duplicate accounts of the same incident and variations of style, denied that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. He is generally regarded as the founder of Old Testament criticism.”—*Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 476.*

The Jesuits believed that they could use textual criticism to help them win Protestants back to the fold, by replacing the King James Bible. During the Oxford Movement, they had their opportunity to lay the groundwork in England.

The beginnings of the revision of the King James Version occurred at Oxford University during that period, known as the *Oxford Movement*, which began in 1833. This was a direct attempt to infiltrate Catholicism into the minds of the intellectual leaders of England.

In order to better understand what we are discussing, a brief overview of the Oxford Movement is in order:

“Despite all the persecution they [the Jesuits] have met with, they have not abandoned England, where there are a greater number of Jesuits than in Italy; there are Jesuits in all classes of society; in parliament, among the English clergy; among the Protestant laity, even in the higher stations.

“I could not comprehend how a Jesuit could be a Protestant priest or how a Protestant priest could be a Jesuit; but my [Catholic] Confessor silenced my scruples by telling me, *omnia munda mundis* [when in the world, be of the world], and that St. Paul became as a Jew that he might save the Jews. It was no wonder, therefore, if a Jesuit should feign himself a Protestant, for the conversion of Protestants.”—*Dr. Desanctis, Popery and Jesuitism in Rome, pp. 128, quoted in Walsh, Secret History of the Oxford Movement, p. 33.*

Desanctis was for many years a priest, working in the Vatican, who renounced Catholicism and became a Protestant.

The Protestant historian, Froude, wrote this about what he was taught while attending Oxford University in those days:

“In my first term at the University, the controversial fires were beginning to blaze . . . I had learnt, like other Protestant children, that the Pope was the Antichrist, and that Gregory VII had been a special revelation of that being.

“[But] I was now taught [at Oxford] that Gregory VII was a saint. I had been told to abhor the Reformers. The Reformation became a great schism. Cranmer a traitor and Latimer a vulgar ranter. Milton was a name of horror.”—*J.A. Froude, Short Studies on Great Subjects, pp. 161, 167.*

Rome had been trying to win over England for centuries; and, in doing so, she was only continuing a penetration—and using methods—which she had been using elsewhere for hundreds of years.

“Whoever, therefore, desires to get really to the bottom of what is commonly called the Catholic revival in England is involved in a deep and far-reaching study of events, a study which includes not merely events of ecclesiastical history—some of which must be traced back to sources in the dawn of the Middle Ages.”—*F.C. Kempson, The Church in Modern England, p. 59.*

Does all this sound a little creepy to you? It should. Exactly the same procedure is now occurring within the Seventh-day Adventist denomination! No one seems to be in charge; everyone does what he wants; and, as long

as leadership in the church is not opposed, the colleges and universities are free to change the thinking of the denomination! And, if time lasts, within a few decades they will be able to do it, since they train the future leaders of the church.

In order to grasp the immensity of what was happening in mid-19th century England, the reader needs to understand that, by the early part of that century, the center of the Church of England was Oxford University. Half of the young clergymen of the nation were instructed in this institution. Catholics on the continent also recognized that it was the heart of the Anglican Church.

In 1832, **John Henry Newman** (1801-1890), vicar of St. Mary's at Oxford, went to southern Europe, accompanied by Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-1836), another secret Catholic. While there, Newman sought an interview with Cardinal Wiseman, who was later to have a telling influence on the 1871-1881 revision of the King James Bible and the romanizing of the English Church.

It is known that, with Froude by his side, Newman asked Wiseman what it would take to return England to the Roman faith. The answer to the two Oxford professors was this: The Church of England must accept the Council of Trent. **Newman's future was now clear to him. He immediately left the city of Rome, declaring, "I have a work to do in England."** (It was on the return voyage that he wrote the words for the hymn we so often sing, "Lead kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom." He felt God was leading him out of Protestantism, back to the Mother Church.)

Upon his return to England, on July 9, 1833, the Oxford Movement began. He organized secret Catholics (including Jesuit agents planted in the church and university) into a working whole. They were quietly taking orders from the Vatican. In 1841, he wrote this to a Roman Catholic:

"Only through the English Church can you act upon the English nation."—*J.H. Newman, Apologia Pro Vita Sue, p. 225 [published years later when he openly renounced Protestantism and became a Catholic cardinal].*

Newman was able to accomplish so much, so rapidly—because he and his associates had gained control of the teaching faculty at Oxford University! This is the reason why

the liberals in our own denomination have been able to make such rapid inroads! The Theological Seminary at Andrews University has been almost entirely composed of new theology liberals since 1980. Most of our other colleges and universities in North America have, since the early 1980s, swung into the orbit.

These pro-Catholics at Oxford came to be known as "*tractarians*, because of the many small leaflets and tracts they published. These were called *Tracts for the Times*, and were written between 1833 and 1841. Newman wrote 24 of them. Each paper said it was written "against Popery and Dissent"; yet, without exception, these little sheets explained why Britains needed to return to Rome. —And neither university officials nor the British government moved a finger to shut this down!

One might wonder how these men could so lie through their teeth. But the answer is simple enough. They were using the Jesuitic method adapted by Ignatius Loyola from an earlier baptized pagan, Clement of Alexandria (about A.D. 200). The device is known as *mental reservation* and was used in these tracts.

Clement wrote this:

"He [the Christian] both thinks and speaks the truth; except when consideration is necessary, and then, as a physician for the good of his patient, he will be false, or utter a falsehood. . . He gives himself up for the church."—*Clement of Alexandria, quoted in Newman's Arians, p. 81.*

The son of Mr. Ward, another prominent leader in the movement, later made this comment about the activities of those men:

"Make yourself clear that you are justified in deception and then lie like a trooper."—*Newman's letters, Vol. 2, p. 249.*

It was for such reasons that Newman and his associates would, at times, vigorously attack Rome. This relaxed their critics, so the work of changing the beliefs of the students and the English people who read the publications could continue.

Nearly a hundred of these tracts were published. In *Tract 90* (published in 1841), Newman declared that the principles of Roman Catholicism could be taught in the Church of England under the Thirty-Nine Articles. Release of that tract created a terrific stir in the nation. By 1845, it was obvious that Newman had accomplished all he could secretly, so he then openly left the Church of England. Pope Leo XIII later made

him a cardinal.

“One of the better-known Jesuit plants of this period was Cardinal John Henry Newman (1801-1890). His followers such as Frederick William Faber (1814-1863) had labeled the preaching of fellow Englishmen like Booth, Whitefield, and Wesley as ‘detestable and diabolical heresy.’ Of course, their influence had also spread to English politics. The Emancipation Act of 1829 made it legal for Roman Catholics to become elected to parliament. After years of spreading pro-Vatican propaganda within the Church of England, the Oxford professor [Newman] finally ‘jumped ship’ and returned to Rome where he was given a cardinal’s hat in 1879. Part of the story is that within one year of his exodus, over 150 clergy and laymen also crossed over to join him.”—*W.P. Grady, Final Authority, p. 210.*

From the beginning, Newman saw the value of using the university, where the clergy were trained for service, as the basis of his attempted takeover of the denomination.

Newman had claimed that the foundation creed of the Anglican Church, the Thirty-Nine Articles, was essentially like the decrees of the Council of Trent. The two great obstacles which stood in the way of Catholicism’s invading the mental defenses of English Protestantism were these: The Thirty-Nine Articles and the King James Version of the Bible.

He also wrote that the King James Bible was a spurious text, devoid of divine authority. He contrasted it with the Catholic Vulgate which, he declared, was “a true comment on the original text.”

Something still had to be done to undercut the influence of that holy book. **The King James Bible was scornfully referred to by the Catholics as the “Protestant’s paper pope.” The Jesuits well-knew that it was that book which was the center of the strength and religious life of the British people.**

Nicholas Patrick Stephen Wiseman (1802-1865) was the other leader in the Catholic penetration of England. In 1850, the pope made a cardinal of Bishop Wiseman, and appointed him Archbishop of Westminster. Wiseman soon established a chain of twelve Catholic bishoprics throughout England, from which papal teachings could be spread among the people.

“The Catholic most responsible for directing Protestant aggression against the Autho-

rized Version was Cardinal Nicholas Patrick Stephen Wiseman (1802-1865). While rector of the English College at Rome, he studied under Cardinal Angelo Mai (1782-1854), prefect of the Vatican library and celebrated editor of the Codex Vaticanus.”—*W.P. Grady, Final Authority, p. 211.*

Wiseman was responsible for the conversion of hundreds of English Protestants, including Prime Minister William Gladstone (1809-1898), Archbishop Richard Chenevix Trench (1807-1886), and John Newman (1801-1890). Trench and Newman worked closely with him in devising ways to replace the King James Bible with something they considered more appropriate.

By this time, German *higher criticism* was beginning to invade England, and many Anglican clergymen were being attracted to it. This only added to the confusion and disintegration of spirituality in the nation.

There were four key resolutions, adopted at the Council of Trent, which focused on papal authority as above that of Holy Scripture. They are important:

- 1 - Papal tradition is on a level with Scripture.
- 2 - The Apocryphal books are equal to the canonical ones.
- 3 - Jerome’s Latin Vulgate Bible contains no errors.
- 4 - Only the Roman Catholic clergy have the right to interpret the Scriptures.

Thanks to the effects of the Oxford Movement, a process was set in motion which, in the 20th century, has resulted in the elevation of textual critics and modern critical Greek Texts above that of the King James Bible, the crowning achievement (in English) of the Majority Greek Text which God protected down through the centuries.

Just as Cardinals Newman and Wiseman (both ex-Anglican priests) laid the groundwork in Oxford for the British takeover, so there were two other men who provided the theory which was used to downgrade the King James Version in the eyes of the public.

WESTCOTT AND HORT

Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892) were the men who devised the basis for the 20th-century attempt to replace the King James

Bible with inferior translations.

The average believer who uses an English translation of the Bible, different than the King James, does not realize the beliefs of the men who provided the Greek Text for those modern Bibles.

In order to better understand the objectives of these two men who are said to have "laid the basis for modern Biblical knowledge"—we need to understand their personal beliefs.

We find much information in two books: *The Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, Vols. 1-2*, by his son Arthur Westcott (1903), and *The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, Vols. 1-2*, by his son Arthur Fenton Hort (1896).

It is significant that the name, "Jesus," was used only nine times in the 1,800 pages of these two books. Westcott and Hort had a secret love for Catholicism and even paganism, but they had little patience for Christianity.

At the age of 22, Westcott revealed his doubts on the Inspiration of Scripture. He wanted to have a part in changing the situation in England for something he thought was better. In a letter to his fiancée, dated Advent Sunday, 1847, he wrote:

"The battle for the inspiration of Scripture has yet to be fought, and how earnestly I pray that I might aid the truth in that."—*Life of Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 95.*

That same year, he wrote from France to his fiancée about his fascination for the Catholic doctrine of Mariolatry (Mary worship). In the letter, he said that he loved to kneel before an image of Mary.

"I could have knelt there for hours."—*Op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 81.*

Later he wrote:

"I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry bears witness."—*Op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 251.*

Westcott and Hort worked well together, for they had so many interests in common. **Hort was also a secret Mary worshiper.**

"I have been persuaded for many years that Mary worship and 'Jesus' worship have very much in common in their causes and results."—*Life of Hort, Vol. 2, p. 49.*

Hort wished he could have been a Catholic priest. In a letter to Dr. Lightfoot, a member of the Revised Version Committee who believed the same as Hort, he wrote:

"But you know I am a staunch sacerdotalist."—*Op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 86.* [*"Sacerdotalism" refers to the performing of the Catholic ceremonies.*]

Frederick Maurice was a close friend of Hort's, who Hort said "deeply influenced me" (*ibid., p. 155*). Maurice was a dedicated Unitarian minister who had been discharged from King's College because of his atheistic teachings, yet was appointed to the Revised Version Committee through Hort's influence.

Hort wrote to a friend in 1864:

"Christianity with a substantial church is vanity and disillusion. I remember shocking you and Lightfoot not so long ago by expressing a belief that 'Protestantism' is only parenthetical and temporary."—*Op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 30.*

Hort believed that many of the things in the Bible were myths.

"I am inclined to think that no such state as 'Eden' (I mean the popular notion) ever existed, and that Adam's fall in no degree differed from the fall of each of his descendants."—*Op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 78.*

Westcott fully agreed.

"No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history."—*Life of Westcott, Vol. 2, p. 69.*

Although both men were salaried by the Anglican Church, Hort wrote this:

"With that world Anglicanism, though by no means without a sound standing, seems a poor and maimed thing besides the great Rome."—*Life of Hort, Vol. 2, p. 30.*

Here are a few additional quotations by, or about, Westcott:

"He took a strange interest . . . not very long after that time, especially in Mormonism . . . I recollect his procuring and studying the Book of Mormon about 1840."—*Comment by Arthur Westcott, in Life and Letters of John Westcott, pp. 19-20.*

"Oh, the weakness of my faith compared with that of others! So wild, so skeptical am I. I cannot yield."—*Op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 52 (August 31, 1847).*

"I dare not communicate to you my own wild doubts at times . . . which I should tempt no one to share."—*Op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 94 (November 11, 1847).*

"I cannot help asking what I am? Can I claim the name of a believer?"—*Op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 92 (November 7, 1847).*

"What a wild storm of unbelief seems to have seized my whole system."—*Op. cit., Vol. 1, p.*

111 (May 13, 1849).

Over a period of time, the present writer has discovered that a number of founders of new, devilish organizations were receiving communications with demons!

The founder of Jesuitism, **Ignatius Loyola**, regularly held séances with a spirit which would come to him in the woods, in the form of a being clothed in shining light and speak to him as he worked on his rule books for the Society of Jesus.

The founder of Mormonism, **Joseph Smith**, also held regular communication with a demon presence who spoke to him.

The founder of the Jehovah's Witnesses, **C.T. Russell**, was guided by spiritualist séances in the development of his teachings.

We know that **Sigmund Freud** held regular contact with spirits.

We know that **Adolf Hitler** was personally guided by demons.

It is very likely that Charles Darwin was also, but I found no definite information on that.

All of those men started major new organizations which had an important influence on the lives of many in our century.

You will recall that **Buddha** is supposed to have received enlightenment—guidance—as he sat under a tree one day. Buddhism was the result.

It is a known fact that **Muhammad** regularly consulted with a special demon who guided him in his writing of the *Koran*.

In the process of devising their Bible-shattering theory, both Westcott and Hort (both of whom were Cambridge professors) also dabbled in the occult!

I would not want anything to do with a theory which demons helped develop! Would you? Yet the theory which modern Bible translations are founded on was developed by those two men. Here is the story. The sons of the two men documented it well.

In the year 1851, Dr. Hort founded a society for the investigation and classification of ghosts and psychic phenomena. Westcott's own son described such practices as "spiritualism" (op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 119).

Westcott and Hort called their club, which had a number of members, the *Ghostly Guild*. They continued its weekly meetings for decades and were receiving guidance throughout the 1871-1881 Revision Committee.

In one issue of their publication, the *Ghostly Circular*, Westcott wrote about the wonderful knowledge which could be gained by contact with spirits:

"The interest and importance of a serious and earnest inquiry into the nature of the phenomena which are vaguely called 'supernatural' will scarcely be questioned. Many persons believe that all such apparently mysterious occurrences are due either to purely natural causes, or to delusions of the mind or senses, or to willful deception. But there are many others who believe it possible that the beings of the unseen world may manifest themselves to us in extraordinary ways, and also are unable otherwise to explain many facts the evidence for which cannot [be] impeached . . . [by such contacts]. Some progress would be made towards ascertaining the laws which regulate our being, and thus adding to our scanty knowledge of an obscure but important province of science."—*Op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 118.

Westcott wrote as one who had been successfully making frequent contacts with the spirit world. What were the demons teaching him? We will learn that Westcott and Hort were taught what was needed to be done to change 20th-century Bible translations! They had master instructors to guide them.

"The very name of witchcraft is now held in contempt. The claim that men can hold intercourse with evil spirits is regarded as a fable of the Dark Ages. But spiritualism, which numbers its converts by hundreds of thousands, yea, by millions, which has made its way into scientific circles, which has invaded churches and has found favor in legislative bodies, and even in the courts of kings—this mammoth deception is but a revival in a new disguise of the witchcraft condemned and prohibited of old.

"Satan beguiles men now, as he beguiled Eve in Eden, by exciting a desire to obtain forbidden knowledge. 'Ye shall be as gods,' he declares, 'knowing good and evil.' Gen. 3:5. But the wisdom which spiritualism imparts is that described by the apostle James, which 'descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish.' James 3:15.

"The prince of darkness has a masterly mind, and he skillfully adapts his temptations to men of every variety of condition and culture. He works 'with all deceivableness of unrighteousness' to gain control of the children of men, but he can accomplish his object only as they voluntarily yield to his temptations. Those who place themselves in his power by indulging their evil traits of character, little realize where their

course will end. The tempter accomplishes their ruin, and then employs them to ruin others.”—*Story of Redemption*, pp. 395-396.

Hort “came under the spell of Coleridge,” the poet and opium addict who worked to bring a wider knowledge of German higher criticism to England.

Hort also read avidly in the writings of John Keble, the Oxford professor who Newman later said was “the true and primary author of the Oxford Movement” (*Lee and Stephen, National Biography, Vol. 10, p. 1180*).

In addition, **Westcott liked to study ancient pagan writers.**

“I can never look back on my Cambridge life with sufficient thankfulness. Above all, those hours which were spent over Plato and Aristotle have wrought in me which I pray may never be done away.”—*Life and Letters of Westcott, Vol. 1, pp. 175-176*.

Hort highly valued what he learned from ancient pagans. In one letter, he mentioned that it was his atheist friend, Maurice, who urged him in that direction.

“He urged me to give the grandest attention to Plato and Aristotle, and to make them the central points of my reading, and other books subsidiary.”—*Life and Letters of Hort, Vol. 2, p. 202*.

In 1865, only five years before he began work as a member of the Revised Version committee, **Westcott visited the Shrine of the Virgin Mary at LaSalette, France.** LaSalette was one of the more famous shrines of France, where the Catholics claim that the Virgin Mary works miracles. Westcott wrote that a miracle took place while he was there.

“An age of faith was restored before our sight in its ancient guise . . . In this lay the real significance and power of the place.”—*Life and Letters of Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 254*.

When he wrote up a paper which he wanted to publish on the thrilling experience he had observed at the feet of Mary, **Dr. Lightfoot persuaded him not to release it, because it would hinder Westcott’s efforts to ultimately use their critical Greek Text to change the Bible.** Lightfoot was far more influential in the Anglican Church than either Westcott and Hort, and it was he who got them into the committee and helped get the others to vote in favor of their daily textual recommendations.

In July 1970, Pope Leo XIII declared himself infallible! This shocked many people through-

out the world, but not Hort. He wrote his daughter, that **he was so thankful that his mother had sent him a photograph of the pope to place on his wall and treasure** (*Life and Letters of Hort, Vol. 2, p. 227*)!

Six weeks after Hort hung the picture on his wall, Leo XIII issued his encyclical, *Inscrutabili*, in which he declared:

“The Church . . . is in very truth the glory of the Supreme Pontiffs that they steadfastly set themselves as a wall and bulwark to save human society from falling back into its former superstition and barbarism.”—*Leo XIII, quoted in Avro Manhattan, The Vatican-Moscow Alliance, p. 67*.

Ten years later, **Hort sent a letter from Rome and excitedly told his daughter that he had purchased a ticket to take part in a Pontifical Mass; he hoped to be able to kiss the pope’s foot** (*Life and Letters of Hort, Vol. 2, p. 393*).

Hort wrote to Lightfoot in 1880, that **he utterly rejected the infallibility of Scripture. He considered the Bible to be just another book, less interesting than Plato.**

“The more I learn, the more I am convinced that fresh doubts come from my own ignorance, and that at present I find the presumption in favour of the absolute truth—I reject the word *infallibility*—of the Holy Scripture overwhelmingly.”—*Op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 420*.

Anything savoring of unbelief caught their attention.

“Have you read Darwin? I should like a talk with you about it! In spite of difficulties, I am inclined to think it unanswerable. In any case it is a treat to read such a book.”—*Op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 414*.

Hort did not believe in the existence of Satan or the atonement (*op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 120*). He believed that a person could repent of sin after he died (*op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 275*) and that there was a purgatory (*op. cit., Vol. 2, 336*).

Westcott believed he could efficaciously pray for the dead (*Life and Letters of Westcott, Vol. 2, p. 349*).

Neither one liked to preach from the pulpit, for they really had little interest in Christianity. A personal experience with Christ was something neither ever had.

Unbelief, spiritualism, Catholicism, higher criticism, and pagan lore were the deep loves of Westcott and Hort. And his satanic highness used them both as polished instruments

to tear down confidence in the King James Bible and the manuscripts on which it was based.

It is important that we spend time on the above, discovering the beliefs of those two men—for much that followed in 20th-century Protestant Bible history has been based on a theory they devised.

Prior to Westcott and Hort, all translations of the Bible had been made from the Majority Text (the Received Text, or Textus Receptus, family of manuscripts). Because of their influence, all translations since then (from 1881 onward) have been based on the Sinaiticus / Vaticanus family.

Their theory is essentially this: The very small

Sinaiticus / Vaticanus manuscript family should be preferred in all instances in which it conflicts with the very large Majority Text family. **It is said that the Sinaiticus / Vaticanus family was written before the others; therefore it is more accurate.**

But we will find that this is not true.

In this book, we are going to learn that the Sinaiticus / Vaticanus family is not earlier; and, because that family is smaller, its excessive, mutually exclusive variants are not as trustworthy.

In order to properly understand the Westcott-Hort theory, we need to go back to the first centuries after Christ's time, when the early manuscripts were produced.

Hort himself grudgingly conceded, "A theoretical presumption indeed remains that a majority of extant documents is more likely to represent a majority of ancestral documents at each stage of transmission than vice versa."

—*B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort,*
The New Testament in the Original Greek,
Vol. 2, p. 45

The Early Centuries

The Best Manuscripts Support the KJV

THE WARNING WAS GIVEN

The Apostle Paul warned the early church against heresy—and it was quick to assert itself. In an effort to destroy the young church, Satan caused men to arise with every kind of error.

Paul declared that there would come “a falling away” (2 Thessalonians 2:3) and that “the mystery of iniquity doth already work” (verse 7). He warned the Thessalonians not to be soon shaken or troubled in spirit “by letter as from us” (2 Thessalonians 2:2).

Later, on his last journey to Jerusalem, he warned the men from Ephesus:

“Of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.”—*Acts 20:30-31*).

From prison, he wrote Timothy:

“Keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so-called.”—*1 Timothy 6:20*).

The Greek word, in that verse, which is translated “science” is *gnosis*. *Gnosis* means “knowledge.” **The apostle was condemning the false knowledge and theories which were already beginning to arise.**

“The later Gnostics were bolder, but more consistent innovators on the simple scheme of Christianity . . . In all the great cities of the East in which Christianity had established its most flourishing communities, sprang up this revival which aspired to a still higher degree of knowledge than was revealed in the Gospel, and boasted that it soared almost as much above the vulgar Christianity as it did above the vulgar paganism.”—*Henry H. Milman, History of Christianity, Vol. 2, p. 107*.

There were no Gnostic sects after the 5th century; for, by that time, as with all other pa-

gan and heathen religions, their concepts had been absorbed into the Roman system. —That is why Scripture declares it to be “Babylon”! It is a confusing hodgepodge of pagan error.

Yet, even though gnosticism and the Mystery Religions had penetrated the Catholic system, God preserved the Bible manuscripts—so that the errors had not filtered into, what came to be known as, the “Majority Text,” the great majority of manuscripts. One reason this is so is because it was faithful Christians who were preparing those Bible copies. The worldlings, modernists, atheists, cultists, and Catholics were not interested in doing this.

We can know that this is true, not because we were there but, because the Bibles translated into English were translated from the Majority Text; they do not have Gnostic, atheistic, or Catholic teachings.

That statement does not include the Catholic Bibles, all of which are based on the Latin Vulgate and do have Catholic concepts interwoven into it. In the course of writing the book, *The Magnificat*, for Roman Catholics, the writer had to read somewhat widely in the Rheims-Douai (Douay), since all Bible quotations had to be from that book or other Vatican-approved books. The Rheims-Douai definitely contains Catholic error. More on this later.

THE EARLY MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE

The earliest copies of Bible portions were either written on papyrus (also called parchment) or on vellum.

Papyrus was made from the inner bark of the reed-like papyrus plant found along river banks and marshes in Italy and elsewhere in the warmer climates. After drying, these strips of bark were laid side by side in a row with a second layer positioned above in a crisscross

34 The King James and the Modern Versions

manner. The two layers were then gummed together, to create a primitive form of paper.

Vellum was the shaved and scraped skins of sheep, goats, and similar animals. It was more durable and costly. Calf and antelope skin was the most expensive. An entire antelope would only provide about two leaves (four pages) of a large Bible manuscript.

In Bible times, these pages were connected into long strips, called **scrolls**. The average papyrus scroll (about the size of the book of Luke) was 10 inches in height and about 30 feet in length.

In the 2nd century, a little after the time of the apostles, **codices** began to be used. These were pages bound on one side, somewhat like our modern books.

There were four types of early copies of New Testament portions: Greek manuscripts, quotations and comments by early Christian writers (called the "early church fathers"), lectionaries, and early translations. Let us consider each of these:

1 - MANUSCRIPTS

These were papyrus or vellum copies of smaller or larger portions of the Bible.

Just as our Bibles wear out from use, so did those of ancient times. Fortunately, we have so many of those old copies, some partly worn out, that we can compare them and tell when copyists' mistakes occurred.

At the present time, there are over 5,000 surviving manuscripts of the Bible! Most are only a portion of it; some were made within a couple centuries after the time of the apostles while most were produced later. We have far more copies of the Bible than of any other ancient writings. **The New Testament manuscripts are in Greek and the Old Testament is in Hebrew.**

Copies of portions of the Bible were made to be read, to be shared with others, to be placed in churches, or sent with missionaries to foreign lands.

There were two types of Greek Bible manuscripts: the uncials and cursive manuscripts.

(1) THE UNCIALS (MAJUSCULES)

The **uncials** (also called **majuscules**) were written on papyrus or vellum about *quarto* (roughly 9 by 11 inches high) or *folio* size (double

that size), usually with two and occasionally three or four columns on each page.

Unlike the later cursive manuscripts, **uncials were written in capital letters without any spaces or punctuation.** Here is an example of an early uncial (*John 1:1-4*):

INTHEBEGINNINGWASTHEWORDANDTHE
WORDWASWITHGDANDTHEWORDWASGD
THESAMEWASINTHEBEGINNINGWITH
GDALLTHINGSWEREMADEBYHIM
ANDWITHOUTHIMWASNOTANYTHING
MADETHATWASMADEINHIMWASLIFE
ANDTHELIFEWASTHELIGHTOFMEN

The wording, of course, was in Greek not English.

There was a horizontal line just above the word, "GD" ("God"; in the Greek, "THS" for "Theos"). Certain words, known as the *nomina sacra* (sacred names), were abbreviated and a small line was placed over the letters. One of these was the word, "God." In the above uncial, it would be written "GD" and have a small horizontal line just above the GD.

(2) THE CURSIVES (MINUSCULES)

The second type of Greek manuscripts were the **cursives**, also known as **minuscules**. These were written in a lower-case running hand and look like the Greek letters in all printed New Testament Greek Texts, since the time of Erasmus in the 16th century.

(3) THE POPYRI

The **popyri** were portions of the New Testament which were written on paper (**papyrus**). We can also find it in Egypt, since it has a climate dry enough to preserve this ancient paper.

2 - QUOTATIONS FROM THE "FATHERS"

The earliest Christian writers (the early **"fathers"**) quoted extensively from the Bible. This is fortunate; for their statements help us determine the original wording of the Bible. It has been said that most of the New Testament, alone, is found in the writings of these so-called church **"fathers!"** And many of them pre-date the Sinaitic and Vaticanus by many years.

3 - LECTONARIES

These are also important witnesses to the

36 The King James and the Modern Versions

original text of the Bible. Of the more than 5,000 extant manuscripts, 2,143 are *lectionaries*.

A compilation of many important portions of the Bible, the lectionary was important in each local church for use in public readings during church services. The ones containing a daily selection were called *Synaxarion* while those used for special days (such as Easter and Christmas) were named *Menologion*.

4 - TRANSLATIONS

The missionary-minded believers were anxious to carry the message of salvation in Christ to all the world. To do so required translations of the Bible into other languages. A number of such translations were made. These translations also help us know the meaning of the original text of the Bible. We will later discuss a number of those early Bible translations.

All of the above four types of early manuscript evidence are very important in establishing the basic Bible Text we should use today! Modern Bible translations are based on the wrong one.

Later in this study, we shall return to this evidence—and show how it supports the type of text which forms the basis of the King James Bible.

THE WESTCOTT-HORT THEORY

Westcott and Hort conjectured that, of the 5,000 Bible manuscripts, only two should be given the preference: the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus! They said these were older and therefore more reliable than any of the others. It was assumed that, since it was conjectured that they were without error, all variations in the other 5,000 manuscripts must be copyist errors of one kind or another.

That is the basic theory. But we are going to learn it is totally wrong in a number of ways.

Let us now examine both of these manuscripts:

THE SINAITICUS

The Codex Sinaiticus is designated by the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, which is **aleph** (א).

(All codices, cursive manuscripts, lectionaries, translations, etc., have scholarly code letters or numbers. But, throughout this present

book, we will generally not use them. When they are used in a quotation, we will follow it in brackets with the name. A major purpose of this book is to simplify the entire subject rather than adding to the confusion.)

In April 1844, a young German scholar, **Constantin von Tischendorf** (1815-1874), sailed to Egypt, in search of Bible manuscripts. He had just completed a two-year study of ancient manuscripts in Paris. In May, he arrived at the Monastery of St. Catharine, at the foot of Mount Sinai. He later wrote:

“In visiting the library of the monastery . . . I perceived in the middle of the great hall a large and wide basket full of old parchments; and the librarian, who was a man of information, told me that the two heaps of papers like these, mouldered by time, had been already committed to the flames.”—*I.M. Price, Ancestry of Our English Bible*

Among these sheets, he saw a number of pages of a very old Greek uncial manuscript of the Bible. The monks, perceiving that these sheets might be important, only let him take a few. Returning to Paris, he published them. They were parts of several Old Testament books.

Tischendorf returned to St. Catherine's in 1853, but only found a fragment with eleven verses of Genesis. Certain that the rest had been destroyed, he left once again.

Yet he could not but wonder if more might be available. So he went to Moscow and personally appealed to the Russian emperor, to provide funds for him to purchase whatever manuscripts he might be able to locate. After some delay, funds were made available for this purpose.

Toward the end of January 1859, he returned to St. Catherine's Monastery. However, several days search among manuscripts failed to reveal that which he most sought. Then, on the afternoon of February 4, this happened:

“I was taking a walk with the steward of the convent in the neighborhood, and as we returned, towards sunset, he begged me to take some refreshment with him in his cell. Scarcely had he entered the room, when resuming our former subject of conversation, he said, ‘And I, too, have read a Septuagint [called the LXX, an ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament].’

“And so saying he took down from the corner of the room a bulky kind of volume, wrapped

in a red cloth, and laid it before me. I unrolled the cover and discovered to my great surprise, not only those fragments which fifteen years before I had taken out of the basket, but also other parts of the Old Testament, the New Testament complete, and in addition, the Epistle of Barnabas and a part of the Pastor [Shepherd] of Hermas. [The latter two were New Testament pseudopigraphal books.]

"Full of joy, which this time I had the self-command to conceal from the steward and the rest of the community, I asked, as in a careless way, for permission to take the manuscript into my sleeping chamber to look over it more at leisure. There, by myself, I could give way to the transport of joy which I felt."—*Tischendorf, Autobiography.*

Tischendorf would never forget that night.

"This was the most exciting moment in Tischendorf's entire life; he stayed up all night, fathoming his newly found treasure. In his diary, the scholar writes, '*Quippe dormire nefas videbatur.*' ('It really seemed a sacrilege to sleep.')"—*David Beale, A Pictorial History of Our English Bible, p. 54.*

That night, Tischendorf copied part of the codex, and the next morning he requested permission to take the scroll to Cairo to have it completely copied. But the prior, who alone had the authority to make this decision, had left for Cairo two days earlier.

Tischendorf quickly went to Cairo and talked to the prior of the Greek Orthodox monastery. **The Greek Orthodox are no more willing to share Bibles with the world than are their separated brethren in Rome. But Tischendorf hinted that a sizeable amount of money might be paid.**

The young scholar was then given permission to take the codex to Cairo, where he made a copy of the entire manuscript.

It is doubtful whether the reader can grasp the amount of work required to do that! How would you like to copy part of the Old Testament and all of the New—not in English, but in ancient Greek capital letters without punctuation or spaces between letters! The task took about eight months.

On September 24, 1859, he returned to the monastery and was given permission to take the codex to Moscow, where it could be copied more accurately. On November 19, he presented his manuscript finds, including the Sinaiticus, to the emperor at his winter palace.

The emperor purchased it from the monas-

tery for 9,000 rubles. The manuscript remained in St. Petersburg until 1933, when the Soviets, who had no need of extra Bibles around, sold it to the British Museum for 100,000 pounds.

The Sinaiticus has 346½ leaves of vellum, made from the finest quality antelope skins. If the entire Old Testament had been included, the codex would have required the skins of a couple thousand animals! **The leaves are 15 by 13½ inches in size. Each page has four columns, except in the poetical books, which have two. It is written in large uncials with 12 to 14 letters to a line.**

This codex is thought by the experts to have been written about A.D. 340. There are definite reasons for dating it to that time; and we will learn that the Majority Text (the basis for the King James Bible) goes back to an earlier date.

Of the Old Testament, only fragments remain from the earlier parts, but complete books from the later part. The entire New Testament is included.

The entire document includes fragments of *Genesis 23 and 24, Numbers 5-7, 1 Chronicles 9:27 to 19:17, Ezra 9:9 to 10:44*, but also *Nehe-miah, Esther, Tobit, Judith, 1 Maccabees, 4 Maccabees, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations 1:1 to 2:20, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum to Malachi, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus), and Job*. Note that six of these were from the Old Testament Apocrypha. In addition to the complete New Testament, the Shepherd of Hermas was at the end. That is a New Testament pseudopigraphal book, the first time any Westerner had ever seen it.

Tischendorf later went on to discover other Bible manuscripts, and eventually prepared a Greek text with his findings.

"From 1859 he was professor of theology at Leipzig. Between 1840 and 1860 he visited many libraries in Europe and the Near East in search of manuscripts, the most famous of his finds being his dramatic discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus. Besides careful editions of several important Biblical manuscripts (e.g., Codex Ephraemi, 1843-1845; Codex Amiatinus, 1850; Codex Claromontanus, 1852), he published between 1841 and 1869 eight editions of the Greek text of the New Testament with a full critical apparatus of the variant readings."—*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p.*

1380.

Not all Greek Texts include *apparati*. **The apparatus is the technical name given, by scholars, to the extensive footnotes at the bottom of each page of some critical Greek Texts.** Those footnotes show the variants and tell which manuscripts, lectionaries, church “fathers,” and translations support them. They are very helpful. We will personally examine this later.

Frederick Scrivener, a firm believer in the trustworthiness of the Majority Greek Text upon which the King James Version was translated, later examined the Sinaiticus carefully. **Scrivener concluded that it had been corrected repeatedly, because of copyist errors and that it was not of an early, but late, date.**

“Since this document was first inscribed, it has been made the subject of no less than ten different attempts of revision and correction [by later scribes]. The number of these attempts is witnessed by the different chirographies [handwriting styles] of the revisers, and the centuries in which they were respectively made can be approximated by the character of the different handwritings by which the several sets of corrections were carried out . . . Many of these corrections were contemporaneous with the first writer [copyist], but far the greater part belonging to the 6th or 7th century.”—*Scrivener Plain Introduction*, p. 267.

Based on Scrivener’s findings, **Philip Mauro discusses how deeply flawed the Sinaiticus was:**

“Here is a document which the [1870-1881] revisers have esteemed (and that solely because of its antiquity [said to be in the 4th century]) to be so pure that it should be taken as a standard whereby all other copies of the Scriptures are to be tested and corrected. Such is the estimate of certain scholars of the 19th century.

“But it bears upon its face the proof that those in whose possession it had been, from the very first, and for some hundreds of years thereafter, esteemed it to be so impure [so full of copyist errors] as to require correction in every part . . . Considering the great value to its owner of such a manuscript (since it is on velum of the finest quality) and that he would be most reluctant to consent to alterations in it except the need was clearly apparent, it is plain that this much admired codex bears upon its face the most incontestable proof of its defective character.

“But, more than that, Dr. Scrivener tells us that the evident purpose of the thorough-going revision which he places in the 6th or 7th cen-

tury was to make the manuscript conform to manuscripts in vogue at that time which were ‘far nearer to our modern Textus Receptus.’”—*Mauro, quoted in D.O. Fuller, True or False? p. 75.*

Textus Receptus is the name given to the third edition of Erasmus’ Greek Text, from which nearly all European Reformation-era Bibles were translated from—and all English Bibles. The exceptions were the 9th-century Alfred’s, the 14th-century Wycliffe’s translation, and the Catholic Rheims-Douai (Douay). **The Textus Receptus (the “Received Text”) is the Majority Text which has been rejected by 20th-century Bible translators.**

(As we will learn later, it was not until the mid-20th century that a Catholic Bible, in any language, was translated from something other than the Vulgate.)

Dr. Scrivener concluded his denunciation of the quality of the Sinaiticus with these words:

“It must be confessed, indeed, that the Codex Sinaiticus abounds with similar errors of the eye and pen, to an extent unparalled, but rather unusual in documents of first rate importance; so that Tregelles has freely pronounced that ‘the state of the text, as proceeding from the first scribe, may be regarded as very rough.’”—*Scrivener, Plain Introduction*, p. 267.

—Yet this is the manuscript, along with the Vaticanus, which, according to Westcott and Hort’s theory, has become the basis for all 20th-century Bible translations!

Dean Burgon, another brilliant Greek scholar who also carefully examined the Sinaiticus, wrote about **the utter carelessness of the Sinaiticus’ copyists:**

“On many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through very carelessness. Letters and words, even whole sentences, are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately cancelled; while that gross blunder, whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament.”—*Dean Burgon, Causes and Corruption of the Traditional Text*, p. 128.

Scrivener shows in some detail how **the Sinaiticus disagrees so frequently with all the other codices.**

“The relation in which Cod. 2 [Codex 2, now called Codex Aleph, is the Sinaiticus] stands to the other four chief manuscripts of the Gospels may be roughly estimated from analyzing

the transcript of four pages first published by Tischendorf, as well as in any other way. Of the 312 variations from the common text therein noted, forty-five stand alone, and eight agrees with ABCD united (much of C, however, is lost in these passages), with ABC together thirty-one times, with ABD fourteen, with AB thirteen, with D alone ten, with B alone but once (Mark 1:27), with C alone once: with several authorities against AB thirty-nine times, with A against B fifty-two, with B against A ninety-eight."—*Scrivener, Plain Introduction, Vol. 2., pp. 267-268.*

The above four codex designations are Alexandrinus (A); Sinaiticus (Aleph or }); Vaticanus (B); Ephraemi (C); Bezae (D).

Why was the Sinaiticus so sloppily produced? We earlier said that God protected the text as faithful Christians made copies. Those thousands of copies became the Majority Text which so wonderfully agrees with itself.

But the Sinaiticus and (we will learn below) the Vaticanus were both sloppily prepared. This was due to the fact that the copyists were men paid, by Constantine, to do the job. These men had been hired through Eusebius, a favorite of the emperor and confidant of Pope Sylvester. The scribes cared not for quality of their workmanship; and it shows in the finished product.

THE VATICANUS

The Codex Vaticanus (B) is the most complete known manuscript of the Greek Bible; it includes much of the Old Testament and all of the New Testament while breaking off at Hebrews 9:14.

It was brought to the Vatican Library by Pope Nicholas V, who heard about it in 1448; and it was listed in the first catalog of the library in 1475. Its earlier history is not known. But **everything about it—the age of the vellum skin, the lettering, the type of ink, etc.—identifies it as having been written at about the same time as the Sinaiticus.**

It has been said that the Vatican secretly wrote it. It is more likely that it was an ancient copy of the Bible. Rome did not want the world to know about it—and did everything possible to keep scholars from reading it. They did not like Bibles being made available to people. If the Reformation had not occurred, the people still would have no Bibles!

This codex was first made known in 1533, when Sepúlveda called the attention of Erasmus to it. But Sepúlveda was not permitted near it; and Erasmus did not want to bother with it. He preferred the Majority Text of the Greek. No Protestant was permitted to study the book until the middle of the 19th century.

In 1669, Bartolucci, librarian of the Vatican, made a collection of some of its variant readings, but nothing was published.

When Napoleon invaded Italy, he took it to Paris, where Hug carefully examined it in 1809. For the first time, the world learned of its existence.

In 1815, after Waterloo, it was restored to Rome, where it was once again hidden. No scholar could go near it. The Catholic Church today claims to be the one that gave the Bible to the world, yet history reveals that, for centuries, it tried to destroy every copy of the book it could find. Those it did not burn, it chained to walls in dark corners of monasteries.

In 1843, after several months delay, Tischendorf was permitted to look at it for six hours. How kind they were! The next year, DeMuralt was allowed nine hours to read in it.

In 1845, the English scholar Tregelles—even though he had an introduction from Cardinal Wiseman of England—was not allowed to copy a word. If he looked too intently at any passage, the two attendants which stood next to him, would snatch the volume from him and turn the page! When he left the room where it was kept, his pockets were searched and all writing material was taken from him. When it comes to keeping the Scriptures from the public, Rome has had years of experience.

"They would not let me open it without searching my pocket, and depriving me of pen, ink and paper . . . If I looked at a passage too long the two *prelati* (prelates) would snatch the book out from my hand."—*Tregelles, quoted in Frederick Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, Vol. 1, p. 112.*

Other scholars who traveled to Italy from distant lands to see the codex were, if anything, treated worse.

We might wonder why the Vatican so feared to have any scholar look at this codex. The answer probably is that they were frightened at what anyone might find in it! The ancient codex was written in capital let-

ters, without spaces or periods; and, very likely, no Catholic scholars could read it! All they knew was their precious dead language, Latin.

Rome's refusal to let anyone see the codex created such a stir in the scholarly world; so much so that, in order to avoid the scandalous label that it was trying to keep the Scriptures from the people, the Vatican hired some folk to make a copy for publication. But, since no one in Italy cared much about Bibles, the work was very sloppy and full of errors. Under the auspices of Cardinal Angelo Mai, the work was done between 1828 and 1838. Nineteen years later, someone got around to hauling it over to a print shop. In 1857 it was published in five volumes. From the few glimpses they had been able to obtain of the original, scholars throughout Europe immediately recognized it to be an inferior production of the original. Rome never was very good at publishing Bibles.

In 1866, Tischendorf made a third attempt to see the codex. This time he asked for permission to edit the text; that is, to identify errors in the published copy. So, centuries after the Vatican acquired the manuscript, Tischendorf was permitted, under the supervision of a prelate, C. Vercellone, to look at it for three hours a day.

Recalling the fabulous amount he was able to accomplish at St. Catherine's, by the end of the eighth day he had managed, contrary to directions, to actually copy 20 pages from the original! Vatican officials were incensed and almost threw him out of town. But, because of what he had done seven years earlier in bringing the Sinaiticus to the world in 1859, Tischendorf had become world famous. It would not look right to kick him out; so, Vatican officials grudgingly let him have six more days to read in it. Because he had a near photographic memory, when Tischendorf left, he was able, in 1867, to publish the best edition of the text up to that time.

Seeing the cat was out of the bag, and ashamed that other people were publishing their book, Vercellone and his successors at the Vatican published a very complete edition in six folio volumes in 1868-1881. The Westcott-Hort Text was based on that edition. But it was not until 1889-1890, that a photographic facsimile edition of the entire codex was prepared by Abate Cozza-Luzi and issued.

Codex Vaticanus (B) is written in uncials on 759 folios of fine vellum, three columns (of about 42 lines each) to a page, 10 inches

wide by 10½ inches high. Because of the vellum and the type of print, it is dated in the first half of the 4th century, to about the year A.D. 340—the same time that the Sinaiticus was copied.

It contains solid capital letters, with no spaces between words, no punctuation, and no divisions into chapters or sections. It is all just one solid paragraph, from start to finish!

Tischendorf was certain that the scribe of the New Testament portion was the same one who prepared a part of Codex Sinaiticus. We will learn later that this helps explain why the ending of Mark is gone from both codices.

The codex originally contained the entire Greek Bible. In its present state, after the ravages of going from place to place for centuries, it **lacks Genesis 1:1 to 46:28; Psalms 106-138; and everything after Hebrews 9:14.**

A PROBLEM DEEPER THAN SINAITICUS AND VATICANUS

We have discussed these two books in detail, since they lie at the heart of the controversy.

The truth is that it is not the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus which are the problem. They are just Bible manuscripts, howbeit, with serious flaws.

The problem is this: (1) The Westcott-Hort theory claims that those two manuscripts should have superiority over 5,000 other manuscripts. (2) All 20th-century scholars prepare Bibles in accordance with that theory. For this purpose, modern translators use the Nestle-Aland or UBS (United Bible Societies) Greek Text, both of which favor the readings of those two manuscripts, over and above all others.

It is not the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus which are the problem, it is the adulation that translators give to them by preferring them above the Majority Text. The great strength of the Majority Text (used to translate the King James Version) is that it was a combination of many manuscripts. As a result, the Majority Text tended to be much more free from the copyist errors to be found in one or a few manuscripts.

Yes, there are some copyist errors in all manuscripts, but relatively few in those which comprise the Majority Text.

"Some look to us gravely and say, 'Don't you think there might have been some mistake in

the copyist or in the translators?' This is all probable, and the mind that is so narrow that it will hesitate and stumble over this possibility or probability would be just as ready to stumble over the mysteries of the Inspired Word, because their feeble minds cannot see through the purposes of God . . .

"I take the Bible just as it is, as the Inspired Word. I believe its utterances in an entire Bible."—*1 Selected Messages, 16-17 [Manuscript 16, 1888; written at Minneapolis, Minnesota, autumn 1888].*

Copyist errors did, indeed, occur from time to time in the copying of manuscripts; but the Majority Text tended to eliminate them for two reasons: (1) Those manuscripts were prepared by faithful, prayerful followers of Christ and God blessed their efforts to be accurate. (2) As scholars compared manuscript with manuscript of the many in the Majority Text, they could the more easily weed out the errors.

SINAITICUS AND VATICANUS BOTH SERIOUSLY FLAWED

Regarding the quality of the transcription in the Vaticanus, upon very careful examination of it, Dr. Scrivener found that it was not much better than the Sinaiticus:

"That no small proportion of these are mere oversights of the scribe seems evident from the circumstance that this same scribe has repeatedly written words and clauses twice over."—*Philip Scrivener, Plain Introduction, Vol. 1, p. 120.*

If I repeated or miswrote the same thing same thang, you would consder me me an incompetent writer. (as demonstrated in this paragraph.) Yet those two codices made such mistakes repeatedly.

John W. Burgon gives an example from the Vaticanus:

"Matthew 21:4, five words written twice over; Matthew 26:56-57, six words; Luke 1:37, three words or one line; John 17:18, six words. These however, are but a few of many . . .

"The impurity of the text exhibited by these codices is not a question of opinion but of fact . . . In the Gospels . . . Codex B [Vaticanus] leaves out words or clauses . . . It bears traces of careless transcription on every page."—*Burgon, quoted in Scrivener, Vol. 1, p. 120.*

Citing a comtemporary scholar, Dr. Dobbin, Scrivener mentions still more omissions of the sacred Scriptures in the Vaticanus:

"One marked feature, characteristic of this copy, is the great number of its omissions, which has induced Dr. Dobbin to speak of it as presenting 'an abbreviated text of the New Testament' . . . and certainly the facts he states on this point are startling enough. He calculates that Codex B [Vaticanus] leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 330 times in Matthew, 365 in Mark, 439 in Luke, 357 in John, 384 in the Acts, 681 in the surviving Epistles; or 2,556 times in all."—*Scrivener, Plain Introduction, Vol. 1, p. 120.*

Such ommissions were very serious. The problem is intensified, since the omitted words or phrases occur at times in unison.

"By what possible hypothesis will such a correspondence of the copies be accounted for if these words, clauses, and sentences are indeed, as is pretended, nothing else but spurious accretions to the text?"—*Ibid.*

Burgon recognized a common flow of errors, in the two codices, that pointed to an underlying attempt to insert errors.

"Between the first two [Sinaiticus and Vaticanus] there subsists an amount of sinister resemblance, which proves that they must have been derived at no very remote period from the same *corrupt original*. Tischendorf insists that they were partly written by the same scribe. Yet they vary repeatedly from one another on every page; as well as differing widely from the commonly Received [Majority] Text, with which they have been carefully collated. On being referred to this standard, in the Gospels alone, B is found to omit at least 2,877 words: to add, 536: to substitute, 935: to transpose, 2,098: to modify, 1,132 (in all 7,578)—the corresponding figures for being severally 3,455, 839, 1,114, 2,299, 1,265 (in all 8,972). And be it remembered that the omissions, additions, substitutions, transpositions, and modifications, are by no means the same in both. It is in fact easier to find two consecutive verses in which these two manuscripts differ the one from the other than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree."—*Burgon, Revision Revised, p. 12.*

ORIGIN OF THE SINAITICUS AND VATICANUS

The Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are not as old as the Majority Text. They originated in Alexandria, Egypt, a continual breeding ground for paganizing Christian error. They were influenced by the Alexandrian heretic, Origen.

These two codices were extremely expensive.

They required the sacrifice of well-over a thousand antelopes (since each adult antelope could only provide skin for two leaves—four pages—of a codex).

Only an extremely wealthy person could afford to commission the preparation of such a book; yet **both books are very similar in a number of ways. The style and handwriting is quite similar; the remarkable number of copyist errors are also! In addition, Tischendorf declared that part of the Vaticanus was written by the same scribe which produced all of the Sinaiticus.** There is no reason to consider him wrong in that conclusion.

It is believed that both codices were commissioned by Constantine I, as part of an order for fifty copies. It is also believed that they were transcribed in Alexandria, Egypt.

“Constantine applied to Eusebius for fifty handsome copies, amongst which it is not improbable that the manuscripts . . . B and Aleph were to be actually found.”—*Burgon, Traditional Text, p. 163.*

In order to do this, **Constantine asked Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, to arrange for the copying of the fifty new Bibles. Eusebius went to the memorial library of Pamphilus, where he led a team of copyists to carry out this request.**

“Most scholars believe that, like the Vaticanus, it [the Sinaiticus] was written in Alexandria, Egypt . . . The New Testament text of the codex is closely allied to that of the Vaticanus, together with which it is the chief witness to the ‘Neutral Text.’ ”—*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, 310.*

Tischendorf also believed that this was how the Sinaiticus originated.

“Is it possible that this Bible, Aleph, could be one of the 50 copies which Emperor Constantine ordered Eusebius to place in Constantinople, his new capital.”—*Tischendorf, quoted in Beale, Pictorial History, p. 54.*

It is very significant that there is such decided evidence that these two codices were produced in Alexandria, the capital at that time of Egypt. **Not only was 4th-century Alexandria noted for its mixture of pagan philosophy with Christianity, but it had a reputation for very early “textual criticism”: i.e., trying to change the Word of God.**

In addition, Origen, the worst Christian apostate alive, was there. It was also the center of the blasphemous, Christ-denying her-

esy of Arianism (the teaching that Christ was a created being). In referring to this error, Burgon writes:

“It is a circumstance that cannot fail to give rise to suspicion that the Vaticanus and Sinaitic manuscripts had their origin under a predominant influence of such evil fame. At the very least, careful investigation is necessary to see whether these copies were in fact free from that influence which has met with universal condemnation.”—*Burgon, Traditional Text, p. 161.*

This Alexandrian connection is highly significant. It explains the numerous errors in the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, both typographically and doctrinally, as revealed in their 3,000 plus disagreements with one another in only four books. **When we recall that Constantine and Eusebius leaned toward Arianism, the potential for treachery increases.**

1 Timothy 3:16 is a shocking example of what happens when modern translators take two manuscripts (the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus)—and ignore all the rest.

Under the urging of Westcott and Hort, the Revision Committee of 1871-1881 viciously attacked the Deity of Christ in 1 Timothy 3:16. They altered the traditional, “God was manifest in the flesh,” to the corrupt, “he who was manifest in the flesh.” **They had the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus as support for this change.**

In response to this, Burgon wrote a letter, pleading with the committee’s chairman, Bishop Ellicott, not to permit that to be put in the new Bible.

“Behold then the provision which the Author of Scripture has made for the effectual conservation in its integrity of this portion of His written Word! Upwards of 1,800 years have run their course since the Holy Ghost, by His servant Paul, rehearsed ‘the Mystery of Godliness,’ declaring this to be the great foundation fact, namely, that ‘God was manifest in the flesh.’ *And lo! out of 254 copies of St. Paul’s Epistles, no less than 252 are discovered to have preserved that expression.* The copies whereof we speak were procured in every part of Christendom, being derived in every instance from copies older than themselves; which again were transcripts of copies older still. They have since found their way, without design or contrivance, into the libraries of every country in Europe, where they are jealously guarded . . . We submit, as a proper and just conclusion from these facts, that men who, in view of the evidence

before them, would cast out of the Scripture at this vital point, the word 'God' and replace it by 'he who' have thereby demonstrated their unfitness for the work of revising the Greek text of the New Testament."—*Burgon, quoted in Fuller, True or False? p. 98.*

It is truly astounding that Westcott and Hort would base their entire theory on those two inferior manuscripts! They maintained that the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were "pure texts" and that all others were partly corrupt—especially the ones used in the preparation of the King James Bible.

The liberal scholars themselves recognize that those two codices were produced in Alexandria; but it bothered them not that this city was the polluted spring, from whence came the deepest heresies in early Christianity. In separate studies (*Beyond Pitcairn*, for example) the present writer has shown that **Sunday sacredness was first philosophized into the church at Alexandria and, then, commanded into the local churches by the bishop of Rome. Religious leaders at the new Christian centers worked hand in hand to introduce raw paganism into the Christian church.**

(It is of interest that Constantine's orthodox son, Constans, sent a similar request for Bibles; but to the anti-Arian Athanasius. *Burgon, Traditional Text, p. 163.*)

In the following statement, **Dean Burgon summarizes the evidence, from the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, which marks them as produced in Alexandria:**

"Yet I venture also to think that it was in a great measure at Alexandria that the text in question was fabricated. My chief reasons for thinking so are the following: (1) There is a marked resemblance between the peculiar readings of Vaticanus / Sinaiticus and the two Egyptian versions—the Bohairic or Version of Lower Egypt especially. (2) No one can fail to have been struck by the evident sympathy between Origen,—who at all events had passed more than half his life at Alexandria,—and the text in question. (3) I notice that Nonnus also, who lived in the Thebaid, exhibits considerable sympathy with the text which I deem so corrupt.

"(4) I cannot overlook the fact the Codex Sinaiticus was discovered in a monastery under the sway of the patriarch of Alexandria, though how it got there no evidence remains to point out. (5) The licentious handling so characteristic of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament,—the work of Alexandrian Jews,—

points in the same direction, and leads me to suspect that Alexandria was the final source of the text of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. (6) I further observe that the sacred Text . . . in Cyril's Homilies on St. John is often similar to B-Aleph; and this, I take for granted, was the effect of the school of Alexandria,—not of the patriarch himself. (7) Dionysius of Alexandria complains bitterly of the corrupt codexes of his day: and certainly (8) Clement habitually employed copies of a similar kind. He too was of Alexandria."—*Burgon, Traditional Text, pp. 234-235.*

There is also a linkage between the Sinaiticus / Vaticanus—and Jerome's Catholic translation into the Latin Vulgate.

Another factor, linking the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus to Origen through the traceable similarities with Jerome's Latin Vulgate, is Jerome's choice of Pamphilus' library as his primary source of translation labors. This library was the chief depository of Origen's writings, including his famed *Hexapla* (a manuscript of the Old Testament with six translations in Hebrew and Greek arranged in parallel columns for comparative study).

Dr. Frederick Nolan, a careful Greek and Latin scholar, found that the Vaticanus and the Vulgate have a number of remarkable similarities!

"The striking coincidence of the Greek of the Vatican manuscript with the Latin of the Vulgate leads to the establishment of the same conclusion. This version received the corrections of St. Jerome during his abode in Palestine; it is thus only probable that the Greek copies, after which he modeled it, were those, which far from being current in Palestine, were used in the monastery into which he had retired: but these he assures us were of the edition of Eusebius. For this edition he had imbibed an early partiality, through Gregory of Nazianzum, who first put the Scriptures into his hands, who had been educated at Caesarea in Palestine."—*Frederick Nolan, An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or Received Text of the New Testament, pp. 83-84.*

Jerome (who translated the Catholic Latin Vulgate from a Greek manuscript) mentions his familiarity with the manuscripts of Pamphilus and Origen, particularly that of the original of the latter's *Hexapla*. **Jerome said that he relied on those documents as his unquestioned model (see *Scrivener, Plain Introduction, Vol. 2, p. 226*).**

Burgon angrily declares that the modern

revisers have removed the words, "that ye should not obey the truth," from Galatians 3:1—solely on the basis of seven manuscripts (Codices A, B, Aleph, D, F, G, and Papyrus 17), and says that Jerome earlier led out in doing the same. Then Burgon adds:

"But when he comes to the place in Galatians, he is observed, first to admit that the clause 'is found in some copies,' and straightway to add that 'inasmuch as it is not found in the copies of Adamantius, he omits it.' The clue to his omission is supplied by his own statement that in writing on the Galatians he had made Origen his guide."—*Burgon, Traditional Text*, p. 167.

It has been said that Erasmus' Greek Text, the basis of the King James Bible, is inferior because he only had access to the Majority Text and not to the superior Vaticanus. The truth is that he was the first to reject the Vaticanus as a source.

Without taking the space to elaborate on this, there is evidence that Erasmus was told about many variant readings in the Vaticanus, by Sepúlveda, and from the papal librarian, Paul Bombasius, as early as 1521 (*see Wetstein's Prolegomena to the New Testament, Vol. 1, p. 23*). But, with four editions of the Greek New Testament already completed, the 67-year-old accomplished scholar was not impressed with that inferior document at the Vatican. He wanted nothing to do with papal documents. Two years later, Erasmus published his fifth and final edition (a year before his death).

In spite of these facts, liberals defend their errant manuscripts, by declaring the Erasmus only had access to "later" manuscripts.

Before concluding this comparison of the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus with Alexandria and Origen's *Hexapla* (the basic source Jerome used in preparing his *Vulgate* translation), it should be noted that, not only is the style of those two codices like that of Origen's writings, but the content also agree with them.

"The points in which we are specially entitled to look for innovations are: (1) curious and ingenious readings, such, for instance, as those which we have noticed in St. Mark and St. Luke; (2) the removal of words, clauses, or entire sentences which a man of fastidious taste might regard as superfluities or repetitions; (3) a fearless and highly speculative mode of dealing with portions of the New Testament which might contain statements opposed to his prepossessions or present difficulties which even his ingenuity

might be unable to solve."—*Herman C. Hoskier, Codex B and its Allies*, p. 10.

We will learn later that, at the time that the apostate Constantine had those large codices made, faithful Waldensians in the hills of northern Italy protested this corruption of the text!

THE LUCIAN RECENSION THEORY

This is a second part of the Westcott and Hort theory. Those two men and their associates were embarrassed by the truly vast number of manuscripts and other materials which support the King James Bible and disagree with the Westcott-Hort theory, that their beloved Sinaiticus / Vaticanus are the most important manuscripts in the Biblical world.

So they invented the "Lucian Recension Theory." (A *recension* is either an editorial revision of a literary work, especially done on the basis of critical examination of the text and the sources used, or a version of a text resulting from such revision.) Their theory is keyed to the fact that **Lucian, a Christian of Samosata in Asia Minor, tried to produce a unified text, including all the Old Testament and New Testament.** He gathered this from a variety of sources. Lucian had earlier studied in a Christian school at Edessa in Mesopotamia and, by the time he arrived in Antioch, had gained a reputation for scholarship. He worked with a Hebrew scholar in a revision of the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Old Testament, prepared over a span of 150 years and completed about 100 B.C.) that was more thorough than that done by Eusebius of Caesarea.

Lucian, who only had a friend or two to help him, worked faithfully on his little project. Later, he was martyred under the persecution of Emperor Maximus in 312.

Westcott and Hort expanded that historical fact into a fabulous tale, that the emperor commanded that Lucian do his work and that it must be made the standard New Testament text of the Roman Empire!

"The Syrian text must in fact be the result of a 'recension' in the proper sense of the word, a work of attempted criticism, performed deliberately by editors and not merely by [scattered] scribes."—*Hort, quoted in Wilbur, Pickering, Identity of the New Testament*, p. 37.

This is an entirely imaginative theory; yet, mysteriously, these ideas that Westcott and Hort secretly learned, at their séances

with the devil, were eagerly accepted by worldly scholars as truth.

“An authoritative revision at Antioch . . . was itself subjected to a second authoritative revision carrying out more completely the purposes of the first. At what date between A.D. 250 and 350 the first process took place, it is impossible to say with confidence. The final process was apparently completed by A.D. 350 or thereabouts.”—*Ibid.*

According to the theory, this is the reason there are so many thousands of manuscripts in the Majority Text.

Westcott and Hort developed this theory in order to refute the fact that those thousands of manuscripts all came in separate streams from the originals. They contended that this was not true; but that Lucian made a collated text, and that was used almost universally. It is theorized that some official church leader may have mandated that his text be copied and used by all the churches, but that is a convenient conjecture.

The entire “Lucian Recension Theory” is erroneous; and here is the evidence:

First, there is no evidence that any such edict, commanding that Lucian's text be the only one to be copied and used, was ever issued. Indeed, it is speculative as to who might have issued such a requirement.

Second, a significant number of the manuscripts, lectionaries, early church “father” quotations, and foreign translations—most of which support the Majority Text—date as early or earlier than Lucian's research project.

Westcott and Hort were dreaming up their theories under the tutelage of demons who were talking to them during their “Ghostly Club” meetings at Oxford.

“In order to prop up his contention, Dr. Hort is obliged to conjure up the shadows of two or three ‘phantom revisions’ of which no recorded evidence exists. But Dr. Hort, as soon as he found that he could not maintain his ground with history as it was, instead of taking back his theory and altering it to square with facts, tampered with historical facts in order to make them agree with his theory.”—*D.J.W. Burgon, Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, p. 93.*

“Not the slightest confirmation is given to Dr. Hort's notion that a revision or recension was definitely accomplished at Antioch in the middle of the 4th century. There was a gradual improvement as the traditional text gradually established itself against the forward and persistent intrusion of corruption.”—*D.J.W.*

Burgon, Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, p. 121.

Bruce Metzger has assigned the origin of the Majority Text to Lucian of Antioch (d. 312).

“As has been indicated in the previous pages, his [Lucian's] recension of the New Testament was adopted at Constantinople and from there it spread widely throughout Greek speaking lands.”—*Bruce M. Metzger, “The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible,” Chapter in his History of New Testament Textual Criticism, p. 27.*

Bruce Metzger is one of the three editors who decided which readings would be accepted or rejected in the Nestle-Aland and UBS Greek Texts, used by all translators of 20th-century Bibles. When he bought the Westcott-Hort theory about the Sinaiticus / Vaticanus, he also bought the Lucian theory.

A leading American textual critic, Ernest C. Colwell, wrote that **the Majority Text “had, in its origin, no such single focus as the Latin had in Jerome”** (*E.C. Colwell, What is the Best New Testament?*). Many scholars recognize that **the Majority Text, as well as the other major families of the Greek text, are the result of a process rather than a single event in textual history.**

Another scholar, **Jacob Geerlings, who has done extensive work on certain “family” branches of the Majority Text, has stated that “its origins go back to the autographs [the originals]”** (*J. Geerlings, Family E and its Allies in Mark*).

Historical records reveal that **the Eastern Church never officially adopted or recognized a received or authorized text. The Western Church, at Rome, adopted the Latin Vulgate.**

Oddly enough, **even if the theory were correct—the theory would date the Majority Text as having originated at an earlier date than the Sinaiticus / Vaticanus.** Lucian of Antioch, who is supposed to have prepared the “Lucian Recension” which all the “late” Majority Text manuscripts all based on, died in A.D. 312.

According to the Westcott-Hort “Lucian Recension theory,” the basis of the Majority Text was prepared at Antioch between A.D. 250 and 350. Since the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are dated at approximately 340, that would make the Majority Text earlier than them!

54 The King James and the Modern Versions

In attempting to compare the 5,000 manuscripts, scholars have found tendencies for certain ones to be somewhat similar to certain others. The word, "somewhat," is used because there are so many variables that it is impossible to say, "This manuscript is exactly like that one." That never happens. Yet, **in an attempt to arrive at some semblance of order, five primary manuscript "families" have been accepted by modern scholars.**

(These "families" are also spoken of as "Texts," with a capital "T." Scholars use the terms interchangeably.)

An attempt has been made to locate each of these five families to certain regions where the copyists supposedly worked.

J.A. Bengel (about 1734) suggested that the manuscripts might be divided into *Asiatic* and *African*.

J.S. Semler (about 1767) prepared a three-fold classification: *Oriental*, *Western*, and *Alexandrian*. He was the first to call these families, "recensions."

J.J. Griesbach, a pupil of Semler's (1774-1776, 1805), introduced the names, *Constantinopolitan* or *Byzantine*.

J.L. Hug said the Western text was based on an earlier one, and was itself split into three, the *Palestinian* by Origen, the *Egyptian* by Hesychius, and the *Syrian* by Lucian.

Carolus Lachmann suggested the terms, *Oriental* and *Occidental*.

The above, very brief description hardly describes all the speculation, squabbling, and changes in the various theories which occurred.

Then came the F.J.A. Hort and B.F. Westcott theory. They used the terms, Western and Syrian (Antiochian), for two of the groups and divided the third into Alexandrian and Neutral. Hort was the principal member of the team which devised and wrote down their theory of families.

This "family" theory of manuscripts is important, since the two 20th-century critical Greek Texts (the Nestle-Aland and the UBS) are almost entirely based on the Westcott-Hort theory. Nearly all 20th-century translations into English and other languages are made from one or the other of those critical Greek Texts. (More on these later in this book.)

Neutral family. Hort considered this the purest extant form. It was thought to be entirely free from corruption and mixture with

other families, and to represent the nearest approach to the New Testament originals.

Its best representative, according to Hort, was the Vaticanus, with the Sinaiticus second best. Both were thought to be derived independently from a common original, at no great distance from the originals. Therefore, they were called "neutral" or pure. (Some editors call them the *Hesychian* family, on the theory that they were produced under the direction of Hesychius, a scribe in Alexandria, Egypt.)

Here is how the Westcott-Hort theory is applied:

1 - When Sinaiticus and Vaticanus readings (they are the Neutral family) agree, no contradictory readings from other manuscripts are accepted, unless internal evidence contradicts this.

2 - Readings not found in the Neutral, Alexandrian, or Western Texts (or families) are to be rejected as "Syrian."

3 - No reading from the Western or Alexandrian is to be admitted without some support from the Neutral.

Now, let us look at these other families:

The Alexandrian Family. This consists of manuscripts conjectured as having originated at Alexandria. Hort's purpose in splitting the two apart was to separate his so-called Neutral family from Origen and Alexandria. (But Hort freely admitted that his Neutral Text also came from Egypt.)

The Western Family. Included here are Greek manuscripts which originated in central Italy. Do not confuse these with Old Latin, which was an ancient (4th century) translation. A pure and earlier Latin dialect was the Waldensian Italia of northern Italy, translated into Latin by the Waldenses about A.D. 157. The Italia belongs to the Majority Text.

The Syrian Family. This is that other text family which Hort considered to be so utterly worthless. Yes, you guessed it. **This is the Majority Text which the King James and the other Reformation Bibles were translated from.** Listening to the devils at their Ghostly Club, Westcott and Hort figured out a clever scheme to get rid of the purest, largest, and earliest manuscript source.

The *Syrian Text* is also called the *Byzantine* or *Antiochian* family. It is also referred to as the *Traditional Text*, since it was used in preparing the earlier English and European Bibles. Another

name for it is the **Received Text** or **Textus Receptus** (which is actually the name of the third edition of Erasmus' Greek Text, based entirely on this family of manuscripts). However, throughout this book, we will call it by the most descriptive name: the **Majority Text**.

In Hort's opinion, Greek and Syrian church "fathers" produced this as a revision of existing manuscripts in the vicinity of Antioch in the late 4th century. Hort declared it to be later than the other families and, therefore, essentially worthless. Yet the Majority Text includes most of the uncials (which Hort arbitrarily decided must have been produced in later centuries) and nearly all the thousands of cursive manuscripts.

It is of interest that **even Dr. Hort admitted that the Syrian Family (Majority Text) was as old as his so-called Neutral family.**

"The fundamental text of late extant Greek manuscripts, generally is beyond all question identical with the dominant Antiochian or Graeco-Syrian text of the second half of the fourth century."—*F.J.A. Hort, quoted in J.W. Burgon, The Revision Revised, p. 257.*

According to that admission, the Majority Text was at least as old as the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus! Yet, according to the Westcott-Hort theory, the two codices were supposed to be "purer" because they were said to be older! There is something wrong here in someone's thinking.

Add to this the point that, according to their "Lucian Recension theory," the basic Majority Text was prepared at Antioch between A.D. 250 and 350. Since the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are dated at approximately 340, that would make it older than them!

Very small "families," each with only a very few manuscripts in them, have since been added: the "Ferrar" manuscripts (or Family 1) which includes 1, 13, 124, 346, and 69; and the Codex Theta. These manuscripts would receive but little notice, except that they exhibit some of the strange peculiarities of the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.

Now we are ready to track down still more evidence that the Majority Text is the purest, earliest, and best.

MOST SOURCES SUPPORT THE KJV

You will recall that we earlier mentioned four early Bible text sources. These were (1) **Greek manuscripts**, (2) **lectionaries** (Bible compilations read in churches which could not afford a larger manuscript of a Bible portion), (3) **quotations**

by the early church "fathers," and (4) **translations** into other languages. We have now learned enough to return to them.

We are now going to discover that the great majority of those four sources, when they are very early, support the Majority Text, which, as you know, is the basis of the King James Bible! They also disprove the "Lucianic Recension theory," since they existed prior to the time that Lucian could have prepared his recension.

1 - Greek manuscripts. As mentioned earlier, **there are 5,000 of these!** These include the following: (1) **Over 200 uncials** (all capital letters), counting all fragments, which range in date from the 2nd to the 9th century. (2) **About 100 papyri and ostraca** (*ostraca* are written on clay tablets). These are mainly uncial. (3) **Approximately 3,000 cursives**, dating from the 9th to the 15th centuries. There are also **lectionaries**.

Comparatively few of these materials contain the complete New Testament and many are very fragmentary, especially those among the uncials and papyri. Yet, **as far as the quality and quantity of the evidence, the New Testament is by far the best-preserved ancient document in the world.**

The entire New Testament is substantially contained in only two uncials (Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus; most of Matthew being missing in the latter) and in about 50 cursive manuscripts. Approximately 120 other manuscripts contain all but the Revelation; and about 50 contain all but the Gospels.

The most abundant single group is the four Gospels, with some 1,500 documents; and the next, in order, would be combinations of the other groups (Acts and the General Epistles, Pauline Epistles, and Revelation).

About 30 manuscripts contain the Acts and General Epistles alone. (The General Epistles are all those not written by Paul). About 35 have the Pauline Epistles alone. Another 45 only have Revelation alone.

The remainder of the 5,000 manuscripts are too fragmentary to classify.

Why so many fragments? —They are mute testimony to the work of Satan, down through the centuries, to destroy Christians, their homes, their churches, and their Bible portions!

—But we find that nearly all of the above listed manuscripts support the Majority Text!

The Greek papyri should also be mentioned here. They are among the very oldest manuscripts of the New Testament. Because they were written in Egypt, they frequently have some corrupt Alexandrian readings; yet, much of the time, they agree with Majority Text readings. It is possible to find papyri in Egypt, since it has a climate dry enough to preserve them. That is where these were written and preserved.

2 - Lectionaries. The second of the four witnesses to the original text of the Bible are the lectionaries. As mentioned earlier, copyists would assemble many choice passages into books, and use them in church readings. Each one would contain selected portions of Scripture, arranged in a particular schedule for congregational reading. Each of the lectionaries is called a *lection*. There are about 2,143 of these lectionaries.

Many of these date very early, and they frequently favor the text upon which the King James Version is based.

Here is the comment of one scholar, that the lectionary evidence does not support the conjecture that Lucian's text was required of all the churches:

"The Lectionaries also indicate that the **Traditional [Majority] Text** could not have been imposed on the church by the ecclesiastical authorities. These, as has been stated, are manuscripts containing the New Testament Scripture lessons appointed to be read at the various worship services of the ecclesiastical year. According to the researches of E. Colwell (1933) and his associates, the oldest of these lessons are not Traditional but 'mixed' in text. Westcott and Hort's theory was that the Traditional text from its very beginning had never enjoyed official status."—*Edward Hills, Believing Bible Study, p. 100.*

3 - Quotations by early church "fathers." The writings of early Christians (called "fathers") are also referred to as *patristic* ("fatherly") testimony. This is the correspondence and miscellaneous works of the church's earliest writers, theologians, and bishops.

Although some of these men believed heretical notions—when they quote the New Testament, they tend to quote it accurately, in accordance with the manuscripts they had available to them. These quotations provide us with a valuable witness as to what the Bible text was in their day and are invaluable evidence.

"Besides establishing the antiquity of the **Traditional [Majority] Text**, the quotations in the early "fathers" reveal the streams of corruption which prevailed in the first ages, till they were washed away by the vast current of the transmission of the text of the Gospels."—*D.J.W. Burgon, Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, p. 117.*

"The original predominance of the Traditional [Majority] Text is shown in the list given of the earliest "fathers." Their record proves that in their writings, and so in the church generally, corruption had made itself felt in the earliest times, but that the pure waters generally prevailed."—*D.J.W. Burgon, Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, p. 121.*

Hort's entire security is based on the theory that the manuscripts did not exist before his preferred family of texts or before any of the other families.

"The text, found in the mass [Majority] of existing manuscripts, does not date further back than the middle of the fourth century. Before that text was made up [when the so-called Lucian recension was supposedly required to be distributed], other forms of text were in vogue, which may be termed respectively Neutral, Western and Alexandrian."—*Hort, quoted in Dean Burgon, Traditional Text, p. 91.*

But the quoted Scriptures, found in the early Christian writers, disprove the Westcott-Hort theory!

The writings of just five early writers (Tertullian, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Origen, and Clement of Alexandria) have provided us with 30,147 Scripture citations alone! —Yet the great majority of their quotations agree with the Majority Text!

And consider this: All five of those men died between 20 and 150 years before the approximate dates when the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were copied; many of them died before the conjectured Lucian recension could have been made!

"It has been pointed out elsewhere that, in and by itself, the testimony of any first-rate 'father,' where it can be had, must be held to outweigh the solitary testimony of any single codex which can be named . . . For instance the origin and history of Codices A, B, Aleph, and C [Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Ephraemi] is wholly unknown: their dates and the places of their several production are matters of conjecture only. But when we are listening to the articulate utterance of any of the an-

cient 'fathers,' we not only know with more or less of precision the actual date of the testimony before us, but we even know the very diocese of Christendom in which we are standing. To such a deponent we can assign a definite amount of credibility, whereas in the estimate of the former class of evidence [the Greek manuscripts] we have only inferences to guide us. Individually, therefore, a 'father's' evidence where it can be certainly obtained—*caeterius paribus* [Latin: other things being equal] is considerably greater than that of any single known codex."—*Edward Miller, quoted in Dean Burgon, Traditional Text, 57.*

Just how "early" did these "fathers" actually live? Here are the facts:

"With the Council of Nicea (A.D. 325) acting as their chronological watershed, church historians will generally arrange the 'fathers' by the era in which they lived; Apostolic (A.D. 75-150); Ante-Nicene (A.D. 150-325); and Post-Nicene (A.D. 325-500).

"However, an even more significant designation would be by geographical area; Western, Alexandrian and Antiochian. The relevance of this regional triad to the study of manuscript evidences should be apparent by now. Therefore, the following breakdown of the most pertinent 'fathers' is listed according to both criterion.

"*For the Apostolic Age, we have:* the Western—Clement of Rome (A.D. 30-100); the Antiochian—Ignatius (A.D. 35-107) and Polycarp (A.D. 69-155); and no major Alexandrian 'fathers.' In the Ante-Nicene Period: the Western—Irenaeus (A.D. 120-192), Hippolytus (A.D. 170-235), Tertullian (A.D. 160-225), and Cyprian (A.D. 200-258); the Alexandrian—Justin Martyr (A.D. 100-165), Clement (A.D. 150-215), Origen (A.D. 185-254), and Didymus (A.D. 313-398); and the Antiochian—Lucian (A.D. 250-312).

"*The Post-Nicene Fathers are:* In the West—Augustine (A.D. 354-430); in Alexandria—Athanasius (A.D. 293-373) and Cyril (A.D. 315-386); and finally, the Antiochian—Diodorus (d. 394), Chrysostom (A.D. 347-407), Theodoret (A.D. 393-458), Basil (A.D. 329-379), Gregory Nazianzen (AD. 329-390), and Gregory of Nyssa (A.D. 330-395)."—*W.P. Grady, Final Authority, pp. 37-38.*

As stated earlier, the majority of the "fathers," including the earliest of them, quoted from the Majority Text!

4 - Papyri. Consisting of Greek New Testament fragments written on ancient paper, called

papyrus (singular form), **these are the very earliest Greek manuscript fragments of the New Testament that we have.** Papyri have only been recovered in Egypt because the climate there was consistently dry enough to preserve them.

There are very few of these earliest manuscript sources; but, **although they demonstrate some Alexandrian errors (since they were copied in Egypt), they also quite consistently support Majority Text readings which Sinaiticus and Vaticanus reject.**

"In Hort's day . . . the early papyri were not extant [available]. Had they been, the Westcott-Hort theory could scarcely have appeared . . . Each of the early papyri (A.D. 300 or earlier) vindicates some Byzantine [Majority Text] reading . . . Bodmer II shows some Syrian readings to be anterior to [earlier than] corresponding Aleph and B readings . . . The early papyri vindicate Byzantine readings in 660 (or 885) places where there is a significant variation."—*Pickering, Identity of the New Testament Texts, p. 224.*

H.A. Sturz carried out a careful analysis of the papyri, and wrote his findings down in his book, *Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism*. **His research studies showed that the Majority Text was quoted more frequently by the papyri than any other manuscript family.**

"H.A. Sturz . . . surveyed all the available papyri . . . Each new manuscript discovered vindicated Byzantine [Majority Text] readings . . .

"The magnitude of this vindication can be more fully appreciated by recalling that only about 30% of the New Testament has early papyri attestation . . . If we had at least three papyri covering all parts of the New Testament, all of the 5,000, plus, Byzantine [Majority Text] readings rejected by the critical, eclectic texts would be vindicated by early papyri . . .

"Henceforth, no one may reasonably or responsibly characterize the Byzantine [Majority] text-type as being late . . . Although modern editors continue to reject these readings, it can no longer be argued that they are late."—*Op. cit., pp. 77, 184, 202.*

Klijn compared Aleph and B (both are 4th century) with the papyri (2nd century) and found that the papyri were closer to the Majority Text (*A.F.J. Klijn, Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels*).

Here are the statements of five additional Biblical scholars, that the papyri do not sup-

port the Sinaiticus / Vaticanus text; but, instead, they support the Majority Text, the basis of our King James Bible:

"[Majority Text-type] readings previously discarded as late are in Papyrus 46 . . . Are all Byzantine readings ancient? . . . G. Pasquali answers in the affirmative . . . Papyrus 46 and 45 support the Majority Text readings."—*G. Zuntz, Texts of the Epistles, p. 55.*

"Papyrus 75 supports the Majority Text dozens of times. In relation to the [Majority] text, Papyrus 46 (about A.D. 200), shows that some readings . . . go back to a very early period . . . Papyrus 66 [has] readings that agree with the [Majority] . . . text type."—*Bruce Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible, pp. 64, 108.*

"Byzantine readings which most critics have regarded as late, have now been proved by Papyrus Bodmer II to be early readings."—*Hills, quoted in Dean Burgon, The Last Twelve Verses of Mark, p. 54.*

"Papyrus 66 supports the reading of the Majority Text."—*Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 2, p. 381.*

"Some of the New Testament papyri that have been discovered show remarkable similarity with later manuscripts. In fact, several of the extant early papyri are related to many later manuscripts (fourth century and beyond) or at least share a common ancestor."—*Philip W. Comfort, Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the Bible, p. 11.*

From the collected research of these scholars, listed below, are some sample papyrus manuscripts. In each instance, they supported the Majority Text more than the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.

PAPYRUS	ALEPH	B	MAJ TEXT
P 45	19	24	32
P 66	14	29	33
P 75	9	33	29

Colwell made an interesting discovery. He found that, **as early as A.D. 200 (which is very early!) there was already evidence of tampering with the manuscripts! Men were already trying to change the Majority Text into something else!**

Of course, when this is done, the text is either poorly erased and something new is written in or a variant reading is written above or in the margin beside the original reading.

"The Bodmer John (P⁶⁶) is also a witness to the early existence of many of the readings found in the Majority Text. Strangely enough, **the contemporary corrections in that papyrus frequently change a Majority Text reading to**

something different. This indicates that at this early period, variant readings were supplanting the Majority Text."—*E.C. Colwell, "Origin of Text types of New Testament Manuscripts," in Allen Wikgren, Early Christian Origins, ed., pp. 128-138.*

Do you see it? Satan was intent on destroying the basis of the Majority Text as early as A.D. 200! That is only a hundred years after the death of the Apostle John!

5 - Translations into other languages. Faithful Christians were so anxious to share the good news of salvation in Jesus Christ, that rather early they began translating the New Testament into other languages.

(1) Syrian translations. Translations were made for the Syrian people, dwelling northeast of Palestine. There were at least four major versions: the Peshitta (A.D. 145); the Old Syriac (A.D. 400), the Palestinian Syriac (A.D. 450), and the Philoxenian (A.D. 508). The last one was revised by Thomas of Harkel, in A.D. 616, and is known as the Harclean Syriac.

The earliest of these was the Peshitta—translated only about 50 years after the last book in the Bible was written! The name, "Peshitta," means "straight" or "rule," and that is what it is. The Peshitta set the standard for excellence and purity of text, due to its early translation. It closely agrees with the Majority Text! This is a most powerful evidence that the Majority Text is the most accurate text.

Because of the obvious embarrassment caused by this document, which is two centuries earlier than the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus codices, modern liberal scholars went against the known facts of nearly two millennia and upped the translation date of the Peshitta to A.D. 415.

(2) Gothic Translation. This was the first translation into a purely European language. It was prepared in A.D. 330 by Ulfilas, an earnest soul-winning evangelist. (His name means "little wolf.") **This translation was prepared about 10 years before the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, and it agrees closely with the Majority Text.**

"The type of text represented in it is for the most part that which is found in the majority of Greek manuscripts."—*Frederick G. Kenyon, Critical Text of the New Testament, 1912 edition.*

So Ulfilas had access to King James Version

readings before the Sinaiticus or Vaticanus were copied! For example, his translation has the traditional ending on Matthew 6:13, which the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus and the modern versions omit:

“For Thine is the kingdom, and the power,
and the glory, for ever. Amen.”

We are fortunate to know the readings in the Gothic translation; for there are only eight copies still in existence.

Interestingly enough, since that ancient northern language is related to our modern English, we can see traces of our language in it. Here is the first sentence of the Lord's Prayer in English and in ancient Gothic:

Our Father which art in heaven.

Atta unsar thu in himinam.

hallowed be Thy name.

Weihnai name thein.

(3) Armenian Translation. Scholars call this the “Queen of the Versions,” because there are so many copies still in existence (1,244).

Mesrob, an evangelist, and Sahak translated it about A.D. 400; and it closely matches the readings in the Majority Text.

(4) Georgian Translation. Even the liberals recognize the early date of this translation, which was prepared for the people dwelling between the Black and Caspian Seas of southern Russia. It also supports the Majority Text.

“The Georgian Version . . . arose in the fifth century on the outskirts of Christianity. Armenian tradition ascribes it to the work of Mesrob, who is said to have invented the Georgian alphabet.”—*Ancestry of Our English Bible*, Ira Maurice Price, pp. 117-118.

(5) Coptic Translations. The Egyptian translations are called “Coptic,” and divided into two main versions, based on dialect and locality. Since these are Egyptian, we find that they do not agree with the Majority Text. Remember, Egypt is where the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus came from.

[1] The Sahidic Translation was used in the southern part of Egypt (called “Upper Egypt,” meaning “up the Nile River”), and is dated from about the beginning of the 3rd century.

[2] The Bohairic Translation is northern (“Lower Egypt”), and is as late as the 6th century (about a hundred years after the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus).

Both of these Coptic translations are fre-

quently different from the Majority Text. The reason for this is their proximity to Alexandria, where Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and their many liberal and heretic friends were located. The Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were produced in Alexandria. We would today call Alexandria a “university town”; it would be comparable to Berkeley, California, with its rampant liberalism. The university at Alexandria was, at that time, the largest in the world and contained the most paganizing Christians.

(6) Ethiopian Translation. Prepared in the nation closest to Egypt, this translation is corrupt just like the Coptic translations. It also includes 14 non-canonical books.

(7) Latin Translations.

[1] The Italia (Old Latin) Translation. The first of these was made no later than A.D. 157, about 60 years after the last book of the Bible was finished. It is called the Old Latin Translation or Italia. This translation was made for the young churches established in the Italian Alps (the far northern part of Italy). It is an excellent translation and agrees closely with the Majority Text. Yet it occurs a full century before the theorized “Lucian Recension” is supposed to have been made, and two full centuries before the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were produced.

The Waldensian Bible was either produced from this Italia translation or from the Majority Text Greek manuscripts.

It is highly significant that, in spite of the Romish apostasy, the faithful Latin-speaking believers in the hills of northern Italy continued to use their beloved Italia down through the centuries. They ignored the Vulgate and remained with the Italia and its successor, the Waldensian Bible.

“The old Italic version into the rude Low Latin of the second century held its own as long as Latin continued to be the language of the people. The critical version of Jerome [the Vulgate] never displaced it, and only replaced it when the Latin ceased to be a living language, but became the language of the learned.

“The Gothic version of Ulfilas, in the same way, held its own until the tongue in which it was written ceased to exist . . . The reason for these facts seems to be this: that the languages into which these versions were made were almost perfectly adapted to express the broad, generic simplicity of the original text . . . It was

partly because the Low Latin of the second century, and the Gothic of Ulfilas, and the rude, strong German of Luther had that character in a remarkable degree, that they were capable of rendering the Scriptures with a faithfulness which guaranteed their permanence.”—*Fulton, The Forum, June 1887; quoted in Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, pp. 27-28.*

The Old Latin translation held its own for 900 years after the Vulgate appeared (*Jacobus, Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared*). **The common people wanted the Old Latin, not the pope's Vulgate.** Since the Vulgate was issued about A.D. 397, nine hundred years brings us to about A.D. 1280. It is known that, in 1229, the pope issued orders to begin a most terrible crusade against the Albigenses of southern France and the Waldenses of northern Italy.

The Italia manuscripts were brought to the Island of Iona where Columba, Patrick, and their faithful helpers made copies and sent out missionaries throughout Europe.

“When the Saxons invaded Britain, heathenism gained control. The conquerors disdained to be instructed by their slaves, and the Christians were forced to retreat to the mountains and the wild moors. Yet the light, hidden for a time, continued to burn. In Scotland, a century later, it shone out with a brightness that extended to far-distant lands. From Ireland came the pious Columba and his colaborers, who, gathering about them the scattered believers on the lonely island of Iona, made this the center of their missionary labors. Among these evangelists was an observer of the Bible Sabbath, and thus this truth was introduced among the people. A school was established at Iona, from which missionaries went out, not only to Scotland and England, but to Germany, Switzerland, and even Italy.”—*Great Controversy, p. 62.*

The “church in the wilderness,” in rural areas hidden from the despotism of Rome, the faithful continued to use the basic Majority Text, even though it may have been translated into Syrian, Gothic, Armenian, or Old Latin.

“The old Latin versions were used longest by the Eastern Christians who would not bow to the authority of Rome—*e.g.*, the Donatists; the Irish in Ireland, Britain, and the Continent; the Albigenses; etc.”—*Jacobus, Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared, p. 200.*

There are thousands of Old Latin and Vulgate manuscripts in the public and private libraries of Europe (some estimate it at 8,000).

There are more than 800 in the libraries of Paris alone.

“Now among translations themselves, the Italia is to be preferred to the others, for it keeps closer to the words without prejudice to clearness of expression.”—*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 2, p. 542.*

More on the Waldensian translation later.

[2] The Latin Vulgate. In A.D. 382, Bishop Damasus of Rome (they were not yet called “popes”) commissioned Jerome to make a new, “improved” edition of the Old Latin. That which he produced was the infamous Latin Vulgate.

Jerome was born about A.D. 341-342 of wealthy parents who gave him the best education available. He spent five years (374-379) in the desert in a hermit-like “self-discipline,” and then began studying Hebrew and Greek.

Jerome became a close friend of Pope Damasus; and, after living for several years in Antioch and Constantinople where he learned the latest philosophies, he went to Rome in A.D. 382, “where he spent more than two years in close association with Pope Damasus” (*Ira M. Price, Ancestry of Our English Bible, p. 86*).

At the request of the pope, he began work on a “modern” Latin Bible. First he translated a revision of the Gospels which appeared in A.D. 383. This was followed soon by Acts and the rest of the New Testament. His work on the Old Testament began with a revision of the Old Latin Psalter, done on the basis of the Septuagint (a Greek translation of the Old Testament completed about 150 B.C.).

When Pope Damasus died about A.D. 384, Jerome left Rome the next year and eventually settled in Bethlehem in Palestine, where he founded two religious houses. One was a monastery which he managed for the next 15 years. The other was a nearby nunnery, which a nun was in charge of.

From A.D. 390 to 404, he translated the rest of the Old Testament (including part of the Apocrypha). **So the entire Vulgate Bible was translated between A.D. 382 and 397.**

In A.D. 580, Pope Gregory praised this wonderful translation, the Vulgate. It was a book very dear to the heart of the pontiffs.

The Vulgate is still the official Psalter in St. Peter's, in Rome. Jerome's translation was always appreciated by the popes.

Later in this book, we will encounter the Vulgate again; for it was used by Rome to withstand Protestant Bibles. It was first used

to destroy the effect of the Waldensian Bible. After the Reformation began, translations of it into English and other languages were used to withstand the Protestant European and English Bibles. The Rheims-Douai was specifically translated from the Vulgate, in order to overcome the King James Bibles.

"In the fourth century, Helvidius, a great scholar of northern Italy [where the Waldenses lived], accused Jerome, whom the pope had empowered to form a Bible in Latin for Catholicism, using corrupt Greek manuscripts (*Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 6, p. 338*).

"How could Helvidius have accused Jerome of employing corrupt Greek manuscripts, if Helvidius had not had the pure Greek manuscripts?"

"And so learned and so powerful in writing and teaching was Jovinian, the pupil of Helvidius, that it demanded three of Rome's most famous 'fathers'—Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose—to unite in opposing Jovinian's influence. Even then, it needed the condemnation of the pope and the banishment of the emperor to prevail.

"But Jovinian's followers [the Waldenses] lived on and made the way easier for Luther."—*Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, p. 33*.

We will later return to the Rheims-Douai translation and its strange readings.

THE MAJORITY TEXT IS THE EARLIEST

The most reliable copies became the Majority; for they were copied by faithful Christians, scattered throughout the Near East and Europe.

We might ask why, if God protected the copies back then, a corrupt text is being used today? Back then, faithful Christians did the copying—but today worldlings, trained in secular universities, have substituted a greatly inferior Greek text.

Yet do not forget that, in the providence of God, He has provided us with the King James Version! In spite of the efforts of men to overthrow it, we still have that wonderful book!

Not only were the best copies the Majority ones; but, as you would expect, they were also the earliest! —If they were not the earliest, then they would have had to have been copied from the corrupt copies which Westcott and Hort said were the earliest!

The Bible writers themselves told us that,

very early, copies of God's Word were made and circulated everywhere.

"And the Word of God increased."—*Acts 6:7*.

"But the Word of God grew and multiplied."—*Acts 12:24*.

"The Word of the Lord was published throughout all the region."—*Acts 13:49*.

"So mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed."—*Acts 19:20*.

Here is a remarkable collection of statements by scholars, in support of the fact that the Majority Text—the basis of the King James Bible—comes from manuscripts which are the earliest:

"As far as the 'fathers' who died before A.D. 400 are concerned, the question may now be put and answered. Do they witness to the traditional text as existing from the first or do they not? The results of the evidence, both as regards the quantity and the quality of the testimony, enable us to reply not only that the traditional text was in existence, but that it was predominant during the period under review."—*D.J.W. Burgon, Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, p. 116*.

Pickering explains the multiplication of the originals throughout history.

"We may reasonably assume that in the earliest period of the transmission of the text, the most reliable copies of the autographs [the originals] would be circulating in the region that held the autographs. With an ever-increasing demand and consequent proliferation of copies throughout the Graeco Roman world and with the potential for verifying copies by having recourse to the centers still possessing the autographs, the early textual situation was highly favorable to the wide dissemination of manuscripts in close agreement with the original text . . .

"It follows that within a relatively few years after the writing of the New Testament books, there came rapidly into existence a 'Majority Text,' whose form was essentially that of the autographs . . . the science of statistical probability demonstrates that a text form in such circumstances could scarcely be dislodged from its dominant position . . .

"In every age, from the apostolic to the nineteenth century, the text form in question . . . was the one that the church in general recognized, used, and transmitted."—*Pickering, The Identity of the New Testament Text, pp. 116-120, 237*.

Simple arithmetic confirms that the nearer a particular reading is to the original, the longer the time span will be for descen-

dants to follow and multiply! The larger the family is, the older the original source must be.

Leading scholars of the world agree on the overwhelming dominance of this type of New Testament text in the early church and throughout history.

E.C. Colwell called it “the uncontrolled popular edition of the 2nd century” (*Colwell, Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism*, p. 53).

Philip Comfort wrote this:

“It became the most prevailing type of text throughout the Greek speaking world . . . It was nearly standardized. From then on, almost all manuscripts follow the Byzantine [Majority] text, including those manuscripts used by Erasmus in compiling the text that eventually would become the Textus Receptus [the Greek Text type underlying the King James Bible].”—*Philip W. Comfort, Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*, pp. 13-14.

Regarding the Majority Text, Geerlings affirmed:

“Its origins . . . go back to the autographs.”—*J. Geerlings, Family E and Its Allies in Mark*, p. 1.

Hodges wrote this:

“The Majority Text, it must be remembered, is relatively uniform in its general character with comparatively low amounts of variation between its major representatives . . . The majority of manuscripts in the transmission of any book will, *a priori* [when reasoning from cause to effect] preserve the best text. Thus the Majority Text, upon which the King James Version is based, has in reality the strongest claim possible to be regarded as an authentic representation of the original text . . . based on its dominances in the transmissional history of the New Testament text.”—*Hodges, Which Bible?* p. 37.

The *Harvard Theological Review* cited Kirsopp Lake’s exhaustive examination of manuscripts which revealed, “the uniformity of the text exhibited by the vast majority of the New Testament manuscripts.”

The *Theological Review* also pointed out that Von Soden, who made the most extensive review of the text yet accomplished, called it the Common (Kappa) text, showing that it was the Greek text type most commonly used throughout history.

Bruce Metzger, a leading Greek scholar in the mid-20th century, agreed with this verdict of history. He spoke of the “the great majority of the

minuscule manuscripts on which the Textus Receptus rests” (*Bruce Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, p. 86).

Hills, another New Testament scholar, wrote this:

“The vast majority of these extant Greek New Testament manuscripts agree together very closely, so closely indeed that they may fairly be said to contain the same New Testament. This Majority Text is usually called the Byzantine Text by modern textual critics. This is because all modern critics acknowledge that this was the Greek New Testament text in general use throughout the greater part of the Byzantine Period (A.D. 312-1453). For many centuries, before the Protestant Reformation, this Byzantine text was the text of the entire Greek Church, and for more than three centuries after the Reformation, it was the text of the entire Protestant church . . . [It is] found in the vast majority of the Greek New Testament manuscripts. . . The Traditional Text . . . is the true text because it is that form of the Greek New Testament which is known to have been used in the church of Christ in unbroken succession . . .

“Thus the evidence which has accumulated . . . is amply sufficient to justify the view . . . that therefore the Byzantine Text found in the vast majority of the Greek New Testament manuscripts is that true text.”—*Dr. Edward F. Hills, quoted in Which Bible?* pp. 104, 89, 90.

90% OF THE MANUSCRIPTS SUPPORT THE KING JAMES BIBLE

It is a remarkable fact that, not only the great majority of the ancient Biblical manuscripts are the basis of our King James Bible—but at least 90% of them are.

Kurt Aland’s collation of 1000 minuscules in 1000 different passages shows that 90% contain the Traditional Text. (He is the current editor-in-chief of the Nestle Text.)

Work done at The *Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung* [Institute for New Testament Studies] in Munster, Germany, confirms this same 90%. When they include papyrus and uncials together with cursive manuscripts, the number remains above 80% (*Pickering, Identity of the New Testament Text*, p. 160).

“The outstanding feature of the Received [Majority] Text is its high percentage of agreement among so many thousands of independent witnesses. This agreement is often placed at about 90 percent; in other words, 90 percent of all

existing manuscripts agree with one another so miraculously that they are able to form their own unique text. In contradistinction to such unity, the remaining **10 percent** comprises a selection of manuscripts that will both agree with the Majority Text in many particulars while disagreeing wildly in others. Again, let it be stated that many of these variant readings are also unique to the individual manuscript containing it; where the **10 percent** disagree from the majority, these departures also disagree with each other!"—*W.P. Grady, Final Authority, p. 28.*

Pickering, a careful researcher into the New Testament manuscripts, explains in detail these percentages. **Here is an excellent breakdown of the percentages:**

"A better, though more cumbersome, way to describe the situation would be something like this: 100% of the manuscripts agree as to, say, 80% of the text; 99% agree as to another 10%; over 95% agree as to another 4%; over 90% agree as to another 3%; only for 3% (or less) of the Text do less than 90% of the manuscripts agree."—*Wilbur Pickering, Identity of the New Testament Text, p. 118.*

Here is another manuscript analysis, prepared by Dr. Hodges:

"A very large number of Greek manuscripts of the New Testament survive today. A recent list gives these figures: papyrus manuscripts, 81; majuscules (manuscripts written in capital letters), 267; minuscules (manuscripts written in smaller script), 2,764. Of course, many of these are fragmentary and most of them do not contain the entire New Testament. Nevertheless, for an ancient book the available materials are massive and more than adequate for our needs, providing they are properly handled by scholars.

"It is also well known among students of textual criticism that a large majority of this huge mass of manuscripts—somewhere **between 80%-90%**—contain a Greek text which, in most respects, closely resembles the kind of text which was the basis of our King James Version. This piece of information, however, may come as a surprise to many ordinary Christians who have gained the impression that the Authorized Version is supported chiefly by 'inferior manuscripts.'"—*Zane C. Hodges, in Which Bible? p. 26.*

"**95%** of the manuscripts belong to the Byzantine tradition . . . [That is] the textual tradition which in large measure stands behind the KJV. There are far more manuscripts extant in this tradition than in the other three combined

[Caesarian, Western, and Alexandrian]."—*D.A. Carson, quoted in G.A. Riplinger, New Age Bible Versions, p. 478.*

Kurt Aland is the scholar to whom textual critics have committed the task of assigning official numbers to Greek manuscripts as they are found. He is the one who has compiled the figures in the above list. In addition to the totals given above, Aland also lists 2,143 lectionaries (manuscripts containing the Scripture lessons which were read publicly in the churches); so that the grand total of all these types of texts is 5,255 (*Kurt Aland, "The Greek New Testament: Its Present and Future Editions," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVII, June, 1968, p. 184.*)

Aland explains that the percentage of minuscules belonging to this type of text is about **90%** (say, 2,400 out of 2,700) while its representatives are found also among the codices (majuscules) and later papyri.

Among 44 significant codices described in Metzger's handbook, at least half either belong to or have affinities with this text form (*Bruce M. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration, pp. 42-61.*)

The low figure of 90% is, therefore, an overly safe estimate of the percentage of witnesses to this text from among papyri, majuscules, and minuscules taken together, which support the Majority Text. But a number of other scholars figure the percentage to be 95%. The present writer has worked with the apparatus of the Nestle Text (which Aland now edits), and he finds that relatively few manuscripts are consistently cited in favor of the Westcott-Hort type of readings. The great majority of witnesses opposing them are listed as "Byzantine" (Majority Text).

ONLY A 1% MINORITY SUPPORTS THE MODERN VERSIONS

The Bible says, "A false balance is abomination to the Lord" (Prov. 11:1). That is what the modern versions are based on.

The textual variations among the Majority Text are minor. On the other hand, the remaining handful of manuscripts are frequently extremely divergent from one another in their readings. **This handful not only disagrees with 'the Majority,' as to what the New Testament says, but disagree among themselves!** These include such manuscripts as Vaticanus (B), Sinaiticus

(Aleph), Bezae (D), Papyrus 75 and a smattering of versions. Of the four uncials, Aleph, B, C, and D, Burgon said this:

“All four are discovered on careful scrutiny to differ essentially, not only from the 99 out of 100 of the whole body of extant manuscripts, but even from one another.”—*John Burgon, The Revisions Revised*, p. 12.

Astoundingly, in the year 1881, this 1% minority text type supplanted the Majority Text with its almost two thousand years as the leading manuscript source. A ‘New’ Greek Text, based on the Vaticanus manuscript was introduced by Westcott and Hort. It has been used as the Greek Text for all subsequent versions. It seems that no 20th-century scholar or Bible translator dares oppose the will of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort.

Frederic Kenyon, the late Director of the British Museum and author of the most widely used textbooks on textual criticism, wrote this about the Majority Text:

“This is the text found in the great majority of manuscripts, entrenched in print by Erasmus and Stephenus and known as the *Textus Receptus* or Received Text . . . Until 1881 . . . it held the field as the text in practically universal use and when its position was then decisively challenged, a stiff fight was made in its defence by advocates such as Burgon.

“[This New Minority-type Greek text] predominantly used . . . Aleph and B [Sinaiticus and Vaticanus] type readings . . . [The changes] amount to an extensive modification of the text. It has been the dominating influence in all modern critical editions.

“It is clear that . . . deliberate alteration . . . has been at work on a large scale in one text or the other . . . The *Textus Receptus* [Majority Text] being habitually the longer and fuller of the two.”—*Frederick Kenyon, Text of the Greek New Testament*, pp. 197-204, 224, 231.

Did you catch that point? Kenyon, a world-recognized scholar of his day, said it was obvious that either Sinaiticus and Vaticanus had been deliberately altered or the Majority Text had. Then he pointed out that the fault could not lie with the Majority Text; for there were too many manuscripts containing its readings!

Wilbur Pickering deplors the fact that all modern Bible translators continue to rely on this inferior 1%-2% of the manuscripts, in preparing their new Bible versions. Here is a most excellent analysis of the situation:

“[The new versions] ignore the over 5,000 Greek manuscripts now extant . . . The evidence cited does prove that aberrant forms of the New Testament text were produced. Naturally some of those text forms may have acquired a local and temporary currency. Recall that the possibility of checking with the autographs must have served to inhibit the spread of such forms. We have what Aland calls the Majority Text (which Burgon calls the Traditional Text), dominating the stream of transmission with a few individual witnesses going their idiosyncratic ways . . . One may reasonably speak of 90% of the extant manuscripts belonging to the Majority Text type . . . The remaining 10% do not represent a single competing form.

“The minority manuscripts disagree as much (or more) among themselves as they do with the majority. We are not judging between two text forms, one representing 90% of the manuscripts and the other 10%. Rather we have to judge between 90% and a fraction of 1% (comparing the Majority Text with P75 and B text form for example). Or to take a specific case, in 1 Timothy 3:16, over 300 Greek manuscripts read ‘God’ [KJV] . . . Greek manuscripts read ‘who’ [NIV, NASV, etc.] So we have to judge between 97% and 2% . . .

“It really does seem that those scholars who reject the Majority Text are faced with as serious a problem . . . They are remnants reflecting ancient aberrant forms. It is a dependence on such aberrant forms that distinguishes contemporary critical editions of the New Testament . . . I submit that due process requires us to receive as original that form of the text which is supported by the majority of witnesses. To reject their testimony in favour of our own imagination as to what a reading ought to be is manifestly untenable.”—*Wilbur Pickering, The Identity of the New Testament Text*, pp. 114-120, 25, 149, 150, 237.

In the above statement, Pickering says that **it is not 90% of the manuscripts saying this, as opposed to 10% which say that; but it is 90% which stand solidly in mutual agreement while 10% disagree fiercely among themselves. Therefore, on any given passage, it is 90% against 1% or 2%, not 90% vs. 10%.**

Then there is Hodges; he says that **modern textual critics do the opposite of scientists in other fields: Everyone else goes by what majority research proves, not that which the minority presents.**

“Modern criticism repeatedly and systematically rejects Majority readings on a large scale . . . [This is] monstrously unscientific . . . If mod-

ern criticism continues its trend toward more genuinely scientific procedures, this question will once again become a central consideration . . . The Textus Receptus was too hastily abandoned.”—*Zane C. Hodges, quoted in op. cit., pp. 159-179.*

**THIS 1% REPRESENTS
ONLY ONE SMALL, AND MOST
CORRUPT, LOCALITY**

Not only are these manuscripts a minority of witnesses, but they represent only one geographical area: Alexandria, Egypt. The Majority Text, on the other hand, come from manuscripts from Greece, Constantinople, Asia Minor, Syria, Africa, Gaul, South Italy, Sicily, England, and Ireland.

Pickering wrote this:

“A reading found in only one limited area cannot be original . . . if a reading died out in the fourth century, we have the verdict of history against it.”—*Op. cit., pp. 143-144.*

And that is what happened. The great majority of the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus scribal changes in the text were not copied by scribes! They recognized that those two codices were flawed.

Hodges maintained that, because most of the non-Byzantine type of manuscripts have come from Egypt, therefore they probably represent a textual tradition pertaining only to that geographical area (*Hodges, The King James Version Debate, p. 49*).

Another textual scholar, Zuntz, was careful to note that the agreement between our modern editions does not mean that we have recovered the original text. Indeed, all that has been done is that modern editors have followed one narrow section of the evidence, namely the non-Western old uncials (*G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles, p. 8*).

Regarding those two codices, which form the basis of all modern Bible translations, K.W. Clark said it well: “All are found on the same Egyptian recension” (*K.W. Clark, “Today’s Problems with the Critical Text of the New Testament,” in Transitions in Biblical Scholarship, ed. by J.C.R. Rylaarsdam, p. 166*).

What is a “recension”? According to Webster, it is a “revision.” The NASV Interlinear Greek-English New Testament refers to its “Greek text” as a “recension” (*Alfred Marshall, The NASV Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, p. vi*). Wouldn’t you really rather have “the origi-

nal”? That is what you get in the Bible translated from the Majority Text.

ERRORS WERE INTRODUCED EARLY

It is said that the King James-based manuscripts are late and practically worthless, and the Sinaiticus / Vaticanus manuscripts (which were also comparatively early) are very pure because they are early.

We have found that the first part of that sentence is untrue; now we will learn that the last part is equally false.

“It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed; that Irenaeus [A.D. 130-200] and the African ‘fathers’ and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephenus thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Textus Receptus.”—*Fredrick H.A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament for the Use of the Biblical Student, Vol. 2, pp. 264-265.*

Even Hort admitted that his beloved Alexandrian manuscripts were not very good. In a letter to Westcott, he wrote:

“Inaccuracy may in certain men or at certain periods run into a laxity which is careless about words though supposing itself faithful to sense, and which draws no sharp line between transcribing and editing, *i.e.* mending or completing. This last characteristic naturally belongs to the early period.”—*A.F. Hort, Life and Letters of F.J.A. Hort, Vol. 2., p. 228.*

While some of these flaws were of an unintentional nature (human error or scribal carelessness, etc.), many others resulted from deliberate interference. Sometimes the tampering was heretical; at other times it was pious but misguided.

There are four basic types of corruptions which can occur in a text. Here they are: omissions, additions (interpolations), changes (substitutions), and transpositions (reversing word order). Omissions constitute the largest number while additions are the smallest.

Upon examining the very earliest manuscripts, the papyri, we find they had such errors:

The Chester Beatty and Bodmer papyri, two of the oldest manuscripts (but both from Egypt)

had almost total disagreement with one another. Out of 70 extant verses, they disagreed with one another in 73 places, apart from mistakes.

When the nearly 100 extant papyrus fragments are carefully examined, we find that corruption is the rule and not the exception.

One of the oldest papyrus manuscripts in existence is P⁶⁶ (Bodmer Collection); dated at about A.D. 200, P⁶⁶ contains 104 leaves of John 1:1 to 6:11; 6:35b to 14:15, and fragments of forty other pages from John 14 to 21.

Wilbur Pickering has cited the results of E.C. Colwell's collation of P⁶⁶ along with P⁴⁵ (c. 250) and P⁷⁵ (c. 225):

"The nearly 200 nonsense readings and 400 itacistic (vowel interchange) spellings in P⁴⁵ are evidence of something less than disciplined attention to the basic task. To this evidence of carelessness must be added those singular readings whose origin baffles speculation, readings that can be given no more exact label than carelessness leading to assorted variant readings. A hurried count shows P⁴⁵ with 20, P⁷⁵ with 57, and P⁶⁶ with 216 purely careless readings."—*W. Pickering, The Identity of the New Testament Text*, p. 123.

Commenting on this, Pickering said this:

"Colwell's study took into account only singular [unique] readings—readings which no other manuscript supports. He found P⁶⁶ to have 400 itacisms plus 482 other singular readings, 40 percent of which are nonsensical. 'P⁶⁶ editorializes as he does everything else—in a sloppy fashion.' In short, P⁶⁶ is a very poor copy—and yet it is one of the earliest!

"P⁷⁵ is placed close to P⁶⁶ in date. Though not as bad as P⁶⁶, it is scarcely a good copy. Colwell found P⁷⁵ to have about 145 itacisms plus 257 other singular readings, 25 percent of which are nonsensical. Although Colwell gives the scribe of P⁷⁵ credit for having tried to produce a good copy, P⁷⁵ looks good only by comparison with P⁶⁶. (If you were asked to write out the Gospel of John by hand, would you make over 400 mistakes? Try it and see.)"—*Op. cit.*, p. 125.

Here we have manuscripts dated very early; yet they are full of mistakes! P⁶⁶ is dated at A.D. 200. Another papyrus, P⁴⁶, is one of three manuscripts in the famed Chester Beatty collection. Consisting of 86 mutilated leaves, this fragment comprises eight of the Pauline epistles. Gunther Zuntz says this about it:

"In spite of its neat appearance (it was written by a professional scribe and corrected—but very imperfectly—by an expert). P⁴⁶ is by

no means a good manuscript. The scribe committed very many blunders . . . My impression is that he was liable to fits of exhaustion."—*Op. cit.*, p. 125.

Farther down on the same page, Zuntz adds this:

"The scribe who wrote the papyrus did his work very badly. Of his innumerable faults, only a fraction (less than one in ten) have been corrected and even that fraction—as often happens in manuscripts—grows smaller and smaller towards the end of the book. Whole pages have been left without any correction, however greatly they were in need of it."—*Ibid.*

Later in time, we come to the ancient uncials, but we find them to also be in poor shape. Dean Burgon did an analysis of Luke's account of the Lord's Prayer in "the five old uncials." These five are the Sinaiticus (aleph), Vaticanus (B), Alexandrinus (A), Ephraemi (C), and Bezae (D). The Bezae is also called the Cantabridgiensis.

This is what he discovered:

"The five old uncials (Alpha, A, B, C, D) falsify the Lord's Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among themselves, that they throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from the Traditional Text [the Majority Text]; and yet they are never able to agree among themselves as to one single various reading; while only once are more than two of them observed to stand together, and their grand point of union is no less than an omission of the article. Such is their eccentric tendency, that in respect of thirty-two out of the whole forty-five words they bear in turn solitary evidence."—*D.J.W. Burgon, Traditional Text*, p. 84.

Burgon provides another example of this lack of agreement among the ancient codices with his comments on Mark 2:1-12:

"In the course of those 12 verses . . . there will be found to be 60 variations of reading . . . Now, in the present instance, the 'five old uncials' *cannot be* the depositories of a tradition,—whether Western or Eastern,—because they render inconsistent testimony *in every verse*. It must further be admitted (for this is really not a question of opinion, but a plain matter of fact) that it is unreasonable to place confidence in such documents. What would be thought in a Court of Law of five witnesses, called up 47 times for examination, who should be observed to bear contradictory testimony *every time*?"—*Burgon, The Revision Revised*,

pp. 30-31.

Kurt Aland, the man most responsible today for promoting the papyrus manuscripts and the five ancient uncials (since he is the editor-in-chief of the Nestle and UBS Texts which all modern versions are translated from) said this:

"We need not mention the fact that the oldest manuscript does not necessarily have the best text. P⁴⁷ is, for example, by far the oldest of the manuscripts containing the full or almost full text of the Apocalypse, but it is certainly not the best."—Kurt Aland, quoted in *Pickering, Identity of the New Testament Text*, pp. 125-126.

Hort himself conceded this:

"The confusion of attestation introduced by these several cross currents of change is so great that of the seven principal manuscripts (Aleph, A, B, C, D, L, and Delta), no two have the same text in all four places."—Hort, quoted in *Fuller, True or False?* p. 71 [L stands for Codex Regius; and Delta stands for Codex Sangallensis.]

If both Aland and Hort admit the truth, why does anyone still believe the lie?

In view of what we have so far read in this section, on what basis can it be said that any manuscript can be any good, if some of the early ones had so many errors?

The answer is quite obvious. (1) The 10% of the manuscripts with all those errors, whether copied early or later, were either made in Egypt where there was little respect for Biblical accuracy or they were made by major codex copyists who were paid by kings and popes to do the job and cared little for the quality of their work.

But (2) God cared for the manuscripts copied by the faithful who, with little fanfare, produced thousands of copies. Those copies agreed almost perfectly and were reverently prepared by humble folk who loved God's Word.

Taught by devils, Westcott and Hort maintained that the readings, which the largest number of manuscripts had in common, would be the most corrupt. But Hodges explained why they would, instead, be the most accurate:

"The manuscript tradition of an ancient book will, under any but the most exceptional conditions, multiply in a reasonably regular fashion with the result that the copies nearest the autograph will normally have the largest number of descendants. The further removed in the history of transmission a text becomes from its

source, the less time it has to leave behind a large family of offspring. Hence, in a large tradition where a pronounced unity is observed between, let us say, eighty per cent of the evidence, a very strong presumption is raised that this numerical preponderance is due to direct derivation from the very oldest sources. In the absence of any convincing contrary explanation, this presumption is raised to a very high level of probability indeed."—Hodges, quoted in *Fuller, Which Bible?* p. 37.

Even Hort admitted the fact:

"A theoretical presumption indeed remains that a majority of extant documents is more likely to represent a majority of ancestral documents at each stage of transmission than vice versa."—Hort, quoted in *ibid.*

Church history confirms that **the initial copies of Scripture were blessed with an unprecedented proliferation.** For instance, Clement of Rome refers to at least eight New Testament books in his epistle to the Corinthians, dated about A.D. 96. Many such similar references confirm the early existence of a burden to both propagate and receive the precious words of God.

Although the dedicated early Christians eagerly made copies of the Scriptures, they were concerned about doing it very carefully. Such caution was a natural reaction to the vicious onslaught of heretical corruption which quickly began. Having copied the very prophecies of the enemy's approach, they were suddenly confronted by their ominous fulfillment—as they learned of the heresies and poorly made copies produced down in the university town of Alexandria.

The early true Christian leaders worked vigorously to resist the apostasy. This is mentioned in Scripture:

"I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars."—*Revelation 2:2.*

Polycarp, bishop in Smyrna (A.D. 69-155) had been a personal disciple of John. He continued his teacher's concern, to safeguard the Word of God. He wrote: "Whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord . . . he is the first-born of Satan."

Irenaeus, at the end of his manuscript letter, *On the Ogdoad*, included this note:

"I adjure you who shall copy out this book, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by His glorious advent when He comes to judge the living and

the dead, that you compare what you transcribe, and correct it carefully against this manuscript from which you copy; and also that you transcribe this adjuration and insert it in the copy.”—*Irenaeus, quoted in Pickering, Identity, p. 108.*

As Adam, Methuselah, and Noah preserved the entire preflood oral tradition, the church’s accessibility to New Testament autographs offered a similar security for the written record. That the originals were used in this very manner is confirmed by the written testimony of Tertullian as late as the year A.D. 208. In his defensive work, entitled *On Persecution against Heretics*, he rebuked the skeptics of his age with the challenge that **the “authentic writings” of the apostles were still possessed by Christians in his day:**

“Come now, you who would indulge a better curiosity, if you would apply it to the business of your salvation, run over [to] the apostolic churches, in which the very thrones of the apostles are still pre-eminent in their places, *in which their own authentic writings are read*, uttering the voice and representing the face of each of them severally. Achaia is very near you, [in which] you find Corinth. Since you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi; (and there too) you have the Thessalonians. Since you are able to cross to Asia, you get Ephesus. Since, moreover, you are close upon Italy, you have Rome, from which there comes even into our own hands the very authority (of apostles themselves). How happy is its church, on which apostles poured forth all their doctrine along with their blood!”—*Tertullian, quoted in Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 3, p. 260.*

Satan was trying, in a thousand ways, to corrupt the faith of the saints.

THE PSEUDOPIGRAPHA

The pseudopigrapha should be mentioned here. These were apocryphal books which claimed to have been written by the apostles or their helpers, yet which taught various errors.

Alluded to by Luke (Luke 1:1-2), these non-inspired books were among the earliest irritations to the young churches. Eusebius said this about them:

“Among the spurious must be numbered, both the books called The Acts of Paul, and that called Pastor, and The Revelation of Peter. Beside these, the books called The Epistle of Barnabas, and what are called The Institutions

of the Apostles.”—*Eusebius, quoted in Pamphilus, Ecclesiastical History, pp. 215-216.*

Photius, a Christian writer in the 9th-century, listed over 280 of these fake New Testament books. These included the Gospels of Thomas, Peter, Nicodemus, Barnabas, Andrew, Philip, and Thaddeus; as well as numerous missing “epistles” of Paul; along with the Apocalypse of Peter, Paul, Thomas, and Stephen (*N.L. Geisler and W.E. Nix, General Introduction to the Bible, pp. 200-201*).

The pope told Jerome to include the Old Testament Apocrypha in his Latin Vulgate, which he did (although he commented that he did not believe they were inspired). At the Council of Trent, Rome decided to keep most of the Old Testament apocryphal books, since they helped prove pergatory and some other Catholic inventions.

But not even Rome accepted any of the New Testament pseudopigraphal books.

THE TRUE CHURCH FLEES WITH THE MANUSCRIPTS INTO THE WILDERNESS

Ultimately, with the passing of the centuries, the Roman apostasy grew to the point that **the bishop of Rome demanded that all the local churches bow in submission to him. This only accelerated the scattering of the faithful, as they fulfilled the prophecy of Revelation 12 and fled into the wilderness. And what did they take with them?—those pure Biblical manuscripts! The corrupt ones, from Alexandria, they left behind for the pope and his henchmen to work with.** Wilkerson said it well:

“But soon the scene changed; the fury of Satan, robbed of further opportunity to harass the Son of God, turned upon the written Word. Heretical sects, warring for supremacy, corrupted the manuscripts in order to further their ends. ‘Epiphanius, in his polemic treatise the *Panarion*, describes not less than eighty heretical parties.’ The Roman Catholics won. The true church fled into the wilderness, taking pure manuscripts with her.”—*Benjamin G. Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, p. 7.*

GOD’S GUIDANCE IN THE SELECTION OF THE MAJORITY TEXT

In view of such desperate efforts by Satan to corrupt the faith of the people of God, it is a great marvel that we have a holy Bible at all!

But the God of heaven, who inspired the Sacred Writings, was also protecting it.

The Lord guided His true church to prepare careful copies, reject false readings, and only accept the good ones. Just as surely as He guided in the selection of which books should be in the inspired canon of Scripture, so He guided in the preparation of manuscript copies. Hills explains what happened:

“No sooner had the New Testament books been given to the church through the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit than the spirit of darkness began his endeavors to corrupt their texts and render them useless, but in these efforts also the evil one failed to attain his objective. In regard to the New Testament text as well as in regard to the New Testament canon God bestowed upon His church sufficient grace to enable her to overcome all the wiles of the devil.

“Just as God guided the church to reject, after a period of doubt and conflict, all non-canonical New Testament books, so God guided the church during this same period of doubt and conflict, to reject false readings and to receive into common usage the true New Testament text.

“For an orthodox Christian, Burgon’s view is the only reasonable one. If we believe that God gave the church guidance in regard to the New Testament books, then surely it is logical to believe that God gave the church similar guidance in regard to the text which these books contained. Surely it is very inconsistent to believe that God guided the church in regard to the New Testament canon but gave the church no guidance in regard to the New Testament text.”—*Edward F. Hills, quoted in D.O. Fuller, Which Bible? p. 99.*

According to the liberal view, all the Bible manuscripts are worthless, except for two especially, plus a few others. Hills powerfully replies to that error:

“I am utterly disinclined to believe, so grossly improbable does it seem—that at the end of 1,800 years 995 copies out of every thousand, supposedly prove untrustworthy; and that the one, two, three, four or five which remain, whose contents were till yesterday as good as unknown, will be found to have retained the secret of what the Holy Spirit originally inspired.

“I am utterly unable to believe, in short, that God’s promise has so entirely failed, that at the end of 1,800 years, much of the text of the Gospel had in point of fact to be picked by a German critic out of a wastepaper basket in

the convent of St. Catherine; and that the entire text had to be remodeled after the pattern set by a couple of copies which had remained in neglect during fifteen centuries, and had probably owed their survival to that neglect; whilst hundreds of others had been thumbed to pieces and had bequeathed their witness to copies made from them.”—*Op. cit., p. 92.*

Oh, that all the Bible translators in the world could read the above statements by Edward Hills!

The Presbyterian theologian, B.B. Warfield, theorized that God had worked providentially through Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott, and Hort to preserve the New Testament text, by their inclusion of the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus in a prominent roll in critical Greek Texts! To this, in a different book, Hills gave this forceful reply:

“But this suggestion leads to conclusions which are extremely bizarre and inconsistent. It would have us believe that during the manuscript period orthodox Christians corrupted the New Testament text, that the text used by the Protestant Reformers was the worst of all, and that the true text was not restored until the nineteenth century, when Tregelles brought it forth out of the Pope’s library, when Tischendorf rescued it from a wastebasket on Mt. Sinai, and when Westcott and Hort were providentially guided to construct a theory of it which ignores God’s special providence and treats the text of the New Testament like the text of any other ancient book.

“But if the true New Testament text was lost for 1,500 years, how can we be sure that it has ever been found again?”—*Edward F. Hills, The King James Version Defended, pp. 110-111.*

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS ON THIS CONTROVERSY

We have found that the Greek manuscripts clearly favor the Majority Text, which is the basis of the King James Version—even though, as we shall learn later, that Majority Text has been rejected by all 20th-century Bible translations, without exception!

The Majority Text (also called the Received Text, the Textus Receptus, Syrian Text, Antiochian Text, and—slurringly by the liberals—the Byzantine Text) contains the purest, most accurate, and earliest Greek manuscripts.

How thankful we can be to our kind heavenly Father, that He has protected His holy Word through all past ages. But now, in the end time,

the warning of Revelation 12:17 is being fulfilled. The dragon is desperately at work to destroy the faith of the remnant, keeping in delusion all those who might be attracted to the final truths for our generation. May we be faithful in defending God's Word. For when we do, we defend God Himself. And what an honor it is to be able to do that!

In concluding this section, we will cite a few additional quotations by Bible scholars.

Wilbur Pickering, author of the scholarly book, *Identity of the New Testament Text*, and recipient of a TH.M in Greek Exegesis from Dallas Theological Seminary, with an M.A. and Ph.D. in Linguistics, from the University of Toronto, wrote this:

"The distressing realization is forced upon us that the 'progress' of the past hundred years has been precisely in—the wrong direction—our modern versions and critical texts are found to differ from the Original in some six thousand places, many of them being serious differences . . . [They] are several times farther removed from the originals than are the A.V. and TR [King James Version and its foundation, the Greek Textus Receptus]. How could such a calamity have come upon us? . . . Much of the work that has been done is flawed."—*Pickering, The Identity of the New Testament Text*, pp. 149-150, 237.

Dean John Burgon, the scholar who collated the earliest New Testament documents—including codices, cursive Manuscripts, papyri, lectionaries, quotations by early "fathers" (87,000 in all)—wrote this about the changes the liberals were making in Greek texts and Bible translations:

"Ordinary readers . . . will of course assume that the changes result from the reviser's skill in translating—advances which have been made in the study of Greek. It was found that they had erred through defective scholarship to an extent and with a frequency, which to me is simply inexplicable . . . Anything more unscientific . . . can scarcely be conceived, but it has prevailed for fifty years. We regret to discover that . . . their work is disfigured throughout by changes which convict a majority of their body alike of an imperfect acquaintance with the Greek language."—*Burgon, The Revision Revised*, pp. 54, xi, 270, 277.

Edward F. Hills, author of *The King James Version Defended*, and graduate of Yale University, Westminster Theological Seminary, recipi-

ent of the Ph.D. from Harvard, and the TH.M from Columbia University, declared that "modern speech Bibles are unscholarly" (*Hills, King James Version Defended*, p. 219).

Dr. E.C. Colwell, past president of the University of Chicago and a leading North American New Testament Greek scholar, authored scores of books, including *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Ultimately, he recognized that the liberal position was totally wrong—and he returned to fullest confidence in the Majority Text.

"Scholars now believe that most errors were made deliberately . . . the variant readings in the New Testament were created for theological or dogmatic reasons. Most of the manuals now in print (including mine!) will tell you that these variations were the fruit of careless treatment . . . The reverse is the case."—*Colwell, What is the Best New Testament?* pp. 53, 49.

Zane Hodges, professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis at Dallas Theological Seminary and co-editor of a Greek New Testament, made this comment about the new versions:

"Monstrously unscientific, if not dangerously obscurantist. The average well-taught Bible-believing Christian has often heard the error that the King James Version is corrected on the basis of better manuscripts or older authorities."—*Hodges, quoted in Pickering, Identity of the New Testament Text*, p. 160.

"Lacking any kind of technical training in this area, the average believer probably has accepted such explanations from individuals he regards as qualified to give them."—*Hodges, quoted in D.O. Fuller, Which Bible?* p. 25.

William Palmer, scholar and author of *Narrative of Events on the Tracts for the Times*, made this comment:

"Ordinary Christians have little idea [concerning the new Greek text] . . . it rests in many cases on quotations which are not genuine . . . on passages which when collated with the original, are proved to be wholly inefficacious as proofs."—*Palmer, quoted in op. cit.*, p. 265.

WALDENSIAN BIBLE

The Waldenses, in the Italian Alps of northern Italy, maintained a pure faith for centuries. According to the following statement, those believers in the Piedmont valleys held to the pure Apostolic faith to as far back as the 4th century A.D. and earlier.

“The method which Allix has pursued, in his History of the Churches of Piedmont [the Waldensian churches], is to show that in the ecclesiastical history of every century, from the fourth century, which he considers a period early enough for the inquirer after apostolical purity of doctrine, there are clear proofs that doctrines, unlike those which the Romish Church holds, and conformable to the belief of the Waldensian and Reformed churches, were maintained by believers of the north of Italy down to the period, when the Waldenses first came into notice.

“Consequently, the opinions of the Waldenses were not new to Europe in the eleventh or twelfth centuries, and there is nothing improbable in the tradition that the Subalpine Church persevered in its integrity in an uninterrupted course from the first preaching of the Gospel in the valleys.”—Gilly, *Waldensian Researches*, p. 113.

It was because the Waldenses had the Word of God in their own language, that they were able to maintain their faith through all those centuries. They first had the Italia manuscripts which, as we earlier learned, were faithful to the Majority Text. Later they prepared the Waldensian Bible.

The Waldensians, also known as the Vaudois

[pronounced “VAW-doh”], were a distinct group of earnest Christians with their own Bibles, as early as the early part of the 4th century, in the time of Constantine.

“There are modern writers who attempt to fix the beginning of the Waldenses from Peter Waldo, who began his work about 1175. This is a mistake. The historical name of this people as properly derived from the valleys where they lived, is Vaudois. Their enemies, however, ever sought to date their origin from Waldo . .

“There remains to us in the ancient Waldensian language, *The Noble Lesson (La Nobla Leycon)*, written about the year A.D. 1100, which assigns the first opposition of the Waldenses to the Church of Rome to the days of Constantine the Great, when Sylvester was pope . . Thus, when Christianity, emerging from the long persecutions of pagan Rome, was raised to imperial favor by the Emperor Constantine, the Italic church in northern Italy—later [called] the Waldenses—is seen standing in opposition to papal Rome.

“Their Bible was of the family of the renowned Italia. It was that translation into Latin which represents the Received Text. Its very name, ‘Italia,’ is derived from the Italic district, the regions Oof the Vaudois.

“Of the purity and reliability of this version,

“The multiplication of witnesses [Biblical manuscripts] and variants [differences between them] attests the tremendous importance of the New Testament in the early centuries and really guarantees the general integrity of the text [because there are so many manuscripts].

“Only 400 or so of the 150,000 variants [in the those manuscripts] materially affect the sense, and of these perhaps 50 are of real significance. But no essential teaching of the New Testament is greatly affected by them.”

—Ira Maurice Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible*, p. 222

The Centuries Between

Pre-King James Bibles Are Made

Augustine, speaking of different Latin Bibles (about A.D. 400) said:

“ ‘Now among translations themselves the Italian (Italia) is to be preferred to the others, for it keeps closer to the words without prejudice to clearness of expression.’

“The old Waldensian liturgy which they used in their services down through the centuries contained ‘texts of Scripture of the ancient version called the Italick.’ ”—*Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, pp. 34-35.

The Waldensians existed from the earliest times in the territory now known as northern Italy. But we are told that, when intense persecution came to them, some apostatized, others moved farther into the Italian Alps, while still others carried the faith to foreign lands.

“But of those who resisted the encroachments of the papal power, the Waldenses stood foremost. In the very land where popery had fixed its seat, there its falsehood and corruption were most steadfastly resisted. For centuries the churches of Piedmont maintained their independence; but the time came at last when Rome insisted upon their submission. After ineffectual struggles against her tyranny, the leaders of these churches reluctantly acknowledged the supremacy of the power to which the whole world seemed to pay homage.

“There were some, however, who refused to yield to the authority of pope or prelate. They were determined to maintain their allegiance to God and to preserve the purity and simplicity of their faith. A separation took place. Those who adhered to the ancient faith now withdrew; some, forsaking their native Alps, raised the banner of truth in foreign lands; others retreated to the secluded glens and rocky fastnesses of the mountains, and there preserved their freedom to worship God.”—*Great Controversy*, 64.

It was the Waldensians which were the true church, not the proud church down in Rome.

“But those humble peasants, in their ob-

scure retreats, shut away from the world, and bound to daily toil among their flocks and their vineyards, had not by themselves arrived at the truth in opposition to the dogmas and heresies of the apostate church. Theirs was not a faith newly received. Their religious belief was their inheritance from their fathers. They contended for the faith of the apostolic church,—‘the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.’ Jude 3. ‘The church in the wilderness,’ and not the proud hierarchy enthroned in the world’s great capital, was the true church of Christ, the guardian of the treasures of truth which God has committed to His people to be given to the world.”—*Great Controversy*, 64.

It was because they had the pure text of the Bible in their own language, that they were especially hated by Rome—for only the clear teachings of Scripture could unveil the hideous deceptions of the papacy.

“The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation they possessed the Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution. They declared the Church of Rome to be the apostate Babylon of the Apocalypse, and at the peril of their lives they stood up to resist her corruptions.

“While, under the pressure of long-continued persecution, some compromised their faith, little by little yielding its distinctive principles, others held fast the truth. Through ages of darkness and apostasy there were Waldenses who denied the supremacy of Rome, who rejected image worship as idolatry, and who kept the true Sabbath. Under the fiercest tempests of opposition they maintained their faith. Though gashed by the Savoyard spear, and scorched by the Romish fagot, they stood unflinchingly for God’s Word and His honor.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 65.

Notice that they had the Bible “hundreds of

years” before the Reformation.” **Peter Waldo did not start the Vaudois, as though they originated with him.** He was a wealthy Christian businessman in Lyons, France.

What Bible was this that they had? What was the Waldensian Bible? It was the *Italia*, the ancient translation their forefathers had made from manuscripts very close in time to the originals. How powerful was that Bible? So powerful that, in spite of continued persecution, they kept the true faith for centuries.

The secret of success was the fact that the Bible was the primary textbook in their schools. Parents maintained home schools and diligently taught the pure Word to their children.

“Pure, simple, and fervent was the piety of these followers of Christ. The principles of truth they valued above houses and lands, friends, kindred, even life itself. These principles they earnestly sought to impress upon the hearts of the young.

“From earliest childhood the youth were instructed in the Scriptures and taught to regard sacredly the claims of the law of God. Copies of the Bible were rare; therefore its precious words were committed to memory. Many were able to repeat large portions of both the Old and the New Testaments. Thoughts of God were associated alike with the sublime scenery of nature and with the humble blessings of daily life. Little children learned to look with gratitude to God as the giver of every favor and every comfort.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 67.

Another important strength of this people was that their pastors only preached from the Inspired Writings. They did not refer to the works of uninspired commentaries and philosophers.

“The Vaudois churches, in their purity and simplicity, resembled the church of apostolic times. Rejecting the supremacy of the pope and prelate, they held the Bible as the only supreme, infallible authority. Their pastors, unlike the lordly priests of Rome, followed the example of their Master, who ‘came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.’

“They fed the flock of God, leading them to the green pastures and living fountains of His holy Word. Far from the monuments of human pomp and pride the people assembled, not in magnificent churches or grand cathedrals, but beneath the shadow of the mountains, in the Alpine valleys, or, in time of danger, in some rocky stronghold, to listen to the words of truth from the servants of Christ.”—*Great Contro-*

versy, p. 68.

In addition to their parents, godly pastors, with the Word of God in their hands, taught the youth.

“From their pastors the youth received instruction. While attention was given to branches of general learning, the Bible was made the chief study. The Gospels of Matthew and John were committed to memory, with many of the Epistles. They were employed also in copying the Scriptures. Some manuscripts contained the whole Bible, others only brief selections, to which some simple explanations of the text were added by those who were able to expound the Scriptures. Thus were brought forth the treasures of truth so long concealed by those who sought to exalt themselves above God.”—*Great Controversy*, pp. 68-69.

In addition to their duties in the home, on the farm, and in the orchard, these godly young people also worked at making copies of the precious Bible manuscripts.

“By patient, untiring labor, sometimes in the deep, dark caverns of the earth, by the light of torches, the Sacred Scriptures were written out, verse by verse, chapter by chapter. Thus the work went on, the revealed will of God shining out like pure gold; how much brighter, clearer, and more powerful because of the trials undergone for its sake only those could realize who were engaged in the work. Angels from heaven surrounded these faithful workers.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 69.

This preservation of the pure manuscripts in the *Italia* had gone on for centuries. Because the people were conscientious and dedicated, the angels could guide their hands so they were not likely to make copyist errors.

The agents of Satan were enraged. They wanted to corrupt and destroy the Word of God; yet here was a people who were preserving it in its pure form!

“Satan had urged on the papal priests and prelates to bury the Word of truth beneath the rubbish of error, heresy, and superstition; but in a most wonderful manner it was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness. It bore not the stamp of man, but the impress of God. Men have been unwearied in their efforts to obscure the plain, simple meaning of the Scriptures, and to make them contradict their own testimony; but like the ark upon the billowy deep, the Word of God outrides the storms that threaten it with destruction.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 69.

These divinely inspired statements are

highly significant. Liberals today declare that only the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, and related manuscripts, have the original text. But it is clear that the Waldenses had it!

“The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation they possessed the Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 65.

“Satan had urged on the papal priests and prelates to bury the Word of truth beneath the rubbish of error, heresy, and superstition; but in a most wonderful manner it was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness. It bore not the stamp of man, but the impress of God.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 69.

As the youth became older, they were sent out as missionaries, secretly carrying portions of Scripture with them to be shared with others. This was the basis of their evangelistic work. (See *Great Controversy*, pp. 70-76.)

The evangelistic work of laymen today should also be based on sharing the Inspired Writings: the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy with so many out there who know them not.

As in all ages, those who have the Word of God and who share the Word of God are persecuted.

“The Waldensian missionaries were invading the kingdom of Satan, and the powers of darkness aroused to greater vigilance. Every effort to advance the truth was watched by the prince of evil, and he excited the fears of his agents. The papal leaders saw a portent of danger to their cause from the labors of these humble itinerants. If the light of truth were allowed to shine unobstructed, it would sweep away the heavy clouds of error that enveloped the people. It would direct the minds of men to God alone and would eventually destroy the supremacy of Rome.

“The very existence of this people, holding the faith of the ancient church, was a constant testimony to Rome’s apostasy, and therefore excited the most bitter hatred and persecution. Their refusal to surrender the Scriptures was also an offense that Rome could not tolerate. She determined to blot them from the earth. Now began the most terrible crusades against God’s people in their mountain homes. Inquisitors were put upon their track, and the scene of innocent Abel falling before the murderous Cain was often repeated.”—*Great Controversy*,

p. 76.

Why is it that those who claim to be God’s “remnant” in these last days are not being persecuted? The answer is obvious: They are not earnestly, urgently sharing the Word, and its end-time teachings.

“There is another and more important question that should engage the attention of the churches of today. The apostle Paul declares that ‘all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution,’ 2 Timothy 3:12. Why is it, then, that persecution seems in a great degree to slumber? The only reason is that the church has conformed to the world’s standard and therefore awakens no opposition.

“The religion which is current in our day is not of the pure and holy character that marked the Christian faith in the days of Christ and His apostles. It is only because of the spirit of compromise with sin, because the great truths of the Word of God are so indifferently regarded, because there is so little vital godliness in the church, that Christianity is apparently so popular with the world.

“Let there be a revival of the faith and power of the early church, and the spirit of persecution will be revived, and the fires of persecution will be rekindled.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 48.

Leger, a noble scholar of Waldensian ancestry tried to save their records in the terrible massacres of 1655. His book, *General History of the Evangelical Churches of the Vaudois Churches*, published in French in 1669, revealed their history.

It was the Waldensian faith and their Bible which laid the foundation for the later Protestant French Bible. Leger said that Olivetan’s French Bible of 1537 was “entire and pure,” because its ancestry was not the papal productions, but the Waldensian Bible.

“I say ‘pure’ because all the ancient exemplars, which formerly were found among the papists, were full of falsifications, which caused Beza to say in his book on *Illustrious Men*, in the chapter on the Vaudois [the French word for ‘Waldenses’], that one must confess it was by means of the Vaudois of the Valleys that France today has the Bible in her own language.

“This godly man, Olivetan, in the preface of his Bible, recognizes with thanks to God, that since the time of the apostles, or their immediate successors, the torch of the Gospel has been lit among the Vaudois, and has never since been extinguished.”—*Leger, General History of the Vaudois Churches*, p. 165.

THE WYCLIFFE BIBLE (1384)

John Wycliffe (1330-1384) is generally considered as the first English Reformer. He gave to England its first Bible.

John Wycliffe (also written Wycliff) was born in Yorkshire, about 1330, and completed his education at Oxford. In 1361, he resigned his position as Master of Balliol College and settled at Fillingham, Lincolnshire; so he could write tracts and pamphlets about current religious problems.

From 1366 to 1378, he wrote semi-political and anti-papal papers. From 1378 to 1384, he carried on open war against Rome. It was during this latter period that he translated the Bible.

Wycliffe's translation was made from the Latin Vulgate and, for that reason, contained significant errors.

"Wycliffe's Bible had been translated from the Latin text, which contained many errors."—*Great Controversy*, p. 245.

It should be kept in mind that Wycliffe only had access to the Latin Vulgate; he did not have a copy of the Italia (the Waldensian Bible). It is for this reason that we are told that the Latin text he worked from had "many errors."

Wycliffe did the best he could; he did not have any other translation sources available to him. The Greek texts, which Tyndale and later English translators used, had not yet been collated from the Majority Text manuscripts. Most ancient Bible manuscripts were hidden away in libraries; and Wycliffe was not in contact with the Waldenses.

"The time had come for the Scriptures to be translated and given to the people of different lands in their native tongue. The world had passed its midnight. The hours of darkness were wearing away, and in many lands appeared tokens of the coming dawn.

"In the fourteenth century arose in England the 'morning star of the Reformation.' John Wycliffe was the herald of reform, not for England alone, but for all Christendom. He was the progenitor of the Puritans; his era was an oasis in the desert . .

"The greatest work of his life was the translation of the Scriptures into the English language. This was the first complete English translation ever made. The art of printing being still unknown, it was only by slow and wearisome labor that copies of the work could be multiplied; yet this was done, and the people

of England received the Bible in their own tongue. Thus the light of God's Word began to shed its bright beams athwart the darkness. A divine hand was preparing the way for the Great Reformation."—*Story of Redemption*, pp. 336-337.

"Before the Reformation there were at times but very few copies of the Bible in existence, but God had not suffered His Word to be wholly destroyed. Its truths were not to be forever hidden. He could as easily unchain the words of life as He could open prison doors and unbolt iron gates to set His servants free.

"In the different countries of Europe men were moved by the Spirit of God to search for the truth as for hid treasures. Providentially guided to the Holy Scriptures, they studied the sacred pages with intense interest. They were willing to accept the light at any cost to themselves. Though they did not see all things clearly, they were enabled to perceive many long-buried truths. As Heaven-sent messengers they went forth, rending asunder the chains of error and superstition, and calling upon those who had been so long enslaved, to arise and assert their liberty.

"Except among the Waldenses, the Word of God had for ages been locked up in languages known only to the learned; but the time had come for the Scriptures to be translated and given to the people of different lands in their native tongue. The world had passed its midnight. The hours of darkness were wearing away, and in many lands appeared tokens of the coming dawn.

"In the fourteenth century arose in England the 'morning star of the Reformation.' John Wycliffe was the herald of reform, not for England alone, but for all Christendom. The great protest against Rome which it was permitted him to utter was never to be silenced. That protest opened the struggle which was to result in the emancipation of individuals, of churches, and of nations . .

"While Wycliffe was still at college, he entered upon the study of the Scriptures. In those early times, when the Bible existed only in the ancient languages, scholars were enabled to find their way to the fountain of truth, which was closed to the uneducated classes. Thus already the way had been prepared for Wycliffe's future work as a Reformer. Men of learning had studied the Word of God and had found the great truth of His free grace there revealed. In their teachings they had spread a knowledge of this truth, and had led others to turn to the living oracles.

"When Wycliffe's attention was directed to

the Scriptures, he entered upon their investigation with the same thoroughness which had enabled him to master the learning of the schools. Heretofore he had felt a great want, which neither his scholastic studies nor the teaching of the church could satisfy. In the Word of God he found that which he had before sought in vain. Here he saw the plan of salvation revealed and Christ set forth as the only advocate for man. He gave himself to the service of Christ and determined to proclaim the truths he had discovered.”—*Great Controversy*, pp. 79-81.

When he was old and broken in health, Wycliffe finally entered upon the translation of the Bible into English.

“The greatest work of his life was to be the translation of the Scriptures into the English language. In a work, *On the Truth and Meaning of Scripture*, he expressed his intention to translate the Bible, so that every man in England might read, in the language in which he was born, the wonderful works of God.

“But suddenly his labors were stopped. Though not yet sixty years of age, unceasing toil, study, and the assaults of his enemies had told upon his strength and made him prematurely old. He was attacked by a dangerous illness. The tidings brought great joy to the friars. Now they thought he would bitterly repent the evil he had done the church, and they hurried to his chamber to listen to his confession. Representatives from the four religious orders, with four civil officers, gathered about the supposed dying man. ‘You have death on your lips,’ they said; ‘be touched by your faults, and retract in our presence all that you have said to our injury.’ The Reformer listened in silence; then he bade his attendant raise him in his bed, and, gazing steadily upon them as they stood waiting for his recantation, he said, in the firm, strong voice which had so often caused them to tremble: ‘I shall not die, but live; and again declare the evil deeds of the friars.’ ”—*J.H. Merle D’Aubigne*, b. 17, ch. 7.

Astonished and abashed, the monks hurried from the room.

“Wycliffe’s words were fulfilled. He lived to place in the hands of his countrymen the most powerful of all weapons against Rome—to give them the Bible, the Heaven-appointed agent to liberate, enlighten, and evangelize the people. There were many and great obstacles to surmount in the accomplishment of this work. Wycliffe was weighed down with infirmities; he knew that only a few years for labor remained for him; he saw the opposition which he must

meet; but, encouraged by the promises of God’s Word, he went forward nothing daunted. In the full vigor of his intellectual powers, rich in experience, he had been preserved and prepared by God’s special providence for this, the greatest of his labors. While all Christendom was filled with tumult, the Reformer in his rectory at Lutterworth, unheeding the storm that raged without, applied himself to his chosen task.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 88.

In the year 1384, John Wycliffe completed his translation of the Bible.

“At last the work was completed—the first English translation of the Bible ever made. The Word of God was opened to England. The Reformer feared not now the prison or the stake. He had placed in the hands of the English people a light which should never be extinguished. In giving the Bible to his countrymen, he had done more to break the fetters of ignorance and vice, more to liberate and elevate his country, than was ever achieved by the most brilliant victories on fields of battle.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 88.

But it was with great difficulty that copies were made of Wycliffe’s Bible.

“The art of printing being still unknown, it was only by slow and wearisome labor that copies of the Bible could be multiplied. So great was the interest to obtain the book, that many willingly engaged in the work of transcribing it, but it was with difficulty that the copyists could supply the demand. Some of the more wealthy purchasers desired the whole Bible. Others bought only a portion. In many cases, several families united to purchase a copy. Thus Wycliffe’s Bible soon found its way to the homes of the people.

“The appeal to men’s reason aroused them from their passive submission to papal dogmas. Wycliffe now taught the distinctive doctrines of Protestantism—salvation through faith in Christ, and the sole infallibility of the Scriptures. The preachers whom he had sent out circulated the Bible, together with the Reformer’s writings, and with such success that the new faith was accepted by nearly one half of the people of England.”—*Great Controversy*, pp. 88-89.

This was the one weapon, against Rome, which the authorities feared most.

“The appearance of the Scriptures brought dismay to the authorities of the church. They had now to meet an agency more powerful than Wycliffe—an agency against which their weapons would avail little. There was at this time no law in England prohibiting the Bible, for it

had never before been published in the language of the people. Such laws were afterward enacted and rigorously enforced. Meanwhile, notwithstanding the efforts of the priests, there was for a season opportunity for the circulation of the Word of God.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 89.

The common folk labored diligently to make and spread copies of portions of Wycliffe’s Bible. Are we as diligent today to share the Inspired Writings?

“So scanty was the supply of Bibles at this time, that but few of those who craved its teaching could hope to possess the sacred volume. But this lack was partly made up by the earnestness of those whose interest was awakened in the Bible. If only a single copy was owned in a neighborhood, these hard-working laborers and artisans would be found together, after a weary day of toil, reading in turn, and listening to the Words of life; and so sweet was the refreshment to their spirits, that sometimes the morning light surprised them with its call to a new day of labor, before they thought of sleep.”—*John Foxe, Foxes’ Martyrs of the World*, p. 346.

Here is John 17:13 in Wycliffe’s Bible:

“These thingis Jesus spak; and whanne he hadde cast up hise eyen into thi hevene, he seide: ‘Fadir, the our cometh; clarifie thi sone, that thi sone clarifie thee; as thou hast yovun to hym power on ech fleische, that al thing that thou hast yovun to hym, he yyve to hem everlastynge lif. And this is everlastynge lif, that thei knowe thee very God aloone and whom thou hast sent, Jesu Christ.”—*Quoted in Dowley, Handbook to Christianity*, p. 339.

Understandably, the Catholic reaction was sheer panic! One priest lamented, “The jewel of the clergy has become the toy of the laity.” Henry de Knyghton nearly wept over the great tragedy:

“This Master John Wiclif hath translated the Gospel out of Latin into English, which Christ had intrusted with the clergy and doctors of the Church, that they might minister it to the laity and weaker sort, according to the state of the times and wants of men. So that, by this means, the Gospel is made vulgar and made more open to the laity . . . than it used to be to the most learned of the clergy and those of the best understanding! And what was before the chief gift of the clergy and doctors of the Church, is made for ever common to the laity.”—*Quoted in McClure, Translators Revived*, pp. 15-16.

They were elated when “wicked Wycliffe” died! Walsingham, a leading British prelate, exclaimed:

“On the feast of the passion of St. Thomas of Canterbury, John Wicklif—that organ of the

devil, that enemy of the Church, that author of confusion to the common people, that idol of heretics, that image of hypocrites, that restorer of schism, that storehouse of lies, that sink of flattery—being struck by the horrible judgment of God, was struck with palsy, and continued to live in that condition until St. Sylvester’s Day, on which he breathed out his malicious spirit into the abodes of darkness.”—*Watkinson, John Wicklif*, pp. 195-196.

Edicts were immediately issued, banning the Wycliffe Bibles. The godly laymen, which Wycliffe had trained to go out and preach (called “Lollards”), were hunted to the death. Local prosecutors’ records tell of groups meeting here and there—to read “in a great book of heresy all in one night certain chapters of the evangelists in English” (*J.R. Green, English People*, p. 357).

“The Lollards were tracked to the lonely, unfrequented places where they met, often under shadow of night, to worship God. Neighbor was made to spy upon neighbor; husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers and sisters, were beguiled or forced to bear witness against each other. The Lollards’ prison again echoed with the clanking of chains; the rack and the stake once more claimed their victims.”—*Foxe, Christian Martyrs*, p. 345.

THE 15TH-CENTURY GREEK TEXTS

But, a little over a century after Wycliffe’s Bible was completed, the champions of Rome really had something to wring their hands over. A Greek Text, based on manuscripts comprising the Majority Text, had been produced. The situation was getting serious!

“They have found a language called Greek, at which we must be careful to be on our guard. It is the mother of all heresies. In the hands of many persons I see a book, which they call the New Testament. It is a book full of thorns and poison. As for Hebrew, my brethren, it is certain that those who learn it will sooner or later turn Jews!”—*Early 16th-century Catholic writer, quoted in Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 6, p. 722.

Until the Greek texts were prepared, the only way to translated the Bible into the language of the people was to translate it from the Italia (the Waldensian Bible) or from Jerome’s Latin Vulgate.

Translations were not made from the Greek texts, since they were hidden away in libraries.

But, at the beginning of the Reformation, Greek texts began to be prepared. Each one was a collation of a number of Greek manuscripts.

Since the Majority Text was 90%-95% of the manuscripts, it was not difficult to develop an excellent Greek text.

Because no single Greek manuscript contained all of the New Testament, it was necessary to gather together a sizeable quantity of them; and, from them, prepare what became known as a "Greek Text."

The first scholar to prepare a Greek Text was Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536). It is a tragedy that he timidly refused to unite with the Reformers, since it was His Greek Text which laid the foundations of the Reformation throughout Europe. This is because all Reformation translations (with the exception of the French translation, based on the Waldensian Bible) were translated from Erasmus' Greek Text.

Erasmus' Greek text was published in 1516, just one year before Martin Luther pounded nails into the thesis on the church door at Wittenberg and began the Reformation.

This was also the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament. As we will learn below, **the third of his five editions became the standard for the follow-up Greek texts of Stephenus, Beza, and Elzevir.**

The Greek text of Robert Stephenus (also called "Stephen," 1550) came next. After that, Beza (1598) and Elzevir (1624) produced theirs. All three were dedicated Protestant scholars. All their Greek texts were based on the Majority Text, and were decidedly anti-Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.

The third edition of Erasmus' Greek text became the basis of the Stephenus text. It is considered the standard and was called the "Textus Receptus." Because it made use of the greatest number of Majority Text Greek manuscripts, it was considered the most accurate of the Greek Texts.

This was the Greek text used to translate the King James Bible (1611).

The King James Bible was the last truly Protestant Bible produced in England. After that came the English Revised Version of 1881, which was based on the Westcott-Hort critical Greek Text.

Although they rejected his Greek Text, modern scholars recognize that it was a very good one.

"The Unitarian scholar who sat on the English New Testament Revision Committee [in

1890] acknowledged that the Greek New Testament of Erasmus (1516) is as good as any (G.V. Smith, *Nineteenth Century, July 1881*)."—Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, p. 73.

A.T. Robertson is considered the leading Greek scholar of the first half of the 20th century. He wrote this:

"It should be stated at once that the Textus Receptus is not a bad text. It is not an heretical text. It is substantially correct."—A.T. Robertson, *Introduction, The Greek Text of the New Testament*, p. 21.

"Erasmus seemed to feel that he had published the original Greek New Testament as it was written . . . The third edition of Erasmus (1522) became the foundation of the Textus Receptus for Britain since it was followed by Stephenus. There were 3,300 copies of the first two editions of the Greek New Testament of Erasmus circulated. His work became the standard for three hundred years."—*Op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.

The Erasmus Greek Text which formed the basis of every English Bible translation from Tyndale to the King James' was greatly superior to the Westcott-Hort Text, which was based on just two Greek manuscripts.

Because it was essentially identical to "the bulk of the cursive manuscripts" (*i.e.*, the Majority Text), and because those manuscripts reached all the way back to earliest times, Erasmus' text was an excellent one.

Two of the members of the committee which produced the English Revised Version (1881, 1885), wrote a booklet in which they mentioned that Erasmus' text was outstanding:

"The manuscripts which Erasmus used, differ, for the most part, only in small and insignificant details from the bulk of the cursive manuscripts,—that is to say, the manuscripts which are written in running hand and not in capital or (as they are technically called) uncial letters. The general character of their text is the same.

"By this observation, the pedigree of the Received Text is carried up beyond the individual manuscripts used by Erasmus to a great body of manuscripts of which the earliest are assigned to the ninth century."—*Two Members of the New Testament Company on the Revisers and the Greek Text*, pp. 11-12.

Then, after quoting Hort about the good quality of the Erasmus text, they made this comment:

"This remarkable statement completes the pedigree of the Received Text. That pedigree [an-

cestry] stretches back to a remote antiquity. The first ancestor of the Received Text was, as Dr. Hort is careful to remind us, at least contemporary with the oldest of our extant manuscripts, if not older than any one of them.”—*Ibid.*

The Majority Text in Greek, having through Erasmus reassumed its ascendancy in the west of Europe as it had maintained it in the east in earlier centuries, bequeathed its indispensable heritage to all but one of the Reformation Bible translations, including those in English.

THE REFORMATION TRANSLATIONS

According to Wilkinson, the Waldenses, through their Bible, helped get the Reformation started!

“Four Bibles produced under Waldensian influence touched the history of Calvin: namely, a Greek [Text], a Waldensian vernacular, a French, and an Italian.

“Calvin himself was led to his great work by Olivetan, a Waldensian. Thus was the Reformation brought to Calvin, that brilliant student of the Paris University.

“Farel, also a Waldensian, besought him to come to Geneva and open up a work there . . . According to Leger, Calvin recognized a relationship to the Calvins of the valley of St. Martin, one of the Waldensian Valleys.

“Finally, persecution at Paris and the solicitation of Farel caused Calvin to settle at Geneva, where, with Beza, he brought out an edition of the Textus Receptus [Received Text] . . . Of Beza, Dr. Edgar says that he ‘astonished and confounded the world’ with the Greek manuscripts he unearthed. This later edition of the Received Text is in reality a Greek New Testament brought out under Waldensian influence.

“Unquestionably, the leaders of the Reformation, German, French, and English, were convinced that the Received Text was the genuine New Testament, not only by its own irresistible history and internal evidence, but also because it matched the Received Text which in Waldensian form came down from the days of the apostles.

“The other three Bibles of Waldensian connection were due to three men who were at Geneva with Calvin, or, when he died, with Beza, his successor, namely, Olivetan, Leger, and Diodati. How readily the two streams of descent of the Received Text—through the Greek East and the Waldensian West—ran together, is illustrated by the meeting of the Olivetan Bible [based on the Waldensian Italia] and the Received Text [based on the Greek manuscripts].”—

Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, pp. 37-38.

Both the Waldensian Bible (from the Italia) and the great majority of Greek manuscripts were from the same source. We call it the Majority Text.

Before turning our attention to the English translations, we will briefly overview four European translations of the Bible:

The Bohemian Bible was an early translation.

“The Gospel had been planted in Bohemia as early as the ninth century. The Bible was translated, and public worship was conducted, in the language of the people. But as the power of the pope increased, so the Word of God was obscured. Gregory VII, who had taken it upon himself to humble the pride of kings, was no less intent upon enslaving the people, and accordingly a bull was issued forbidding public worship to be conducted in the Bohemian tongue. The pope declared that ‘it was pleasing to the Omnipotent that His worship should be celebrated in an unknown language, and that many evils and heresies had arisen from not observing this rule’ (*Wylie, b. 3, ch. 1*).

“Thus Rome decreed that the light of God’s Word should be extinguished and the people should be shut up in darkness. But Heaven had provided other agencies for the preservation of the church. Many of the Waldenses and Albigenses, driven by persecution from their homes in France and Italy, came to Bohemia. Though they dared not teach openly, they labored zealously in secret. Thus the true faith was preserved from century to century.”—*Great Controversy, p. 97.*

Persecution immediately began, as soon as the Bible was translated into French.

“The bishop of Meaux labored zealously in his own diocese to instruct both the clergy and the people. Ignorant and immoral priests were removed, and, so far as possible, replaced by men of learning and piety. The bishop greatly desired that his people might have access to the Word of God for themselves, and this was soon accomplished. Lefevre undertook the translation of the New Testament; and at the very time when Luther’s German Bible was issuing from the press in Wittenberg, the French New Testament was published at Meaux. The bishop spared no labor or expense to circulate it in his parishes, and soon the peasants of Meaux were in possession of the Holy Scriptures.

“As travelers perishing from thirst welcome

with joy a living water spring, so did these souls receive the message of heaven. The laborers in the field, the artisans in the workshop, cheered their daily toil by talking of the precious truths of the Bible. At evening, instead of resorting to the wine-shops, they assembled in one another's homes to read God's Word and join in prayer and praise. A great change was soon manifest in these communities. Though belonging to the humblest class, an unlearned and hard-working peasantry, the reforming, uplifting power of divine grace was seen in their lives. Humble, loving, and holy, they stood as witnesses to what the Gospel will accomplish for those who receive it in sincerity.

"The light kindled at Meaux shed its beams afar. Every day the number of converts was increasing. The rage of the hierarchy was for a time held in check by the king, who despised the narrow bigotry of the monks; but the papal leaders finally prevailed. Now the stake was set up."—*Great Controversy*, pp. 214-215.

The French Bible was made available to colporteurs at low cost, so they could scatter it everywhere.

"Long before the persecution excited by the placards, the bold and ardent Farel had been forced to flee from the land of his birth. He repaired to Switzerland, and by his labors, seconding the work of Zwingli, he helped to turn the scale in favor of the Reformation. His later years were to be spent here, yet he continued to exert a decided influence upon the reform in France.

"During the first years of his exile [in Switzerland], his efforts were especially directed to spreading the Gospel in his native country. He spent considerable time in preaching among his countrymen near the frontier, where with tireless vigilance he watched the conflict and aided by his words of encouragement and counsel.

"With the assistance of other exiles, the writings of the German Reformers were translated into the French language and, together with the French Bible, were printed in large quantities. By colporteurs these works were sold extensively in France. They were furnished to the colporteurs at a low price, and thus the profits of the work enabled them to continue it."—*Great Controversy*, p. 231.

Luther's German Bible profoundly influenced his nation. It was the basis for the German Reformation.

"True Christianity receives the Word of God as the great treasure house of inspired truth and the test of all Inspiration. Upon his return from the Wartburg, Luther completed his trans-

lation of the New Testament, and the Gospel was soon after given to the people of Germany in their own language. This translation was received with great joy by all who loved the truth; but it was scornfully rejected by those who chose human traditions and the commandments of men.

"The priests were alarmed at the thought that the common people would now be able to discuss with them the precepts of God's Word, and that their own ignorance would thus be exposed. The weapons of their carnal reasoning were powerless against the sword of the Spirit. Rome summoned all her authority to prevent the circulation of the Scriptures; but decrees, anathemas, and tortures were alike in vain. The more she condemned and prohibited the Bible, the greater was the anxiety of the people to know what it really taught.

"All who could read were eager to study the Word of God for themselves. They carried it about with them, and read and reread, and could not be satisfied until they had committed large portions to memory. Seeing the favor with which the New Testament was received, Luther immediately began the translation of the Old, and published it in parts as fast as completed."—*Great Controversy*, pp. 193-194.

The Bible was translated into Danish; and it affected the whole nation.

"Tausen began to preach. The churches were opened to him, and the people thronged to listen. Others also were preaching the Word of God. The New Testament, translated into the Danish tongue, was widely circulated. The efforts made by the papists to overthrow the work resulted in extending it, and ere long Denmark declared its acceptance of the reformed faith."—*Great Controversy*, 242.

Olaf Petri translated the Bible into Swedish. The king declared it to be the book which the entire nation should read.

"As the result of this disputation the king of Sweden accepted the Protestant faith, and not long afterward the national assembly declared in its favor. The New Testament had been translated by Olaf Petri into the Swedish language, and at the desire of the king the two brothers undertook the translation of the whole Bible. Thus for the first time the people of Sweden received the Word of God in their native tongue. It was ordered by the Diet that throughout the kingdom, ministers should explain the Scriptures and that the children in the schools should be taught to read the Bible

"Steadily and surely the darkness of ignorance and superstition was dispelled by the

blessed light of the Gospel. Freed from Romish oppression, the nation attained to a strength and greatness it had never before reached. Sweden became one of the bulwarks of Protestantism.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 244.

Waldensian traveling teachers helped bring the Bible truth to Holland.

“Those early teachers who, traversing different lands and known by various names, bore the character of the Vaudois missionaries, and spread everywhere the knowledge of the Gospel, penetrated to the Netherlands. Their doctrines spread rapidly. The Waldensian Bible they translated in verse into the Dutch language. They declared ‘that there was great advantage in it; no jests, no fables, no trifles, no deceits, but the words of truth; that indeed there was here and there a hard crust, but that the marrow and sweetness of what was good and holy might be easily discovered in it’ (*Gerard Brandt, History of the Reformation in and about the Low Countries, Book 1, p. 14*). Thus wrote the friends of the ancient faith, in the twelfth century.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 238.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE VULGATE TO COUNTER PROTESTANT BIBLES

There were just too many Bibles to destroy! What should be done? Rome decided to produce Bible translations which could include some of their errors.

“The Reformers . . . welcomed the rising spirit of intelligence which shone forth in the new learning.

“But the priests loudly denounced it. [Erasmus noted that] they said the study of Greek was of the devil and [they] prepared to destroy all who promoted it.”—*Wilkinson*, p. 51.

Once again we return to the Latin Vulgate, the monastic Jerome’s Latin translation (A.D. 382-384) which the Vatican so valued. In 1452 to 1456, Johann Gutenberg produced the first printed Bible in the world. It was a Vulgate.

Rome would have preferred to keep the Bible hidden, even its Vulgate editions; but, first the Waldenses and, then, the Protestant Reformers were bringing the Bible to the people. So Rome decided that their own translations, based on the Vulgate, must be used in the battle against Protestantism.

Down through the centuries, all Roman Catholic translations have been based on the Vulgate, until the Jerusalem Bible was published in 1966. (But it included lots of notes to

keep it doctrinally correct.)

The primary Catholic English translation from the Vulgate is the Rheims-Douai (which we will later discuss in more detail).

The preface to the Rheims New Testament mentions an earlier Catholic translation in French, also based on the Vulgate, which was produced in the hope that it would eliminate the Waldenses.

“More than two hundred years ago, in the days of Charles V the French king, was it [the Vulgate] put forth faithfully in French, the sooner to shake out of the deceived people’s hands, the false heretical translations of a sect called Waldenses.”—*Preface, Rheims New Testament, 1582*. [This preface was written by Jesuits.]

“The Vulgate was the chief weapon relied upon to combat and destroy the Bible of the Waldenses.”—*Benjamin G. Wilkinson, Our Authorized Version Vindicated*, p. 51.

Seventy-three years after Luther’s theses were nailed to the church door at Wittenberg, and only a few years after the Council of Trent completed its work, in 1590, Pope Sixtus V commissioned the Vatican Press to publish an edition of the Vulgate. Pope Clement VIII issued another one in 1592, and it became the standard Vulgate used for Catholic Bible translations down to the present day.

Protestants recognized that, because of its many errors, the Vulgate was a dangerous translation. Cartwright, the well-known Puritan scholar, wrote this:

“All the soap and nitre they could collect would be insufficient to cleanse the Vulgate from the filth in which it was originally conceived and had since collected in passing so long through the hands of unlearned monks, from which the Greek copies had altogether escaped.”—*Brook’s Memoir of Life of Cartwright*, p. 276.

THE TYNDALE BIBLE (1525-1526)

In the history of the English Bible, William Tyndale’s (1494-1536) is the most important of the Bible translators.

In a sense, Tyndale’s Bible towers over all the others. There are two reasons for this:

- It was the first English translation to be translated from the Greek Text. Tyndale used Erasmus’ text.
- It was such a good translation that all the later ones, up to and including the King

James, were almost identical to it. It appears that those later translators relied heavily on what Tyndale had accomplished. They were not lazy, but found they could hardly improve on it.

After studying at Oxford, William Tyndale went to Cambridge to study Greek under Erasmus, who was teaching there from 1510 to 1514. After Erasmus returned to the continent, Tyndale continued studying.

John Tyndale was an absolute genius in his ability with foreign languages. Herman Buschius, a scholarly friend of Erasmus, said this:

“Tyndale was so skilled in seven languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English, French, that, whichever he spoke, you would suppose it his native tongue.”—*Buschius, quoted in Demaus, Life of Tyndale, p. 130.*

It was this powerful aptitude in language studies which enabled Tyndale to so accurately render the Majority Text into English. Those who followed him recognized his genius and tended to remain in his tracks. That is why the King James Bible is basically Tyndale’s.

As Luther took Erasmus’ Greek Text and produced the magnificent German Bible, so Tyndale took the same text and produced the English Bible—almost the same Bible which we have today (except with modern spelling).

“While Luther was opening a closed Bible to the people of Germany, Tyndale was impelled by the Spirit of God to do the same for England. Wycliffe’s Bible had been translated from the Latin text, which contained many errors. It had never been printed, and the cost of manuscript copies was so great that few but wealthy men or nobles could procure it; and, furthermore, being strictly proscribed by the church, it had had a comparatively narrow circulation.

“In 1516, a year before the appearance of Luther’s theses, Erasmus had published his Greek and Latin version of the New Testament. Now for the first time the Word of God was printed in the original tongue. In this work many errors of former versions were corrected, and the sense was more clearly rendered. It led many among the educated classes to a better knowledge of the truth, and gave a new impetus to the work of reform. But the common people were still, to a great extent, debarred from God’s Word. Tyndale was to complete the work of Wycliffe in giving the Bible to his countrymen.”—*Great Controversy, p. 245.*

It was while reading in Erasmus’ Greek Text that Tyndale found Christ and was converted.

“A diligent student and an earnest seeker for truth, he had received the Gospel from the Greek Testament of Erasmus.”—*Great Controversy, p. 245.*

When he left Cambridge, Tyndale accepted a position as a tutor in the home of a private landowner. This gave him opportunity for study, preaching, and writing. It was while he was there that he began writing tracts against the papacy.

Here is a sample of his earnest preaching. He could not be frightened into silence.

“He fearlessly preached his convictions, urging that all doctrines be tested by the Scriptures. To the papist claim that the church had given the Bible, and the church alone could explain it, Tyndale responded: ‘Do you know who taught the eagles to find their prey? Well, that same God teaches His hungry children to find their Father in His Word. Far from having given us the Scriptures, it is you who have hidden them from us; it is you who burn those who teach them, and if you could, you would burn the Scriptures themselves’ (*D’Aubigne, History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, bk. 18, ch. 4.*)”—*Great Controversy, pp. 245-246.*

But Tyndale found he was only one man. Somehow he must multiply his message. Then he realized God wanted him to multiply God’s Word!

“Tyndale’s preaching excited great interest; many accepted the truth. But the priests were on the alert, and no sooner had he left the field than they by their threats and misrepresentations endeavored to destroy his work. Too often they succeeded. ‘What is to be done?’ he exclaimed. ‘While I am sowing in one place, the enemy ravages the field I have just left. I cannot be everywhere. Oh! if Christians possessed the Holy Scriptures in their own tongue, they could of themselves withstand these sophists. Without the Bible it is impossible to establish the laity in the truth.’”—*Ibid.*

His mission in life was now clear to him. He must dedicate his life to producing an outstanding English translation of the Holy Bible.

“A new purpose now took possession of his mind. ‘It was in the language of Israel,’ said he, ‘that the psalms were sung in the temple of Jehovah; and shall not the Gospel speak the language of England among us? . . . Ought the church to have less light at noonday than at

the dawn? . . . Christians must read the New Testament in their mother tongue.' The doctors and teachers of the church disagreed among themselves. Only by the Bible could men arrive at the truth. One holdeth this doctor, another that . . . Now each of these authors contradicts the other. How then can we distinguish him who says right from him who says wrong? . . . How? . . . Verily by God's Word."—*Ibid.*

Notice the above words about using our native language to read and share God's Word. We, who speak English, should speak about God's Word in our language, not in a foreign language. The tongues error, of the Charismatics, and the "sacred name" error, of many Protestants, teach that we must use another language in order to be accepted by God.

One day, while disputing with a learned man who said the pope's laws were above God's laws, Tyndale uttered his famous vow: "I defy the pope and all his laws; and if God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plow to know more of the Scripture than you do!"

"It was not long after that a learned Catholic doctor, engaging in controversy with him, exclaimed: 'We were better to be without God's laws than the pope's.' Tyndale replied: 'I defy the pope and all his laws; and if God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plow to know more of the Scripture than you do' (*Anderson, Annals of the English Bible, page 19*)."—*Great Controversy, p. 246.*

In order to carry on his translation work, Tyndale went to London and, later, to Germany.

"A London alderman gave him bed and board for six months, while the youth labored on the task. In 1524 Tyndale went to Wittenberg, and continued the work under Luther's guidance. At Cologne he began to print his version of the New Testament from the Greek text as edited by Erasmus. An English agent roused the authorities against him; Tyndale fled from Catholic Cologne to Protestant Worms, and there printed 6,000 copies."—*Will Durant, The Story of Civilization, Vol. 6, p. 533.*

"The purpose which he had begun to cherish, of giving to the people the New Testament Scriptures in their own language, was now confirmed, and he immediately applied himself to the work. Driven from his home by persecution, he went to London, and there for a time pursued his labors undisturbed. But again the violence of the papists forced him to flee. All England seemed closed against him, and he re-

solved to seek shelter in Germany. Here he began the printing of the English New Testament. Twice the work was stopped; but when forbidden to print in one city, he went to another. At last he made his way to Worms, where, a few years before, Luther had defended the Gospel before the Diet. In that ancient city were many friends of the Reformation, and Tyndale there prosecuted his work without further hindrance. Three thousand copies of the New Testament were soon finished, and another edition followed in the same year."—*Great Controversy, pp. 246-247.*

But then Tyndale was captured by papal agents.

"[English Cardinal] Wolsey sent orders to arrest Tyndale, but Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, protected the author, and he proceeded, at Marburg, with his translation of the Pentateuch (1530). Slowly, by his own labor or under his supervision, most of the Old Testament was rendered into English. But in a careless moment he fell into the hands of Imperial officials."—*Will Durant, The Story of Civilization, Vol. 6, p. 533.*

The book, *Great Controversy*, does not provide us with details about Tyndale's betrayal and imprisonment. Here are two quotations which provide more information about this tragic event; truly, a day of infamy in the history of the Roman Catholic Church.

"Early in 1535, a trusting Tyndale was betrayed by an undercover Catholic agent, Henry Phillips, who had gained the Reformer's confidence. Following Phillips' last-minute borrowing of forty shillings from his generous victim, the pair departed Tyndale's boardinghouse for dinner. The treacherous Phillips pretentiously insisted on his 'friend' going before him. Once outside the door, Phillips, in the spirit of Judas Iscariot, pointed at him from behind his back, as the prearranged sign for waiting officials. The aged saint was promptly committed to the dungeon of the nearby fortress of Vilvorde, eighteen miles north of Antwerp."—*W.P. Grady, Final Authority, p. 136.*

"Throughout his eighteen-month imprisonment, Tyndale suffered accordingly. One of the saddest extant documents in all of church history (taken from the archives of the Council of Brabant) is a letter written in Latin and in the Reformer's own hand to the governor of Vilvorde, perhaps the Marquis of Bergon:

"I believe, dear sir, that you are not unaware of what may have been determined concerning me. Wherefore I beg your lordship, and that by the Lord Jesus, that if I am to remain here

through the winter, you will request the commissary to have the kindness to send me, from the goods of mine which he has, a warmer cap, for I suffer greatly from cold in the head, and am afflicted by a perpetual catarrh, which is much increased in this cell; a warmer coat also, for this which I have is very thin; a piece of cloth, too, to patch my leggings. My overcoat is worn out; my shirts also are worn out. He has a woollen shirt, if he will be good enough to send it. I have also with him leggings of thicker cloth to put on above; he has also warmer night-caps.

“‘And I ask to be allowed to have a lamp in the evening; it is indeed wearisome sitting alone in the dark. But most of all I beg and beseech your clemency to be urgent with the commissary, that he will kindly permit me to have the Hebrew Bible, Hebrew grammar and Hebrew dictionary, that I may pass the time in that study. In return may you obtain what you most desire, so only that it be for the salvation of your soul. But if any other decision has been taken concerning me, to be carried out before winter, I will be patient, abiding the will of God, to the glory of the grace of my Lord Jesus Christ; whose Spirit (I pray) may ever direct your heart. Amen.’”—*Op. cit.*, pp. 136-137.

As he died at the stake, Tyndale cried out, “Lord, open the King of England’s eyes!” Consider the amazing way that prayer was answered:

“What is strangest of all, and is unexplained to this day, at the very time when Tyndale by the procurement of English ecclesiastics, and by the sufferance of the English king, was burned at Vilvorde, a folio-edition of his translation was printed at London, with his name on the title-page, and by Thomas Berthelet, the king’s own patent printer. This was the first copy of the Scriptures ever printed on English ground.”—*McClure, Translators Revived*, p. 32.

Even more amazing, Henry VIII, king of England, officially sanctioned the printing of two English Bibles within a year after Tyndale had been martyred in October 1536!

Here is a brief summary of these six Bibles, from Tyndale’s to the King James:

After the Tyndale Bible (1526), came five other English Bibles: the **Coverdale Bible** (1535), the **Great Bible** (1539), the **Geneva Bible** (1560), the **Bishops’ Bible** (1568), and the **Authorized (King James) Bible** (1611).

Consider the first part of the Lord’s Prayer, as it is given in each of those Bibles, and you

can see how closely they all stayed with Tyndale’s outstanding translation:

Tyndale (1526) “O oure father which arte in heven halowed be thy name. Let thy kyngdom come. Thy wyll be fulfilled as well in erth as it ys in heven.”

Coverdale (1535) “O oure father which art in heaven, halowed be thy name. Let thy kyndome come. Thy wyll be fulfilled upon earth as it is in heaven.”

Great Bible (1539) “Oure father which art in heaven, haiowed be thy name. Let thy kingdome come. Thy will be fulfilled, as well in erth, as it is in heaven.”

Geneva Bible (1560) “Our father which art in heaven, halowed be thy Name. Thy kingdome come. Thy will be done even in earth, as it is in heaven.”

Bishops’ Bible (1568) “O our father, which art in heaven, halowed be thy name. Let thy kyngdome come. Thy wyll be done, as well in earth, as it is in heaven.”

Authorized (King James) Bible (1611) “Our Father, which art in Heaven, hallowed by Thy name” [using our modern spelling].

It is because of the powerful influence of his translation on the five subsequent Bibles, that William Tyndale has been justly designated the “Father of the English Bible.”

“Tyndale was a master of a simple and forceful literary style. This, combined with exactness and breadth of scholarship, led him so to translate the Greek New Testament into English as largely to determine the character, form, and style of the Authorized [King James] Version.

“There have been some painstaking calculations to determine just how large a part Tyndale may have had in the production of the version of 1611. A comparison of Tyndale’s version of 1 John and that of the Authorized Version shows that nine-tenths of the latter is retained from the martyred translator’s work. Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians retains five-sixths of Tyndale’s translation. These proportions are maintained throughout the entire New Testament. Such an influence as that upon the English Bible cannot be attributed to any other man in all the past.”—*Ira Maurice Price, Ancestry of Our English Bible*, p. 251.

It should be noted that William Tyndale did not complete all of his Old Testament translation of the Bible prior to his arrest. The portion which he did not translate was the historical books (Joshua to 2 Chronicles), poetical books, and prophetic books.

Tyndale was burned at the stake in October 1536.

ROME RUINED BY PRINTED BIBLES

Tyndale's Bible (1526) was a special threat to the Catholics, since it was the first English Bible to be printed from the Greek text. This meant that it could be distributed in large quantities.

"Clergymen had discouraged the reading of the Bible in any form, arguing that special knowledge was necessary to a right interpretation, and that Scriptural excerpts were being used to foment sedition. The church had raised no official objection to pre-Wycliffe translations, but this tacit permission had been of no moment, since all English versions before 1526 were manuscript.

"Hence the epochal importance of the English New Testament printed by Tyndale in 1525-1526."—*Will Durant, The Story of Civilization, Vol. 6, p. 533.*

A primary weapon of Rome, and of all despots, was to keep the people in ignorance. But the invention of printing by Johann Gutenberg was a deathblow to that effort. It is well-known, by historians, that it was Gutenberg's invention which not only gave the Reformation its power, but also started all modern research and scientific endeavor.

HENRY VIII BREAKS WITH ROME

The present writer has in his library a lengthy book on the history of King Henry VIII of England—which presents a surprising new understanding of the background of what actually took place.

We had always been taught that Henry just wanted to get rid of wives and marry new ones, and it was the pope's opposition to the scheme which led to Henry's break with Rome.

That is true, but the new light is that it was the Catholics which got the break started! Henry's first wife, Catherine of Aragon, although a Spanish princess, was being influenced by associates in the royal palace toward Protestantism. Fearing that this could lead to problems, Henry anxiously prodded toward a divorce with her. That started a chain of divorces which ultimately resulted in Henry's total break with Vatican authority.

Henry VIII separated from Rome on November 11, 1534, at which time the Act of

Supremacy was approved by Parliament. Although he did not renounce Catholic doctrine, the break with Rome was definite.

The result, over the next century, was a deluge of new English Bibles.

THE COVERDALE BIBLE (1535)

Miles (Myles) Coverdale (1488-1568) had been Tyndale's faithful proofreader at Antwerp. Although not an accomplished Greek and Hebrew scholar, he continued the work laid down by Tyndale when, after 18 months in prison, Tyndale was martyred.

To accomplish this task, Coverdale based his Bible on Tyndale's translation. In the sections Tyndale had left undone, Coverdale used Zwingli's Zürich Bible (1529) while referring to Luther's German Bible (1522-1534).

Although Coverdale was forced to publish his first edition in Cologne (1535), he very prudently dedicated it to the King of England. He was also careful to omit the controversial side notes which were in Tyndale's Bible.

Henry VIII was happy with the book, and issued a license, permitting publication of Coverdale's second edition (1537). The cover page showed Henry seated and crowned, with a drawn sword and a dedicatory page, crediting him as "defender of the faith."

"It is apparent that Coverdale was essentially an editor, who gathered together the best materials within reach, and so selected and modified them as to construct a Bible that would meet both the demands of the public and those of the ecclesiastical authorities. His great good sense, as shown in the use of language to secure beauty, harmony, and melody, made him a wise editor.

"His essentially peaceful nature led him to restore many beloved ecclesiastical terms that Tyndale had thrown out for new and more exact translations of the original Greek and Hebrew texts. Indeed, so helpful are some of the translations of Coverdale that they were perpetuated in the King James Bible."—*I.M. Price, Ancestry of Our English Bible, p. 253.*

In 1537, only one year after Tyndale's death, two revised Coverdale editions were printed, each carrying this statement: "set forth with the king's most gracious license."

Coverdale's Bibles were the first printed complete Bibles in the English language.

Thus, less than one year after Tyndale's death, the entire Bible had been translated,

printed, and distributed in England—with the full permission of its monarch.

THE MATTHEW BIBLE (1537)

Although known as the Matthew Bible, **this translation was actually made by John Rogers** (c. 1500-1555), an Oxford graduate, who used the pseudonym, Thomas Matthew, because of Roger's well-known association with Tyndale.

Rogers went to Antwerp and worked closely with Tyndale (and, of course, knew Coverdale, his editor). **When Tyndale was imprisoned in Vilvorde Castle, he turned over to John Rogers his unpublished work, which he had prepared in prison—his translation of Joshua to 2 Chronicles.**

Rogers then published a new Bible which, for the first time, had Tyndale's final translation material. **The rest of the Old Testament was from the Tyndale and Coverdale Bibles.** The Bible was initially published in Antwerp. It was dedicated to

"The moost noble and gracyous Prynce Kyng Henry the Eyght and Queen Jane,"

and signed "Thomas Matthew." This delighted the king and he gave the Bible his approval.

Common folk sometimes gave special names to the Bibles. The Matthew Bible was spoken of as the "Wife-Beater's Bible," because of an added note at 1 Peter 3, which read:

"If she be not obedient and healpfull unto hym [he] endeavoureth to beate the feare of God into her heade, that therby she maye be compelled to learne her dutie, and to do it."—*Quoted in Beale, Pictorial History of the Bible, p. 25.*

Another one of these Bibles was called "the Wicked Bible," because a typesetter left the "not" out of the seventh commandment of a single edition. However, in preparing this book, I could not locate that data again.

THE GREAT BIBLE (1539)

Because it was such a large book, common folk called this the "Great Bible." Because Archbishop Cranmer wrote an introduction at the front, it was also sometimes called the "Cranmer Bible."

Being a compilation of Tyndale and Coverdale, the Matthew Bible was the best English Bible in print. But Thomas Cromwell (a leading official in Henry's court, not the Oliver Cromwell

of later English history) wanted a complete translation, not a tossed-together edition, as the Coverdale and Matthew Bibles were.

So, with the permission of the king, he secured the services of Coverdale to prepare a revised Bible. Because he was not an accomplished Greek and Hebrew scholar, Coverdale used scholars who were.

When the task was done (there was no printing facility large enough in London to produce these large Bibles), Coverdale went to Paris in the spring of 1538. With Regnault, the French printer, and under royal license, the printing began. But the Inquisition uttered its voice, and ordered the work to be confiscated. Rome did not want more Bibles! With trickery equal to that of the Jesuits, Coverdale managed to transfer printed sheets, printers, presses, type, and other equipment and supplies to London! Coverdale was a very capable man, and the Lord used him.

In April 1539, the new Bible was fully printed. Because of its large size, it was called "The Great Bible." It was in large folio; that is, each page was 16½ x 11 inches in size!

Everyone was anxious to please the king, so an artistic frontispiece portrayed Henry in royal dress, handing the Bible down to Cranmer and Cromwell, who in turn distribute it to the people amid their shouts of "Vivat Rex!" ("Long live the king!")

This Bible was basically a revised edition of John Rogers' "Matthew" Bible, which was the most complete presentation of the work of Tyndale, whose martyrdom had occurred only three years earlier (October 1536).

The announcement went out to the people from the king, "*In God's name, let it go abroad among our people!*" **In 1526, Tyndale's New Testament was publicly burned at St. Paul's Cathedral in London. In 1538, the same book, under another cover and name, was ordered by sanction of royal authority, if not decree, to be placed in public places, where all could read it.**

A paper dating from 1539 declared:

"Englishmen have now in hand, in every church and place, the Holy Bible in their mother tongue, instead of the old fabulous and fantastical books of the 'Table Round.'"—*Quoted by the church historian Collier, in H.W. Hoare, Evolution of the English Bible, p. 194.*

Bishop Tunstall, good politician that he was,

had earlier bought up Tyndale's books so he could burn them (called "the bishop of Durham" in *Great Controversy*, p. 247). But, now that the situation had changed, he had his name placed on the title page of two of the 1840 editions of the Great Bible as officially endorsing its publication. Due to immense public popularity and demand for the book, within two years seven editions of the Great Bible were printed. It became the basis of the English Prayer Book.

THE TAVERNER BIBLE (1539)

This Bible was prepared by Richard Taverner, by direction of the King's printer, Thomas Barthlet. Taverner was a good Greek scholar but not well-acquainted with Hebrew.

The Old Testament was like the Matthew revision, with only slight changes (made by comparing it with the Vulgate). The New Testament was solely from the Greek and added a few items which later went into the King James text. This was the first Bible to be completely printed in England, but it tended to be superceded by the Great Bible.

THE CATHOLIC REACTION OF 1543-1547

Thomas Cromwell had led out in getting Bibles printed and widely circulated. Although he was very highly placed in the English government, he fell into disfavor because of his efforts to destroy Catholic shrines and images, as well as taking over abbeys and monasteries. He even destroyed a few Catholic churches. He had made the same mistake as the French Protestants who wanted to produce strong public protests against Catholics, and only brought death to themselves amid a Catholic uprising (*Great Controversy*, 217:2; 224:3-227:1). We have been warned elsewhere in the Spirit of Prophecy that we, today, should not make direct attacks on the Catholics (*9 Testimonies*, 240-241, 243; *Evangelism*, 573-574, 576; *Counsels to Writers and Editors*, 45-46, 64-65). We should instead give the final message about obedience to the Law of God and, in the context of the change of the Sabbath, tell necessary historical facts.

This crisis led to an uprising of Catholics in the nation (of which there were very many; some say a majority), and Henry VIII feared for his throne. So, in reaction, Cromwell was

executed and Bibles were publicly burned by the hundreds. Only the Great Bible was spared; and it was only to be read by the upper classes. The decree read in part:

"No laboring men or women should read to themselves or to others, publicly or privately, any part of the Bible, under pain of imprisonment."

As might be expected, Bishop Tunstall immediately retracted his name from the front of the Great Bible. He was once again the Catholic he had always been.

At the climax of this reaction, Henry VIII died on January 28, 1547. Surely, it was thought that there would never again be a Bible in England.

EDWARD VI (1547-1553)

This young king was always frail and sickly; yet he was devoted to the Bible, requiring that it be carried before him during his coronation. During his brief six-and-one-half years reign, the English Bible was reprinted many times and in many editions, totaling 35 editions of the New Testament and 13 of the Old!

Edward began his reign by immediately decreeing that Bibles be made available in every church for people to read. Reformers who had fled to England returned. Very likely, Bishop Tunstall expressed a renewed devotion to the Bible.

BLOODY MARY (1553-1559)

"And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus."—*Revelation 17:6*.

On the death of Edward, Mary Tudor came to the throne. The daughter of Henry's wife, Catherine, Mary was a fanatical papist. She immediately inaugurated a reign of terror by lighting the fires of Smithfield. Archbishop Cranmer and John Rogers, along with hundreds of others, were burned at the stake—for the crime of loving the Bible. Miles Coverdale, now Bishop of Exeter, barely managed to escape to the continent. Scores of other Reformers also fled.

"On the fourth of February, in the year 1555, in the morning, the prisoner [John Rogers, who produced the Matthew Bible] was warned suddenly by the keeper's wife, to prepare himself for the fire. Being sound asleep, he could scarcely be awakened. At length being roused, and told

to make haste, he said, 'Is then this the day? If it be so, I need not be careful of my dressing.'

"Now when the time had come, the prisoner was brought from Newgate to Smithfield, the place of his execution. Here Woodroffe, one of the sheriffs, asked him if he would change his religion to save his life; but Rogers answered, 'That which I have preached I will seal with my blood.'

"It is related that 'Rogers' wife and eleven children, ten of whom were able to walk and one was at the breast, met him by the way as he went toward Smithfield, repeating the 51st Psalm. This sorrowful sight of his own flesh and blood did not move him; but he constantly and cheerfully took his death with wonderful patience in the defence of Christ's Gospel."—*Foxe, Book of Martyrs, pp. 422-423.*

Green adds:

"He died bathing his hands in the flames as if it had been in cold water."—*J.R. Green, A Short History of the English People, p. 372.*

These people laid down their lives for the Bible. Do we value it as much today?

Over 300 Christians were burned at the stake in Smithfield, near London.

But a powerful reaction set in. So horrible was the reign of "Bloody Mary," that everyone—even Catholics—hated her. After five years of a living horror, Mary died a miserable death on the morning of November 17, 1558.

The murders of so many Christians—including Ridley, Latimer, and Cranmer—had left her nearly insane.

But her efforts to rid the land of Christians and the Holy Bible backfired, as we shall soon learn.

THE GENEVA BIBLE (1560)

A number of the Christian scholars who had fled from Mary's wrath, gathered in Geneva, Switzerland. There they formed a committee to prepare a new translation of the Bible.

Theodore Beza, the most noted Biblical scholar, lived there. Working with him, such men as John Knox, William Whittingham, and Miles Coverdale labored six years to produce the Geneva Bible.

There were no political or religious restrictions in Geneva and these men had time to produce an outstanding Bible.

Whittingham (a brother-in-law of John Calvin) supervised the work of publication. **For**

the first time, the English Bible was divided into verses (using the ones first marked in the margins of Stephenus' Greek Text of 1551). **In addition, Whittingham added words in italics, to complete the sense when words were not in the Greek. Both practices were later carried over in the King James Bible.**

Another outstanding achievement was the fact that **this was the first English Bible to have Ezra through Malachi translated from the Hebrew. This was the most accurate English Bible yet to appear. The New Testament was basically identical to Tyndale's.**

Another advantage was the abandonment of the black letter for the plain, simple roman type (such as you find in the book you are now reading.) The book of Revelation carried strong anti-Catholic notes. Those in Romans were somewhat Calvinistic.

Queen Elizabeth I was crowned two years before this Bible was finished; so, when it was completed, it was dedicated to her. The cost of printing was subsidized by the people of Geneva. Queen Elizabeth never promoted the Geneva Bible, but did nothing to oppose it; and **it was widely sold for decades. But the Great Bible continued to be the Bible read from the pulpit in the churches and cathedrals.**

The Geneva Bible was also known as "The Breeches Bible" because of its rendering of Genesis 3:7, "They sewed figge tree leaves together, and made themselves breeches." The Geneva translation enjoyed a circulation from Shakespeare's desk to the Mayflower's deck.

The first complete English Bible to use verse divisions was the *Geneva Bible* of 1560. Rabbi Nathan is credited with devising the present verse numbers for the Old Testament in 1448. The verse divisions for the New Testament were made by the scholar-printer, Robert Stephenus, for his Greek-Latin New Testament of 1551. They constitute a useful reference tool and are essential for a concordance.

QUEEN ELIZABETH I (1533-1603)

Henry VIII only had three children who outlived infancy: Edward VI, who was sickly and died at fifteen, Mary who was barren in marriage, and Elizabeth who never married. In her reign, the proverb was fulfilled:

"Take away the wicked from before the king, and his throne shall be established in righteousness."—*Proverbs 25:5.*

In November 1558, the 25-year-old Elizabeth came to the throne, and immediately Protestantism was once again in favor. Elizabeth was careful not to disturb any religious group, but she clearly promoted the Protestant cause.

“This persecution [by Bloody Mary] aroused a mighty reaction that made England forever Protestant. It has well been said that “the excesses of this bloody reaction accomplished more for the Protestantization of England than all the efforts put forth under Edward’s reign.”—*Albert Henry Newman, A Manual of Church History, Vol. 2, pp. 266-267.*

Elizabeth ruled for 41 years; and Bibles were published in profusion during that time.

THE BISHOPS’ BIBLE (1568)

For some reason, the ever-increasing popularity of the Geneva Bible disturbed the religious authorities of England. They wanted to use their own approved Bible. By this time, 140 editions of the Geneva Bible had been printed and it was in demand everywhere.

In 1563, Archbishop Parker called for a committee to be formed, to produce a new Bible. Because nine of the revisers were bishops, the resultant Bible came to be called the Bishops’ Bible.

The only improvements in this Bible were lots of pictures, thicker, and more expensive paper, and little else. But it did include the verse divisions of the Geneva Bible. A portrait of Queen Elizabeth was on the title page.

Although highly promoted, **this Bible, which was produced during Elizabeth’s reign, never gained the favor of the people. They were thoroughly content with the Geneva Bible. An added advantage of the Geneva Bible was that it was relatively small. This made it easier to carry and store. The Coverdale, Matthew, and Great Bibles were all twice the page size of the Geneva Bible.**

The last edition of the Bishop’ Bible was in 1606. Another Bible was soon to gain the ascendancy in England—and be retained for hundreds of years.

The King James Bible

The Crowning Result of Tyndale's Sacrifice

JAMES I (1566-1625)

Elizabeth I, who had never married, left no heir. James was the son of another infamous Mary: the Catholic "Mary, Queen of Scots" (1542-1587). You can read about her in *Great Controversy*, pp 250-251. Although she feared John Knox, she would have liked nothing more than to strike him dead.

After his mother was imprisoned in London for sedition against her half-sister, Elizabeth, Queen of England, James came to the throne and was crowned James VI of Scotland (1567-1603).

The date was July 29, 1567, and James was rather young—only 13 months old. (Five months earlier, his father, Henry Stuart, Mary's second husband, had been killed by a bomb blast in his home.)

Twenty years later, his mother, Mary, was beheaded at the age of 44.

On the death of Elizabeth in 1603, James came to the throne of England, and was crowned James I (1603-1625).

The present writer has read historical studies, that James was a secret Catholic who, unable to openly slay Protestants, contented himself with harassing Christian minorities.

Other writers say he was a solid Protestant.

"James I came to the throne in 1603. His early life and training had made him a student of the Bible. He had even tried his hand at authorship, having written a paraphrase of the book of Revelation and translated some of the Psalms."—*I.M. Price, Ancestry of Our English Bible*, p. 468.

It is true that James did not provide a pleasant home for the most dedicated believers in Christ. It was for this reason that the Mayflower sailed to America in 1621, just ten years after the King James Bible was published.

But, if there was any doubt, one event surely helped James choose to unite with the Protestant side! It was a cheerful little attempt by the Catholics to blow him to pieces.

Here is the story of what happened:

Two years after James ascended the English throne, on October 26, 1605, an unsigned letter was delivered to the Lord Chamberlain, Monteagle, warning him to stay away from the much-delayed opening session of Parliament on November 5.

Puzzled, he wondered what this was all about. It was planned that the King, his entire royal family, and all the members of Parliament would be in Westminster Palace that day.

Monteagle took the brief note to the King's chief minister, Robert Cecil (first Earl of Salisbury), who woke James out of bed and showed it to him.

It so happened that four dedicated Roman Catholics (Thomas Winter, Thomas Percy, John Wright, and Guy Fawkes) led by another papist (Robert Catesby) had taken an oath to assassinate King James and everyone else in that immense building. Their pledge was sealed at a solemn communion service, served by the Jesuit priest, John Gerard.

The plan was simple enough: Blow up the building while the people were in it and, then, start an insurrection outside with arms smuggled in from Flanders. It was hoped that an open revolt would follow and all the Protestants would be slain.

But, somehow, the opening of Parliament kept being postponed. This worried the conspirators, and they counseled with two other Catholic priests.

One was Oswald Greenway, who they spoke with during confessional. The other was Henry Garnet, Provincial of the English Jesuits.

In the providence of God, it was only because of the repeated delays that they decided to warn a few pro-Catholic members of Parliament to stay away from the opening of Parliament on November 5, 1605.

Monteagle's note was one of them, sent to him by his Catholic relative, Francis Tresham.

The date of the note was October 26. The opening of Parliament was set for November 5. The government had only eight days in which to solve this mystery.

As soon as King James learned of the crisis, he immediately launched a major investigation. Day after day passed, and still no results.

Finally, on the evening of November 4, investigators were still at work. Parliament was scheduled to open the next morning, amid special ceremonies. Then, on the stroke of midnight, British security agents discovered the suspicious presence of Guy Fawkes standing outside the cellar door of Westminster Palace.

Who was this man? Why was he standing there at midnight?

Men had earlier looked through the cellar and found nothing. Now they searched it thoroughly—and discovered, hidden beneath a large pile of faggots and coal, **and positioned beneath the very spot where James would be standing in only few hours—THIRTY-SIX barrels of gunpowder.** When they searched Fawkes, they found in his pockets a tinder box and matches.

At 1 a.m., Fawkes was summoned to face the hurriedly awakened council in the king's bedchamber at Whitehall Palace.

Fawkes was emotionally unmoved, only expressing his regret that he had failed to blow the king and his Protestant followers all the way to the infernal place.

When the authorities went after Catesby, Percy, and Wright, they were met with gunfire, and the three fellow conspirators were slain.

This left Fawkes and three other collaborators to stand trial on January 27, 1606, and be hanged the same week in St. Paul's churchyard.

It was learned that the conspirators had secured a nearby house and spent 16 hours a day, for nearly a year, digging a tunnel from their basement to that of the Palace. But, arriving there, they found the foundation walls were nine feet thick.

So they went to another adjacent property and managed to gain access to the basement.

To this day, Britishers celebrate "Guy Fawkes Day," as a day they slew the Catholics who wanted to kill their king.

Why was Satan so anxious to destroy the king and Parliament? There was a special reason. On January 16-18, 1604, the sovereign had decided to have a large group of scholars begin work on a new translation of the Bible.

That project was just getting started when the Gunpowder Plot was discovered on the evening of November 4, 1605.

If the plot to kill all the Protestant leaders of the nation had succeeded, Satan would have succeeded in destroying the Authorized (King James) Bible.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE

Four days after Elizabeth's death, the new king departed for London. The date was April 5, 1603.

Before arriving at his destination, he was met by a delegation of Puritan ministers who presented him with a statement of grievances against the Church of England. What came to be known as the *Millenary Petition* was signed by nearly a thousand English clergymen, about 10 percent of the ministers in the nation.

Considering the matter carefully, King James issued a proclamation, "touching a meeting for the hearing and for the determining; things pretended to be amiss in the church."

The conference was held on January 14, 16, and 18 of the year 1604. The meeting place was Hampton Court. The largest of the royal palaces, it contained a thousand rooms.

The black plague was killing people in London (for Europeans still did not know the cause of the bubonic plague; it was caused by the droppings of the common [Norway] rat in the food-stuffs); so Hampton Court, located 15 miles southwest of London on the north bank of the Thames River, was considered a safe distance from the plague-ridden capital. Before the year was over, over 30,000 Englishmen would die.

But James did not like the Puritans. They did not believe in having bishops rule the church, and James considered church democracy a threat to his throne.

The four Puritans who came to the gathering were excluded on the opening day. Then, on January 16, they were led in to face over

fifty high church officials (including the Archbishop of Canterbury) led by Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London.

The chairman's convictions were easily detectable from his invitation to discuss "things pretended to be amiss in the church." Although James appreciated the Puritans' anti-Catholic position, he strongly disapproved of their Presbyterian form of government as a threat to his royal absolutism. On one occasion, he stated that "presbytery and monarchy agreed together as well as God and the devil." The king's best-remembered words expressing his fears of a Puritan-sponsored ouster of his politically supportive bishops was his cliché, "No bishops—No king." It was for such reasons that the Mayflower sailed to America in 1621.

As the meeting progressed, subjects of lesser importance began causing even more dissension.

After having one request after another denied, the leader of the Puritan delegation, Dr. Rainolds (also spelled "Reynolds" at times) made the request that changed Bible history.

" 'May your Majesty be pleased,' said Dr. John Rainolds in his address to the king, 'to direct that the Bible be now translated, such versions as are extant not answering to the original.'

"Rainolds was a Puritan, and the Bishop of London felt it his duty to disagree. 'If every man's humor might be followed,' His Grace, 'there would be no end to translating.'

"King James was quick to put both factions down. 'I profess,' he said, 'I could never yet see a Bible well translated in English, but I think that of Geneva is the worst.' These few dissident words started the greatest writing project the world has ever known."—*G.S. Paine, Men behind the King James Version, p. 1.*

God works in mysterious ways, His purposes to perform. At the time of James' coronation, an unfortunate spirit of rivalry existed between the Geneva Bible and the Bishops' Bible. The Geneva Bible was, by far, the more popular of the two among the common people. But church officials preferred the Bishops' Bible. The King did not like the fact that the Geneva Bible had not been prepared and printed in England. In addition, it had some Calvinistic notes in it and the King remembered how John Knox, in his homeland of Scotland, had spoken to his mother.

The King was only too aware that his prosperous subjects owed a "national debt" to the

liberating doctrines of Holy Scripture. Having abandoned the Catholicism of his own mother, James had observed firsthand that, "The entrance of thy words giveth light" (*Psalms 119:130*).

In order to see what the Bible had accomplished for England, all James had to do was to look at what had happened to England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when everybody had access to the Bible:

"No greater moral change ever passed over a nation than passed over England during the years which parted the middle of the reign of Elizabeth from the meeting of the Long Parliament. England became the people of a book, and that book was the Bible. It was as yet the one English book which was familiar to every Englishman; it was read at churches and read at home, and everywhere its words, as they fell on ears which custom had not deadened to their force and beauty, kindled a startling enthusiasm . . .

"The popularity of the Bible was owing to other causes besides that of religion. The whole prose literature of England, save the forgotten tracts of Wycliffe, has grown up since the translation of the Scriptures by Tyndale and Coverdale. No history, no romance, no poetry, save the little-known verse of Chaucer, existed for any practical purpose in the English tongue when the Bible was ordered to be set up in churches . . .

"As a mere literary monument, the English version of the Bible remains the noblest example of the English tongue. Its perpetual use made it from the instant of its appearance the standard of our language. But for the moment its literary effect was less than its social. The power of the book over the mass of Englishmen showed itself in a thousand superficial ways, and in none more conspicuously than in the influence it exerted on ordinary speech. It formed, we must repeat, the whole literature which was practically accessible to ordinary Englishmen; and when we recall the number of common phrases which we owe to great authors, the bits of Shakespeare, or Milton, or Dickens, or Thackeray, which unconsciously interweave themselves in our ordinary talk, we shall better understand the strange mosaic of Biblical words and phrases which colored English talk two hundred years ago. The mass of picturesque allusion and illustration which we borrow from a thousand books, our fathers were forced to borrow from one . . .

"But far greater than its effect on literature or social phrase was the effect of the Bible on the character of the people at large. Elizabeth

might silence or tune the pulpits; but it was impossible for her to silence or tune the great preachers of justice, and mercy, and truth, who spoke from the book which she had again opened for the people.

"The whole moral effect which is produced nowadays by the religious newspaper, the tract, the essay, the lecture, the missionary report, the sermon, was then produced by the Bible alone. And its effect in this way, however dispassionately we examine it, was simply amazing. The whole temper of the nation was changed. A new conception of life and of man superseded the old. A new moral and religious impulse spread through every class . . . the whole nation became, in fact, a church."—*J.R. Green, A Short History of the English People, pp. 455-457.*

James did not like the fact that the Geneva Bible, which was so extremely popular with the English people, had been translated and printed in a foreign country.

He saw that he now had an excellent opportunity to provide his subjects with a Bible that would be truly English, totally translated and printed on English soil. The prestige gained from successful completion of the project could only enhance his fledgling reign. So **King James ordered the translation to be made.**

"That a translation be made of the whole Bible, as consonant as can be to the original Hebrew and Greek; and this to be set out and printed, without any marginal notes, and only to be used in all churches of England, in time of Divine service."—*Decree of King James, quoted in McClure, Translators Revised, p. 59.*

Interestingly enough, every possible excuse is today made to downgrade the King James Bible. One is that James never authorized its translation. But that is not true.

Writing at the time the project began, Bishop Bancroft wrote this to an assistant:

"I move you in his majesty's name that, agreeably to the charge and trust committed unto you, no time may be overstepped by you for the better furtherance of this holy work. You will scarcely conceive how earnest his majesty is to have this work begun!"—*Quoted in G.S. Paine, Men behind the King James Version, p. 11.*

In the Preface to the Authorized (King James) Bible, we are told:

"Hereupon did his Majesty begin to bethink himself of the good that might ensue by a new translation, and presently after gave order for this translation which is now presented unto thee."

PREPARATION OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE

As mentioned earlier, the recommendation for a new revision had been made by Dr. John Rainolds (also written Reynolds by others in his time), president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and a leading Puritan.

Rainolds cited as the reason for a new translation was that the official Prayer Book, based on the Great Bible and Bishops' Bible, had translation errors in it. This charge was, by itself, a significant reason for a new translation. A better Prayer Book could be prepared from the new Bible.

After the January 14-18, 1604, Hampton Court conference ended, a diligent search was made for scholars "who had taken pains in their private study of the Scriptures" (G.S. Paine, pp. 12-13). The king requested the aid of "all our principal learned men within the kingdom" (op. cit., p. 13).

By July, James publicly announced his selection of 54 of the nation's best scholars to work on the project. The project formally began in 1607.

The revisers were divided into six companies, each assigned to work on a specific section of the Bible. The Old Testament groups translated from the Hebrew while the New Testament groups translated from the Greek:

1 - In the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster, ten men under the direction of Lancelot Barlow translated Genesis through 2 Kings.

2 - Also working at Westminster, William Barlow chaired a group of seven which worked on Romans through Jude.

3 - At Oxford, John Harding led seven men in their work on Isaiah through Malachi.

4 - Also at Oxford, Thomas Ravis oversaw the work of eight men working on the Gospels, Acts, and Revelation.

5 - At Cambridge, Edward Lively's group translated 1 Chronicles through Song of Solomon.

6 - Also at Cambridge, John Bois' team translated the Apocrypha.

When the group work was completed, two members of each of the three companies were chosen to check over the final revision, prior to sending it to a London printing house.

In summary, The entire work was divided in this manner: **The first three years (1604-1607) were occupied in finalizing and perfecting the preliminary arrangements. Dur-**

ing this time, some of the translators carefully worked over the material they would soon be translating.

The next two to three years were occupied in the individual and cooperative labor of the six groups of revisers. The translation was completed during this time.

After this, in London nine months were devoted to working on the final revision.

THE COMPLETED BOOK

The Bible was printed by Robert Barker in a large folio edition that, in appearance, was very much like the Bishops' Bible.

A flattering dedication to King James was at the front. A longer Preface was also at the front of the Bible. Unfortunately, this Preface, written by Miles Smith, one of the translators, is no longer included. But it was very worthwhile and replied to the charge of the Catholics, that no English Bible was needed.

It is only available today in a booklet published by Edgar J. Goodspeed (who himself translated an early 20th-century Bible translation), entitled, *The Translators to the Reader*. Miles Smith's Preface was excellent!

"But it is high time to leave them [the critics], and to show in brief what we proposed to ourselves, and what course we held in this our perusal and survey of the Bible. 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 one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark. To that purpose there were many chosen [to work on the project] . . . If you ask what they had before them, truly it was the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, the Greek of the New. These are the two golden pipes, or rather conduits where-through the olive branches empty themselves into the gold."—*Miles Smith, part of the Preface, Authorized (King James) Bible.*

For the New Testament, the King James translators used the Erasmus, Stephenus, and Beza Greek Texts. Theodore Beza, a faithful Protestant had gathered additional manuscripts, which he placed in a text. But his text was essentially the same as that of Erasmus, except that it had a broader number of Majority Text manuscripts in it.

For the Old Testament, they produced a

translation from the Hebrew manuscripts which far surpassed any English translation in its faithful representation of the Hebrew text, yet did it in a simplicity admirably representative of the Elizabethan age.

It has been said that the New Testament is so expressive in language and form, that it even surpasses the original Greek as literature.

When all the intellectual attainments of the scholars, their careful work, and the careful rules were established in order to produce the most careful, accurate text—the fact remains that, according to a consensus of authorities, approximately 90 percent of Tyndale's words were left intact by the King James translators.

John Foxe wrote this:

"Before Tyndale's day, the English versions of the Bible had been but translations of a translation, being derived from the Vulgate or older Latin versions. Tyndale, for the first time, went back to the original Hebrew and Greek. And not only did he go back to the original languages seeking for the truth, but he embodied that truth when found in so noble a translation that it has ever since been deemed wise by scholars and revisers to make but few changes in it; consequently every succeeding version is in reality little more than a revision of Tyndale's. It has been truly said that the peculiar genius which breathes through the English Bible, the mingled tenderness and majesty, the Saxon simplicity, the grandeur—unequaled, unapproached in the attempted improvements of modern scholars—all are here, and bear the impress of the mind of one man, and that man William Tyndale."—*John Foxe, Foxes' Christian Martyrs of the World, p. 362.*

Tyndale has justly been called "the father of the English Bible" (*Dowley, Handbook to Christianity, p. 370*).

But not everyone liked the King James Bible. A marginal note in the Catholic Rheims-Douai Bible, produced later specifically to introduce Catholic errors and take the place of the King James Bible, said this: The men who made the King James Bible "would be abhorred in the depths of hell" (*quoted in McClure, Translators Revised, p. 88*).

As soon as the King James Bible came off the press, it met opposition from some groups. Everything good is always opposed by someone. But it soon outran in popularity the Bishops' Bible, which had not been reprinted since 1606.

With the Geneva Bible, it waged a running fight for a full half century. But character and merit won the contest, and the King James Bible completely took the field.

LATER REVISIONS

In later years, several revisions were made, which consisted solely of efforts to eliminate earlier printer's errors.

The most important changes occurred in the 18th century. In 1762, Dr. Thomas Paris published a revision at Cambridge; and in 1769 Dr. Benjamin Blayney, after about four years' work, brought out another at Oxford.

Blayney's revision was especially valuable for the modernization of spelling, punctuation, expression, and elimination of printer's errors.

The 1769 Blayney revision is the King James Bible we use today.

Over the years, various helpful marginal notes were added. **Bishop Lloyd's Bible in 1701 was the first to include the Biblical chronology, worked out by Archbishop Ussher and published in 1650-1654.** As you know, it placed the date for Creation at 4004 B.C., a date which we know, from the Spirit of Prophecy, cannot be far off. The present author's in-depth analysis of the date of Creation, based on a variety of scientific data, also places the creation of our world as having occurred at an extremely recent date, and recommends a working date of 4000 B.C. (*See chapters 5 and 6, of Origin of the Universe, which is Vol. 1 of the 3-volume Evolution Disproved Series.*)

It is extremely important that the reader understand that the King James Bible was the LAST English Bible translation based on the Majority Text! Never since 1611, has another one been made!

All modern English translations are primarily or wholly based on the Westcott-Hort / Nestle Text which, in turn, is based on a few variant manuscripts! We have discussed this earlier and will return to it later in this study. Even the so-called New King James Version, published by Thomas Nelson and Co., actually includes a fair amount of Nestle-Aland Text tossed in!

ANSWERING

THE CRITICS' COMPLAINTS ABOUT THE KING JAMES BIBLE

In spite of the carping complaints of the crit-

ics that the King James Bible is the result of only four years effort, the truth is that, **during those four years, 54 of the best scholars in England worked on the project.**

But there is more: **The King James Bible is not the work of a four-year project, but of an 86-year project of scrutinizing revision—beginning with William Tyndale.**

In a *Moody Monthly* article, Leslie Keylock wrote the typical slur we find in the 20th century, about the magnificent King James Version:

"Because of the limitations of seventeenth-century scholarship, the KJV has major weaknesses."—*Leslie R. Keylock, "The Bible that Bears His Name," in Moody Monthly, July-August, 1985.*

A major objection is that there are so-called archaic words in the Authorized Version. Keylock wrote:

"Many sentences in the KJV cannot be understood today unless the reader consults a good Bible commentary."—*Ibid.*

The highly regarded *Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces* would disagree with Keylock's contention. From the information contained on the inside jacket cover, we understand that the purpose of this work is to recommend, to the student, the most readable text of any number of literary works:

"Every selection, every text, every translation has been reexamined to ensure that the students of the 1980s have the fewest obstacles between them and the great masterpieces of the Western tradition."—*Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces, 5th edition.*

The Norton editors selected the 1611 Authorized Version as the best they could find, when they printed their "masterworks edition" of the Old and New Testaments of the Holy Bible!

Although the critics may carp, actually, **the "archaic" words of the King James Bible have already been "updated" more than 100 times in as many years for an average of one modern version per year. The truth is that the King James Bible is an outstanding version for our time in history.**

It is also said that the King James translators used incorrect grammar. It is true that occasionally the King James uses the grammatical structure known as *anacoluthon* ("a change from one grammatical construction to another within the same sentence, sometimes as a rhetorical device," *such as Webster's New World Dic-*

tionary). But the fact is that while the critics declare it has wrong tenses, improper treatment of the article, “the,” and a refusal to translate literally—they do it themselves in their own modern translations.

Modern revisions, such as the New American Standard Version (NASV) and others, frequently refuse to translate their own Greek articles. And they insert the English article in numerous verses without the “authoritative” go-ahead of the corresponding Greek article.

It is said that the King James Bible adds words which are not in the Greek text. That is true, but it places them in italics. In contrast, the modern versions do the same, but they do not place the added words in italics.

But there are other modernists who say that absolutely no words must ever be added, not in the Greek or Hebrew—and that the shameful King James Bible does just that.

Here is an instance when the King James does this—and notice that the added words are always placed in italic (something the modern versions do not do when they add words):

“And there was again a battle in Gob with the Philistines, where Elhanan the son of Jaare-oregim, a Bethlehemite, slew *the brother of Goliath the Gittite*, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver’s beam.”—2 Samuel 21:19.

Here is what happens when a modern translator tries to take out every italicized word:

“In another battle with the Philistines at Gob, Elhanan son of Jaare-Oregim the Bethlehemite killed Goliath the Gittite, who had a spear with a shaft like a weaver’s rod.”—2 Samuel 21:19, NIV.

According to this, after David slew Goliath, someone else killed him a second time!

“First, take a Bible (King James, of course) and read *Psalms 16:8*. ‘I have set the LORD always before me: because *He is* at my right hand, I shall not be moved.’ You will notice that the two words ‘He is’ are in italics.

“Yet when we find the Apostle Peter quoting this verse in the New Testament in *Acts 2:25* we find it says: ‘For David speaketh concerning Him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for He is on my right hand, that I should not be moved.’ So here we find the Apostle Peter quoting *Psalms 16:8*, italicized words and all! You would almost believe that God wanted them in there wouldn’t you?”—*Samuel C. Gipp, The Answer Book, p. 54.*

Another “error” in the King James is the fact that it does not split the book of Isaiah

at the end of chapter 39, into two books.

Well, neither did the Hebrew Old Testament! And neither does Christ Himself! He attributes both halves of the book of Isaiah to the same author (*Matthew 12:17 and 13:14*)!

There are the critics who tell you there are thousands and thousands of errors in the King James Version.

“Few people realize, for example, that thousands of errors have been found in the KJV.”—*Leslie R. Keylock, “The Bible that Bears His Name,” in Moody Monthly, July-August, 1985.*

These are reckless statements and not true. **They refer to the lithographical (printer’s) errors which have been corrected**, since the first edition in 1611, and the many orthographical (spelling and punctuation) updates which have been made since then. With every character set by hand, a multitude of typographical mistakes could be made. (The lead type was also set in place backward, so it would print correctly on paper.) Each new edition of the King James Bible corrected some of these while introducing others. Sometimes words were inverted. Other times, a plural was written as a singular or vice versa.

Another type of “printing mistakes” consisted of nothing more than changes in type styles.

In the original 1611 edition, the Gothic “v” looked like a Roman “u” while the Gothic “u” looked like a Roman “v.” The Gothic “j” resembled the Roman “i.” The lower-case “s” looked like an “f.” **Such “changes” account for a significant percentage of the “tens of thousands” of changes and errors in the King James Bible.**

By the way, there was no uniform spelling when the King James was first printed. Spelling did not begin to be standardized until the 18th century, and the King James was not standardized until the last half of that century. “Darke” was changed to “dark,” and “rann” to “ran.” **So, over the centuries, a lot of changes had to be made.** We are thankful they were.

Most historians do not date the beginning of modern English until the 1500s. **Frankly, it was the King James which helped set our basic English in concrete. But the spelling and punctuation still kept changing down to our own time.**

Corrected editions of the King James appeared in 1629, 1638, 1644, 1676, 1680, 1701,

1762, 1769, 1806, 1813, 1850, and 1852; this, of course, changed typographical errors.

Dr. Frederick Scrivener, in one of his books defending the King James Version, prepared a list of corrections. In his Appendix A (list of wrong readings of the Bible of 1611, amended in later editions) of his informative work, *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*, Scrivener cataloged but a fraction of the “tens of thousands of errors” that modernists claim are in the King James. Instead, the actual number of “errors” are in the hundreds, not in the thousands. And even this figure is misleading, when you consider that many of the instances were repetitious in nature. (Six such changes involve the corrected spelling of “Nathanael” from the 1611’s Nathaneel in *John 1:45-49* and *21:2*).

“Whereas Geisler and Nix cited Goodspeed’s denouncing of Dr. Blayney’s 1769 Oxford edition [of the King James Bible] for deviating from the [original] Authorized Version in ‘at least 75,000 details,’ Scrivener alludes to less than two hundred as noteworthy of mention.”—*W.P. Grady, Final Authority, p. 170* (cf. *Frederick H.A. Scrivener, The Authorized Edition of the Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*).

Here is a sample list of the type of alterations which were made in the King James Bible down through the years. The samples give the first textual correction on consecutive left-hand pages of Scrivener’s book. First, the 1611 reading is given. It is then followed by the present reading and the date when the change was made:

1. this thing—this thing also (1638)
2. shalt have remained—ye shall have remained (1762)
3. Achzib, nor Helbath, nor Aphik—of Achzib, nor of Helbath, nor of Aphik (1762)
4. requite good—requite me good (1629)
5. this book of the Covenant—the book of this covenant (1629)
6. chief rulers—chief ruler (1629)
7. And Parbar—At Parbar (1638)
8. For this cause—And for this cause (1638)
9. For the king had appointed—for so the king had appointed (1629)
10. Seek good—Seek God (1617)
11. The cormorant—But the cormorant (1629)
12. returned—turned (1769)
13. a fiery furnace—a burning fiery furnace (1638)
14. The crowned—Thy crowned (1629)
15. thy right doeth—thy right hand doeth (1613)
16. the wayes side—the way side (1743)
17. which was a Jew—which was a Jewess (1629)

18. the city—the city of the Damascenes (1629)
19. now and ever—both now and ever (1638)
20. which was of our father’s—which was of our fathers (1616)

Such alterations are purely of a correlative nature. There are no doctrinal errors here!

It is clear that the true text of the A.V. 1611 remained unaffected throughout these corrective stages. This was confirmed in a special report to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society in 1852. The official findings of this committee of seven, chaired by Dr. James W. McLane, were as follows:

“The English Bible as left by the translators has come down to us unaltered in respect to its text . . . With the exception of typographical errors and changes required by the progress of orthography in the English language, the text of our present Bibles remains unchanged, and without variations from the original copy as left by the translators.”—*Report of the Committee on versions to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, James W. McLane, Chairman, pp. 7, 11.*

According to the critics, another “problem” with the King James is the fact that it had the Apocrypha in it.

“It is also interesting—and perhaps you are not aware of it—that the early editions of the Authorized Version contained the Apocrypha. Horrors!”—*Robert L. Sumner, Bible Translations, p. 9.*

Why was the Apocrypha included in this Bible? It has been suggested that the translators believed the Apocrypha were inspired books. That is not true. **They did not want it in the King James Bible, but the king asked that it be included.**

So, instead of scattering the Apocryphal books all through the Old Testament (as you will find if you look in a Rheims-Douai—or any other Roman Catholic—Bible), they placed all the Apocryphal books by themselves between the Testaments.

The King James translators were not confused over this matter. **They listed seven reasons why the apocryphal books were to be categorically rejected as part of the Inspired canon.**

Later in this book, when we discuss the modern translations, we will discuss the Apocrypha, its history and problems, in some detail.

**EFFECTS OF
THE KING JAMES BIBLE**

One of the great results of the King James Version was not only that it became the Bible of England—but it also became the Bible of America! Think of all the great evangelistic work which has been done, using that book! **How many evangelists do you find today who are winning souls with the modern versions?** For some reason, by the time they turn to the modern versions, so many frequently stop trying to labor as earnestly for the lost.

It was only 27 years after the King James Bible was printed that Roger Williams founded "Providence." His Rhode Island settlement, founded in 1638, became the first government

in history based on total religious freedom.

We originally intended to include many quotation here, showing the importance of the Authorized (King James) Bible down through the centuries. But we instead placed them in the Introduction at the front of this book.

Three agencies were employed in an effort to destroy the Reformation, its followers, and its Bibles:

- **The Jesuits**
- **The decisions of the Council of Trent**
- **The production of Catholic Bibles with their various mistranslations and errors**

And that brings us to the Counter Reformation.

Last eve I paused beside the blacksmith's door
And heard the anvil ring the vesper chimes;
Then looking in, I saw upon the floor
Old hammers worn-out with beating years of time.

"How many anvils have you had," said I,
"To wear and batter all these hammers so?"
"Just one," said he and then with twinkling eye,
"The anvil wears the hammers out, you know."

And so I thought, the anvil of God's Word
For ages skeptics' blows have beat upon,
Yet, though the noise of falling blows was heard,
The anvil is unharmed, the hammers are gone.

The Counter Reformation

The Threefold Effort to Destroy Protestant Bibles

THE JESUITS (1534)

First, we will consider the Jesuits:

“Throughout Christendom, Protestantism was menaced by formidable foes. The first triumphs of the Reformation past, Rome summoned new forces, hoping to accomplish its destruction. At this time, the order of the Jesuits was created, the most cruel, unscrupulous, and powerful of all the champions of Popery . .

“To combat these forces, Jesuitism inspired its followers with a fanaticism that enabled them to endure like dangers, and to oppose to the power of truth all the weapons of deception. There was no crime too great for them to commit, no deception too base for them to practice, no disguise too difficult for them to assume. Vowed to perpetual poverty and humility, it was their studied aim to secure wealth and power, to be devoted to the overthrow of Protestantism, and the reestablishment of the papal supremacy.

“When appearing as members of their order, they wore a garb of sanctity, visiting prisons and hospitals, ministering to the sick and the poor, professing to have renounced the world, and bearing the sacred name of Jesus, who went about doing good. But under this blameless exterior the most criminal and deadly purposes were often concealed. It was a fundamental principle of the order that the end justifies the means. By this code, lying, theft, perjury, assassination, were not only pardonable but commendable, when they served the interests of the church.

“Under various disguises the Jesuits worked their way into offices of state, climbing up to be the counselors of kings, and shaping the policy of nations. They became servants, to act as spies upon their masters. They established colleges for the sons of princes and nobles, and schools for the common people; and the children of Protestant parents were drawn into an observance of popish rites.”—*Great Controversy*, pp. 234-235.

Ignatius Loyola was totally dedicated to the Church of Rome. He had a fanatical drive to aid the pope and destroy Protestantism.

“Ignatius Loyola came forward and must have said in substance to the Pope: ‘Let the Augustinians continue to provide monasteries of retreat for contemplative minds; let the Benedictines give themselves up to the field of literary endeavor; let the Dominicans retain their responsibility for maintaining the Inquisition; but we, the Jesuits, will capture the colleges and the universities.

“We will gain control of instruction in law, medicine, science, education, and so weed out from all books of instruction, anything injurious to Roman Catholicism. We will mould the thoughts and ideas of the youth. We will enroll ourselves as Protestant preachers and college professors in the different Protestant faiths. Sooner or later, we will undermine the authority of the Greek New Testament of Erasmus, and also of those Old Testament productions which have dared to raise their heads against the Old Testament of the Vulgate and against tradition. And thus will we undermine the Protestant Reformation.”—*B.G. Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, pp. 59-60.

Ignatius Loyola was guided by demons. He had a favorite place in the woods near Rome, where he would go for private séances. As he sat there with his writing materials, an angelic being in glowing light would appear and instruct him how to train his workers and clarify the work he was to do.

Wilkinson explains the training program for Jesuit agents:

“Their complete system of education and of drilling was likened, in the constitution of the order itself, to the reducing of all its members to the placidity of a corpse, whereby the whole could be turned and returned at the will of the superior. We quote from their constitution:

“‘As for holy obedience, this virtue must be perfect in every point—in execution, in will, in intellect—doing what is enjoined with all celerity, spiritual joy, and perseverance; persuading ourselves that everything is just; suppressing every repugnant thought and judgment of one’s own, in a certain obedience . . and let every one persuade himself that he who lives under obedience should be moved and directed, under

Divine Providence, by his superior, just as if he were a corpse (*perinde ac si cadaver esset*) which allows itself to be moved and led in any direction' (R.W. Thompson, *Ex-Secretary of Navy. U.S.A., The Footprints of the Jesuits*, p. 51).

"That which put an edge on the newly forged mentality was the unparalleled system of education impressed upon the pick of Catholic youth. The Pope, perforce, virtually threw open the ranks of the many millions of Catholic young men and told the Jesuits to go in and select the most intelligent.

"The initiation rites were such as to make a lifelong impression on the candidate for admission. He never would forget the first trial of his faith. Thus the youth are admitted under a test which virtually binds forever the will, if it has not already been enslaved. What matters to him? Eternal life is secure, and all is for the greater glory of God.

"Then follow the long years of intense mental training, interspersed with periods of practice. They undergo the severest methods of quick and accurate learning. They will be, let us say, shut up in a room with a heavy Latin lesson, and expected to learn it in a given period of hours."—*Op. cit.*, pp. 61-62.

It is well to understand how Jesuit teachers operate; for they are scattered throughout secular, Catholic, and Protestant universities:

"They early realized the vast importance of directing higher education as a means of gaining control of the lives of the ablest and best-connected young men and making trained intellect subservient to their purposes . . . The marked ability of the Jesuit teachers, their unsurpassed knowledge of human nature, their affability of manners, and their remarkable adaptability to the idiosyncrasies and circumstances of each individual, made them practically irresistible when once they came into close relations with susceptible youth."—*Albert Henry Newman, Manual of Church History, Vol. 2, pp. 374, 383.*

Sir Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was deeply impressed with Jesuit schools, and wrote, "Such as they are, would that they were ours" (*quoted in Will Durant, Story of Civilization, Vol. 6, p. 915*). **Once a Jesuit professor gained the friendship of a student, he would gradually work to win him fully over.**

"It is probable that more time was employed in molding their religious and moral characters into complete harmony with the ideals of the [Jesuit] Society than in securing a mastery of the studies of the course . . . Large numbers

of the most desirable young men who entered their schools, with no intention of becoming members of the Society, were won by the patient efforts of those in charge."—*Op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 374.

The Jesuits have a special dispensation from the pope, that they do not have to wear any special religious clothing or sleep in a monastery at night. This makes it possible for them to enter many different walks of life and carry on their work for the pope.

"It is the same today. The 33,000 official members of the Society operate all over the world in the capacity of her personnel, officers of a truly secret army containing in its ranks heads of political parties, high ranking officials, generals, magistrates, physicians, faculty professors, etc.; all of them striving to bring about, in their own sphere God's work—in reality, the plans of the papacy."—*Edmond Paris, Secret History of the Jesuits, p. 30.*

Their reputation for subterfuge—lying, espionage, subversion, and worse—is well-known to the student of history.

"It is permitted to an individual to kill a tyrant in virtue of the right of self-defense; for though the community does not command it, it is always to be understood that it wishes to be defended by every one of its citizens individually, and even by a stranger . . . Thus, after he has been declared to be deprived of his kingdom, it becomes legal to treat him as a real tyrant; and consequently any man has a right to kill him."—*Suarez, a later high-ranking Jesuit leader, quoted in Newman, Manual of Church History, Vol. 2, p. 380.*

Thomas B. Macaulay, a well-known 19th-century thinker and writer, said this:

"It was in the ears of the Jesuit that the powerful, the noble, and the beautiful, breathed the secret history of their lives. It was at the feet of the Jesuit that the youth of the higher and middle classes were brought up from childhood to manhood, from the first rudiments to the courses of rhetoric and philosophy. Literature and science, lately associated with infidelity or with heresy, now became the allies of orthodoxy. Dominant in the south of Europe, the great order soon went forth conquering and to conquer. In spite of oceans and deserts, of hunger and pestilence, of spies and penal laws, of dungeons and racks, of gibbets and quartering-blocks,

"Jesuits were to be found under every disguise, and in every country; scholars, physicians, merchants, serving men; in the hostile court of Sweden, in the old manor-house of Cheshire,

among the hovels of Connaught; arguing, instructing, consoling, stealing away the hearts of the young, animating the courage of the timid, holding up the crucifix before the eyes of the dying. Nor was it less their office to plot against the thrones and lives of the apostate kings, to spread evil rumors, to raise tumults, to inflame civil wars, to arm the hand of the assassin.

“Inflexible in nothing but in their fidelity to the church, they were equally ready to appeal in her cause to the spirit of loyalty and to the spirit of freedom. Extreme doctrines of obedience and extreme doctrines of liberty, the right of rulers to misgovern the people, the right of every one of the people to plunge his knife in the heart of a bad ruler, were inculcated by the same man, according as he addressed himself to the subject of Philip or to the subject of Elizabeth.”—*Macaulay, Essays, pp. 480-481.*

“If Protestantism, or the semblance of Protestantism, showed itself in any quarter, it was instantly met, not by petty, teasing persecution, but by persecution of that sort which bows down and crushes all but a very few select spirits. Whoever was suspected of heresy, whatever his rank, his learning, or his reputation, knew that he must purge himself to the satisfaction of a severe and vigilant tribunal, or die by fire. Heretical books were sought out and destroyed with similar rigor.”—*Op. cit., pp. 482-483.*

John Adams wrote this to Thomas Jefferson:

“I am not happy about the rebirth of the Jesuits. Swarms of them will present themselves under more disguises ever taken by even a chief of the bohemians, as printers, writers, publishers, school teachers, etc. If ever an association of people deserved eternal damnation, on this earth or in hell, it is this Society of Loyola.”—*John Adams, Letter to Thomas Jefferson, quoted in Edmund Paris, Secret History of the Jesuits, p. 75.*

We will return to the Jesuits later, as we view more of their effort to take over England and destroy its precious heritage: the King James Bible.

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (1545-1563)

It is a remarkable fact that the Roman Catholic Church remained in such disorder for centuries, that it never got around to codifying its doctrines. This was due to the fact that the prelates, bishops, and priests were sensual and pleasure-loving while engaged in continual rivalries as each group struggled for power.

In such a state of affairs, it was little wonder

that papal leadership had never gotten around to defining their beliefs. They were too busy with wine, women, and politicking.

But the 16th-century Reformation frightened Rome to its core. Something had to be done to stop this. Part of the solution was to convene a church council to define their doctrines, so they would be in a better position to attack the Protestants.

The Council of Trent (1545-1563) was held off and on over a period of years and gradually muddled its way through a number of enactments.

Here are several statements about the work of this council:

The pope wisely set the Jesuits in charge of infusing the council with their strange logic, which could prove black to be white, and white black.

“The Society came to exercise a marked influence to which their presence in the Council of Trent, as the Pope’s theologians, gave signal testimony. It was a wise stroke of policy for the Papacy to entrust its cause in the Council so largely to the Jesuits.”—*Hulme, Renaissance and Reformation, p. 428.*

Popes always fear church councils—because they sometimes put popes to death! But Paul III wisely sent the Jesuits to be his agents, to make sure everything went well during the sessions.

“The Council of Trent was dominated by the Jesuits. This we must bear in mind as we study that Council. It is the leading characteristic of that assembly. ‘The great Convention dreaded by every Pope’ was called by Paul III when he saw that such a council was imperative if the Reformation was to be checked. And when it did assemble, he so contrived the manipulation of the program and the attendance of the delegates, that the Jesuitical conception of a theocratic Papacy should be incorporated into the canons of the church.”—*Wilkinson, Our Authorized Bible Vindicated, p. 63.*

Throughout the Council of Trent, the single, most important, most basic dogma could not be settled. It was this: **What was the basis of Roman Catholic authority? It could not be said that it was the Bible;** for then the power would be taken out of the hands of the papacy, and they could not let that happen!

Some type of reasoning had to be worked out, on which the supremacy of the pope and the councils could be firmly planted.

In the present author’s book, *Beyond Pit-*

cairn, pp. 132-134, how that was done is carefully explained. You will want to read it carefully.

Astoundingly, the reasoning went like this: centuries before, the papacy changed the Bible Sabbath to Sunday; therefore it had the authority to command all other things—above Scripture!

That is surely Jesuitical thinking! Since we got away with earlier having changed the Law of God, without being struck dead by Heaven for so doing, it must mean we have the authority to do anything we want to do! Apparently, not even God dares to oppose us.

THE RHEIMS-DOUAI (DOUAY) BIBLE (1582-1610)

Because of Tyndale and those who followed him, every plowboy now had a Bible, and Rome needed a Bible of their own. This was difficult, since they knew nothing about the book.

“The Catholics in England were placed at great disadvantage when the Protestant Bible was translated. Armed with the Bible in English, the Protestants could quickly turn to it in a dispute and simply read the passage. The unfortunate Catholic had no English Bible and had to translate [from the Vulgate] on the spot. Even in teaching their own parishioners, the Catholic priests were handicapped.”—*S. Kubo and W. Specht, So Many Versions? p. 53.*

In previous centuries, the priests merely recounted the legends and fables of the church for the hearing of the ignorant. But, now that the Bible was available in the language of the people—the extent of their ignorance was becoming embarrassing. Something had to be done.

William Allen, a leading English Catholic, well-aware of the problem, appealed to the pope for permission, to produce a new translation, in English, which the priests could use to oppose the Protestants. He wrote this:

“Catholics educated in the academies and schools have hardly any knowledge of the Scriptures except in Latin. When they are preaching to the unlearned and are obliged on the spur of the moment to translate some passage into the vernacular they often do it inaccurately and with unpleasant hesitation because either there is no vernacular version of the words, or it does not occur to them at the moment.

“Our adversaries, however, have at their finger tips from some heretical version all those passages of Scripture which seem to make for them, and by a certain deceptive adaptation and alteration of the sacred words produce, the ef-

fect of appearing to say nothing but what comes from the Bible. This evil might be remedied if we too had some Catholic version of the Bible, for all the English versions are most corrupt . . . If His Holiness shall judge it expedient, we ourselves will endeavor to have the Bible faithfully, purely, and genuinely translated according to the edition approved by the church [Jerome's Vulgate], for we already have men most fitted for the work.”—*William Allen, letter to the pope, quoted in Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen, pp. 64-65, as quoted in Hugh Pope, English Versions of the Bible, p. 250.*

There was an urgent need for an English translation which could twist the Scriptures and add notes which could twist those difficult to change in the text.

For example, the Bible speaks of “repentance.” But Catholics do not repent; they only do penance. So **Catholic translations were needed which carefully make this switch to “penance” in every verse in which “repent” or “repentance” would otherwise appear.** Very clever? Yes, very clever.

In 1568, the same year that the Bishops' Bible came off the press, the Jesuits worked with some English Catholics who had fled from England—and started a English college at Douai, in Flanders. This French city was the seat of a university, founded by Philip II of Spain in 1562; and the English college, now part of it, became the continental center for the training of English agents, spies, teachers, and translators.

The founder of this college, William Allen, had taught at Oxford and been a canon [high-placed church official] under Bloody Queen Mary.

Working with the Jesuits, Allen conceived the idea of producing an English Bible at Douai, France, which would contain Roman Catholic teachings.

The actual translation of the work was carried on by Gregory Martin, another Oxford graduate.

In 1578, warfare erupted partway through the New Testament translation, and the entire project had to be moved to the city of Rheims, where the New Testament was published in 1582. It included controversial pro-Catholic and anti-Protestant notes in the margins.

In 1593, more political problems caused the college to move out of Rheims and back to Douai again—where the Old Testament was published in 1609-1610.

This is why it is called the Rheims-Douai Bible. (Douai is also spelled “Douay.”)

This Bible never sold as well as the Jesuits planned, so only three editions of the New Testament were printed between 1582 and 1750, and the Old Testament only once.

The title page of this Bible said this:

“The Holie Bible, Faithfully Translated Into English Out of the Authentical Latin.”

That Latin was, of course, Jerome’s Vulgate.

A relatively long Preface at the front apologized for the issuing of the Bible, declaring that it was only being done because there were so many heretical and false versions. To counteract these menaces to the Church of Rome and to vindicate the good name of Roman Catholic scholarship was given as the reason for the flood of controversial notes throughout the book.

The translation is extremely literal, even where the Latin is obscure and confused. The confusion is faithfully carried over into English. This stiff, formal, wooden style was excused in the Preface:

“We presume not in hard places to nullify the speeches or phrases, but religiously keep them word for word, and point for point, for fear of missing, or restraining the sense of the Holy Ghost to our fantasy.”

This Catholic Bible was heavily worked over about a century later.

“The Rheims-Douai Version was subjected to notable revision in the eighteenth century by Bishop Challoner of London and Archbishop Troy of Dublin. This and subsequent work was so far-reaching that it has been at times remarked with exaggeration that scarcely a word of the original translation remains.”—*I.M. Price, Ancestry of Our English Bible, p. 301.*

If that is so, as it surely must be, the original Rheims-Douai must have, indeed, been terrible. In order to write the missionary book, *The Magnificat*, for Roman Catholics, the author found it necessary to use the Rheims-Douai for the book’s many Scripture quotations. **The current Rheims-Douai is extremely difficult to read and understand, and it surely does contain Roman Catholic errors, as the examples below will demonstrate:**

According to the Rheims-Douai, **we need to confess our sins to fellow human beings:**

“Confess therefore your sins to one another: and pray one for another, that you may be saved.”—*James 5:16, Rheims-Douai.*

All Roman Catholic Bible translations have

been altered doctrinally. If you are giving Bible studies to a Catholic, you will need to use one of these Bibles. But they are somewhat difficult to work with and are based on a Latin translation (Jerome’s Latin Vulgate), which itself had serious flaws.

One small example is the omission of the ending of the Lord’s prayer in *Matthew 6:13*.

In the margin of older editions of the Rheims-Douai is found a note that **the number, 666, refers to Martin Luther** and also to the anti-christ, of whom he is the forerunner.

Did you know that Catholic teaching about Mary destroying Satan is written right into their Bible? According to their translation of *Genesis 3:15*, **it is Mary who destroys the serpent;** she, in turn, is unable to do even the slightest damage to her immaculate body:

“I will put enmities between thee and the women, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.”—*Genesis 3:15, Rheims-Douai.*

Consider this strange translation:

“Let us all hear together the conclusion of the discourse. Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is all man.”—*Ecclesiastes 12:13, Rheims-Douai.*

The following example totally ruins the only verse in the Bible which defines sin (*GC 493:0*)!

“Whosoever committeth sin committeth also iniquity; and sin is iniquity.”—*1 John 3:4, Rheims-Douai.*

The translators garbled that wonderful verse into a tautology: **The definition of sin is said to be sin!** I checked on this in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, and found exactly the same as in the Rheims-Douai.

It should be mentioned that, if you will read in the author’s book, *The Magnificat*, you will occasionally find the RSV quoted. If you look up each verse quoted from the RSV in the Rheims-Douai, you will find a problem. At times we quoted the Revised Standard Version because, in the early 1970s, it was officially accepted by the Vatican as a Bible which faithful Catholics could read. From what we understand, they hardly do read it; but the commonality of a single translation has simplified post-1965 efforts, by Catholic and Protestant officials, in their ongoing meetings at Geneva (WCC headquarters), to draw closer together. Much more on joint Catholic-Protestant Bibles later.

The book, *The Magnificat*, deserves wide distribution among faithful Catholic believers.

All faithful Roman Catholics are required to swear allegiance to the pope and the Tridentine Profession of Faith (1564) which says, in part:

“I acknowledge the sacred Scripture according to that sense which Holy Mother Church has held and holds, to whom it belongs to decide upon the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures, nor will I ever receive and interpret the Scripture except according to the unanimous consent of the fathers”—*quoted in Henry Bettenson, ed., Documents of the Christian Church, 2nd ed., p. 375.*

Yet Roman Catholics are carefully taught to avoid the Bible. It is Mary, the Rosary, the Confessional, and the Mass that are important. Rarely does a Catholic read in any Bible.

Those people need our help.

About 1582, when this Jesuit New Testament was launched to destroy Tyndale's English Version, the Jesuits dominated 287 colleges and universities in Europe.

Later in this book we will learn that Roman Catholic Bibles continued to be translated from Jerome's inferior Latin Vulgate—until the mid-20th century, when, for the first time, one was translated from something else. And what was it translated from? A modern critical Greek Text. No Catholic Bible has ever been translated from the Majority Text!

We earlier said that three agencies were used to destroy the Reformation and its followers: The Jesuits, the decisions of the Council of Trent, and the production of Catholic Bibles with their various mistranslations and errors.

However, three centuries after the Reformation began, a fourth agency would be started: a direct attack on the integrity of the text and transmission of the Bible. At the beginning of this book, we read about this attack. Then we read about events of earlier centuries.

We will now move past the earlier Reformation centuries,—and into centuries closer to our own time.

THE JESUIT EFFORT TO REGAIN ENGLAND

Let us now turn our attention to the efforts of the Jesuits to take over England. We viewed some of those effects at the beginning of this book. It is clear that there was a master-

mind agency behind, what culminated in, the Oxford Movement and the work of Westcott and Hort. That agency was the Jesuits.

We already noted how, just six years after the end of the Council of Trent—in 1569—the Vatican agent, William Allen established a college in Douai (at that time in the Spanish Netherlands). A second school was established in Rome ten years later (1579); this one was for the training of Jesuit missionaries to Britain.

During these training sessions, the agents were not only taught every lying, diabolical method which the Jesuits could invent, but they were stirred to a heat of anger against the Protestants. Allen speaks:

“We make it our first and foremost study . . . to stir up in the minds of Catholics . . . zeal and just indignation against the heretics. This we do by setting before the eyes of the students the exceeding majesty of the ceremonial of the Catholic Church in the place where we live . . .

“At the same time, we recall the mournful contrasts that obtains at home [in England]; the utter desolation of all things sacred which there exists . . . Our friends and kinsfolk, all our dear ones, and countless souls besides, perishing in schism and godlessness; every jail and dungeon filled to overflowing, not with thieves and villains but with Christ's priests and servants, nay, with our parents and kinsmen. There is nothing, then, that we ought not to suffer, rather than to look on at the ills that affect our nation.”—*William Allen, quoted in Will Durant, Story of Civilization, Vol. 7, p. 20.*

Temporary confusion reigned when Calvinist troops besieged and took the town of Douai in 1578. The Jesuit college managed to carry all its translation work in Rheims until 1593, when a military reversal permitted the school to return to Douai.

By the year 1585, a total of 268 graduates had secretly infiltrated England (*Manschreck, History of Christianity, p. 114*).

The two leading Jesuit agents were Robert Parsons and Edmund Campion who entered England in 1580, disguised as English military officers. Their assigned objective was the overthrow of Queen Elizabeth.

“Under diverse disguises, they spread from county to county, from country house to castle. In the evening, they would hear confession, in the morning, they would preach and give communion; then they would disappear as myste-

riously as they had arrived.”—*Edmund Paris, Secret History of the Jesuits, p. 43.*

These agents appeared to be working men or tradesmen, anything to hide their identity. Their many disguises included “the cassock of the English clergy” (*Green, English People, p. 412*).

A favorite method was this: Bright young men, after learning spy methods at a Jesuit training school, were sent to Oxford or Cambridge, where they graduated into the ministry or government positions.

This method is still used today, throughout the Protestant denominations. You can always tell when a denomination has been successfully infiltrated, and the agents have attained important positions: *That denomination no longer speaks negatively about Rome!* Even more sinister is the fact that **once Jesuit agents have penetrated high positions in the colleges and executive positions of a church, they are able to make sure that incoming agents are hired and rapidly advanced.**

It has been estimated that Jesuit agents won over 20,000 converts, within a year after their arrival in England (*Durant, Story of Civilization, Vol. 7, p. 21*).

Soon the English authorities came upon literature everywhere, inciting the people to assassinate the queen. An intense investigation followed. While Parsons managed to escape to the Continent, Campion was captured and tortured in the Tower in order to obtain names of fellow conspirators. But, good Jesuit that he was, Campion did not relent. On December 1, 1581, he and 14 others were publicly hanged.

Desperately determined to reconquer England and return it to the darkness of the Dark Ages, Pope Gregory XIII in 1583 and his counselors devised a plan to invade from three sides at once: Ireland, France, and Spain.

But British agents discovered the plot and counter-measures were so well put in place, that the scheme was abandoned.

The next scheme was under the direction of John Ballard, another Jesuit agent. In 1586 he was arrested for plotting to cause a general uprising of England’s Catholics, which would overthrow Queen Elizabeth and bring Mary Stewart of Scotland to the throne. He and 13 others were hanged.

Over the next 15 years, 61 priests and 49

laymen were hanged for conspiracy against the throne.

When Mary Stuart (Elizabeth’s half-sister) was implicated in the plots in 1587, she was beheaded.

In the estimation of Pope Sixtus V, that was the final straw. Within weeks after Mary’s execution, he pledged 600,000 gold crowns to Philip II, if he would invade England with a mighty convoy of ships.

By this time, William Allen (the one who started Douai College) was a cardinal, and he was ecstatic at the news. Surely, in his words, England’s “usurping heretic” queen would be deposed and slain.

We will not take the space here to describe the preparations, sailing, and battles of the Armada. It is a remarkable story.

On the morning of May 29, 1588, over 27,050 sailors and soldiers set sail from Lisbon aboard about 130 ships; each vessel had an average weight of 445 tons. This was the largest fleet in maritime history.

Before the Armada arrived off the coast of England, Sir Francis Drake assured the queen:

“God increase your most excellent Majesty’s forces both by sea and land daily . . . for this I surely think; three was never any force so strong as there is now ready or making ready against your Majesty and true religion. But . . . the Lord of all strengths is stronger and will defend the truth of His Word.”—*Munro, Fleets Threatening, p. 31.*

English losses from the sea battle totaled 60 men and no ships. Not a single ship received a hole below the waterline.

God used the winds to destroy the Spanish fleet; and only 51 ships with 10,000 survivors limped back into Lisbon.

By this time, Philip’s kingdom was near bankruptcy and he appealed to the pope to send the promised 600,000 gold crowns. But the pope replied that he did not need to, since Philip had not taken England. Not one gold crown was sent to Philip.

With the Armada lost, the Jesuits returned to their standard methods of takeover: infiltration of agents. To this, they decided to add a new feature: Somehow devise a way to destroy the English Bible. Was it not the basis of the hated Protestant faith, the earthly source of all their strength?

“It is the same today. The 33,000 official members of the Society operate all over the world in the capacity of her personnel, officers of a truly secret army containing in its ranks heads of political parties, high ranking officials, generals, magistrates, physicians, faculty professors, etc.; all of them striving to bring about, in their own sphere God’s work—in reality, the plans of the papacy.”

—*Edmond Paris,*
Secret History of the Jesuits, p. 30

Textual Criticism Begins

The Manuscript Sources Are Attacked

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

It is an intriguing fact that textual criticism began just before the Armada failed in its mission, to retake England and drive out the Protestants. Simon's books came off the press in 1689 and 1695.

When the battered ships returned, the Jesuits gave even more attention to this new way to destroy the Book which linked the English-speaking world to heaven.

As mentioned near the beginning of this book, **the first scholar to apply so-called "scientific methods" to the text of the Bible was a Catholic priest, Richard Simon.**

"Biblical scholar. From 1662 to 1678, he was a member of the French Oratory . . . his *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (1678), arguing from the existence of duplicate accounts of the same incident and variations of style, denied that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. He is generally regarded as the founder of Old Testament criticism."—*Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 1277.

One of the Catholics who helped get textual criticism started was **Jean Mabillon** (1632-1707), which the *Oxford Dictionary* calls, "the most erudite and discerning of all Maurists" (*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p. 853). The Maurists were a Benedictine order.

Another Benedictine priest, **Bernard de Montfaucon** (1655-1741) published a book, *Paleographic Graeca* in Paris in 1708, which applied Mabillon's critical rules in such a way as to downgrade Erasmus' Textus Receptus (the Majority Text in Greek).

Jean Astruc (1684-1766) was a Catholic physician and theologian who decided that two different men wrote the Mosaic books. He said the Pentateuch had been pieced together from earlier documents.

The Jesuits were thrilled when a pro-Catholic ascended the English throne in 1642.

The flagrant Catholic policies of Charles I (1600-1649) led to a civil war. On January 30, 1649, he was beheaded, and Oliver Cromwell took control of the government for a number of years. (Later when another Catholic, Charles II ascended the throne in 1660, he had Oliver Cromwell's body dug up and decapitated.)

Having set the science of textual criticism upon a solid footing, the Jesuits gained German helpers who carried on the work. The Jesuits had taken time to prepare for this, having early founded the *Collegium Germanicum* in Rome, to train secret agents who would enter Germany and labor there for the pope. **Johann Adam Mohler (1796-1838), a Catholic priest who was professor of history and theology at Tübingen; and, at Munich, he helped coordinate the attack on the Bible. (Munich, at that time, was called the "German Rome.")**

We earlier mentioned **Semler's** threefold-classification (1767) of manuscript "families" into Oriental, Western, and Alexandrian; he was the first to call these "recensions."

Griesbach, a pupil of Semler's, continued on with those theories. He changed the name of the Majority Text readings from "Oriental" to "Constantinopolitan" or "Byzantine." Griesback suggested that the Byzantine [Majority] Text evolved from the other two (Western and Alexandrian).

As you will recall, we have already learned that the Western text had some strange readings and came from central Italy; whereas the Alexandrian Text came from Alexandria, Egypt—and represented the type of textual errors found in the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.

You may also recall that Constantine commissioned the preparation of 50 large Bibles; and they were prepared in Alexandria. It is generally agreed that the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were two of those 50 Bibles. We also discovered that, although copied onto very expensive antelope skin pages, the copyists were remarkably

careless in their work. It is believed that a number of their errors were purposely introduced by Origen and his associates.

(See the earlier chapters for the Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and the Manuscript Families, for more on this.)

19th-CENTURY CATHOLIC BRITISH PENETRATION

We essentially covered this earlier, under the section on the *Oxford Movement*. But the bare outlines should be noted once again, since that which happened was so crucial.

Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882) and **Frederick Denison Maurice** (1805-1872), along with **John Keble**, spearheaded the pro-Catholic Oxford Movement (also known as *tractarianism*, because of the many pro-Catholic tracts written at the time)—which resulted in a powerful penetration of secret Catholic agents into the Church of England and Oxford and Cambridge, the two leading universities of the nation.

Even though he taught auricular confession and transubstantiation, Pusey, a leading professor at Oxford, was highly regarded by the university administration.

Why were such men permitted to stay in office? The answer is simple: Jesuit penetration had been carried on so successfully for over a century—that there were enough agents, working in key offices, to protect the others! Decades of infiltration were bringing a victory which the pope could not earlier win with the battleships of Philip II.

John Henry Newman (1801-1890) and **Frederick William Faber** (1814-1863) greatly aided the movement to return England's leaders to Rome.

In addition to most of those listed below, all of the above secret Catholics were friends of Westcott and Hort.

Here are seven secret Catholic-English churchmen and / or university professors who helped, through textual criticism theories, to pave the way for a fuller attack on the King James Bible:

Cardinal Nicholas Patrick Stephen Wiseman (1802-1865). He coordinated the various activities of the secret pro-Catholics in the Church of England and in Oxford and Cambridge Universities. Wiseman, himself, was fully dedicated to the cause of textual criticism.

John W. Colenso (1814-1883). As Bishop of

Natal, he openly questioned the authorship of the Pentateuch and Joshua.

Benjamin Jowett (1817-1893). A high-placed administrator at Oxford who, in his article, spiritualized away the Inspiration of Scripture, angered many; but he was not fired. In 1871, he also translated the writings of the ancient pagan, Plato.

Rowland Williams (1817-1870). This high-placed churchman was suspended from the ministry for a year, because of his articles on Biblical criticism. But the pro-Jesuit Committee of the Privy Council annulled the sentence in 1864.

Henry P. Liddon (1829-1890). This Oxford professor was a staunch supporter of the men who were writing the pro-Catholic tracts. He spent a quarter of a century promoting Catholic dogma in the Church of England.

Samuel R. Driver (1846-1914). A leading Bible scholar at Oxford, he was influential in questioning the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy.

William R. Smith (1846-1894). When he was fired by a college in Aberdeen, Scotland for denying the Inspiration of Scripture, he was immediately hired by Cambridge. Smith also advocated Wellhausen's dangerous theories on the Pentateuch.

As mentioned earlier, English leaders who were won to Rome by these men included **Prime Minister William Gladstone** (1809-1898), **John Newman** (1801-1890), and **Archbishop Richard Chenevix Trench** (1807-1886).

THE SECRET LIVES OF WESTCOTT AND HORT

Near the beginning of this book, we discussed the terrific impact that Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892) made on all modern Bible translations (English and otherwise).

We also discovered that they favored pagan writers (especially Plato), Mormon writings, Catholicism, atheism, and the practice of the cults. They started spiritualist séances at Oxford, which they conducted weekly meetings and encouraged students and professors to attend.

Here is a brief chronological overview of events. Anyone reading it can see that Satan guided in the preparation of their Greek Text—which has become the basis for the Nestle Text and all modern Bible translations.

("Wescott" stands for the book, *Life and Letters of B.F. Westcott*, edited by his son, 2 vols.,

1903. "Hort" stands for *Life and Letters of F.J.A. Hort, edited by his son (Arthur F. Hort), 2 vols., 1896.*)

1840 "He took a strange interest in Mormonism . . . procuring and studying the Book of Mormon."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 19.*

1842 "In the evening I go with Tom to the wizard; but he does not dare perform before us."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 9.*

1845 Westcott, Hort, and Benson started the Hermes Club on the campus of Oxford University.

1846 "His diary tells of a walk to Girton with C.B. Scott, in which metaphysics was discussed."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 42.*

Refers to missionary-minded Christians as "dangerous" and "unsound" (*Westcott, Vol. 1, pp. 44-45.*)

"New doubts and old superstitions and rationalism all trouble me . . . I cannot determine how much we must believe, how much in fact is necessarily required of a member of the church."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, pp. 46-47.*

1847 "So wild, so skeptical am I; I cannot yield."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 52.*

"Referring to heretic Dr. Hampden, he says, If he be condemned, what will become of me?"—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 52.*

1848 Hort mentions the "fanaticism of bibliolaters." "The pure Romish view seems to me nearer and more likely to lead to truth than the Evangelical."—*Hort, Vol. 1, pp. 76-77.*

"Protestantism is only parenthetical and temporary; it will pass away."—*Hort, Vol. 2, p. 31.*

1850 "I spoke of the gloomy prospect should the Evangelicals carry on their present victory."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 160.*

Westcott was "troubled about this passage" [blasphemy against the Holy Spirit] (*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 109.*)

1851 Hort joined the Philosophical Society. "Maurice urged me to give the greatest attention to Plato and Aristotle and to make this the center point of my reading."—*Hort, Vol. 1, pp. 202, 93.*

Hort speaks of "the common orthodox heresy: Inspiration [of the Bible]." (*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 181.*)

Westcott and Hort started the Ghostly Guild (weekly meetings for spiritualistic séances).

Westcott was ordained a priest in the Anglican Church.

1852 Hort became a fellow at Cambridge.

Westcott became a teacher at Harrow.

Westcott and Hort distributed Ghostly Guild literature, to encourage others to begin attending.

Hort and Westcott began work on their Greek text (which was published in 1881).

Referring to the Majority Text in Greek, then currently in use, Westcott says, "I am most anxious to provide something to replace them." Admitting that he was planning drastic changes in the text, he called it "our proposed recension of the New Testament" (*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 229.*)

1853 Hort "was diligently preparing for his ordination" into the Anglican priesthood.

"It was during these weeks with Mr. Westcott, who had come to see him [Hort] at Umberslade, that the plan of a joint revision of the text of the Greek Testament was first definitely agreed upon."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 240.*

Westcott then contacted others and, "about this time, Mr. Daniel Macmillan suggested to him [Hort] that he should take part in an interesting and comprehensive *New Testament Scheme*. Hort was to edit the text in conjunction with Mr. Westcott, the latter was to be responsible for a commentary, and Lightfoot was to contribute a *New Testament Grammar and Lexicon*."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 241.*

"We came to a distinct and positive understanding about *our* Greek Text and the details thereof. We still do not wish to be talked about, but are going to work at once and hope we may have it out in a little more than a year. This, of course, gives good employment."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 264.*

1855 "How certainly I should have been proclaimed a heretic."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 233.*

1856 "Campbell's book on the atonement . . . unluckily, he knows nothing except Protestant theology."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 322.*

"I hope to go on with the New Testament Text more unremittingly."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 355.*

1857 Hort became a full professor at Cambridge.

"I am just now chiefly occupied about a proposed Cambridge translation of the whole of Plato . . . another scheme likely to be carried out, if a publisher can be found."—*Hort, p. 349.*

1858 "Without doubt there was an element of mystery in Westcott. He took his turn preaching in chapel, but he dreaded and disliked the duty and he was quite inaudible."—*Westcott, Vol.*

1, p. 198.

"The principle literary work of these years was the revision of the Greek Text of the New Testament. All spare hours were devoted to it . . . 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, Vol. 1, p. 400.*

1859 "My dear Lightfoot, thank you very much for your kind present. But why did you send beer instead of coming yourself?"—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 403.*

1860 "We avoid giving grave offense to the miscalled orthodoxy of the day."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 421.*

"If you make a decided conviction of the absolute infallibility of the New Testament a *sine qua non* [without exception] for cooperation, I fear I could not join you."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 420.*

"My doubts about infallibility remain."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 422.*

"I reject the word 'infallibility' of Holy Scriptures overwhelmingly."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 207.*

"I am glad that you take the same provisional ground as to infallibility that I do."—*Hort's letter to Lightfoot; Hort, Vol. 1, p. 424.*

1861 "This may sound cowardice: I have sort of a craving that our text should be cast upon the world before we deal with matters likely to brand us with suspicion. I mean, a text issued by men who are already known for what will undoubtedly be treated as dangerous heresy will have great difficulty in finding its way to regions when it might otherwise hope to reach and whence it would not be easily banished by subsequent alarms."—*Hort's letter to Westcott; Hort, Vol. 1, p. 445.*

1862 "English clergy are not compelled to maintain the absolute infallibility of the Bible."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 454.*

1864 "Westcott talks of our keeping pace with the printers."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 461.*

1865 "The idea of [Mary's appearance at] La Salett was that of God revealing Himself now, not in one form, but in many."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 251. [Westcott visited a Catholic shrine in Europe and was thrilled by it.]*

1866 "All the questionable doctrines which I have ever maintained are in it."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 290.*

1869 Westcott became a canon at Peterborough Cathedral.

1870 Westcott became Professor of Divinity

at Cambridge.

"Dr. Butler calls him [Westcott] mysterious . . . His voice from the pulpit reached but a few and was understood by still fewer."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 272.*

"Dr. Westcott and myself have for about seventeen years been preparing a Greek text . . . We hope to have it out early next year."—*Hort, Vol. 2, p. 137.*

"Much evil would result from the public discussion of our beliefs."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 229.*

1871 "I shall aim at what is transcendental in many people's eyes . . . I suppose I am a communist by nature."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 309.*

Westcott, Hort, and Bishop Lightfoot (none of whom believed in Biblical Inspiration) were invited to join the Revision Committee of the New Testament.

"Westcott believes we ought to seize the opportunity, especially since we three are on the list."—*Hort, Vol. 2, p. 133.*

(Westcott, Hort, and Lightfoot are the "we three" in the Ghostly Guild.)

Work on the New Testament Revision Committee began, and continued until 1881, when the English Revised Version (ERV, originally known as the RV) was printed.

1872 Westcott, Hort, and Bishop Lightfoot began the Eranus Club. Sidgwick and Balfour soon started the Society for Psychical Research and also join it.

1873 "Truth is so wonderfully large."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 333.*

1877 Eranus club members continued their meetings, but in Hort's quarters.

1881 "Our Bible, as well as our faith, is a mere compromise."—*Westcott, On the Canon of the New Testament: A General Survey, p. vii.*

"The work which has gone on now for nearly 30 years was brought to a conclusion."—*Hort, Vol. 2, p. 234 [speaking of their joint effort to change the Bible].*

The Revised Version, based on the Westcott-Hort Text and the "new Greek" of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus was published.

1882 "The truth seems to me to be so overwhelmingly vast and manifold that I shrink from drawing any outline except provisionally,"—*Westcott, Vol. 2, p. 36.*

1889 "Life and truth grow more and more mysterious."—*Westcott, Vol. 2, p. 61.*

1890 Westcott became Bishop of Durham.

1891 At this juncture, without much else to

do, and no religious faith, Westcott become a beer sot.

1893 "He sometimes with much seriousness professed to be much drawn to beer."—*Westcott, Vol. 2, p. 178* (son speaking).

"His zeal in the cause of pure beer involved him in a correspondence which was published in the newspapers in the later part of 1893; and his picture, together with some of the following words spoken by him, was utilized for the adornment of the advertisement of a brewer of pure beer' (statement by son). 'My idea is that they might have a public house in which good beer alone would be sold . . . I consider pure beer . . . to be an innocent and wholesome beverage . . . Substitutes for malt . . . is not what the purchaser demands nor expects.'"—*Westcott, Vol. 2, pp. 218-219; including Westcott's letter to the Brewer's Society, in asking that inferior beer not be made.*

1896 "The prohibitionists [who want to ban alcoholic beverages] once more showed themselves to be unstatesmanlike."—*Westcott, Vol. 2, p. 238.*

1899 "But from my Cambridge days, I have read the writings of many who are called mystics with much profit."—*Westcott, Vol. 2, p. 309.*

It is an interesting fact that these two spiritualists, who secretly admired Catholicism and communism, liked those groups also hated democracy and America.

"I cannot say that I see much as yet to soften my deep hatred of democracy in all its forms."—*Hort, Vol. 2, p. 34.*

"The American empire is a standing menace to the whole civilization of Europe . . . It cannot be wrong to desire and pray from the bottom of one's heart that the American Union [U.S.A.] may be shivered to pieces."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 459.*

THE WESTCOTT-HORT THEORY

Price, of the University of Chicago, summarizes the influence of Westcott and Hort on the modern Biblical world:

"The final blow was administered to the Textus Receptus [Majority Text] by the work of the British scholars, Dr. F.J.A. Hort and Bishop B.F. Westcott. The two collaborated in the product of a text and in the elaboration of a theory of criticism which has had an enormous influence from that day to this. Building upon the achievements of the scholars whom we have noticed, they brought out in 1881-1882 a two-volume edition of text (without critical appa-

tus [i.e. without variant passage footnotes]) and method which was some thirty years in preparation and has become a sort of watershed in the history of the textual criticism of the New Testament."—*Ira Maurice Price, Ancestry of Our English Bible, p. 208.*

Although Westcott and Hort worked on their Greek Text off and on for three decades, it was Hort who developed the theory underlying it. For this reason, all textual scholars call it the "Hort theory."

What the two men lacked in knowledge, they made up in prejudice.

"I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of texts, having read so little Greek Testament, and dragged on with the villainous Textus Receptus [Majority Text] . . . Think of that vile Textus Receptus leaning entirely on late manuscripts; it is a blessing there are such early ones."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 211.*

Early in these pages we have clearly demonstrated the fact that the Majority Text, upon which the King James Bible is founded, represents the earliest Greek manuscripts. But **Westcott and Hort were ignorant both of church history and the transmission of the Greek text.**

Speaking about the King James Bible, Westcott said:

"I feel most keenly the disgrace of circulating what I feel to be falsified copies of the Holy Scripture."—*Westcott, Vol. 1, pp. 228-229.*

Westcott was not one to read much in the Bible, any Bible. He was too busy imbibing the sentiments of spirits at his weekly séances. It was the demons who felt disgraced by the widespread circulation of the Majority Text in English—the King James Bible.

The ghosts at their guild counseled Westcott and Hort to keep secret their project to change the text of the Bible, until they could carry it out.

"We came to a distinct and positive understanding about our Greek Text, and the details thereof. We still do not wish it to be talked about."—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 264.*

At a later time, Hort wrote this. Read it slowly, for it is a very important statement, describing the conspiracy in which many were involved, to overthrow the King James Bible:

"The errors and prejudices, which we agree in wishing to remove, can surely be more wholesomely and also more effectually reached by individual efforts of an indirect kind than by combined open assault. At present, very many orthodox but rational men are being unawares acted on by influences which will assuredly bear

good fruit in due time, if the process is allowed to go on quietly; but I cannot help fearing that a premature crisis would frighten back many.”—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 400.*

By 1861, as they continued work on their Greek Text, Westcott and Hort questioned whether to publish some of their heresies in the liberal journal, *Essays and Reviews*. They finally decided that the reaction would injure the credibility of their Greek New Testament, when it was finally published. Recognizing that, if they really told the public what they believed, the Christian public would totally reject any of their later accomplishments, Hort wrote this to Westcott:

“Also—but this may be cowardice—I have a sort of craving that our text should be cast upon the world before we deal with matters likely to brand us with suspicion. I mean, a text, issued by men already known for what will undoubtedly be treated as dangerous heresy, will have great difficulties in finding its way to regions which it might otherwise hope to reach, and whence it would not be easily banished by subsequent alarms.”—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 445.*

Hort had demonic intelligence available to him. He said it right: Once the Westcott-Hort Text and Hort’s textual theory was accepted—it would become extremely difficult, in spite of alarms, to dislodge it.

As mentioned earlier, their Greek Text was basically the Vaticanus, plus the Sinaiticus and sometimes other manuscripts, when they agreed with the two codices.

The two men had a special reason for liking those two manuscripts—for both were produced in Alexandria, Egypt, the home of the heretics, Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Westcott and Hort had carefully studied the heresies of those men and liked them. Arthur Westcott wrote this:

“My father’s promised contributions, however, were completed; the most important being his articles on the Alexandrian divines, including Clement, Demetrius, Dionysius, and greatest of all, Origen. For many years the works of Origen were close to his hand, and he continually turned to them at every opportunity.”—*Westcott, Vol. 1, pp. 319-320.*

In the thinking of those secret heretics, “Why bother to read the Bible, when you can fill your mind with Origen?” Hort even translated the “Candlelight Hymn” of the corrupt Alexandrian Church. (Rome got its love of burning candles from the Alexandrian church, which in turn inherited

it from the Egyptian worship of the Queen of heaven and her infant god-son, Horus.)

Here, in succinct form, is a statement of the Hort theory, on which all modern Bible translations are founded:

“The ‘Neutral’ text, as the name implies, was considered by Hort to be the purest extant form. It was thought to be entirely free from corruption and mixture with other texts and to represent the nearest approach to the New Testament autographs. Its best representative was Codex Vaticanus, and its second best, Sinaiticus. These two codices were thought to be derived independently from a common original, at no great distance from the autographs.

“When their [Sinaiticus and Vaticanus] readings agreed, the evidence for Westcott and Hort was generally conclusive against overwhelming numerical evidence of later witnesses, unless internal testimony contradicted . . . In general, readings unknown to the Neutral, Alexandrian, or Western texts [manuscript families] were to be rejected as ‘Syrian’ [the Majority Text, which was always rejected], and no reading from the Western or Alexandrian was to be admitted without some support from the Neutral . . . We may add that, among the church “fathers” such Neutral elements were considered to be most numerous in Origen, Didymus, Cyril of Alexandria, and Eusebius; and, among the versions [translations into other languages], in the Coptic [Egyptian].”—*I.M. Price, Ancestry of Our English Bible, p. 209.*

Notice in the above statement, that **the manuscripts, commentators (“fathers”), and translations considered closest to the “Neutral,” were those in Alexandria, Egypt—from whence came the most unorthodox, heretical teachings in all Christendom at that time (4th century A.D.).**

In spite of the fact that there were over 3,000 disagreements between the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, the Westcott-Hort Text did not need the 30 years to prepare, which those two men put into it. It was actually a mechanical, lazy text.

Here is how Westcott and Hort prepared their Greek Text: First, they took the Vaticanus Text and underlined everything which was essentially the same in the Sinaiticus. That was the basic text. No alternative readings were permitted to have any weight, unless they concerned those instances which were not underlined: places where the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus disagreed. When that happened, the only readings considered worthy of acceptance were other Neutral

(Vaticanus-Sinaiticus-like), Alexandrian (anything else which sounded like Clement or Origen), or Western (anything obviously coming from the city of Rome). The Syrian (Majority Text) manuscripts were flatly and totally rejected. If a question still existed, the comments of the church "fathers" living in Alexandria had preference!

Did I overstate the case? No! Read again the above quotation from Ira Maurice Price, *Ancestry of Our English Bible*, p. 209. Late professor of Semitic Languages at the University of Chicago, he represented the highest level of modern 20th-century textual criticism and clearly explained the modern viewpoint on such matters.

It was fortunate for Wescott and Hort that they had such a simple, mechanical way to construct their Greek text, because they spent so much of their time talking to ghosts in their club, writing skeptical letters, visiting shrines of the Virgin, studying Origen and Plato (whose writings Origen also valued), grumbling about democracy, praising communism, complaining about the teachings of Christians, or drinking beer.

THE REVISION COMMITTEE IS APPOINTED

By 1870, the Oxford Movement had done its work well; and a skeptical, semi-Catholic, liberal hierarchy were fast gaining the ascendancy in the Church of England and at Oxford and Cambridge.

It was no accident that Anglican Church leaders decided to form a committee, to revise the Bible—at the very time that the Westcott-Hort Greek Text was being completed.

"In 1870, the Convention of the Church of England commissioned a revision of the Authorized [King James] Version. A gleam of hope shone in the eye of every Roman Catholic in England and the continent. An eager anticipation filled every Jesuit-inspired, Protestant scholar in England. Although it was meant to correct a few supposed 'errors' in the Authorized Version, the textual critics of the day assured themselves that they would never again have to submit to the Divine authority of the Universal [Majority] Text."—*Samuel C. Gipp, An Understandable History of the English Bible*, p. 162.

However, the liberals were not quite in total control yet. Fearing that liberals might take over the committee, formal resolutions were passed by the Church of England's Southern

Convocation on February 10, May 3 and 5, 1870, which, in the strongest language, limited the activities of the committee to revising only "plain and clear errors" (*John William Burgon, The Revision Revised*, p. 3).

In spite of the modernism and pro-Catholicism creeping into the Church of England, its leaders still hesitated to make major changes in the King James Version. The fact that the committee they appointed flagrantly violated that directive, and did so anyway, was due to the influence of three men: Hort, Westcott, and Bishop Lightfoot, plus help from a fourth: a man named Smith.

Ninety-nine men were invited to join the committee, of whom 49 were Anglican clergymen. One of the other 50 was a V. Smith, pastor of St. Stephen's Gate Unitarian Church. Learning that a man who totally denied the divinity of Christ was on the committee, several thousand Anglican pastors affixed their signatures to a solemn protest, which caused the Upper House of Parliament to pass a resolution that Smith should be removed from the committee.

But Westcott declared that he would leave the committee if Smith was forced out. So Smith was kept on the committee. It is for such reasons that, when the English Revised Version was printed in 1881, 1 Timothy 3:16 was changed from "God was manifest in the flesh" to "who was manifest in the flesh."

Smith later commented on that passage, noting that a mythology had arisen after the death of Christ; that He was divine when, in Smith's opinion, that was not true.

"The old reading is pronounced untenable by the revisers, as it has long been known to be by all careful students of the New Testament . . . It is in truth another example of the facility with which ancient copiers could introduce the word 'God' into their manuscripts,—a reading which was the natural result of the growing tendency in early Christian times . . . to look upon the humble teacher as the incarnate Word, and therefore as 'God manifest in the flesh.'"—*Burgon, Revision Revised*, p. 515.

THE REVISION COMMITTEE CONDUCTS ITS WORK

Bishop Charles Ellicott, committee chairman, frequently expressed his deep concern that the British nation did not have enough qualified scholars and knowledge of the an-

cient languages, to adequately revise the Bible.

In addition, he repeatedly told the committee that it should only attempt a very few changes.

Ellicott wrote this before the committee was appointed:

"It is my honest conviction that for an authoritative revision, we are not yet mature; either in Biblical learning or Hellenistic [Greek] scholarship. There is good scholarship in this country . . . but it has certainly not yet been sufficiently directed to the study of the New Testament . . . to render any national attempt at revision either hopeful or lastingly profitable."—*Burgon, Revision Revised, p. xiii.*

Ellicott warned the committee when it was first convened:

"What course would revisers have us to follow? . . . Would it be well for them to agree on a Critical Greek Text? To this question we venture to answer very hesitatingly in the negative . . . We have certainly not yet acquired sufficient critical judgment for any body of revisers hopefully to undertake such a work as this . . . Nothing is more satisfactory at the present time than the evident feelings of veneration for our Authorized Version, and the very generally felt desire for as little change as possible."—*Burgon, Revision Revised, pp. 368-369.*

He also told the convocation of the committee in February of that year (1870): "We may be satisfied with the attempt to correct plain and clear errors, but there it is our duty to stop" (*op. cit., p. 368*).

That rule was officially adopted by the committee. Another rule was this:

"The condition was enjoined upon them that whenever 'decidedly preponderating evidence constrained their adoption of some change in the Text from the Authorized Version was made,' they should indicate such alteration in the margin."—*Ibid.*

But two other decisions were also made—which destroyed the efforts of Ellicott to keep the committee from gutting the King James Bible.

This was the first:

"Each member of the Company had been supplied with a private copy of Westcott and Hort's [Greek] Text, but the Company did not, of course, in any way bind itself to accept their conclusions."—*Hort, Vol. 2, p. 237.*

And the second was this: Although the astonished participants were not bound "to accept

their conclusions" (ten years of intimidation by Hort would take care of that); they were obligated to a vow of secrecy that they possessed and were going to use the Westcott and Hort Greek Text. The devils, talking to Westcott and Hort in their weekly séances all through those years, guided them in what to do and say at the committee meetings, so as to ram through their erroneous theories and readings.

"When the English New Testament Committee met, it was immediately apparent what was going to happen. Though for ten long years the iron rule of silence kept the public ignorant of what was going on behind closed doors, the story is now known."—*D.O. Fuller, Which Bible? p. 290.*

Yes, now known, but only after the damage has been done.

Westcott and Hort purposely did not print their new Greek Text until May 12, 1870, only five days before the committee began its work. Then it was secretly handed to the committee members and they were vowed to secrecy.

The diabolical subtlety of Westcott and Hort's planning was remarkable. A super intelligence was at work.

The two men planned a takeover of the committee proceedings.

"The rules though liberal are vague, and the interpretation of them will depend upon action at the first."—*Hort, quoted in Fuller, p. 290.*

We earlier learned that Bishop Lightfoot was a skeptic and close friend to Westcott and Hort. The two men felt confident that, with Lightfoot's help, they could control the meetings.

Who was Lightfoot? Here is a little background on this man, whom we earlier found to also be a secret skeptic that Westcott and Hort wrote many letters to. (He is the one, you will recall, who sent the beer instead of coming himself.)

Joseph Barber Lightfoot (1828-1889) attended Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was a private pupil of Westcott. He afterward moved up through the ranks and became a professor at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1857 and taught some Greek and Hebrew. In 1871, he was appointed a Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral; and in 1875, he became a divinity professor at Cambridge. From 1870 to 1880 he was a leading member of the New Testament revision committee. In 1879, he was made Bishop of Durham.

As noted above, Westcott felt that, with the help of Lightfoot who was quite influential, the three of them could change the objective of the committee. Writing to Hort, he said:

“Your note came with one from Ellicott this morning . . . Though I think that Convocation [the committee] is not competent to initiate such a measure, yet I feel that as ‘we three’ are together it would be wrong not to ‘make the best of it’ as Lightfoot first says . . . There is some hope that alternative readings might find a place in the margin.”—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 390.*

Continually pushing to have their way, they ultimately brought the alternative readings right into the text and crowded out the King James readings.

Beginning with the first one, before each crucial meeting of the committee, the three met for consultation.

“Ought we not to have a conference before the first meeting for Revision? There are many points on which it is important that we should be agreed.”—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 396.*

As usual, Hort led out in the plotting. Incredibly, before long, he actually talked Ellicott into acceding to their plan for a more thorough revision!

“The Bishop of Gloucester [Ellicott] seems to me to be quite capable of accepting heartily and adopting personally a thorough scheme.”—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 393.*

The word, “scheme,” was the code word they had used for several years, to describe their plan to replace the King James Bible. Hort was an expert at using Jesuit approaches to obtaining what he wanted. He wrote, “I am rather in favor of indirect dealing” (*Hort, quoted in Fuller, Which Bible? p. 282*).

But the scholars of England were not qualified nor skilled in how to carry out such a complete revision. Burgon explained the problem:

“It can never be any question among scholars that a fatal error was committed when a body of divines, appointed to revise the Authorized English Version of the New Testament Scriptures, addressed themselves to the solution of an entirely different and far more intricate problem, namely the reconstruction of the Greek Text.”—*Burgon, Revision Revised, p. 6.*

At this juncture, we should identify two other important people at that time.

The first was Scrivener:

Frederick Henry A. Scrivener (1813-1891). Educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, he was

one of the very few English experts in Greek manuscripts in the late 19th century.

“He made a very comprehensive study of the text of the New Testament, publishing collations and detailed descriptions of a large number of (especially minuscule) manuscripts, some of them hitherto unexamined. His *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, of which the first edition appeared in 1861 (listing some 1,170 manuscripts), and the fourth (posthumous, ed. by E. Miller) in 1894 (listing over 3,000) is still a valuable book of reference, despite the attempt made in it to defend the Textus Receptus [Majority Text].”—*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 1253.*

The other was Burgon:

John William Burgon (1813-1888) was educated at Worcester College, Oxford, and became, along with Scrivener, one of the most forceful opponents of the efforts of Westcott and Hort to ruin the King James Version. They were heroes of God at the time of a great crisis. The crisis continues; who will stand in defense of the King James today, as they did back then?

“He was an old-fashioned High Churchman who was famous for his support of a long series of lost causes . . . He was also a strenuous upholder of the Textus Receptus of the New Testament, publishing in 1871 *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to St. Mark Vindicated*, and in 1883 *The Revision Revised*. Two further works were published posthumously.”—*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 211.*

To put it bluntly, Burgon was a pain in the neck to the liberals of his day. **He had a remarkably brilliant mind and a firm devotion to the King James Bible. He also knew the Greek manuscripts well enough to prepare devastating attacks on the decisions of the revision committee and the resultant English Revised Version (1881).** He is frequently called “Dean Burgon,” since he was the dean of a school during the closing years of his life.

His posthumous book, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, Vindicated and Established*, was edited by Edward Miller (1896) and published eight years after his death.

(Miller was also a Greek expert and posthumous editor of the fourth edition of Scrivener’s *Plain Introduction*.)

If it were not for Scrivener, Burgon, and Miller, the history of what happened back then would have been totally covered over

and lost to us.

Scrivener was the most competent New Testament scholar on the revision committee. Neither Burgon nor Miller were permitted to be on that committee; but, as soon as the revised version was published, Burgon studied it and learned from Scrivener exactly what had taken place in those secret sessions.

As for Westcott and Hort, Westcott tended to take a backseat in the meetings and let Hort, who was fiercely contentious for the acceptance of his ideas, push everyone in the committee around. In strong contrast, Scrivener became the chief spokesman for the minority party in the sessions.

Committee meetings became a war between Hort and Scrivener. Scrivener would arrive at a meeting with detailed and organized material, showing that the King James text was correct and should be left as it was.

Hort arrived with, what he called his “eclectic method,” which amounted to little more than whims, imaginings, and personal caprice. Hort frequently said he was “feeling his way through” the data, and heavily relying on what he called “internal evidence.”

Whereas Scrivener presented facts from the manuscripts, Hort came with hunches and theories about what the original New Testament writers must have meant and how the copyists were likely to have changed the original words to make them agree with “myths.”

Hort described the method, as taught him by his father:

“The obvious method of deciding between variant readings, is for the critic to ask which the author is most likely to have written, and to settle the question by the light of his own inner consciousness.”—*Hort, Vol. 2, p. 248.*

Of course, Hort’s ghosts gave him plenty of “inner consciousness.” Burgon explains:

“The only indication we anywhere meet of the actual ground of Dr. Hort’s certainty, and reason of his preference, is contained in his claim that, ‘every binary group [of manuscripts] containing [the readings of] B [Vaticanus] is found to offer a large proportion of readings, which, on the closest scrutiny, have the ring of genuineness; while it is difficult to find any readings so attested which look suspicious after full consideration.’ ”—*Burgon, Revision Revised, p. 307.*

How is that for making hunches into a science? Hort contended that he could always iden-

tify the correct reading because it had the “ring of genuineness.” **I surely would not wish to entrust my copy of the New Testament to the imagination of a man who visited privately with devils, loved pagan authors, detested Biblical Inspiration, and wished he could join the Catholic Church.**

“And thus we have, at last, an honest confession of the ultimate principle which has determined the Text of the present edition of the New Testament: ‘The ring of genuineness’ . . .

“Thus, behold, at last we have reached the goal! . . . Individual idiosyncrasy,—not external evidence. Readings ‘strongly preferred,’ not readings strongly attested. ‘Personal discernment’ (self! still self!) conscientiously exercising itself upon Codex B [Vaticanus]; this is the true account of the critical method pursued by these accomplished scholars.

“They deliberately claim ‘personal discernment’ as ‘the surest ground for confidence.’ Accordingly, they judge of readings by their looks and by their sound. When, in their opinion, words ‘look suspicious,’ words are to be rejected.”—*Burgon, Revision Revised, pp. 307-308.*

As the committee meetings wore on, month after month, year after year, the pressure was intense on Scrivener to just give up and quit the committee. With the passing of time, with the help of Westcott and Lightfoot, more and more of the committee came under the control of the domineering Hort.

Hort would talk and talk and talk, until he got his way. **Whereas, Scrivener had manuscript evidence, Hort had talk. He overwhelmed everyone with it.**

“Nor is it difficult to understand that many of their less resolute and decided colleagues must often have been completely carried off their feet by the persuasiveness and resourcefulness and zeal of Hort, backed by the great prestige of Lightfoot, the popular Canon of St. Paul’s, and the quiet determination of Westcott, who set his face as a flint. In fact, it can hardly be doubted that Hort’s was the strongest will of the whole Company, and his adroitness in debate was only equaled by his pertinacity.”—*Hemphill, quoted in Fuller, Which Bible? p. 291.*

One unnamed detractor, quoted by Hort’s son, calculated that “Dr. Hort talked for three years out of the ten” (*Hort, Vol. 2, p. 236*)!

On May 24, 1871, Westcott wrote to his wife: “We have had hard fighting during these last

two days, and a battle-royal is announced for tomorrow.”—*Westcott, Vol. 1, p. 396.*

Here is a profound statement—especially the final paragraph:

“This was the mode: A passage being under consideration, the chairman asks, ‘Are any textual changes proposed?’ If a change can be proposed then ‘the evidence for and against is briefly stated.’ This is done by ‘two members of the company: Dr. Scrivener and Dr. Hort.’ And if those two members disagree: ‘The vote of the company is taken, and the proposed reading accepted or rejected. The text being thus settled, the chairman asks for proposals on the rendering [how the Greek will be translated].

“Thus it appears that there was no attempt whatever on the part of the revisionists to examine the evidence bearing upon the many disputed readings [they did not look at what the manuscripts said]. They only listened to the views of two of their number.”—*Philip Mauro, quoted in D.O. Fuller, True of False? p. 93.*

Instead of nobly standing in defense of God’s Word, most of the committee members meekly kept quiet or quit the committee. Dr. Newth said that Hort’s overbearing manner caused 88 percent of the members to quit (*Newth, quoted in Hort, Vol. 2, p. 236*).

“The average attendance was not so many as sixteen, concerning whom, moreover, the fact has transpired that some of the most judicious of their number often declined to give any vote at all.”—*Burgon, Revision Revised, p. 109.*

Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford and an extremely influential man, resigned his position on the committee as its original chairman after the first meeting; he bemoaned afterward to a friend, “What can be done in this most miserable business” (*Wilberforce, quoted in Fuller, Which Bible? p. 291*)? Much could have been done in defense of the Majority Text, but far too many men preferred peace in their time.

It is clear that godly men could have defeated this nefarious work, but they remained silent or stood aside. Similar things are being done today in our own denomination. A few speak up and are branded as “troublemakers” while far too many run for cover.

THE ENGLISH REVISED VERSION (1881, 1885)

On May 17, 1881, the long-awaited New Testament portion of the Revised Version was published. The Old Testament was completed

in 1885. The entire Bible later became known as the English Revised Version (ERV). (At that time, it was called the Revised Version or RV.)

Dean Burgon immediately applied his brilliant mind to analyzing the ERV. Then he wrote a series of three scholarly articles, the first of which appeared in the October 1881 issue of the *Quarterly Review*. These, along with his 150-page open letter of protest to the turncoat, Bishop Ellicott, totaled 500 pages.

Frederick Scrivener also set to work and wrote a book, his massive protest, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament (1883). The first edition of that work totaled 506 pages, the second had 920 pages.

There are two remarkable things about those books: (1) They are so competently done and their conclusions so obviously right. (2) All the churchmen and scholars of the day were too sleepyheaded to unite with Burgon and Scrivener in defense of the King James.

Keep in mind that, at this same time, the great evil of Darwin’s evolutionary theories were also taking control of the intellectual world. **Satan was desperately at work, seeking to overpower every aspect of the modern world—he knew that Christ had entered the Second Apartment of the Sanctuary above and the end of time was nearing.**

At the very beginning of his book, *Revision Revised*, Burgon listed the four summary problems, cited by Scrivener, against the “system” on which Westcott and Hort had made their changes in the Bible. These points were also noted in Scrivener’s *Plain Introduction*.

“1. There is little hope for the stability of their imposing structure, if its foundations have been laid on the sandy ground of ingenious conjecture. And, since barely the smallest vestige of historical evidence has ever been alleged in support of the views of these accomplished editors [Westcott and Hort], their teaching must either be received as intuitively true or dismissed from our consideration as precarious and even visionary.

“2. Dr. Hort’s System is entirely destitute of historical foundation.

“3. We are compelled to repeat as emphatically as ever our strong conviction that the Hypothesis to whose proof he has devoted so many laborious years, is destitute not only of historical foundation, but of all probability, result-

ing from the internal goodness of the text which its adoption would force upon us.

“4. ‘We cannot doubt’ (says Dr. Hort) ‘that St. Luke 23:34 comes from an extraneous source,’ (Notes, p. 68). Nor can we, on our part, doubt [replies Scrivener] that the System which entails such consequences is hopelessly self-condemned.”—*Burgon, Revision Revised, p. iv.*

This is the Bible verse that Hort has arbitrarily decided needs to be removed from your Bible:

“Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them for they know not what they do, and they parted His raiment, and cast lots.”—*Luke 23:34.*

The revision committee violated the rules which had been assigned them. Rule Four stipulated that they must list all changes in the margin. This they did not do. Rule One was that they were not to make any but the most necessary changes.

Scrivener found that **the underlying Greek of Erasmus’ Greek Text (the Textus Receptus) had been changed by the Westcott and Hort Text in approximately 5,337 instances.**

(We will later learn that the Nestle Text, based on the Westcott-Hort Text, has 5,604 alterations from the Majority Text.)

As for **the English Revised Version, it contained 36,191 changes in the text, from the King James (Miller, Guide to Textual Criticism, p. 3)!**

In addition, the ERV had many marginal notes which cast suspicion on readings which were left in the text. Here are a couple examples of these marginal notes:

Matthew 1:18 has “Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise” in the King James (KJV). The marginal note in the ERV says, “Some ancient authorities read ‘of the Christ’.”

Mark 1:1 has “The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God” in the KJV. The ERV marginal note says, “Some ancient authorities omit ‘the Son of God.’”

Obviously, Hort wanted to instill doubt in the reader.

It is an intriguing fact that the only thing the revisers were commissioned to do, improve the language of the King James—they entirely failed to do! Having accepted Hort’s foolish suggestions, the resultant translation was stiff and wooden. No one wanted to read it. Bishop Ellicott had predicted this in 1870:

“No revision in the present day could hope to meet with an hour’s acceptance if it failed to preserve the tone, rhythm, and diction of the present Authorized Version.”—*Ellicott, quoted in Burgon, Revision Revised, p. 226.*

Bishop Wordsworth compared the results of abandoning the King James for the Revised Version in these words:

“To pass from the one to the other, is, as it were, to alight from a well-built and well-hung carriage which glides easily over a macadamized [asphalt paved] road,—and to get into one which has bad springs or none at all, and in which you are jolted in ruts with aching bones over the stones of a newly mended and rarely traversed road, like some of the roads of our North Lincolnshire villages.”—*Wordsworth, quoted in Burgon, Revision Revised, p. 112.*

Burgon powerfully condemned the pedantic and wooden phrasing of the English Revised Version:

“They had a noble version before them, which they have contrived to spoil in every part. Its dignified simplicity and essential faithfulness, its manly grace and its delightful rhythm, they have shown themselves alike unable to imitate and unwilling to retain.

“Their queer uncouth phraseology and their jerky sentences; their pedantic obscurity and their stiff, constrained manner; and their habitual achievement of English which fails to exhibit the spirit of the original Greek—are sorry substitutes for the living freshness, and elastic freedom, and habitual fidelity of the grand old version which we inherited from our fathers, and which has sustained the spiritual life of the Church of England, and of all English-speaking Christians, for 350 years . . .

“The Authorized Version, wherever it was possible, should have been jealously retained. But on the contrary, every familiar cadence has been dislocated. The congenial flow of almost every verse of Scripture has been hopeless marred.”—*Burgon, Revision Revised, pp. 225-226.*

We could spend pages citing examples of changes made in the English Revised Version. But we will not do so, as its sloppy text helped it die out of public notice—and its doctrinal errors we will meet again as we give careful attention to their appearance in more recent translations.

Indeed, this was the problem: Not that the ERV survived the test of public acceptance; it totally failed in that regard—but that the errors in the Greek text it came

from (the Westcott-Hort Text) were perpetuated into the 20th century through the Nestle Text.

THE MODERN CRITICAL GREEK TEXTS

In these last days of earth's history, a large number of Christians use the modern Bible versions. But when you remain with the only Bible available today—the King James—which is based on the Majority (Received) Text, you stand with a majority of those in past ages who have owned a Bible or part of it.

In contrast, those who use the modern versions do not realize the unstable nature of the collated Greek texts they are based on. **Instead of using the Majority Text, based on manuscripts which essentially read alike—the new translations are founded on an assemblage of confusing variants, generally opposed to one another.**

There are over 5,366 manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. Together they give a view of the text much like a shifting kaleidoscope. "They contain several hundred thousand variant readings . ." notes Pickering (*cf. his Identity of the New Testament Text, pp. 16-18*).

At the present time there are over two dozen critical Greek texts, of which the Nestle Text is the primary one. Each one is filled with thousands upon thousands of variants. No two of those books are alike. Scholars who use them argue among themselves as to which variants to use and which to reject.

Even Westcott and Hort admitted, "Equally competent critics often arrive at contrary conclusions as to the same variation" (*Westcott and Hort, Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek, p. 21*).

ANOTHER LOOK AT THE MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE

Evidence for the New Testament is composed of papyrus fragments and manuscripts, uncial and minuscule manuscripts (modified capitals and cursives), and lectionaries (books used in churches). Each of the 5,366 manuscripts and 2,209 lectionaries extant today are given a name, an abbreviation and / or a number (*Bruce Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible, p. 54*).

At the present time, there are:

- 88 papyri (identified as P1, P2, etc.)
- 274 uncials (Aleph, A, B, C, D, etc.)
- 2,795 minuscules, or cursives (1, 2, 3, etc.)
- 2,209 lectionaries (L1, L2, L3, etc.)

In addition to the above, there are other witnesses to the wording of the originals written by Matthew, Paul, and the other apostles.

Many foreign language translations were made in the 2nd century and those immediately following. These include the Old Latin, the Syriac, the Coptic, the Ethiopic, and a dozen others. These provide witnesses to the correct readings of the New Testament.

Finally, scores of 2nd, 3rd and 4th century Christian writers (the "fathers")—such as John Chrysostom, Irenaeus, Tertullain, and Justin Martyr, to name just a few—left writings containing citations of Scripture verses, witnessing to the original readings of the New Testament.

Dean John Burgon extrapolated (analyzed and compared) over 87,000 of the above manuscripts and citations. Many of his comments are quoted in this present book. **He fully acknowledged that the King James Bible was founded on the very best manuscripts; and he clearly foresaw the confusion that would result if the confusing variant readings, so many of which originated in Alexandria, Egypt, were permitted to be preferred over the Majority Text.**

The overwhelming majority of all the manuscripts, lectionaries, and quotations agree generally with each other as to the readings of the New Testament. Manuscripts from the 2nd century (P⁸⁶) down through the Middle Ages (A.D. 1500) attest to the readings of the Majority Text.

Dean Burgon, who found and collated this Majority Text in most of the early writers, called it the **Traditional Text**. It is also called the **Syrian Text**, the **Byzantine Text**, the **K (Kappa) Text**, **Koine Text**, or **Common Text**. Kurt Aland, the editor-in-chief of the Nestle Text and the UBS Text, calls it the **Majority Text**. Many others call it the **Received Text** or the **Textus Receptus**.

This text type is available today in English only in the Authorized Version or, as it is called in the United States, the King James Version.

The 809,000,000 copies of the King James Bible, published since 1611 in 300 languages, demonstrates the continuum of this Majority Text. **It is a tragedy that the new versions are**

not based on this Majority Text; but, instead, they are based on a dissenting handful of manuscripts which disagree with the Majority.

AN ANALOGY TO EXPLAIN A RIDICULOUS THEORY

It is difficult to explain the utter foolishness of this modern Bible manuscript theory. The present writer encountered the same difficulty when he attempted to present in simple language the deep things of scientific learning in his 1,326-page three-volume *Evolution Disproved Series*. The problem is that the average reader tends to be afraid of scientific facts, assuming they are above his head; when, in reality, common sense can explain a lot.

The same applies to the present subject. Most people fear to encounter a "Greek expert"; when, in reality, there are only a handful of them in the world. The rest of the so-called "Greek experts" are shams who can only, with greatest difficulty, turn to a portion of the New Testament that you may select and read any of it.

The present writer graduated with a double major (Theology and Biblical Languages) in college; and he was one course short of having a second major in Biblical Languages (in addition to Systematic Theology) at our Theological Seminary.

Yet, even with his background, he finds it difficult to present the remarkable foolishness of the liberal theory, which Westcott and Hort bequeathed to us. This is because everyone assumes the subject is too deep for their comfort.

So here is an illustration which may help the reader understand the simple facts about these ancient Greek manuscripts, translations, and quoted citations:

We have a pumpkin, one pumpkin. It is the original. *This would stand for the original Greek autograph—the original Greek manuscripts written by the apostles and other inspired Bible writers.*

Because there is nothing like it anywhere, many, many people eagerly want pumpkins like this original. They are thankful to be able to obtain seeds from it, which they plant. *Copies are made of the original manuscript.*

More pumpkins are the result, and their seeds are planted, producing still more pumpkins. *Still more copies are carefully made from*

the earlier copies; and, just as the Apostle said, the Word of God multiplies. A high degree of accuracy is maintained because the copies are prepared by faithful Christians.

This continues; and the result is a very large number of pumpkins, nearly all of which look alike and taste wonderful. *The Majority Text is produced and includes not only most manuscripts, but also lectionaries, quotations, and many translations; all these have relatively few variants.*

Unfortunately, some worthless pumpkins are also produced. Some grow accidentally while others are intentionally irradiated, so they will grow malformed. *A minority of only about 10% of the total number of manuscripts are corrupt. Some of the errors were caused by sloppy copyists. Others are intentionally made in order to introduce doctrinal errors into the Bible.*

The existence of bad pumpkins (especially those produced in Alexandria) was no problem for centuries. Folk used the good pumpkins, ate them, and used their seed to produce more.

But, then, a century ago, some people who knew little about farming, decided to discard the good pumpkins—and only use the deformed ones that did not taste as good!

In spite of the protests of competent farmers, they picked over the thousands of pumpkins (assuming that pumpkins keep well, which they naturally do not) and tossed out the good ones while only retaining the ones which were misshapen, brown, spotted, moldy, or did not taste good. These foolish modern farmers declared that the formerly rejected ones—were actually the best! The reason they gave for their decision was their theory that the best pumpkins would only be the minority—the few—which were different.

Then these strange farmers deliberately bred the worst pumpkins, banned all the good ones from the market, and only sold the worst.

—*Am I stretching the point? No, I am not.* This is exactly what was done! The good quality manuscripts were set aside, and the inferior ones were prized and used to produce the new Bibles.

But let us carry the analogy further:

Agricultural scientists decided this would make a good research study which they could get the universities to fund; so they decided to make a Critical Pumpkin Text. It would list all

the variants in each of the bad pumpkins. Why focus attention on the bad ones? Well, the scientists would quickly be out of a job if they only compared the good pumpkins—for they were all alike!

After publication of the initial Critical Text, new editions of the text have continually been issued ever since, as more and more bad pumpkins are found. Their Critical Text lists the spotted and speckled, the ones with worms, decayed seeds, those with moldy parts, as well as the brownish and half-rotten ones. Attention is given in their scholarly Text to the bad-tasting ones; and categories are made for the various disgusting flavors. Those with very advanced stages of disease and mold also receive special attention. Everything receives numbered or alphabetized designations.

The general public is overawed by the project, since it is so complicated. It just seems so scientific. Indeed, the scientists have devised special names for each type of diseased, misshapen, rotten kind of pumpkin.

Every single thing wrong in each pumpkin is carefully listed under its separate heading in the critical text. Under the category of “stems,” the bad pumpkins which have stem problems are listed by their code number. The same for “seeds,” different areas on the outer rind, and various sections of the pulp.

In order to add to the confusion, all the comments are written in a complicated code of numbers and letters.

What about the majority of the pumpkins—which are all so much alike, and which taste better? They are lumped together in the critical text as “Byzantine,” or “Syrian,” and are said to have been produced in just one local area. Based on a theory they devised, scholars said it was obvious that the normal pumpkins were not the originals, but had been grown centuries later—from seed produced by the half-rotten variants!

The scholars declared that, on the basis of their research studies, the Byzantines were so inferior, they should be kept from the buying public. Why have a normal pumpkin, when you can have one that is so different, so exotic that, as soon as you buy it, you have to examine it in an attempt to find the worms and the moldy spots?

With this pumpkin analogy in hand, you are now prepared to understand the modern Critical Greek Texts.

THE NESTLE -ALAND GREEK TEXT

In 1898, Eberhard Nestle in Germany published an inexpensive Critical Greek Text for the Stuttgart Bible Society. The text was based on the readings of Tischendorf and Weymouth (later Weiss), but primarily Westcott-Hort.

In 1904, the British and Foreign Bible Society set aside the Erasmus Greek Text (called the *Textus Receptus*)—and began using the Nestle Text instead. That was a most influential decision! Because Bible translators tend to go to the Bible societies for copies of the Greek text they will use in their work, the Nestle Text became the translation standard. That situation has not changed, from that day to this. (As we will learn below, today, the UBS (United Bible Societies) Text is often used, but it is essentially the same as the Nestle Text.)

On the death of Nestle in 1913, his son, Erwin Nestle, took over the work. For the first time, a brief apparatus was added. This “apparatus” consists of footnotes which, using an abbreviation code, lists the sources used for what is in the text and the variants which are in the footnote (the rejected readings).

Gradually, over the years, the Nestle Text has enlarged and gone through over two dozen editions, each one containing more changes in the text and footnotes. The title of the book has not changed: *Novum Testamentum Graece*.

In 1950, custody was transferred to Kurt Aland who, with the help of Matthew Black, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, has continued the work that Westcott and Hort pushed upon modern Bible translators. (However, there has been a partial return to the Majority Text by the men in charge of the Nestle-Aland Text.)

Those same three men also produced a Greek Text, called *The Greek New Testament*, sponsored by the United Bible Societies (which includes the American Bible Society); it is now generally called the “UBS Text.” More on this later.

Currently the manuscripts for both the Nestle-Aland Text and the UBS Text are being collated by the *Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung*, under the direction of Kurt Aland in Munster, Germany. Many microfilms are housed in the archives of the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center in Claremont, California.

Should the reader wish to pursue his own

investigation, a list of sources where copies of those manuscripts may be found is given below.

Here are the directories where you can locate all the New Testament manuscripts, so facsimile copies may be obtained for personal study. But keep in mind that these are all in Greek or other ancient languages:

The Paleography Collection in the University of London Library, Vols. 1-2 (Boston, 1968).

John L. Sharp's *Checklist of Collections of Biblical and Related Manuscripts on Microfilm*, published in *Scriptorium*, XXV (1971), pp. 97-109.

The rest of the sources are in books which have introductions, comments, and footnotes in French, German, or Latin.

The simplest procedure is to purchase a copy of the *Nestle Text*, edited by Kurt Aland, from the American Bible Society (address: 1865 Broadway, New York, NY 10023).

You will recall that Scrivener found that **the underlying Greek of the Erasmus Greek Text (called the Textus Receptus), on which the King James Bible is based, had been changed 5,337 times in the process of preparing the Westcott-Hort Text.**

In our generation (1992), Dr. D. A. Waite made a careful study of the Nestle-Aland Greek Text (26th edition) and found 5,604 alterations. Dr. Waite made this comment:

"Of these 5,604 changes, I found 1,952 to be omissions (35%), 467 to be additions (8%), and 3,185 to be changes (57%). In these 5,604 places that were involved in these changes, there were 4,366 more words involved, making a total of 9,970 Greek words that were involved. This means that in a Greek text of 647 pages, this would average 15 words per page that were changed from the Received Text [the Textus Receptus of Erasmus]."—*D.A. Waite, The King James Bible's Fourfold Superiority, p. 31.*

Few Biblical Greek scholars today bother with the Westcott-Hort Text. Instead, they use the Nestle-Aland or UBS Text—but, for the most part, they follow the same textual principles laid down in Hort's theory.

"The supremacy and popularity of the Westcott-Hort Text continued for many years. The research of Bernhard Weiss and the propagation of the Nestle Text especially helped to establish its wide usage."—*I.M. Price, Ancestry of Our English Bible, p. 212.*

It is a definite fact that the Nestle-Aland Text

has tended to move closer to a partial acceptance, at times, of the readings of the Majority Text. But that acceptance is still not very much.

UNITED BIBLE SOCIETIES GREEK TEXT

As mentioned earlier, the same three men who edit the Nestle-Aland Greek Text now produce the UBS Text as well. Both Texts are essentially the same, although the present writer finds the Greek print in the UBS Text is easier to read.

Yet, when you look at the apparatus (the footnotes at the bottom of each page, which contain the variant readings), you find they are based on guesswork:

The uncertainty as to which readings constitute the correct one is shown in the UBS 3rd & 4th editions. The letters A, B, C, and D are enclosed within braces (written like this: { }); they are placed at the beginning of each set of textual variants, to indicate the relative degree of certainty. The letter A signifies the text is virtually certain while B indicates that there is some degree of doubt. The letter C means there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus contains the superior reading while D shows that there is a very high degree of doubt concerning the reading for the text. Pickering comments, "It is hard to resist the suspicion that they are guessing." **Their guesses are based on the Hort theory.**

JOINT PROTESTANT-CATHOLIC TRANSLATION TEAMS

Who is doing the guessing? **The UBS Vice President is Roman Catholic Cardinal Onitsha of Nigeria. The executive committee includes Roman Catholic Bishop Alilona of Italy. Among the editors is Roman Catholic Cardinal Martini of Milan.** In the past, Catholics would not work with Protestants in the work of Bible translation; but times have changed.

"Catholics should work together with Protestants in the fundamental task of Biblical translation . . . [They can] work very well together and have the same approach and interpretation . . . [This] signals a new age in the church."—*Patrick Henry, New Directions in New Testament Study, pp. 232-234.*

This began in 1943, when the Papal encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* called for an ecumenical Bible. It said:

"These translations [should] be produced in

cooperation with separated brothers.”—*New American Bible*, p. vii [Roman Catholic].

Subsequently, Jesuit scholars moved on to editorial positions in the previously Protestant *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Their work on the UBS / Nestle’s Text and influence in Biblical scholarship appears to have so successfully biased so many ‘new’ readings, that the recent Catholic *New American Bible* was translated directly from UBS / Nestle rather than from the traditional Catholic Latin Vulgate. Frankly, that is very revealing!

The *Introduction* in that Catholic Bible says this:

“In general, Nestle’s-Aland’s *Novum Testamentum Graece* (25th edition, 1963) was followed. Additional help was derived from *The Greek New Testament* (editors Aland, Black, Metzger, Wikgren) produced for the use of translators by the United Bible Societies in 1966.”—*New American Bible*, p. ix.

Both the Catholic and ‘New’ Protestant Bibles are now based on the same identical critical Greek Texts (UBS / Nestle’s) which, in turn, are based on the same 1% minority Greek Manuscripts (Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, plus some others reflecting their readings).

Dean Stanley, a member of one of these translation committees, recognized that this new joint Catholic-Protestant cooperation on new versions would help the denominations move toward union with one another and, ultimately, with Rome:

“The revision work is of the utmost importance . . . in its indirect effect upon a closer union of the different denominations.”—*Stanley, quoted in David Schaff, Life of Phillip Schaff*, p. 378.

KITTEL’S GREEK DICTIONARY

We have been speaking of the critical New Testament Greek Texts. Mention should also be made of Gerhard Kittel’s ten-volume *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Serious students of New Testament Greek try to purchase a set. **Kittel’s Greek Dictionary is the standard reference work used in New Testament Greek word studies. Modern translators rely on its judgments.**

Kittel’s labors in Germany on his ten-volume Greek New Testament dictionary also began the same year he became a Gestapo agent, working for Adolf Hitler. **He provided Hitler with a**

“Christian philosophy” for the destruction of the Jewish race.

Kittel’s trial, conviction, and imprisonment for his part in the extermination of two thirds of Europe’s Jewish population is a fact that is not discussed today. His ten-volume set continues to be sold.

“His writings penned between 1937 and 1943 caused the physical death of millions of Jews . . . Using the cloak of ‘Christianity’ and ‘science,’ Kittel was the chief architect of the so-called ‘racial science’ and ‘Christian bias’ for Hitler’s anti-Semitism.

“Scholar Robert Erickson, winner of the 1987 Merit of Distinction from the International Center for Holocaust Studies writes, ‘He established a solid Christian foundation for the opposition to the Jews’ (*Erickson, Theologians under Hitler*, p. 54). Kittel called himself ‘the first authority in Germany in the scientific consideration of the Jewish question’ (*op. cit.*, p. 37).

“William Foxwell Albright, a prominent archaeologist and Semitic scholar, writes: ‘Kittel is . . . even darker and more menacing . . . than Goerring or Goebbels . . . [He had the] grim distinction of making extermination of the Jews theologically respectable’ (*Albright, quoted in History of Archaeology and Christian Humanism*, p. 165).”—*G.A. Riplinger, New Age Bible Versions*, 593.

All new versions, including the New King James Version, have abandoned the traditional Old Testament Hebrew Text (which is the *Ben Chayyim Massoretic Text*) and are using *Biblia Hebraica*, the critical Hebrew Text prepared by Gerhard Kittel’s father, Rudolph Kittel, who lived in the 19th-century Germany during the time when German higher criticism was tearing the Old Testament apart.

Rudolph Kittel’s *Biblia Hebraica* has become the standard critical Hebrew Text of the Old Testament. An illustration of one page from it will be found a few pages from here.

THE MAJORITY GREEK TEXT

There are three Greek Texts which contain the Majority Text. The first is the third edition of Erasmus’ Greek Text, commonly referred to as the Textus Receptus.

The second is the Scrivener Greek Text. That godly man produced a very useful Greek Text of the New Testament.

The third is the Hodges-Farstad-Nelson Majority Greek Text.

The present writer is not certain which of these Greek Texts are still in print today.

The Hodges-Farstad-Nelson Text and the Nestle Text were both used in the preparation of the 1979-1982 New King James Version. More on that translation later.

THE MANUSCRIPT CODES AND ASSIGNED DATES

Throughout this book, we have always named the manuscript instead of giving its code. When a quotation cites only the code, we have printed the name in brackets. It is belief of the present writer that there is no need to make this subject as complicated as some attempt to do. Only Biblical scholars need bother with codes.

However, **within a few pages, we will take a peek into a modern Greek Text; and it would be well if you had a reference guide to some of the codes, along with a brief description of the manuscript, etc.**

In reading through the following list, you will find that the ancient papyri and codices, preferred by the modernists (in accordance with the Hort theory), were generally prepared in Alexandria, Egypt, or contain Western (central Italy) errors.

(It should be kept in mind that the papyri, the earliest of all, frequently support Majority Text readings.)

The cursive manuscripts, although theoretically dated later, match the readings found in the early "fathers," lectionaries, and translations—which were earlier than the codices! Thus we find that a minimum of 90% of the manuscript evidence, of all types, is early. Called "the Majority Text," it is the basis of the King James Bible (with the exception of Wycliffe who did not have access to the Majority Text), of all other Reformation English and nearly all Reformation-European Bibles.

We are going to list below the primary documents referred to in the apparatus (footnotes) of a modern Greek Text. The reason those ancient manuscripts are considered to be most important by the editors of the Nestle / Aland-UBS Greek Texts—is because they vary the most from the Majority Text! Or to put it another way, because they fit the best into the Hort theory, which despised the Majority Text.

PAPYRI—The papyri codes always consist of a capital "P" plus a superscript number.

In agreement with the Hort theory, here are the most important ones: P⁴⁵ (Gospels and Acts, 3rd century); P⁴⁶ (Pauline, 3rd century); P⁴⁷ (Revelation; 3rd century). None of those are complete; and the rest of the papyri are extremely fragmentary. Unfortunately, the above papyri were copied in Egypt and include the type of errors found in the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, which were also copied there. The largest nest of Christian heretics in the 3rd and 4th centuries was in Alexandria, Egypt. Yet, in spite of this, these papyri, which are very early, still generally support many Majority Text readings.

The John Rylands fragment (P⁵²) should be mentioned. Consisting of a verse or two from John 18, it is dated at the middle of the 2nd century or about 50 years after John wrote the words.

CODICES—There are about 45 codices, but only five are primarily discussed. As you will recall, codices are Greek manuscripts bound in books instead of rolls and generally contain capital letters.

5th century **Codex Alexandrinus (A)** is parts of the New Testament. Parts of this Egyptian codex closely agree with the Catholic Vulgate.

4th-century **Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph or)** is parts of the Old and New Testaments. This is also from Egypt (Alexandria).

4th-century **Codex Vaticanus (B)** is all of Old Testament and New Testament up to Hebrews 9:14, from Alexandria.

Ephraemi (C) is parts of the New Testament with date uncertain. The text is generally Alexandrian, but with some late additions.

5th-6th-century **Bezae**, also called **Cantabrigiensis (D)**, is Gospels and Acts only. It is the most complete manuscript with "Western" readings from central Italy (which many scholars agree are rather erroneous, although Westcott and Hort accepted some of them). Here is an example of one of these odd "Western additions":

"On the same day, seeing someone working on the Sabbath, he [Christ] said to him, 'Man, if you really know what you are doing, you are blessed; but if you do not know, you are cursed, and a transgressor of the law.' "—*Luke 6:4-5 in Codex Bezae.*

We should mention once again: **Please do not confuse the Western family of Greek manuscripts, from central Italy, with the Italia. The Italia is the Latin manuscripts which are the basis of the Waldensian Bible. The Italia**

(also called the Old Latin) was prepared by the Waldenses, or Vaudois (pronounced “VAW-doh”), in the 4th century—long before Peter Waldo (which Catholic legend claims to have been the “first Waldensian”) lived around the year A.D. 1175.

Other important codices (which will only rarely be mentioned in this book) include:

6th-century **Codex Claromontanus (D²)** is the Pauline Epistles. Same Western source as Bezae.

7th-century **Codex Laudianus (E²)** is Acts. Same Western source as Bezae.

4th or 5th-century **Codex Freer (or Washington, also called Washingtonian or W)** is the Gospels. It contains portions of Western, Caesarean, and Byzantine [Majority Text] readings. It was purchased from a Cairo dealer, in 1906; and it is now in the Freer Museum in Washington, D.C.

7th-9th-century **Koridethi Gospels (Theta)**. Egyptian.

8th-9th-century **Codex Regius (L)** is the Gospels. Totally Alexandrian.

Why were so many 4th-century codices Egyptian? Because at that time it dominated worldly Christianity and could command the money to produce codices.

Why were so many later codices Western? Because Rome then dominated Christianity and had the money to produce errant codices.

The Majority Text manuscripts and translations were consistently produced by poor people who were genuine Christians. They copied earlier safe manuscripts as accurately as possible.

For your information, the following codices agree with the Majority Text (the basis of the King James Bible). Therefore, Hort arbitrarily assigned them late dates—even though they have uncial (full capital) texts:

Codex Basiliensis (E), dated to 8th century

Codex Cyprius (K), 9th century

Codex Campianus (M), 9th century

Codex V, 9th century, with the Gospels

Codex Delta, 9th century

Codex H, 9th century, with the Gospels

Codex Omega, 8-9th century, with the Gospels

CURSIVES—There are thousands of these

Greek manuscripts; and, because they support the Majority Text and not the Egyptian (as do Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) or Western, they are considered worthless by modern textual critics.

“The cursive manuscripts, like the later uncials, mainly reflect the Byzantine [Majority Text] form of the text and they occupy a smaller place in the considerations of the textual critic.”—*I.M. Price, Ancestry of Our English Bible*, p. 171.

The cursives are coded simply by numbers. Of these, the critics like the very few which include the oddities of the Alexandrian codices. These include **33, 81, 424, 579**, and seven others. The rest are tossed out, with the exception of **28** and **565** which have Caesarean readings, and the “**Ferrar**” manuscripts (or **Family 1**) which includes **1, 13, 124, 346**, and **69**, both having Caesarean characteristics. What makes these manuscripts so valuable? It is their strange readings. One example is that, in common, they have the adultery story after *Luke 21:38* instead of in *John 8*. Another is that they place *Luke 22:43-44* after *Matthew 26:39*. **As you can see, the critics look for oddities; and they dearly prefer to accept them in place of what you find in your King James Bible.**

HOW MANY CHANGES ARE IN A CRITICAL GREEK TEXT?

Throughout this book, we have clearly established that the Majority Text is correct and the minority witnesses have the mistakes.

But we need to clarify a very important fact: There are not a lot of mistakes—even in the minority manuscripts!

For example, the standard Catholic Bible, the Rheims-Douai, was translated from Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, which was based on minority manuscripts. Yet you can bring a person to Jesus Christ, the third angel’s message, and a knowledge of God’s law and the sanctuary message—all from the Rheims-Douai.

This is because it still contains the plan of salvation, although it has glaring errors not even found in the Revised Standard Version.

On page 140, we will reprint, full size, the first two pages from the Gospel of John in the UBS critical Greek Text. It is typical of what you will find all through a modern critical Greek Text.

On the following page, we will reprint

the first page of the Gospel of John in the Nestle-Aland critical Greek Text. Read the two for yourself, and you will see that the main text (the portion in Greek in the upper part of each page) is exactly alike in both the UBS and Nestle-Aland. (However, the UBS is easier to read, because of typesetting factors.) The apparatus (notes on the bottom of each page) are also easier to read and far more complete in the UBS Greek Text.

Three important facts should be noted here:

(1) The variants, listed in the apparatus, are essentially the same.

(2) There are very, very few of them!

(3) Yet, if you will read the Greek text (upper part of each page), you will find it reads exactly the same as your King James Bible!

The reason for this is the fact that, throughout the New Testament, there are only a few thousand variants from the Majority Text in the modern critical Greek Texts (Westcott-Hort, Nestle-Aland, UBS).

Most of these variants are not significant. In order to give you an idea of what they are generally like, here is a description of the variants listed on the first page of the UBS critical Greek Text:

Page 1 contains John 1:1 through 1:7. The upper portion contains the text in cursive (lower-case) Greek. The lower part of the page has the apparatus, which is all the footnotes.

There are two variant possibilities on page 1. Both are in the beginning of verse 4:

Verse 4: **en auto zoe en** = "in Him life was." (The first "en" has a short "e" and means "in";

the last "en" in the verse has a long e, and is a totally different Greek letter. It means "was.")

Variants for the first "en" are listed under "3-4" on the apparatus (lower part of the page).

Variants for the second "en" ("was") are listed under "4" in the apparatus.

Page 2 contains John 1:8 through part of 1:16. It has two variants. You will find them at verse 13 and verse 15.

This means that, from John 1:1 to part way through John 1:16, there are only four variants! Please understand that you are looking at a critical Greek Text. As the apparatus reveals, it lists dozens of codices, cursives, lectionaries, quotations from the "fathers," and translations. —Yet there are only four items in those 16 verses which have variants!

Lest you think I am bluffing on this, let us translate the first page together:

1. *En arche en ho logos, kai ho logos en pros ton theon, and theos en ho logos.*

1. En [the] beginning was the Word, and the Word was with the God, and God was the Word.

2. *Houtos en en arche pros ton theon.*

2. This-one was in [the] beginning with the God.

3. *Panta di autou egeneto, kai choris autou egeneto oude hen ho yeyonen.*

3. All-things through Him became, and without Him became not one-thing which has-become.

4. *En auto zoe en, kai e zoe en to phos ton antropon* [underline = where there are variants].

4. In Him life was, and the life was the light the of-men.

5. *Kai to phos en te skotia phainei, kai e skotia auto katelaben.*

ON THE NEXT THREE PAGES

Sample pages from four critical Bible Texts are illustrated on the next three pages.

1 - **Two pages from the United Bible Societies Critical Greek Text.** This, along with the Nestle-Aland Text, are the two New Testament Greek Texts used by modern Bible Translators. Both are edited by the same three-man team and essentially have the same text. We discuss this in some detail.

2 - **One page from the Nestle-Aland Critical Greek Text.** / On the same page is a chart of the Greek Alphabet. You will note that the

Greek text is identical to that of the UBS Text and the variants are about the same.

3 - **One page from the Alfred Rahlfs Critical Greek Septuagint (LXX).** This two-volume work is the standard critical Text for studies into the Greek translation of the Old Testament.

4 - **One page from the Rudolph Kittel's Biblia Hebraica,** the standard critical Hebrew Text of the Old Testament. Rudolph Kittel was the father of Gerhard Kittel, mentioned on an earlier page as working closely with Hitler in the slaying of millions of Jews.

5. And the light in the darkness shines, and the darkness it not overtook (or overwhelmed).

6. *egeneto anthropos, anestalmenos para theou, onoma auto Iwannes.*

6. There-was a-man, having-been-sent from God, name to-him John.

As you can see from the above, there is no problem in those verses, as they are given in the main text of this critical Greek Text.

Now let us consider the two variants on this page (both are at the beginning of verse 4, and are underlined, above).

Variant 1: The text reads "en auto zoe en" ("In Him life was"). Looking down at the first item in the apparatus, we find that the variant is simply a repetition of the preceding four Greek words: "*oude hen, o gegonen en.*" If we used this variant, the last part of verse 3 and the first of verse 4 would read: ". . and without Him not one thing became which has become. Not one thing became. In Him was life . ." A scribe apparently copied part of the text twice.

Variant 2: The text reads "*en auto zoe en*" ("In Him life was"). The variant is keyed to the "was."

Support for the reading in the main text: Looking down at the apparatus, we find that it says, "²⁴ {A} en." That "en" means "was." The "²" is the footnote number. The "4" tells the verse that the variant is in. The "{A}" tells us that this is the textual support for what is in the text of verse 4 (on the upper part of the page). For a moment, let us look at the evidence for "was" ("In Him was life"). In doing so, we will get a feel for how to work with a critical Greek apparatus:

First is listed the papyri ("P^{66,75}"). Then comes the codices ("A, B, C," etc.). Then come the cursives ("050, 063," etc.). After this is a lectionary (in this case, all the Byzantine [Majority Text] lectionaries). Next come the translations (Vulgate, all three Syriac translations: Coptic, Armenian, and Georgian). Next is listed the quotations from the "fathers" ("Theodotus, Irenaeus," etc.).

Having looked through that, you have a pretty good idea how the witnesses are arranged. All of the above support having "In Him was life" at the beginning of verse 4.

Now we will consider the two variants of "was" ("In Him was life"):

(1) The first is "*estin*," which means "is" (In Him is life"). In support of this, we have the Sinaiticus, D (Codex Bezae, which has Western [middle Italy] readings), several Old Latin manuscripts, Curetonian Syriac translation, two Coptic manuscripts (Sahidic and Fayumic), plus citations by twelve "fathers."

(2) The second is this: omit "W^{supp}." This means that one manuscript omits "was" entirely ("In Him life"). That manuscript is "W^{supp}," which means that the Washingtonian codice has a "supposition item" added here. A portion of a manuscript was supplied by a later hand (a later scribe) where the original was missing. The original scribe probably left out "In Him was life"; so a later scribe wrote in "In Him life."

Well, we have quickly looked at one page of a modern critical Greek Text. Now you can see why modern translators rely on the critical Greek Text rather than do their own research into the ancient manuscripts.

The problem is not that they rely on a Greek Text, but that they rely on the modern ones (based on the Hort theory) instead of one containing only the Majority Text.

Yet, as you can now see—even the modern Greek Texts have very few problems in them!

Later in this book, we will list the worst problems that we could find. They fill several pages; yet it still is only several pages. It is not a whole book of problem translations.

With this fact in mind, we are prepared to discuss the next section in our book: Why did Ellen White quote from some of the modern translations?

ELLEN WHITE AND BIBLE INERRANCY

We are about to briefly consider each of the most important Bible translations of our time. But first, we have another matter to give our attention to:

First, what did Ellen White say about the possibility of errors in the Bible?

Second, why did she use the modern versions, and to what extent?

In this section, we will consider the first question; in the next the second.

To begin with, I urge you to read 1 Selected Messages, pp. 15-23. It says that, yes,

errors may have been made at times by the copyists; but we should trust the Bible and obey it, and not worry about the problems.

“Some look to us gravely and say, ‘Don’t you think there might have been some mistake in the copyist or in the translators?’ This is all probable, and the mind that is so narrow that it will hesitate and stumble over this possibility or probability would be just as ready to stumble over the mysteries of the Inspired Word, because their feeble minds cannot see through the purposes of God . . .

“I take the Bible just as it is, as the Inspired Word. I believe its utterances in an entire Bible.”—*1 Selected Messages*, pp. 16-17 [Manuscript 16, 1888; written at Minneapolis, Minnesota, autumn 1888].

Here is another interesting passage:

“I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible; yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that they were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition. But I saw that the Word of God, as a whole, is a perfect chain, one portion linking into and explaining another. True seekers for truth need not err, for not only is the Word of God plain and simple in declaring the way of life, but the Holy Spirit is given as a guide in understanding the way to life therein revealed.”—*Story of Redemption*, p. 391.

The message is clear enough: We can trust our Bibles.

The modernists in our own church declare that the Bible is not infallible and that Ellen White admitted the fact.

As evidence for their claim, they cite the passage we have just quoted:

“Some look to us gravely and say, ‘Don’t you think there might have been some mistake in the copyist or in the translators?’ This is all probable.”—*1 Selected Messages*, p. 16.

How can the Bible have mistakes, when Ellen White repeatedly said it was infallible? The answer is this: **That which the prophets wrote is infallible, but copies of the originals could have occasional mistakes in them. Yet, she hastens to add, we can fully trust our Bibles. Therefore, the mistakes must not be very serious.**

Although Ellen White repeatedly said that man’s words and ideas are fallible, God’s Word is declared to be infallible.

“In His Word God has committed to men the knowledge necessary for salvation. The Holy Scriptures are to be accepted as an authoritative, infallible revelation of His will.”—*Great Controversy*, p. vii.

“Zwingli . . . devoted himself with his whole soul to the search after divine truth . . . The more he searched the Scriptures, the clearer appeared the contrast between their truths and the heresies of Rome. He submitted himself to the Bible as the Word of God, the only sufficient, infallible rule.”—*Great Controversy*, 173.

“[Zwingli] He presented the Word of God as the only infallible authority and the death of Christ as the only complete sacrifice.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 177.

“Wycliffe now taught the distinctive doctrines of Protestantism—salvation through faith in Christ, and the sole infallibility of the Scriptures.”—*Great Controversy*, p. 89.

“Man is fallible, but God’s Word is infallible. Instead of wrangling with one another, let men exalt the Lord. Let us meet all opposition as did our Master, saying, ‘It is written.’ Let us lift up the banner on which is inscribed, The Bible our rule of faith and discipline.”—*1 Selected Messages*, p. 416 (Review, Dec. 15, 1885).

ELLEN WHITE AND THE MODERN VERSIONS

Ellen White sometimes quoted from the ERV (RV); and, when the ASV (ARV) was published, she occasionally quoted from it.

A word of explanation is needed: In her day, the English Revised Version (ERV) was called the Revised Version (RV); and the American Standard Version (ASV) was called the American Revised Version (ARV). In later years, the names were changed.

In view of the fact that the modern versions are not the best, why did Ellen White quote them at times in her books? There is a very sound reason for this; and we will explain it here.

First, let us briefly review the background of what we are dealing with:

The originals were written by the Bible writers. They are called “autographs.” Copies were carefully made over an extended period of time. At times errors were introduced into the copies. Some were deliberately introduced while a majority of others were accidental. But, as we have observed, there were not a lot of variants.

The great majority of the manuscripts tended to read the same way. We call them the Majority Text. There was also a Minority Text, composed of several variant manuscript “families.”

Unfortunately, Westcott and Hort urged that one minority family (which they called the “Neutral Text”) was the best; and modern translators have followed their lead. This is primarily because the Nestle-Aland and UBS Greek Texts provide a relatively easy way to carry on translation work—and they are essentially based on the Westcott-Hort pattern.

But, now, notice this: Even though the Majority Text is superior to the modern Greek Texts, the great majority of readings in both are essentially the same! We have not made an issue of this fact, but it is true. We have just observed this in our analysis of part of a modern critical Greek Text.

If you doubt this, take a copy of any conservative modern version (we will tell you, below, which they are) and compare a chapter in it with the King James Version. You will find that most everything is essentially the same in both Bibles. The wording will be somewhat different, but the concepts will be almost identical. (Note that I said a “conservative modern version; I did not say all modern versions!”)

There are not a million variations between the modern Greek Texts and the King James; there are only about 5,000 of them. We have repeatedly observed that (this information came from scholars favoring the King James) scholars deplored the fact that any existed at all. Yet there are only a few thousand flaws.

Now, follow me closely: **The problem with the modern versions is not primarily the 5,000 variants; it is the changes in phrasing, especially the radical ones which occur in them—especially in the paraphrase Bibles (Phillips, Living Bible, etc.).**

We have observed that the line of English Bible translations—from Tyndale to the King James—were essentially the same. There was very little variation in phrasing. The reason was that the conscientious men who prepared them, not only relied on a good Greek Text (that of Erasmus) but, clearly recognized that Tyndale had made an excellent translation and they should stay very close to it. And they did.

William Tyndale was unusual in that he had two outstanding qualities: *First*, he was a master with languages. Few men in any generation

have had the mind for foreign languages that Tyndale did. *Second*, he was an extremely devoted child of God. The result was an exceptional, outstanding Bible translation!

Those who came after him recognized the fact and they kept their translations close to his.

Down through the centuries, the King James was updated in regard to spelling and obsolete words, but no other changes were made. We still had Tyndale’s version!

But then, in the late 19th century, all this changed. From 1870 down to our own time, men who were not as close to God, and who definitely did not have the foreign language ability of Tyndale, tried their hand at translating.

These modern translations fell into three categories:

1 - Translations which were conservative and attempted to remain closer to the King James.

2 - Translations which dared to be much more innovative in phrasing.

3 - Translations which were made specifically to support special doctrinal beliefs (*i.e.*, the Catholic and Jehovah’s Witnesses Bibles).

More on each of these later in this book.

It is for such reasons that we prefer to remain with the King James. It not only adheres to the Majority Text, but it has the phrasing Tyndale bequeathed to it.

When I read in a Bible or quote from one, I prefer to use the King James. I understand its value and I am aware of those places where, in order to prove an eternally burning hell, it incorrectly translates the text. I am at home with the King James.

But when I read in a modern version, I must continually be on guard to identify, not just the 5,000 Greek Text problems but the subtle phrasing errors placed there by the modern translators.

However, occasionally some of those variant phrasings are actually improvements over the King James phrasing! Neither you nor I know which ones they are, and we surely do not wish to occupy ourselves in trying to figure it out.

But Ellen White had no such qualms. She was a fully inspired prophet of God. The Lord had told her that she could go to the history books and extract information she could use in preparation of the *Great Controversy*.

She read in Milman, *The History of the Jews*; J.A. Wylie, *History of Protestantism*; Baras

Sears, *The Life of Luther*; John Lewis, *History of the Life and Sufferings of John Wiclif*; August Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and the Church*; or J.H. Merle D'Aubigne, *History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*; as well as other historical writings—and was always able to identify that which was true! You and I could not do that, but she could.

You will recall that, in the Garden of Eden, Adam and Eve had a light about them which helped them understand everything in nature, as they approached it. Ellen White had something similar, a divinely guided recognition of truth.

Not only did the Lord direct her to look in history books; He directed her to look in the modern Bible translations.

You might wonder why. There was a good reason for this. There are, indeed, some improvements, here and there, in the modern translations. But you and I do not know where they are. The Lord guided Ellen White to search out those improvements and quote them—so we could have them! What a blessing! Thank the Lord for everything in the Spirit of Prophecy, and reject none of it! It is all from God!

Many of these passages which she quoted from modern versions are taken from the Old Testament. There has been relatively little change in the Hebrew Text of the New Testament; whereas there has been more change in the Greek Text of the New Testament. She quoted from both the Old and the New Testaments in the modern versions—and consistently provided us with excellent help.

The present writer has carefully analyzed a great number of these modern-version quotations by Ellen White. In not one instance has he found that she quoted a bad one!

Later in this book, we will quote a lot of the verses which the modern versions have improperly translated. Some are based on our modern Greek Text while others are the result of foolish translations or efforts to inculcate doctrinal error. **We will show you many of those wrongly translated passages.**

But Ellen White never quotes them. She only quoted improved phrasings which were beneficial for us to know about.

The Lord had her do this in order to help us. We should praise Him for this blessing.

Having said this, are there instances in which

Ellen White did something unusual in her quotations—or lack of quotation—of the Scripture? As an inspired prophet, everything she did was significant. So this should be of interest to every Spirit of Prophecy student.

1 - Are there any instances in which Ellen White used concepts which are in the the original Greek, yet are not in the King James Bible (and which she did not quote from other versions)?

The present writer has been interested in this since his college years. Here are a few examples for your consideration:

*** The comma in Luke 23:43.** It is correct in only one other translation (Rotherham's), which was published in the late 19th century.

“And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise.”—*Luke 23:43, KJV.*

“I say unto thee Today, Thou shalt be with Me in paradise.”—*Desire of Ages, 751.*

There are no commas in the Greek text, so the translators made the verse agree with their theological beliefs.

There was no Bible in Ellen White's day which correctly translated *Luke 23:43*, so she stated it correctly. In doing so, she improved on the King James.

* Did Baalim go with the men? There is an error in the KJV translation of *Numbers 22:21*.

“And God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him, If the men come to call thee, rise up, and go with them; but yet the word which I shall say unto thee, that shalt thou do.

“And Balaam rose up in the morning, and saddled his ass, and went with the princes of Moab.”—*Numbers 22:20-21.*

The Lord told Balaam that if the men came for him the next morning, he could go with them; but otherwise he was not to go (verse 20). The next morning he went with them (verse 21); therefore why was the Lord angry with him and tried to slay him during the journey?

As usual, the Spirit of Prophecy explains the matter. Why?—because, if you are for this truth, the Spirit of Prophecy is more accurate than any Bible translation! Why? not because she is a superior prophet. We have her writings in the original lan-

guage; and these are more precisely detailed. Remember that she told us that some mistakes may have been made by the copyists. Therefore she clarifies the meaning of the Bible. Something else to be thankful for.

“Some look to us gravely and say, ‘Don’t you think there might have been some mistake in the copiest or in the translators?’ This is all probable.”—1 Selected Messages, p. 16.

In reality, the Bible does not say that the men came for him the next morning. So what is the solution? Simply this: Translate verse 21 as “went after” instead of “went with.” Now that makes sense—and it exactly fits the story, as related by Ellen White.

First, the Lord was angry with him (verse 22). *Second*, Baalam obviously made the journey with only his two servants (verses 22-34).

We would also need to change the translation of the prepositions in verse 35: “Go after the men” and “went after the princes.” The entire problem is just a mistranslation of three prepositions.

As usual, the Holy Spirit explains the matter. Read *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 438-443. The men never came to him the next morning; instead, they left before he could go with them. That fully explains *Numbers 22:20-22*.

*** Did Joseph tell his brothers a lie? Genesis 46:34 and 47:3 indicate that Joseph told his brethren to lie to Pharaoh. He told them to tell Pharaoh they were cattlemen, but they told Pharaoh the truth.**

Patriarchs and Prophets, 233:2 explains that Joseph told them to tell Pharaoh they were shepherds, so he would not want to hire the brothers and they could remain with their own people. The word “cattle,” in 46:34, should be translated “sheep.”

“According to Holladay, the Hebrew word, translated “cattle” in *Genesis 46:34*, can be translated “flock” or “movable property” (*William L. Holladay, Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, p. 320).

According to Davidson, that word can be translated riches, possessions, wealth; generally cattle, animals requiring pasturage (*B.*

Davidson, Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, p. DCLXII).

2 - Are there instances in which Ellen White did not use any translation available to her, including the King James, because they were all incorrect?

Here is an example:

*** John 20:17a. “Jesus saith unto her, Touch Me not.”**

The rest of the verse (which she quotes), says, “for I am not yet ascended to My Father.”

At times, Ellen White quotes the last part of that (“I am not yet ascended to My Father”; *DA 790*), but the only time she quotes the first three words (“detain Me not”) is very early in her ministry (*3SP 202-203, quoted in 5BC 1150*). While writing *Desire of Ages*, the Lord taught her the correct meaning, which she wrote down:

“Springing toward Him, as if to embrace His feet, she said, ‘Rabboni.’ But Christ raised His hand, saying, Detain Me not; ‘for I am not yet ascended to My Father; but go . . . [rest of verse is quoted].—*Desire of Ages*, 790.

Christ’s concern was not that she not touch His feet, but that she not detain Him—for He had to make a trip all the way to heaven and back that same day!

Jesus said to her, “*Me mou haptou* (not Me touch), for I have not yet ascended . . .” In the middle tense, it can mean “detain.” Ellen White accurately used a Greek idiom, without ever having studied Greek! Ironically, many scholarly Greek students mistranslate the sentence, because they do not have a clear understanding of how the verb can be translated.

3 - Can you cite an example where Ellen White uses the Majority Test family of manuscripts, when the Neutral Text had something distinctly different?

*** John 7:53-8:11. The story of the woman taken in adultery is not in the body of the modern Greek Text. But Ellen White clearly states that it actually occurred (*Desire of Ages*, pp. 460-462). In his Greek Text, Von Soden commented: “In the great majority of the manuscripts it stands in the text,” therefore he left it in his. But, since it was not in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, it was left out of the Westcott-Hort Test and Nestle Text.**

*** Revelation 22:14.** This very important verse has been changed in the Neutral Text, and therefore in most modern translations.

“Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.”—KJV.

“Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to the tree of life and that they may enter the city by the gates.”—RSV; the footnote reads: “Other ancient authorities read do his commandments.”

Ellen White properly quotes this, as it is found in the KJV, innumerable times.

There are interesting aspects to this variant:

First, it is clearly a doctrinal issue, and antinomians would be glad to see the “commandments” taken out of the verse.

Second, the variant is quite Biblical; for there are two other verses in Revelation which says something similar:

“Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood.”—Revelation 1:5b (KJV).

“These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the lamb.”—Revelation 7:14b (KJV).

Third, it is an intriguing fact that the alternatives in Revelation 22:14 rhyme in the Greek!

“Blessed are those doing the commandments His.”
/ Makarioi oi poiountes tas entolas autou.

“Blessed are those washing the robes His.”

/ Makarioi oi pluntes tas stolas auton.

It is very possible that a copyist became confused, due to the similar sound, and he substituted something like the earlier two verses in Revelation.

Many other examples could be cited where Ellen White used a Majority Text family of manuscripts, when the Neutral Text had something distinctly different.

4 - Can you give an example when Ellen White used a modern Greek Text reading, in addition to the reading in the Majority Text?

*** John 5:39.** The key point to this verse is that we should “search the Scriptures.” Regarding that point, Ellen White quotes the KJV of John 5:39 about 50 times.

But the historical context of that verse is the fact

that Jesus was telling His accusers that, although they were searching the Scriptures, they would not come to Him that they might have life. Ellen White explains this fact in *Desire of Ages*, p. 211:4, where she quotes the RV (today known as the ERV):

“Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of Me.”—John 5:39 (ERV).

She also quotes the ERV of this verse in *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 367.

5 - Is there an example when she quoted a modern text reading and never quoted the Majority Text?

*** One example, found while preparing this book, is Mark 9:44, 46: “Where their worm dieth and the fire is not quenched” (KJV).**

That phrase, repeated three times in three verses, is omitted each time in the non-Majority Texts. She never quotes these phrases, although she quotes some near them (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 312-313, and *Desire of Ages*, p. 438).

Checking further into this, we discover that this omitted phrase is found nowhere else in the New Testament. The phrase implies that the fire is not quenched and the worms eating their bodies (living?) do not cease their action.

But the phrase comes from *Isaiah 66:24*; it is there speaking about “carcasses” (KJV) or “dead bodies” (RSV). In that passage the wicked are already dead and the remembrance of them may always exist, but the wicked are not still alive.

6 - Is there an example where she referred to a concept in a modern text reading, without quoting it?

*** John 5:3-4.** This verse is omitted from the modern Greek Texts and many modern versions.

“. . . waiting for the moving of the water. 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.”—John 5:3b-4 (KJV).

This is obviously a strange passage which has something wrong with it. Angels do not stand around, jumping into pools every so often. In *Desire of Ages*, p. 201, she does not deny that the people were waiting for the waters to move (thus certifying that John 5:3b belongs there),

but she explains that the idea of an angel troubling the waters was a superstition.

• **2 Timothy 3:16.** There are two possible readings of this verse:

All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for . . .—*2 Timothy 3:16 (KJV).*

Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for . . .—*2 Timothy 3:16, RSV, footnote.*

If we assume that “*Scripture*” means the *Bible writings*, then there is no question: All Scripture is inspired of God!

But the Greek word used here means “writings,” not “Bible.” *We would not want to say, All writings are inspired by God.*

In the previous verse (3:15), Scripture is defined as those writings that are holy; *i.e.*, inspired by God. Based on that, verse 16 is well-translated as “All Scripture is inspired by God.”

However, we should keep both possible translations in mind; since a Catholic could say that

this verse proves that the Apocrypha in his Bible is also inspired, since it is included in his copy of the Scriptures!

How did Ellen White handle *2 Timothy 3:16*: In at least 66 instances, she translated it in the usual pattern. But in *Great Controversy*, p. v, she left room for the other concept:

“The Bible points to God as its author; yet it was written by human hands . . . The truths revealed are all ‘given by Inspiration of God.’ ”

For this reason, the 3-volume *Index* lists that passage as quoting the Revised Version (although it is not directly quoting it).

7 - Is there an example where she did not quote a verse which also happens to be omitted from the modern text?

• **Romans 14:6.** “And he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it” is omitted in the RSV and most other modern texts. Ellen White does not quote it either.

Later postscript to this chapter: Earlier in this chapter, I mentioned that, along with some others, the Bible truth about hellfire is incorrectly translated. This quotation may help explain this:

“I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible; yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that they were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was

plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition. But I saw that the Word of God, as a whole, is a perfect chain, one portion linking into and explaining another. True seekers for truth need not err, for not only is the Word of God plain and simple in declaring the way of life, but the Holy Spirit is given as a guide in understanding the way to life therein revealed.”—*Story of Redemption, 391.*

“To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them.”

—*Isaiah 8:20*

“Neither have I gone back from the commandment of His lips; I have esteemed the words of His mouth more than my necessary food.”

—*Job 23:12-13*

Most Frequently Used Modern Versions

The Translators Follow the New Critical Texts

INFERIOR TRANSLATIONS

The new translations lack the accuracy, majestic cadence, and delicate balance of the King James.

"T.S. Elliot, famous American writer, described one new version as an 'example of the decadence of the English language in the middle of the twentieth century.'"—*G.A. Riplinger, New Age Bible Versions, p. 212.*

Here are two rather shocking examples of what you can find in the new versions:

"Perhaps he is talking to someone or else is out sitting on the toilet."—*1 Kings 18:27, Living Bible.*

"And if someone asks, then, what are these scars on your chest and your back? he will say, I got into a brawl at the home of a friend!"—*Zechariah 13:6, Living Bible.*

We even find an invitation to swearing in Phillips: "For God's sake" (*Mark 5:7*), "To hell, with you and your money" (*Acts 8:19*), "May he be damned" and "be a damned soul" (*Gal. 1:9*).

Do you want your children reading such a Bible?

The present writer would also like to call your attention to another flaw in nearly all of the modern versions: They replace "Thee," "Thou," "Thine," when referring to Jesus or God, with "you" and "your." The terms of deepest respect and reverence for the Godhead are replaced by the commonplace "you" and "your." This alone greatly reduces the value of the modern Bibles.

BASED ON WESTCOTT AND HORT

Here is evidence that all the modern versions are based on the erroneous theories of Westcott and Hort.

John R. Kohlenberger, spokesperson for Zondervan (publisher of the NASV, Living Bible, Amplified Bible, NIV, and RSV), is author of *A*

Hebrew NIV Interlinear, as well as *Words about the Word: A Guide to Choosing and Using Your Bible*. He tells us this:

"Westcott and Hort . . . All subsequent versions from the Revised Version (1881) to those of the present . . . have adopted their basic approach . . . [and] accepted the Westcott and Hort Text."—*John R. Kohlenberger, Words about the Word, p. 42.*

Kohlenberger goes on to praise Westcott's *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*, saying, "This century old classic remains a standard" (*op. cit., p. 34*).

Baker Book House, publisher of half-a-dozen modern translations, also prints a Bible selection guide entitled, *The King James Version Debate*. The author makes this admission:

"The theories of Westcott and Hort . . . [are] almost universally accepted today . . . It is on this basis that Bible translators since 1881 have, as compared with the King James Version, left out some things and added a few others. Subsequent textual critical work accepted the theories of Westcott and Hort. The vast majority of evangelical scholars . . . hold that the basic textual theories of Westcott and Hort were right and the church stands greatly in their debt."—*D.A. Carson, The King James Version Debate, pp. 41, 75.*

Dr. Edward Hills, a Princeton and Harvard scholar, declares that the "New International Version . . . follows the critical Westcott and Hort Text" (*E.F. Hills, The King James Version Defended, p. 29*).

Even abbreviated histories of the canon, in reference works like *Young's Concordance* and *Halley's Bible Handbook* agree:

"The New Testament Westcott and Hort Greek texts, which, in the main, are the exact original Bible words."—*Henry H. Halley, Halley's Handbook of the Bible, p. 747.*

Greenlee adds this:

"The textual theories of Westcott and Hort

underlies virtually all subsequent work in New Testament textual criticism.”—*J.H. Greenlee, Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism, p. 78.*

Scholarly books, articles, and critical editions of the Greek New Testament are slowly abandoning the readings of Westcott and Hort in their ‘newest’ Greek texts, yet the homes of Christians are filled with Westcott-Hort based Bibles.

Philip Comfort’s recent book concedes:

“But textual critics have not been able to advance beyond Hort in formalizing a theory . . . this has troubled certain textual scholars.”—*Philip W. Comfort, Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament, p. 21.*

Wilbur Pickering says:

“The dead hand of Fenton John Anthony Hort lies heavy upon us. The two most popular manual editions of the Greek Text today, Nestle-Aland and UBS, really vary little from the Westcott-Hort Text. Why is this? Westcott and Hort are generally credited with having furnished the death blow [to the KJV and the Majority Greek Text].

“Subsequent scholarship has tended to recognize Hort’s mistake. The Westcott-Hort critical theory is erroneous at every point. Our conclusions concerning the theory apply also to any Greek text constructed on the basis of it [Nestle’s-Aland, UBS etc.], as well as those versions based on such texts.”—*Wilbur N. Pickering, The Identity of the New Testament Text, pp. 38, 42, 96, 90.*

H.C. Hoskier, a scholar who authored *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelism and Codex B and Its Allies—A Study and an Indictment*, wrote this:

“The text printed by Westcott and Hort has been accepted as ‘the true text,’ and grammars, works on the synoptic problem, works on higher criticism, and others have been grounded on this text . . . These foundations must be demolished.”—*Hoskier, Codex B and Its Allies, p. 72.*

Alfred Martin (former Vice President of Moody Bible Institute in Chicago) said this in a speech:

“Many people, even today, who have no idea what the Westcott-Hort theory is . . . accept the labors of those two scholars without question . . . An amusing and amazing spectacle presents itself: many of the textbooks, books of Bible interpretation, innumerable secondary works go on repeating the Westcott and Hort dicta although the foundations have been seriously shaken, even in the opinion of former Hortians.” **It is astounding that modern translators rely on the theories devised by F.J.A. Hort, theo-**

ries which require a deep understanding of early church history—when the man admitted he knew little of such things!

“I am afraid I must have talked big and misled you when you were here, for I really know very little of Church History.”—*Hort, Vol. 1, p. 233.*

THE MEN APPOINTED TO THE TRANSLATION COMMITTEES

Who are the men selected to serve on committees, assigned to prepare a modern Bible translation?

They are selected, not so much for their careful grasp of Biblical languages, but in order to show a broad representation of denominations represented on the committee.

This is done in order to increase the later sale of the books. Those chosen may be Greek grammarians; but most are, in no sense, eminent paleographers, papyrologists, codicologists, historians—or, most importantly, earnest Christians.

The editors of the new versions do not have a background of endless hours spent in pouring over the ancient manuscripts, as did Scrivener, Burgon, Colwell, Hoskier, and scores of others. **In fact, as committee member Lewis Foster admits, they are not involved with actual manuscripts or facsimiles at all!**

“The New Testament translators may choose to differ from the decision founded in the Greek text he is using [the Nestle-Aland Text or the UBS Text], but he does not deal with the manuscripts themselves. He works indirectly through the use of the modern Greek Text.”—*Foster, quoted in Selecting a Translation of the Bible, pp. 14-15.*

The translators work with a single critical Greek Text, either Nestle-Aland or the UBS Text (both of which are produced by the same three men, based on the Westcott-Hort Text, and therefore are essentially identical). In addition, they peek at other modern translations, to see what they did with the passage under discussion.

Working from a single Greek Text reduces the hundreds of thousands of variant readings in the Greek manuscripts to a ‘manageable’ 5,500 or so variants. —How very important it is, then, that the Greek Text be a good one!

Sales are the important thing; and the subsidizing book companies recall what happened when the Revised Standard Version came off the

press—and the beliefs of its translators were exposed to public view. So the publisher may choose to not reveal the name of each person on the translation team.

The committee list which prepared the New American Standard Bible remained a closely guarded secret for over 30 years, lest conservative Christians catch a glimpse of the liberal membership. (However, its leader, Dr. Frank Logsdon, has renounced his participation. At numerous speaking engagements he denounces his part in what he now perceives to be a heretical version. “I may be in trouble with God” because of it, he confesses.)

THE FOUR TYPES OF MODERN BIBLES

Every modern Bible falls into the category of one or the other of the following four patterns:

1 - The conservative revisions. These are Bibles which have sought to remain somewhat close to the King James pattern, yet which have still followed the Nestle-Aland or UBS Greek Text. Of these, the New American Standard Version has veered closer to the Majority Text than have the others.

2 - The paraphrases. These are Bibles designed to read like a novel. Because of this, they are the most dangerous modern translations of all. Their authors (the men really were not “translators”) took great liberties with the meaning of the text, in order to make everything flow well and be interesting, even exciting.

3 - The Doctrinal error translations. These also include doctrinal error; but the error was deliberately inserted, to favor the teachings of a certain denomination.

4 - The rest of the modern versions vary in competence; but, as with the others, they adhere to the Westcott-Hort theory.

We will now deal with each of these four types, one at a time:

For the remainder of this section, we will discuss the most significant or frequently used 20th-century translations of the last half of the 20th-century.

THE ENGLISH REVISED VERSION (ERV) [RV] (1881, 1885) AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION (ASV) [ARV] (1901)

The original names for these two translations were the Revised Version (RV) and American Revised Version (ARV). But, in later years, scholars changed their names to English Revised Version (ERV) and American Standard Version (ASV). In order to simplify the situation, in this book we use their current names.

Because the two are nearly identical, we will discuss them together.

The English Revised Version (ERV) [RV]—This is the revision that we earlier discussed, when we talked about Westcott and Hort. The New Testament was completed in 1881, and the Old Testament in 1885.

The American Standard Version (ASV) [ARV]—In 1901, an American committee made a few (not many) changes and published it under the name, American Revised Version (ARV).

These two revised versions sought to render a given word in the original by the same English word consistently, regardless of its context. It was their view that faithfulness to the original demanded a meticulous word-by-word translation. **They attempted a precise rendering of the tenses and the articles. Often in the New Testament they even followed the order of the Greek words rather than the word order that is natural to English.** The result is that both these versions are stiff, pedantic, and unidiomatic. They lack the free literary charm of the KJV.

These versions also used archaic words which no one understood. Here are a few examples:

“The Holy Spirit testifieth . . . that bonds and afflictions *abide* me.”—*Acts 20:23*.

“Come, and I will *advertise* thee what this people shall do to thy people in the latter days.”—*Numbers 24:14*.

“And all they that cast *angle* into the Nile shall mourn.”—*Isaiah 19:8*.

“Their own doings *beset* them about.”—*Hosea 7:2*.

“Though thou shouldest *bray* a fool in a mortar with a pestle.”—*Proverbs 27:22*.

“But *doting* about questionings and disputes of words.”—*1 Timothy 6:4*.

TWO MODERN REVISIONS

The two translations in the 20th century which are most conservative (that is, the most like the King James Version and Tyndale) are the Revised Standard Version (RSV) and the New American Standard Version (NASV). The latter is sometimes called the New American Standard Bible (NASB).

That may come as a surprise to you, but it is true.

We are not recommending that you read these versions; but we want you to know that, of all those produced in the 20th century, they are the safest. This is due to the fact that **they have the smallest amount of paraphrase.** The RSV and NASV do not take liberties with the text the way that Phillips, the New English Bible (NEB), and the Living Bible (LB) do.

The above paragraph may sound like heresy; yet it is true. The RSV and NASV are the safest two modern translations. This is because **they read so clearly and are so similar to the KJV, that it is much, much easier to see the errors in them than it is in the other modern versions.**

However, as we have repeatedly told you, these two translations, like all the others, are based on the Nestle-Aland / UBS Greek Texts; so these will have the errors in those Texts which are based on the Minority Texts.

Therefore we do not recommend that you read either the RSV or the NASV. Stay with the KJV, and you will do best. But, if you ever need to refer to a modern version for some reason or other, the RSV and NASV are the two which will most closely match the text of the KJV. For this reason, it will be easier to see their flaws than in the paraphrastic (paraphrase) translations, such as the Phillips and Living Bible.

In case you some day have a relative who absolutely demands a modern version, buy them one of these.

Of the two, the New American Standard Version is the nearest to the Tyndale-King James pattern. (But, as you will read shortly, the NASV has its flaws too!)

For your information, there is a technical term used by Bible translators. Those modern Bibles which attempted to remain close to the pattern of the King James are called "versions." The rest are called "translations." We have not

used that nomenclature in this book, but this is why only a few Bibles are called "versions."

Later in this book, we will list many of the outstanding errors in the Revised Standard Version and the New American Standard Version.

THE CONSERVATIVE BIBLES

First, we will examine those translations which especially tried to remain close to the Tyndale / King James pattern.

REVISED STANDARD VERSION (RSV)

In the preface to the Revised Standard Version, we read this:

"Yet the King James Version has grave defects. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the development of Biblical studies and the discovery of many manuscripts, more ancient than those upon which the King James Version was based, made it manifest that these defects are so many and so serious as to call for revision of the English translation . . . The King James Version of the New Testament was based upon a Greek text that was marred by mistakes, containing the accumulated errors of fourteen centuries of manuscript copying . . . We now possess many more ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, and are far better equipped to seek to recover the original wording of the Greek text."—*Preface, Revised Standard Version.*

Well, that tells you about their prejudices!

Here is the historical background of the Revised Standard Version:

The copyright of the 1901 ASV (ARV), which had been held by Thomas Nelson and Sons, was transferred in 1928 to the International Council of Religious Education. This body is an association of the educational boards of forty major Protestant denominations of the U.S. and Canada. It was an ecumenical organization. (Later it became the Division of Christian Education, an agency in the National Council of Churches [NCC], based in New York City. We will encounter it again when we discuss the RSV Apocrypha. It is not commonly known that a subsidiary of the notorious NCC holds the copyright to the RSV!)

This council renewed the copyright that year and established an American Standard Bible Committee of scholars to be the custodian of the text of the ASV, with authority to undertake further revisions as deemed advisable. In 1937, the

International Council of Religious Education voted to authorize a new revision, specifying that it should only be a revision of the ASV which should seek to maintain the simple beauty of the KJV.

“There is need for a version which embodies the best results of modern scholarship as to the meaning of the Scriptures, and expresses this meaning in English diction which is designed for use in public and private worship and preserves those qualities which have given to the King James Version a supreme place in English literature. We therefore define the task of the American Standard Bible Committee to be that of the revision of the present American Standard Bible, in the light of the results of modern scholarship, this revision to be designed for use in public and private worship, and to be in the direction of the simple, classic English style of the King James Version.”—*1937 Action of the International Council of Religious Education.*

The revision committee had 32 scholars, plus an advisory board of 50 representatives of cooperating denominations. The committee was divided into two sections: one dealing with the New Testament.

The RSV New Testament was published in February, 1946; and the Old Testament was published in 1952.

The translators said they tried to avoid a slavish devotion to the Westcott-Hort Text and theory. One of the New Testament translators, F.C. Grant, wrote this:

“With the best will in the world, the New Testament translator or reviser of today is forced to adopt the eclectic principle: each variant reading must be studied on its merits, and cannot be adopted or rejected by some rule of thumb, or by adherence to such a theory as that of the ‘Neutral Text.’ It is this eclectic principle that has guided us in the present Revision. The Greek text of this Revision is not that of Westcott-Hort, or Nestle, or Souter; though the readings we have adopted will as a rule, be found either in the text or the margin of the new (17th) edition of Nestle (Stuttgart, 1941).”—*An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, p. 41.*

In thirteen passages, in Isaiah, readings were adopted from the newly discovered Isaiah scroll of the Qumran library. In seven of the thirteen instances the reading has the support of one or more of the ancient versions (*Isa. 14:30; 15:9; 45:2; 49:24; 51:19; 56:12; 60:19*), such

as the Greek, Syriac, Latin, and Aramaic Targums. Numerous other readings, supported by one or more of these versions or (for the Pentateuch) the Samaritan recension, were also accepted. Several substantial additions to the text in various places were thus made. For example, “Let us go out to the field” is inserted in Genesis 4:8, and “Why have you stolen my silver cup?” in *Genesis 44:4*. In *Judges 16:13-14*, the revisers restored some fifteen words from the Greek which they felt had dropped out of the Hebrew text. Substantial material was also added to the traditional text of *1 Samuel 10:1* and *14:41*.

More than any other 20th-century translation (with the exception of the NASV), the RSV tried to preserve the best of the earlier versions while at the same time substituting modern English for antiquated language. But it tended to still conform to the general pattern and, frequently, the exact wording of Tyndale’s version of the 16th century. The revisers strove for simplicity yet dignity in rendering. But they omitted the “Thee” and “Thine” which made the KJV so much more reverent.

The text of prose passages in the RSV is arranged in sense paragraphs, as in the ASV, instead of being broken up into separate verses as in the KJV.

Poetic passages are printed in poetic form. The metrical nature of ancient Semitic poetry is better understood today than it was when the KJV was produced. One of its characteristics is accentual meter. This means that each line contains a certain number of accents or beats. A more striking characteristic is its parallelism of members. The basic unit of Hebrew poetry is a line followed by a second (or, at times, by a third), which complements it by restating it (*synonymous parallelism*), contrasting with it (*antithetic parallelism*), or further developing or completing it (*synthetic or step parallelism*).

The RSV tried to reproduce the accentual meter in its renderings and arrange the lines in couplets or triplets. In addition, it tried to arrange the poetic passages in stanzas. Approximately 40 percent of the Old Testament is in poetic form. This includes not only the poetic books—Job, Psalms, Proverbs, parts of Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, and Lamentations—but major portions of many of the prophetic books as well. In addition, there are poetic passages in the Pentateuch and the historical books.

Regarding the *tetragrammaton*, the ineffable

divine name, the RSV returned to the practice of the KJV, in rendering it LORD (or, under certain circumstances, GOD). This harmonized with the long-established synagogue practice of reading the letters YHWH as *Adonai*, meaning "Lord," as well as the Septuagint Greek rendering of *Kyrios* (Lord), and the Vulgate of *Dominus*.

The RSV translates *sheol* (the grave) as "sheol" (instead of "hell," as in the KJV). Frankly, this is a genuine improvement over the KJV. When people die, they go to sheol, the grave, not to a burning hell.

Later in this book, we will list a number of the outstanding errors in the Revised Standard Version.

CHANGES IN LATER EDITIONS OF THE REVISED STANDARD VERSION

Gradually, the publishing firms discovered that sales figures were more important than the Westcott and Hort theories. In order to increase the sales, **after the initial publication of the RSV in 1952, pressure was brought to bear on the permanent RSV Bible Committee to consider making some changes which would make the version more acceptable to the public.**

The RSV Bible Committee is a continuing committee, with authority to make revisions in the text of the RSV when it is deemed advisable.

A number of changes were made in the text in 1959, as the result of criticisms and suggestions from various readers. These include changing the rendering "married only once" (*1 Tim. 3:2, 12; 5:9*) to "the husband of one wife." In *Job 19:26*, "without my flesh I shall see God" was changed to "from my flesh I shall see God." "Bread," in *Matthew 7:9* and *1 Corinthians 10:17* is changed to "loaf." The Roman Centurion's exclamation is now given as in the KJV: "Truly this was the Son of God!" not "a son of God" as previously (*Matt. 27:54; Mark 15:39*). The translation of *1 Corinthians 15:19* and *John 16:23* was also improved.

The second edition of the RSV New Testament was copyrighted in 1971. Additional suggestions and criticisms from individuals and from two denominational committees were received. So a few more changes in the underlying Greek text were made. The most conspicuous of these was the restoration to the text of two notable passages previously given only in footnotes:

the longer ending of *Mark 16:9-20* and the story of the woman taken in adultery (*John 7:53-8:11*). The blank space separating them from the rest of the text called attention to them; and comments are made in footnotes. Two passages in Luke were also restored to the text (*Luke 22:19b-20; 24:5*) while another (*Luke 22:43-44*) was removed and placed as a footnote. New notes calling attention to significant textual variations in manuscripts were added in a few places (e.g., *Matt. 9:34; Mark 3:16; 7:4; Luke 24:32, 51*).

For improved clarity, a number of changes in the wording were also made. In *2 Corinthians 3:5-6*, "competent" and "competence" are substituted for "sufficient" and "sufficiency." In *Matthew 12:1* "heads of grain" replaces the British "ears of grain." "Move from here to there" (*Matt. 17:20*) replaces "Move hence to yonder place."

NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION (NASV)

The Lockman Foundation has produced two translations: the Amplified New Testament and the New American Standard Bible (NASV). It is a nonprofit Christian corporation formed in 1942 in La Habra, California, to promote Bible translation in several languages.

The NASV New Testament was published in 1963 and the entire Bible in 1971. Its Preface stated that its objective was to remain as close to the KJV and its simplicity as possible. The NASV sought to avoid the word-for-word literalness of the ASV and to return to the pattern in the Tyndale / KJV translations.

Sixteen men worked on each Testament. As is always done in the 20th century, the Nestle Greek Text was followed in the New Testament.

In Matthew, the doxology of the Lord's Prayer (*16:13*) and two whole verses (*18:11; 23:14*) are printed in brackets in the main text; whereas they are only found in footnotes in both the ASV and the Nestle Greek Text. Contrary to Nestle, *Luke 24:12* is printed in the text, but also in brackets. The NASV also follows the ASV, contrary to Nestle, in printing the "Long Ending" of Mark in the text (*16:9-20*) in brackets, as well as the "Shorter Ending" in italics with the title "Addition." It also has in brackets, in the text, the story of the woman in adultery (*John 7:53-8:11*). For examples of other differences from the text of the ASV, see *Mark 1:29; 2:4, 16; 6:14;*

7:4, 24; 12:33; Luke 9:2, 9; 10:42; 24:36, 40; John 8:16; 10:18; 13:32; 15:8.

There is only one column of text on each page. Each verse, like the KJV, is printed as a separate unit. Paragraphs are designated by bold-face numbers. Except in language addressed to Deity, the use of “thou,” “thee,” and “thy” has been replaced by “you” and “your.”

However, there is one redeeming feature: Personal pronouns referring to God the Father, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit begin with a capital letter. This is true when they refer to Jesus Christ, irrespective of the speaker’s attitude toward Him (e.g., the mob: *Matt. 26:68, 27:22*; Herod: *Matt. 2:8*; the high priest: *Matt. 26:63*; Pilate: *Matt. 27:11-14, et al.*).

Like the RSV, the NASV translates the place of the dead (sheol, the grave) as “sheol” (instead of “hell,” as in the KJV). That is very helpful.

Like the RSV, the NASV has gone back to the ancient practice of translating YHWH as LORD or sometimes as GOD.

The corresponding term in the New Testament, “hades,” is likewise transliterated as “Gehenna”; however, it is translated as “hell” (*Matt. 5:22, 29-30; 10:28, et al.*) or “the eternal fire” (*Matt. 18:9*).

The NASV retains the practice, begun in the Geneva Bible and continued through the KJV and ASV, of printing in italics words for which there are no exact equivalents in the original but which have been added to make the translation conform to English idiom.

The NASV tends to be a literal, very readable, translation of the Bible. In the New Testament, it is based on the Nestle Greek Text—but that text has been considerably modified in the direction of the Textus Receptus, which the KJV is based on. A number of verses resting on the Majority Text have been reintroduced into the text from the margin. The translators apparently hesitated to follow the Nestle Text too closely. **The NASV is thus closer to the KJV and its Majority Text than any other 20th-century translation.**

In the Old Testament, the traditional Hebrew text is only occasionally modified by readings from Hebrew manuscripts and ancient versions. But the version does represent an honest attempt to be faithful to the Hebrew text and to the adopted Greek readings. It tries to give an accurate literal rendering of the Hebrew and Greek.

But, in the Old Testament, the NASV is not

as readable as in the New. This is due to the fact that the Hebrew is often difficult to understand (because it says things so briefly). For this reason, **any version which translates the Old Testament very smoothly—is adding conjectures in order to do this.**

All in all, because it is the closest to the Majority Text and the KJV, the NASV is a far better study Bible than any other published in the 20th century—that is, if you want to read any Bible produced in the 20th century.

NEW KING JAMES VERSION (NKJV)

This version demands special attention—since it is not what it purports to be.

There was a need for a King James Version which modernized a few words, and nothing else. This particular Bible was supposed to do that—but has turned out to be partially based on the Nestle Text!

This makes the NKJV something of a fraud. ***How can a Bible dare to call itself “King James,” when it has Westcott and Hort errors in it?***

The New Testament was published in 1979 and the Old in 1982. Advertising for it showed a page from an original 1611 KJV with the comment that, since our current KJV is “just a revision,” you will just love this new revision!

“People trust the King James. It’s the Bible for all who love God’s Word. Since 1611, four major editions of the KJV have been published. And now Thomas Nelson—the world’s leading Bible publisher—is pleased to present the fifth major edition of this magnificent translation, the New King James Version.”—*Ad for New King James Version.*

The problem is that Thomas Nelson believes the “original language” is closer to the Nestle Text than it is to Erasmus’ Text.

“Every word of the New King James Version has been checked against the original in light of increasing knowledge about the Greek and Hebrew languages. Nothing has been changed except to make the original meaning clearer.”—*Ad in Moody Monthly, June 1982.*

In 774 instances, two alternative Greek readings are given, one in the text and the other in footnotes. Even the “-eth” and “-est” (loveth, lovest) have been removed.

THE PARAPHRASE BIBLES

The Bibles we have already discussed tend to be conservative; that is, they follow more closely to the King James pattern while also including Westcott-Hort errors in them.

Now we turn our attention to the paraphrases. These are the worst Bibles of all!

The paraphrased translations (also called paraphrastics) are prepared very differently than all earlier Bibles. These Bibles primarily read like an exciting novel. —And this makes them extremely dangerous.

The two worst are Phillips and the Living Bible; but most of the others, in the last half of the 20th century, tend toward the paraphrase. The reason is simple enough: They sell better.

PHILLIPS

J.B. Phillips had little training or competence in Biblical languages. In fact, he did not find it necessary to even bother much with a Greek Text. His translation is the result.

Phillips was a pastor who wanted to help a London youth group understand the Bible better. So he translated Colossians and read it to them. One day, he sent a copy of it to C.S. Lewis (the well-known author of Christian fairy tales), who encouraged him to go on. While smoking his pipe, Lewis wrote Phillips: "It's like seeing an old picture that's been cleaned. Why don't you go on and do the lot?"

So Phillips kept working till his *Letters to Young Churches* (Pauline Epistles) was published in 1947.

It was a sensation, and people from all over the world encouraged him to go on and do the Gospels. He was reluctant to do this, since people might object to his paraphrasing the actual words of Jesus. But few seemed to care for his lack of concern about what the manuscripts said. Indeed, there is a question whether Phillips knew much Greek or bothered with any Greek Text at all! **The entire New Testament was published in 1958, Four Prophets in 1963, and the revised New Testament in 1973.**

The great popularity of this version lies in its freshness of style and its readability. The New Testament reads as if it were originally written in 20th-century English. It does not read like a translation at all. Phillips' success is due to the care he took in avoiding "translator's English" and in trying out his translation with his friends.

"For myself I have taken the bold step of trying to imagine myself as the original writer, whether he be the careful and precise Matthew, the sturdy, blunt Mark, the sympathetic, understanding Luke, or the more profound and mystically inclined John."—*Phillips, Bible Translator, IV, (1953), p. 55.*

"Greet . . . with a holy kiss" becomes "shake hands." "Sandals" becomes "shoes." "Girding one's loins" becomes "tighten one's belt."

The book has paragraphs with section headings; so it is almost impossible to find a specific verse, since only the first verse in a paragraph is numbered.

In the revised edition, no verse numbers appear at all, making it even more difficult to check anything.

The most famous verse in Phillips' translation is this one:

"Don't let the world around you squeeze you into its own mold, but let God remold your minds from within."—*Romans 12:2.*

The problem is that Phillips is just too free to toss in words and move things around—so everything will sound just fine.

Phillips translates *Matthew 6:2*, "Don't hire a trumpeter"; the Greek simply says, "Sound no trumpet." The idea that someone else is to do the trumpeting for the one who gives alms is not stated; therefore it should not have been translated in the above manner.

"Brush your hair" instead of "anoint your head" (*Matt. 6:17*). (But in the later edition, Phillips went back to "anoint your head.")

Phillips adds "comfortably" in *Matthew 15:35*, but the Greek original does not have this word. In *Matthew 16:18*, Phillips adds "the rock" after Peter.

The forcefulness of Jesus' expression, "Because of the hardness of your hardness of hearts . . ." is lost by Phillips': "It was because you knew so little of the meaning of love" (*Matt. 19:8*).

"Spoils your faith" for "causes you to sin" (*Mark 9:42*).

"Rubbish heap" (*Mark 9:43*) for "hell" (*gehenna*).

"Don't bully people" instead of "Do violence to no man" (*Luke 3:14*).

"Practical and spiritually minded" instead of "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom" (*Acts 6:3*).

Romans 16:16 is translated, "Give one another a hearty handshake all round for my sake [in Christian love]."

“For Christ means the end of the struggle for righteousness-by-the-Law” (*Rom. 10:4*).

In the book of Romans, *Romans 3:31* stands out as a bulwark, proclaiming the importance of obeying the law of God. You will find it in most modern versions, but Phillips manages to twist it into something quite different. He “puts the law into its proper place” as something not worth bothering with.

Phillips surely can add to the text. Compare *Luke 7:33-34* in your KJV with this:

“For John the Baptist came in the strictest austerity and you say he is crazy. Then the Son of Man came, enjoying life [food and drink], and you say, ‘Look, a drunkard and a glutton, a bosom friend of the tax collector and the outsider!’—*Luke 7:33-34 (Phillips)*.

We even find an invitation to swearing: “For God’s sake” (*Mark 5:7*), “To hell, with you and your money” (*Acts 8:19*), “May he be damned” and “be a damned soul” (*Gal. 1:9*).

At the urging of many, J.B. Phillips turned his translational skill to a portion of the Old Testament (*Amos, Hosea, Isaiah 1-35, and Micah, arranged in that order*).

Hebrew is concrete rather than abstract; so Phillips plays with the words in order to put there something that the text does not have.

“The starry universe” in place of “the seven stars and Orion” (*Amos 5:8*).

“The words of Amos . . . which he saw concerning Israel” becomes “These are the words of Amos when he saw the truth about Israel” (*Amos 1:1*).

“For three transgressions . . . and for four” becomes “Because of outrage after outrage” (*Amos 1:3*).

“The Lord said to Hosea” becomes “While Hosea was waiting . . .” (*Hosea 1:2*).

“For she gathered it of the hire of an harlot, and they shall return to the hire of an harlot” becomes simply “For the price of her unfaithfulness pays for her betrayal!” (*Micah 1:7*).

If you are looking for an accurate translation, you will not be happy with Phillips’ production. It was not intended to be used for study purposes. He turns the Bible into something akin to a fiction novel.

LIVING BIBLE (LB) (Taylor)

Kenneth Nathaniel Taylor was another Christian who, having little background in Bib-

lical languages, started writing paraphrases of the Bible—which then became wildly popular.

Taylor lived in Wheaton, Illinois, and would spend a little time, after the day’s work, rephrasing Scripture as he had evening worship with his children.

Riding a commuter train each day from his home in Wheaton to his work in Chicago, where he was the director of the Moody Literature Mission of the Moody Press, he conceived the idea of using commuter time on the train to paraphrase the Bible. Obviously, **he did not have a lot of Greek Texts in front of him; in fact he had none—just an English American Standard Version (ASV, ARV) and a notepad. He began with the Book of Romans. You could say he was translating from English into English!**

In 1962 he decided to form his own publishing company, to promote the paraphrases he was producing. He called his new firm Tyndale House after William Tyndale, the father of the English Bible. What would Tyndale have thought of this?

In 1962 he published a rendering of the **New Testament letters with the title, *Living Letters***. This was followed by *Living Prophecies* in 1965, *Living Gospels* in 1966, and the *Living New Testament* in 1967. In 1967 he also put out *Living Psalms*, followed by *Living Lessons of Life and Love* in 1968, *Living Books of Moses* in 1969, and *Living History of Israel* in 1970. **The complete *Living Bible* (LB) came from the press in 1971.**

Its circulation has been helped by the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, which has publicized it on television and has given away hundreds of thousands of copies. **In 1965, in honor of his great work of translating English into English, Wheaton College conferred on him the honorary degree of Doctor of Literature.**

He includes some of the Majority Text passages (*see Matt. 17:21; 18:11; Mark 15:28; John 5:3b-5; Acts 8:37; 24:6b-8a; Rom. 16:24*). In most of these cases his LB has a footnote calling the reader’s attention to the fact that many ancient manuscripts omit the passage.

He sometimes adds quite a few imaginative details for which there is no warrant in the original. A clear example is in *Amos 1:1-2*. Here the ASV (the version Taylor worked from) gives a literal word-for-word translation of the Hebrew. It

gives the title as “The words of Amos who was among the herdsmen of Tekoa . . .” In the LB this becomes two full sentences: “Amos was a herdsman living in the village of Tekoa. All day long he sat on the hillsides watching the sheep, keeping them from straying.” The ASV continues, “. . . which he saw concerning Israel.” In the LB this becomes: “One day in a vision, God told him some of the things that were going to happen to his nation, Israel . . . This is his report of what he saw and heard.”

At other times he gives us less than what is there: *Psalm 19:7-9* extols the wonders of God’s law in a beautifully structured piece of literary art. The original has six different names for the written revelation and ascribe six different characteristics and functions to it. In the LB, the literary beauty of the poem has given way to simple assertions: “God’s laws are perfect. They protect us, make us wise, and give us joy and light. God’s laws are pure, eternal, and just.”

In one passage, Taylor says, “Look up into the heavens! Who created all these stars?” After this, he gives an analogy completely untrue to the original: “As a shepherd leads his sheep, calling each by its pet name, and counts them to see that none are lost or strayed, so God does with stars and planets!” A footnote to the word “shepherd” says, “Implied”; but there is nothing in the Hebrew implying this figure of speech.

The actual analogy is far more majestic, designed to display, as the prophet declares, the greatness of God’s might and the force of His power. The analogy is not that of a shepherd, but of a great general reviewing his army; for that is what the word, “host,” means in the ASV. God, as the Lord of hosts, leads forth the stars as a general summons his forces.

Above everything else, a translation must be faithful to the text of the original. Does a translator have the right to read his own interpretation into the text. Was the forbidden tree in the Garden of Eden a “Tree of Conscience”?

Taylor adds a legend to Genesis 6. The “sons of God,” in Genesis 6, are made into “evil beings from the spirit world.” He holds that they were God’s “created supernatural beings, but no longer godly in character” (footnote), who fell in love with women on earth, “the daughters of men.” Here is his translation:

“Now a population explosion took place upon the earth. It was at this time that beings from the spirit world looked upon the beautiful earth

women and took any they desired to be their wives . . . In those days, and even afterwards, when the evil beings from the spirit world were sexually involved with human women, their children became giants, of whom so many legends are told.”—*Genesis 6:1-2, 4 (Phillips)*.

Taylor places the entire book of Revelation into the future! “This book unveils some of the future activities soon to occur in the life of Jesus Christ” (*Rev. 1:1*).

Revelation 1:10 has John going to church on Sunday. “It was the Lord’s Day and I was worshipping.”

Look at what Taylor does to the first beatitude: “ ‘Humble men are very fortunate!’ ” he told them, “ ‘for the Kingdom of Heaven is given to them’ ” (*Matt. 5:3*). Although humility is a Christian virtue, there is something deeper implied here. The “poor in spirit” are those who have a deep sense of spiritual poverty (*see Isa. 66:2*). They are not only humble, but have a feeling of spiritual destitution and recognize their need of God.

Taylor repeatedly changes “son of man” to “Messiah” (*Luke 21:27; 24:7*), “I, the Messiah” (*Matt. 8:20; 11:19; 12:8, et al.*), or simply “I” (*Matt. 10:23; 13:41; 16:13, et al.*).

The so-called Living Bible is a translation of a translation. It is further limited by the fact that the translator frankly states he was guided by his theology. It would no doubt be helpful for the reader to know what Taylor means when he says he has “a rigid evangelical position.” But this is not clarified.

By reading the way he twists Scripture, we learn more of his objective.

Consider what he does to the truth about the unconscious state of the dead:

The ASV, which he “translated” from, gives a literal translation of *Psalm 115:17*: “The dead praise not Jehovah, neither any that go down into silence.” But, in the LB, this becomes “The dead cannot sing praises to Jehovah here on earth.”

The ASV rendering of *Psalm 6:5* reads: “For in death there is no remembrance of thee: In Sheol, who shall give thee thanks?” The Living Bible translates: “For if I die I cannot give you glory by praising you before my friends,” implying that he could praise God in heaven.

In the Living Bible, *Ecclesiastes 9:5* is “For the living at least know that they will die! But the dead know nothing; they don’t even have their

memories.” Unable to effectively destroy that passage, Taylor adds this in the footnote: “These statements are Solomon’s discouraged opinion, and do not reflect a knowledge of God’s truth on these points!”

Psalm 73:24 in the ASV reads: “Thou wilt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory” (possibly meaning “honor”). The last clause in the Living Bible is “and afterwards receive me into the glories of heaven.”

Paul’s famous saying, “For I am already being offered, and the time of my departure has come” (*2 Tim. 4:6, ASV*) is translated: “My time has almost run out. Very soon now I will be on my way to heaven.”

1 Thessalonians 4:14 in the Living Bible reads: “For since we believe that Jesus died and then came back to life again, we can also believe that when Jesus returns, God will bring with him all the Christians who have died.”

Here is what Taylor has done to hellfire:

The Hebrew word for the place of the dead, *Sheol*, is consistently transliterated in the ASV. The LB, however, frequently translates it as “hell,” as though it were a place of punishment—contrary to Hebrew thought. “The wicked shall be sent away to hell” (*Ps. 9:17*). “Hell is licking its chops in anticipation of this delicious morsel, Jerusalem” (*Isa. 5:14*). “But they don’t realize that her former guests are now citizens of hell” (*Prov. 9:18*). “The denizens of hell crowd to meet you as you enter their domain” (*Isa. 14:9*). All this sounds like something out of Dante’s *Inferno*!

However, in other passages, *Sheol* is translated “grave.” *Psalm 16:10* is adequately rendered, “For you will not leave me among the dead; you will not allow your beloved one to rot in the grave.” However, when this passage is quoted in *Acts 2:27*, the meaning is distorted by inserting the word, “body,” in contrast to “soul”: “You will not leave my soul in hell or let the body of your Holy Son decay.” Thus a false dichotomy, foreign to Old Testament thinking, is introduced into the quotation. This is made abundantly clear in *verse 31*, where the word, “soul,” is inserted and “flesh” is rendered “body”: “The Messiah’s soul would not be left in hell and his body would not decay.”

This is what Taylor did to the law and the Sabbath:

“For Moses gave us only the Law with its rigid

demands and merciless justice, while Jesus Christ brought us loving forgiveness as well” is the translation given of *John 1:17*. But salvation means more than bringing people to heaven (*Rom. 1:16-17*), and the righteousness of God is more than a “way to heaven” (*Rom. 3:21-22*).

“On every Lord’s Day each of you should put aside something from what you have earned during the week.” The Greek has simply “on the first day of the week,” and there is no evidence that it was called “the Lord’s Day” in the first century.

The translation of *Acts 20:7* is also questionable: “On Sunday, we gathered for a communion service.” Again, the Greek has, “On the first day of the week . . .” The meeting referred to was obviously a night farewell service. It is not entirely clear whether the days are reckoned on the Jewish basis, from sundown to sundown, or on the Roman basis, from midnight to midnight. But the former seems most likely, in which case the meeting was held on Saturday night (see NEB, TEV). Moreover, it is not clear that this was a communion service. The original has “to break bread.” This expression can mean either an ordinary meal (*Acts 2:42, 46*) or the Lord’s Supper. In any case, it was not called a “communion service” in New Testament times.

Other questionable interpretations are given in *Hebrews 5:7, 13:10, 2 Corinthians 7:14, 5:1, 2 Timothy 2:8, 3:16, etc.*

The translations by Phillips and Taylor are among the most dangerous translations in the 20th century. Even the Catholic and Jehovah’s Witness Bibles tend to be more staid, drifting off primarily when they want to strengthen one of their errors.

The New English Bible is also a paraphrase which, sometimes, is quite extreme.

NEW ENGLISH BIBLE (NEB)

The same year the RSV New Testament was published in the United States (1946), plans were laid in the British Isles for the production of the New English Bible (NEB).

As the result of the initiative (taken by the annual General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in approaching other churches regarding a new version), delegates from the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Methodist, Baptist, and Congregational churches met in conference in October. It was decided to under-

take the production of a completely new translation.

In the following year representatives of these churches were appointed to form a "Joint Committee on the New Translation of the Bible," which met in July, 1947. At its third meeting in January, 1948, the committee also invited the Presbyterian Church of England, the Society of Friends, the Churches in Wales, the Churches in Ireland, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the National Bible Society of Scotland to appoint representatives. **At a later time representatives of the Roman Catholic Church in England and Scotland also attended as observers.**

The work of translating the Old Testament, New Testament, and Apocrypha was assigned to three groups. The first edition of the New Testament was published in 1961. The complete Bible was published in March, 1970, in two editions—one with and one without the Apocrypha.

The NEB differs from the RSV in three ways. First, it purports to be a completely new rendering of the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, and not just a revision of older English versions (ASV and KJV).

This means the NEB does not try to stay close to the King James Version, as does the RSV. The New English Bible abandoned the Tyndale / King James tradition and attempted an entirely new translation.

Second, it has a different method of translation. The translators of the Tyndale tradition sought to present a literal word-for-word rendering, as far as they were able to do so consistent with English idiom. In fact, from the Geneva Bible on down to the KJV, English words that were not actually representative of corresponding words in the original but were regarded as necessary to make sense in our language were put in italics.

The method of translation used in the NEB is much freer. Instead of being a word-for-word translation, it is a "meaning-for-meaning" rendering. Those are big words for a paraphrase.

Third, the NEB New Testament differs from the RSV in many passages in its use of the Greek text. The NEB boldly uses variant readings which no other modern—or earlier—translation dared to use! For example, it used

some of the peculiar "Western family" readings—which not even Westcott and Hort would use!

Here are some examples. Some of them are indeed shocking, since they are based on only one or two unimportant manuscripts:

NEB omits all of *Matthew 9:34* following D and the Sinaitic Syriac, on the assumption that this verse is an assimilation to *Matthew 12:24*. "Lebbaeus" is substituted for "Thaddaeus" in the list of the twelve apostles, in *Matthew 10:3*, on the basis of D.

In place of "moved with compassion" in *Mark 1:41*, the NEB follows the reading "being angry" of D, which it translates weakly as "in warm indignation."

Among the variety of forms in which manuscripts give the charge of Jesus to the blind man healed at Bethsaida in *Mark 8:26*, the NEB has adopted the simple one found in no currently known Greek manuscript, but in one old manuscript: "Do not tell anyone in the village."

In *Acts 1:26*, the reading of D and its Latin counterpart, "the twelve apostles," is read instead of "the eleven apostles." "By his holy prophets" is read in *Acts 3:21*, with D, instead of "by his holy prophets from of old."

There are other interesting readings in the NEB Greek text that are not peculiarly Western. In *Mark 8:38*, as in its parallel of *Luke 9:26a*, "words" is omitted with the resulting translation: "If anyone is ashamed of me and mine [*i.e.*, my followers] in this wicked and godless age, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him, when he comes in the glory of his Father and of the holy angels."

The striking reading found in some "Caesarean" type manuscripts that give the name of the notorious prisoner released in place of our Lord as "Jesus Bar-Abbas" is adopted in *Matthew 27:16ff*.

In *Luke 10:1*, the NEB has the interesting reading of "seventy-two" rather than "seventy," and this is supported by the Codex Vaticanus as well as Western and other manuscripts.

John 13:10 reads, "A man who has bathed needs no further washing." But the omission here of "needs only to wash his feet" rests on weak manuscript evidence.

The NEB translators also changed parts of the Old Testament!

They occasionally changed the order of ma-

materials in the text. For example, in *Genesis 26*, verse 18 is placed between verses 15 and 16. Verses 6-7 of *Isaiah 41* are inserted between verses 20 and 21 of *Isaiah 40*.

In *Jeremiah 12* part of verse 14 and all of verse 15 are given after verse 17. Verses 13 and 14 of *Jeremiah 15* are removed from the text and put in a footnote.

Amos 5:7 is transposed to follow verse 9.

In several places in *Joel 3:9-12*, the order of the lines has been rearranged.

Zechariah 2:13 is followed by chapter 4:1-3, 11-13. The remaining verses (4-10) of chapter 4 are left in their normal place after chapter 3:10.

Is such a rearranging of the materials, in harmony with modern concepts of sequential thought, the proper function of translators or should translators confine their activity to rendering the text in the order in which it has been handed down?

The superscriptions in the Psalms have been entirely omitted. These ancient editorial titles were part of the traditional text and are found in the oldest Hebrew manuscripts known. Their great antiquity is shown by the fact that, as early as the time of the translation of the Greek Old Testament, the significance of some of the technical musical terms was already unknown, as their rendering in the LXX reveals. There is no excuse for this, since the NEB translators were very willing to insert headings (many of them) in the text elsewhere in their translation.

The NEB radically changes the Creation of our world:

"In the beginning of creation, when God made heaven and earth, the earth was without form and void, with darkness over the face of the abyss, and a mighty wind that swept over the surface of the waters."—*Genesis 1:1-2*.

A footnote gives the traditional rendering, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Another footnote gives "and the spirit of God hovering" for "a mighty wind that swept."

What does that passage now say: (1) The earth already existed when God began His work of Creation. (2) The Holy Spirit is entirely removed from the Creation process.

These changes are astounding.

In *Genesis 2:2*, the NEB follows the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX in reading "the sixth day" rather than the Hebrew, which has "the seventh day."

"On the sixth day God completed all the work he had been doing, and on the seventh day he ceased from all his work."

The activities of the sixth day had already been described. Also, if we follow the well-known principle of textual critics that the more difficult reading is to be preferred, we would retain the Hebrew "the seventh day." God completed His work on the seventh day by inaugurating the Sabbath. This He did by desisting from His creative work and by blessing and sanctifying the seventh day.

Quite a few words, known to Britishers but unknown to Americans, are included in the NEB:

"Stooks," meaning "shocks," in the Samson story.

"Weeds" for mourning garments in the expression, "widow's weeds" (*Gen. 38:14, 19; Isa. 47:8; Rev. 18:7*).

"In spate," meaning "in flood," is also chiefly Scottish (*Job 6:17, 40:23, cf. 11:2*). One wonders if the following represents a Scotticism: "Do not be haughty, but go about with humble folk" (*Rom. 12:16*).

Here are more strange words:

Now his sons used to foregather (*Job 1:4*); the stronger man seizes it from the panniers (*Job 5:5*); of myself I reckon nothing (*Job 9:21*); not for him to swill down rivers of cream (*Job 20:17*); do not descry him (*Job 23:9*); broke the fangs of the miscreant (*Job 29:17*); tormented by a ceaseless ague in his bones (*Job 33:19*); and its lair in the saltings (*Job 39:6*); strangers will batten on your wealth (*Prov. 5:10; cf. Rev. 17:16*); he will get nothing but blows and contumely (*Prov. 6:33*); your runnels of water pour into the street (*Prov. 5:16*); does that mean that Christ is an abettor of sin? (*Gal. 2:17*); What are they all but ministrant spirits? (*Heb. 1:14*); Moses, then, was faithful as a servitor (*Heb. 3:5*); Alas, alas for the great city . . . bedizened with gold and jewels and pearls (*Rev. 18:17*); Do you bring in the lamp to put it under the meal-tub? (*Mark 4:21*); You strain off a midge, yet gulp down a camel (*Matt. 23:24*)!

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION (NIV)

This is the one 20th-century translation that a book company (Zondervon, in this case) tried the hardest to make acceptable to the broadest number of people. However, like the

others, it is based on the modern Greek Texts.

Interested groups from the Christian Reformed Church and the Commission on Education of the National Association of Evangelicals decided to begin working together on a Bible project. The decision to produce it was formalized by a group of Biblical scholars meeting in Chicago in 1965. In 1967, the New York-based International Bible Society agreed to sponsor it financially. **The New Testament of NIV was published in September 1973.**

The objective was to produce a Bible which was not too informal, was suitable for church use or home reading, not artificial and wooden, not too free or paraphrastic, and not a one-man production.

The NIV is called an international version because the committee producing it consisted of Bible scholars from such English-speaking countries as Canada, England, Australia, and New Zealand, as well as the United States. They sought to avoid the use of Americanisms on the one hand and Anglicisms on the other. (Though a British edition was published in 1974, few changes in vocabulary were felt necessary, though British spelling was adopted.) The translators came from many denominations, including Baptist, Brethren, Church of Christ, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Mennonite, Methodist, Nazarene, Presbyterian, Christian Reformed, and others. An interchange among such a wide variety of religious persuasions is an effective safeguard against sectarianism.

The governing body of the project consists of fifteen members, most of whom are well-known Biblical specialists in the USA. The Executive Secretary of this committee was Edwin H. Palmer. One hundred translators helped produce it.

It is a shame that they did not base their work on the Majority Text!

Here is a list of portions of 147 verses which have been omitted from the NIV:

Matthew 5:44; 6:13; 15:6, 8; 19:9; 20:7, 16, 22-23; 25:13; 27:35; 28:9

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

Luke 1:28; 4:4, 8, 18; 5:38; 7:31; 8:43, 45, 48, 54; 9:54-56; 11:2, 4, 11, 44, 54; 17:9; 18:24; 19:45; 20:23, 30; 22:64, 68; 23:23, 38; 24:1, 42

John 1:27; 3:13, 15; 5:3, 16; 6:11, 22, 47; 8:9, 10, 59; 10:26; 11:41; 12:1; 16:16; 17:12; 19:16

Acts 2:30; 7:37; 9:5-6; 10:6, 21, 32; 13:42; 15:18, 24; 18:21; 20:15; 21:8, 22, 25; 23:9; 24:6, 8, 26; 26:30; 28:16

Romans 8:1; 9:28; 10:15; 11:6; 13:9; 14:6, 21; 15:24

1 Corinthians 6:20, 10:28, 11:24

Galatians 3:1

Ephesians 3:14, 5:30

Philippians 3:16

Colossians 1:2, 14; 3:6

1 Thessalonians 1:1

1 Timothy 3:3; 6:5, 7

Hebrews 2:7; 3:6; 7:21; 8:12; 10:30; 11:11, 13; 12:20

1 Peter 4:14

1 John 4:3, 5:13

Revelation 1:8, 11; 5:14; 11:1, 17; 14:5; 15:2; 21:24

The above constitutes a total omission of 1,284 words from the Holy Bible.

Most of the so-called "harmonizing passages" that the textual critics believe were "added" to the Majority Text in Matthew (and included in the KJV) were omitted. Here are some of them:

Matt. 5:44, 17:21, 18:11, 21:36, Luke 9:54-56, 23:17-18, 24:6, etc.

Also tossed out were words which the editors considered to be "obviously late readings." What makes them "late"? The fact that they are in the Majority Text (and therefore in the KJV), and not in their corrupt Neutral Text. This includes the second half of *Matthew 6:13*, "For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen." Also they included *John 5:3-4*, *Acts 8:37*, *1 John 5:7-8*. But a few "late readings" were left in the text (*Matthew 21:44; Luke 24:6a, 12, 36, 40, 51*).

Remember the above facts, when someone tells you the NIV is a wonderful Bible.

The longer "late reading" passages, such as *Mark 16:9-20* and *John 7:53-8:11*, were kept in the text. But lines are drawn before and after the passages and notes indicate that early manuscripts omit these passages.

There are some passages that are disputed by scholars. In regard to these, the NIV has included *Luke 22:19b, 20; Matthew 12:47; Luke 22:44; Matthew 16:2-3*. In *John 5:2*, NIV has

selected "Bethzatha" instead of "Bethesda"; in *Ephesians 1:1*, it has included "Ephesus"; in *Matthew 27:17*, it has omitted "Jesus" after "Barabbas"; in *Mark 1:41*, it has "filled with compassion" instead of NEB's "in warm indignation."

Certain passages are ambiguous in the Greek text and could be translated in two different ways. Here are five verses which the NIV translated better than another modern version:

Mark 15:39—"Surely this man was the Son of God"! (NIV) / "Truly this man was a son of God" (NEB, RSV, 1st ed.).

John 1:3-4—"Without him nothing was made that has been made. In him was life, and that life was the light of men" (NIV).

"No single thing was created without Him. All that came to be was alive with his life, and that life was the light of men" (NEB).

John 1:9—"The true light that gives light to every man was coming into the world" (NIV). / "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (KJV).

Romans 9:5—"Theirs are the patriarchs, and from them is traced the human ancestry of Christ, who is God over all, forever praised! Amen" (NIV). / "To them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed for ever. Amen" (RSV). / May God be supreme above all, be blessed forever! Amen" (NEB).

1 Timothy 3:2—"The husband of but one wife" (NIV). / "Married only once" (RSV). / "faithful to his one wife" (NEB).

Then there is *Matthew 16:18*, which many modern translations twist in order to please Rome. NIV has: "And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock." To strengthen the point, the note reads "*Peter means rock.*" It is not as explicit as NEB's "You are Peter, the Rock," but not far from it. "Peter" means a rolling stone, not a rock. This is clearly shown in the Greek of this verse. The Greek word for "Peter" is in the masculine; and the word for "Rock," in this verse, is in the neuter—showing the two do not speak of the same thing.

The NIV has followed the practice of the modernists in replacing the "thou," "thee," "thy," and "thine" with the forms of "you" and your—even when Jesus or the Father is addressed.

This translation has a short preface and relatively few notes. The notes give cross references,

alternative translations or readings, and short explanatory remarks. The material is printed in one column with tiny verse numbers. There are short paragraph headings.

The NIV seems to be a nice translation; but when you read it, you find it to be fully modernized and fully in conformity with Wescott and Hort.

THE WATCHTOWER BIBLES

Next we will discuss two translations published by the Watchtower Society (Jehovah's Witnesses).

NEW WORLD TRANSLATION (NWT)

Now we come to two Jehovah's Witnesses Bibles. (You probably did not know they now have two.) For obvious reasons, we want to carefully show you the flaws in these two doctrinally slanted translations.

Other than Catholic Bibles (which we will discuss later), Jehovah's Witnesses produce the most biased Bibles in the world.

The current edition of the New World Translation was published in 1961.

"Jehovah" is constantly given in the Old Testament (as it also was in the ASV); but, in addition, it is introduced 237 times into the text of the New Testament and 72 times in the footnotes. There is absolutely no basis for the translation of the Greek original by the word, "Jehovah."

As you may already know, the word, "Jehovah," is an artificially created word, resulting from the consonants of the name of God, transliterated *YHWH* (*JHVH*), and the Hebrew vowels of the word for Lord, *Adonai*. The Jews refrained from uttering the name of God and usually substituted in its place the word, *Adonai*. Thus the vowels of this latter word were placed with the consonants of *YHWH*, so that the reader would know he should read *Adonai* instead.

Most English Bibles follow the Jewish practice of translating *YHWH* as LORD (full caps), except when *YHWH* is preceded by the word *Adonai*; in this case, it is translated GOD (full caps), for *Adonai* itself is translated Lord.

The translators carefully select between "Lord" and "Jehovah," in order to downgrade Christ.

They sometimes use the word, "Lord," in the

Greek and sometimes “Jehovah,” depending on whether they think the Greek word for “Lord” applies to God or to Jesus. When they think Jesus is referred to, they use “Lord”—for they do not want to call Him “Jehovah.” They only consider Him to be a created angel.

An example of this would be *1 Corinthians 12:3*: “Nobody can say: ‘Jesus is Lord!’ except by the holy spirit” (with “holy spirit” in lower case, since they do not believe in the Third Person of the Godhead either). Another example is *2 Corinthians 4:5*: “For we are preaching, not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord.”

But other times they translate the Greek word for “Lord” as “Jehovah,” even when the reference to Jesus is clear. This is the case in *Acts 19:20* where the NWT reads: “Thus in a mighty way the word of Jehovah kept growing and prevailing.” They did this—even though they had earlier translated the parallel thought by the words, “and the name of the Lord Jesus went on being magnified” (*Acts 19:17*).

The expression, “the Spirit of the Lord,” is always translated as “the spirit of Jehovah”; yet, in the New Testament, it sometimes refers to the Spirit of God and sometimes to the Spirit of Christ. Such a use even occurs within one verse, *Romans 8:9*: In the KJV, it says: “But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.” But NWT translates it as “God’s spirit” and “Christ’s spirit.”

Then there is *John 1:1*: “In [the] beginning the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god.” This is completely in harmony with the theology of Jehovah’s Witnesses; since, for them, Christ is a created being. Therefore, He is to them not God but a god.

The Greek does not have the article before “God” in *John 1:1*. But the structure of Greek sentence requires “the” before “God.” **In this verse *theos* (God) is a predicate noun and precedes the verb and subject. Therefore a definite article must be read here. When a definite predicate noun precedes the verb, a definite article is never to be written before the noun; but it must be read as being there. This *anarthrous* (lack of a definite article) construction emphasizes quality and requires that *theos* be translated as a fully divine being.** Thus we see that there is no justification

for the Jehovah’s Witnesses’ translation of *John 1:1*.

There is no consistency in their translation of *theos* without the article. In the Gospel of John, it is always written as “God”; that is, with a capital G (including, surprisingly, *John 20:28*), except in four passages: *John 6:45*, *John 1:1*, *John 1:18*, and *John 10:33*, where *theos* is translated “a god.”

John 1:18—“No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten god who is in the bosom position with the Father is the one that has explained him.”

John 10:33—“The Jews answered him: ‘We are stoning you, not for a fine work, but for blasphemy, even because you, although being a man, make yourself a god.’”

In the New Testament, several passages have the names, “God” and “Jesus Christ,” joined by a conjunction with one article before the first name. The rule is that when there are two nouns in such a grammatical structure, they refer to the same person or thing.

However, whenever the nouns, “God” and “Jesus Christ,” are found together in the NWT, they are translated so as to make God and Jesus Christ separate persons!

Titus 2:13—“While we wait for the happy hope and glorious manifestation of the great God and of our Savior Christ Jesus” (NWT). / “Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” (KJV). (Two “ands” in a Greek sentence like this can be translated “and . . . even,” instead of “and . . . and.”) / “Awaiting our blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ” (RSV). / “Looking forward to the happy fulfilment of our hopes when the splendour of our great God and Saviour Christ Jesus will appear” (NEB).

The non-NWT translations, above, are similar and make God and Jesus Christ the same person, although it is ambiguous in KJV. There is only a slight change in the NWT; but given the Witnesses’ theological bias, it is sufficient to show that a clear distinction is made between the two by the repetition of the preposition, “of.”

2 Peter 1:1—“The righteousness of our God and [the] Savior Jesus Christ.” The article is not present before “Savior” in the Greek text, but before “God” only; the translators added it to make it appear they are two separate beings.

Colossians 1:16-17—“Because by means of

him all [other] things were created . . . All [other] things have been created through him . . . Also, he is before all [other] things and by means of him all [other] things were made to exist.” Needless to say, the words in the brackets are not in the original but are added to say that Christ Himself was created and then He created all other things.

Philippians 2:7—“Who, although he was existing in God’s form, gave no consideration to a seizure, namely, that he should be equal to God” (NWT). / “But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men” (KJV). / JB: “His state was divine, yet he did not cling to his equality with God.” / “Who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped” (RSV).

The NWT implies that Jesus gave no consideration to being equal with God while the others assert that Christ did not cling to His equality with God but emptied Himself.

The Holy Spirit is something else they want to get rid of. So “Holy Spirit” is always printed as “holy spirit”; and “Spirit” as “spirit.”

Jehovah’s Witnesses believe the Lord’s Supper was only a memorial service; so they twist the Greek of *1 Corinthians 11:24-25*: “This means my body which is in YOUR behalf. Keep doing this in remembrance of me! This cup means the new covenant by virtue of my blood.”

The Greek verb used is “is”; and it should have been translated thus: “This cup is the new covenant in My blood.”

In order to avoid the teaching about the Second Advent, they always translate *parousia* as “presence.” That helps explain all their predicted second comings of God which have failed to occur in the 20th century.

Then there is their use of “torture stake” for the cross and “impale” for crucify. It is based on the belief of the Jehovah’s Witnesses, that the cross on which Jesus was crucified was a single stake.

First, historical and archaeological data fully agree on the cross as the means of crucifixion in the 1st century A.D.

Second, the very word, “impale,” does not mean to nail a person to a post, but to run a rod all the way through him!

“Another unusual translation our unidentified [NWT] committee gives us is that of *Mat-*

thew 10:38, ‘Whoever does not accept this torture stake and follow after me is not worthy of me.’ Again all sorts of authorities are marshaled, this time to back their contention that Christ was impaled (*Matthew 27:38, et al.*).

“First it should be noted that ‘impale’ is used in a sense not acknowledged by *Webster’s New International Dictionary* (Unabridged, 1949). They do not mean the Oriental custom of thrusting a body down on a pointed stake.

“Rather they give an illustration from *Justus Lipsius’ De Cruce*, showing a man affixed by nails to a single upright pole but with the hands attached about a foot above his head on the one upright. It is not mentioned that *Lipsius* gives five different pictures in all and that he himself held in this same book for the traditional representation as true.

“They do lay great emphasis on the original meaning of [the Greek word] *stauros* as a single upright pole. That this single upright pole was used for executions they prove by citing Roman literature. But there is a strange silence about the descriptions of the crucifixions of slaves at the beginning of the Christian era.

“Customarily the slaves were made to carry the *patibulum* or horizontal bar of their cross to the place of execution. So common was this form of crucifixion that the Roman authors use *patibulum* as synonymous with *crux* (*Seneca, De Vita Beata, 19:3; Epistola 101:12, Tacitus, Historiae, IV, 3*). To hold that Constantine introduced the traditional cross as a relic of his pagan worship of the sun god (*p. 771*) is unworthy of their evident scholarship.

“True the cross does not appear in the catacombs as a symbol of Christ before A.D. 312. Neither does their ‘torture stake’; nor later, for that matter.

“As for the ‘fathers,’ it is the traditional cross they describe. To cite only two witnesses, *Irenaeus* speaks of Christ’s cross as having five ends, two longitudinal, two latitudinal, and a fifth on the support for the body of the victim (*Adversus Haereses, II, 24, 4*). He wrote before A.D. 200. Still earlier is the witness of the *Epistle of Barnabas, X, 8*. Here the writer speaks of the cross as having the shape of a Greek *tau*.”—*John Mattingly*.

Jehovah’s Witnesses use several devices to give the impression they are different and, therefore, above everyone else. Their impale on a stake theory. Their statement that they do not have a church or church services, but only “Kingdom Halls.” Their claim that they do not keep any day, yet they always meet on Sunday.

They call the Old Testament by the name, "Hebrew Aramaic Scriptures," and the New Testament, "The Christian Greek Scriptures." This makes them imagine they are very scholarly.

H.H. Rowley, a leading Old Testament scholar, wrote this:

"The jargon which they use is often scarcely English at all, and it reminds one of nothing so much as a schoolboy's first painful beginnings in translating Latin into English. The translation is marked by a wooden literalism which will only exasperate any intelligent reader—if such it finds—and instead of showing the reverence for the Bible which the translators profess, it is an insult to the 'Word of God.'—*Expository Times* 65: 41-42 (1953-1954).

Here are several examples of this strained, wooden, and peculiar translation:

Genesis 7:15—"In which the force of life was active." / KJV: "breath of life."

Genesis 16:12—"As for him, he will become a zebra of a man." / KJV: "And he will be a wild man."

Genesis 17:4—"As for me, look! my covenant is with you, and you will certainly become father of a crowd of nations." / KJV: "father of many nations."

Malachi 3:8—"Will earthling man rob God?" / KJV: "Will a man rob God?"

Matthew 6:17—"Grease your head" / KJV: "Anoint thine head."

Genesis 18:20-21—"Consequently Jehovah said: 'The cry of complaint about Sodom and Gomorrah, yes, it is loud, and their sin, yes, it is heavy. I am quite determined to go down that I may see whether they act altogether according to the outcry over it that has come to me, and, if not, I can get to know it.'"

Genesis 6:1-3—"Now it came about that when men started to grow in numbers on the surface of the ground and daughters were born to them, then the sons of the true God began to notice the daughters of men, that they were good-looking; and they went taking wives for themselves, namely, all whom they chose. After that Jehovah said: 'My spirit shall not act toward man indefinitely in that he is also flesh.'"

Exodus 20:3—"You must not have any other gods against my face."

Isaiah 1:13—"Stop bringing in any more valueless grain offerings. Incense—it is something detestable to me. New moon and sabbath, the calling of a convention—I cannot put up with

the [use of] uncanny power along with the solemn assembly."

Matthew 5:18—"For truly I say to you that sooner would heaven and earth pass away than for the smallest letter or one particle of a letter to pass away from the Law by any means and not all things take place."

I Corinthians 5:1—"Actually fornication is reported among you, and such fornication as is not even among the nations, that a wife a certain [man] has of [his] father."

I Corinthians 10:11—"Now these things went on befalling them as examples, and they were written for a warning to us upon whom the ends of the system of things have arrived."

We should mention here that they repeatedly use "age" or "world" as "system of things." Here is another example:

Matthew 28:20—"And, look! I am with you all the days until the conclusion of the system of things."

Last, but not least, the NWT is based on the Westcott-Hort Greek Text, so all the errors in it are brought into the NWT.

BIBLE IN LIVING ENGLISH (BLE)

This is, indeed, a strange translation; for it is published by the Jehovah's Witnesses, but was not written by one of them.

It is an entirely new translation by Steven T. Byington (1868-1957) who happened to put "Jehovah" in the Old Testament. So the Witnesses wanted to print it. Byington was a congregational church pastor who only had half of one year studying Biblical languages at Oberlin College, in Ohio. After his death, the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society obtained publication rights to print his translation, which they did in 1972.

Why did they not translate a Bible themselves? The answer is that they lack Greek and Hebrew scholars able to do it.

Because someone may bring it into your home someday, here is a very brief overview of this translation.

In the Old Testament, "you" is used when addressing God, but "thou" in the New Testament. Byington says this is because men did not have reverent feelings for God in Old Testament times!

Regarding the overuse of "Jehovah," Byington admits that the name itself is a mismatched blunder; but he says that does not matter, since

it is “a personal name.”

Very strange spellings of proper names are given. Where Byington got them from, no one has been able to figure out: Hambakuk, Malaki, Sephaniah, Zecariah, Enoc, and Lamec.

Byington used something approximating the Nestle Text, but freely departed from it whenever he wished. He said the “old version” (KJV) contained “forged texts.” Byington strongly disliked the King James Bible.

It is interesting to compare Byington’s BLE with the NWT:

“Jehovah” is only used in the Old Testament; whereas, in the NWT, it is used in both.

The word, “God,” is capitalized when used about Christ (*John 1:1; 1:18; 6:45; 10:33*).

Brackets are not used in *Titus 2:13* and *2 Peter 1:1*, as is done in the NWT. So Jesus can be identified as God in those verses.

Its punctuation in *Romans 9:5* clearly identifies Christ as God: “Whose are the fathers, and from whom in the way of flesh comes the Christ, he who is over everything, God blessed forever—Amen!”

The designation, “Holy Spirit,” is capitalized, contrary to the NWT.

The words, “cross” and “crucify,” are used instead of “torture stake” and “impale.”

The only apparent reason why the Witnesses published this translation is the translator’s use of “Jehovah” for God’s name in the Old Testament. If the Witnesses really had some scholars of their own, they surely would have brought out their own translation and not used Byington’s—which did not include all their errors!

Byington’s translation also has many very peculiar readings. But we will not list any here. The above data is enough to arm you for when the Jehovah’s Witnesses knock on your door.

**JOINT
CATHOLIC-PROTESTANT
BIBLES**

The concern of many Protestant, Orthodox, and Catholic denominations to unite is urgent. They realize that, in order to successfully do this, they must have a common Bible.

In order to achieve this, three publications have been released:

- The Revised Standard Version Apocrypha

- An edition of the Revised Standard Version which is acceptable to Roman Catholics
- The Common Bible

**REVISED STANDARD VERSION:
THE APOCRYPHA**

As we noted earlier, the Division of Christian Education (DCE) held the copyright to the RSV. In October 1952, the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church issued a formal request to the DCE, an agency of the National Council of Churches (NCC), based in New York City, to organize a committee to revise the English translation of the Apocrypha.

The General Board of the NCC authorized the appointment of a group of scholars to make and publish The RSV Apocrypha.

The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, Revised Standard Version, was published on September 30, 1957.

The appearance of these books constituted an important step in helping Catholics and Protestants find a common version acceptable to them both. The ecumenists considered this goal to be very important. The Vatican could not approve the RSV until the Apocrypha could be included in it. (More on its RSV approval later.)

Later in this book, we will briefly overview the history and questionable content of the Old Testament Apocrypha.

**REVISED STANDARD VERSION:
CATHOLIC EDITION**

An astounding event occurred in 1965: the publication of a joint Catholic-Protestant edition of the Revised Standard Version!

However, it was to be expected. Since the National Council of Churches owned the copyright of the RSV, it would be expected that it would push for a Bible—which the major Protestant denominations and Rome could both approve.

Here is a brief description of this edition:

The 1965 New Testament edition. A Catholic-approved edition of the RSV New Testament, prepared by the Catholic Biblical Association of Great Britain with the approval of the Standard Bible Committee, was published in 1965.

This was a regular RSV, plus a number of changes. A *List of Changes* can be found in Appendix Two of the Bible. The minimal number of changes made consist of two kinds: those hav-

ing to do with the underlying Greek text and those giving a different translation of the Greek.

The first consisted in restoring the sixteen passages found in the *Received Text* that the RSV had placed in footnotes. This included such passages as the long ending of *Mark 16:9-20*, the story of the woman taken in adultery (*John 7:52-8:11*), and Luke's account of Peter running to the tomb (*Luke 24:12*). In each instance, the RSV has a footnote stating, "Other ancient authorities add . ." The Catholic edition restores the passage and has in the footnote, "Other ancient authorities omit . ."

The second type of change consists in giving a different translation. Joseph, in *Matthew 1:19*, does not resolve to "divorce" Mary quietly but "to send her away quietly." The "brothers" of Jesus (*Matt. 12:48ff.*; *Mark 3:31ff.*; *Luke 8: 19ff.*) are "brethren," based on the belief that they were not real brothers. —"The Greek word or its Semitic equivalent is used for varying degrees of blood relationship." The angel Gabriel's greeting to Mary is "Hail, full of grace" instead of "Hail, thou that art highly favored (*Luke 1:28*). The marginal translation is preferred in *Romans 9:5*, "Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever."

Appendix One consists of *Explanatory Notes* of various passages as required by Canon Law. One includes the interpretation of *Matthew 16:18-19*.

The 1966 complete Bible. The Catholic RSV edition of the entire Bible was published in 1966. No changes were made in the RSV text of the Old Testament. **All of what Protestants call the Apocryphal books, except 1 and 2 Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh (which the Council of Trent did not consider canonical), are included as integral parts of the canon. The order of the books follow the confusing arrangement found in the Latin Vulgate, except that the additions to Esther are incorporated in that book. Twenty-three pages of *Explanatory Notes* are included.**

The significance of this is remarkable. The Catholic-Protestant ecumenists so desperately want a way to unite the denominations, that Rome was willing to accept, what is primarily, a Protestant Bible!

The publication of the RSV Catholic Edition marks a new day in ecumenical relations. The RSV, with a few modifications, provides a translation of the Word of God that all English-speak-

ing Christians can share. Although the problem of the Old Testament canon remains, Protestants and Catholics have largely come to an agreement on the translation of accepted books. This means that, in theological discussions (which they regularly hold in Geneva and elsewhere), all the churches can appeal to the same authoritative text. Dialogue between them is therefore greatly facilitated.

This Bible is entitled, *The Oxford Annotated RSV Bible with the Apocrypha*, and received the *Imprimatur* of Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, in 1965—a year before the publication of the complete Bible.

COMMON BIBLE

The publication of a single RSV for both Protestants and Catholics did not satisfy the concern of the ecumenists for still closer unity between Protestants and Rome in their Bibles.

Their concern was aided by the fact that the RSV Bible Committee is an ongoing committee; and it has been internationalized by the addition of more members from Great Britain and Canada, as well as from the U.S.A.

As you might expect, it also now includes Catholics as well as Protestant members.

After the successful completion of the 1965-1966 Revised Standard Version: Catholic Edition, it was recognized that the ecumenical objective had not yet been fully achieved. Although both sides had essentially the same Bible (plus the Apocrytha), Protestants would purchase the regular RSV while Catholics might purchase its Catholic edition. They were not using the very same Bible! Something must be done about this.

So the committee set to work; and, in 1973, it published the RSV Common Bible with the Apocrypha / Deuterocanonical Books. Amid much advertising, pomp, and ceremonies, the new book was released during the "Week of Prayer for Christian Unity" in England, in February, and during Lent in the United States.

The Common Bible has received the international endorsement of the leaders of the Roman Catholics Church, many Protestant denominations, and (significantly) the Greek Orthodox Church.

Since the three major branches of Christendom war over the Apocrypha, as they do over many other things, to facilitate the use of the RSV as a common Bible, **this edition arranged the Old**

Testament apocryphal books in two groups:

The first group is the Deuterocanonical Books, which are accepted by Catholics as Scripture. And the second group is 1 and 2 Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh, which are not regarded as authoritative by the Roman Catholic Church, but are included in the Greek Canon of Scripture.

In the *Preface*, the position of the various Christian bodies with respect to the Apocrypha is clearly explained (*pp. viii-xi*).

The publication of *The Common Bible* is indeed a significant event in the history of the English Bible! **Theoretically, Catholics, Greek Orthodox, and Protestants can now all use the same translation** (although at home and in church they probably will use other Bibles).

But, most importantly, *The Common Bible* marks the end of the controversy, regarding the authoritative English text to be employed in ecumenical dialogue between different Protestant denominations with Rome and / or with Greek Orthodox churchmen. Its publication is a significant reason the ongoing "dialogue" between the different churches has accelerated since the early 1970s.

"Today in many Bible colleges, professors are constantly altering the King James Bible with Greek and English versions of the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate. Naturally the students lose confidence in the Bible and lack power when they become preachers."—*Dr. Rivera, Sabotage, p. 30.*

ROMAN CATHOLIC BIBLES

We will here consider three major 20th-century Bibles which were prepared solely for Roman Catholics:

- The Knox Bible
- The Jerusalem Bible
- The New American Bible

THE KNOX BIBLE

The revised form of the Rheims-Douai was the only Catholic Bible to have official Vatican approval until the translation of Monsignor Knox's New Testament in 1945. The Old Testament was published in 1948; but, oddly enough, unlike the New Testament, it was not approved as an official version.

Ronald Knox was born into the home of an Anglican priest and educated at Eton and Oxford. Prior to his conversion to Catholicism, he

wrote prose and detective novels. Knox knew how to work with words.

After converting to Catholicism at the age of 29, he entered the priesthood; and, in 1939, he began translating the Bible into English. He was heavily restricted by the fact that he was required to stay close to the Latin Vulgate; yet his translation was still new and fresh.

His translation was based on the 1592 edition of the Vulgate (which had been approved by Pope Clement VIII). **He also used the Latin form for the names of the books** (something which the Jerusalem Bible later abandoned). Have you ever heard of Paralipomena, Osee, Abdias, Sophonias, and Aggaeus? **Of course, the Apocrypha is also included, scattered all through the Old Testament.**

The ending of the Lord's Prayer is omitted from *Matthew 6:13*. (It was also missing in the Rheims-Douai.)

JERUSALEM BIBLE

The Jerusalem Bible (JB) is the first complete Roman Catholic Bible to be entirely translated from the original languages—Greek and Hebrew. It was published in 1966.

Protestant scholars had been studying Greek and Hebrew manuscripts for centuries; and a few of Rome's adherents finally got around to looking at them. Frankly, they were ashamed of the obvious fact that Catholic scholars, on the advice of the Vatican, had been avoiding the ancient Bible manuscripts.

The Old Testament part of the Confraternity Bible had been translated from the Hebrew. Spencer's New Testament had been translated from the modern Greek Texts. But the Jerusalem Bible was the first Catholic Bible to be entirely translated from Greek and Hebrew.

(The Confraternity Bible is the original name of the New American Bible, another Catholic Bible which was not printed until 1970. More on this later.)

Previously, all Catholic Bibles were required to be translated from Jerome's Latin Vulgate, which itself is a translation (and a poor one) from Hebrew and Greek. That included Monsignor Knox's translation, which was based on the Vulgate.

Notes are included all through the JB "to help the faithful" understand the text. These notes are translated from a one-volume French edition (1956) of *La Bible de Jerusalem*, published

by the Dominican Biblical School of Jerusalem. For that reason, the name, "Jerusalem Bible," was given to the book.

Because there are so many small-print notes, this Bible has 2,062 pages and weighs nearly 5 lbs! Rome wanted to make sure the faithful understood the text.

The text is more paraphrastic than the RSV, but not as much as Phillips. Perhaps to confuse the reader, it has more of the Bible in poetic form than any other translation. Even parts of John are in poetic format!

In order to help attract Protestants, personal names are always spelled as in the RSV.

The Apocrypha is scattered all through the Old Testament. When the writer prepared his book, *The Magnificat*, for Catholics (which required quotations from Catholic Bibles), he found it quite difficult to locate passages in the Old Testament because, with Apocryphal books inserted here and there all through it (and some of them are rather long), the result is something of a hodgepodge. For example, in the book of Daniel, Susanna is chapter 13, and Bel and the Dragon is chapter 14.

Here are other interesting features of this Bible:

The note on *1 Corinthians 3:15* says this:

"This is not a direct reference to purgatory but several Doctors of the Church have taken it as a basis for that doctrine."

Whereas other versions have "wife" in *1 Corinthians 9:5*, JB translates it, "Christian woman," with this added note: "Lit. 'a sister, a woman (wife?).'" The objective is to show that the Apostles were not married, but had nuns to help them in their work.

As you might expect, *Genesis 3:15* also required a note. You will recall that the Vulgate, Rheims-Douai, and other Catholic Bibles translated this as the woman (Mary) crushing the serpent's head while it was not able to even hurt her heel (Is she not immaculate?). The note says this:

"The Latin version has a feminine pronoun ('she' will crush . . .) and since, in the messianic interpretation of our text, the Messiah and his mother appear together, the pronoun has been taken to refer to Mary; this application has become current in the Church."

That was a shrewd statement to avoid stating the fact that the Hebrew has a masculine pronoun.

In *Matthew 16:18* ("On this rock I will build my church," KJV), the following note appears:

"Catholic exegetes maintain that these enduring promises hold good not only for Peter himself but also for Peter's successors. This inference, not explicitly drawn in the text, is considered legitimate because Jesus plainly intends to provide for his Church's future by establishing a regime that will not collapse with Peter's death. Two other texts, Luke 22:31ff and John 21:15ff, on Peter's primacy emphasize that its operation is to be in the domain of faith; they also indicate that this makes him head not only of the Church after the death of Christ but of the apostolic group then and there."

This note is appended to *Matthew 19:11-12*:

"Christ invites to perpetual continence those who would consecrate themselves entirely to the kingdom of God."

NEW AMERICAN BIBLE

The Jerusalem Bible had been prepared in England and contains British terms and spelling.

You will recall that the New English Bible was published so the British could have their own Bible and not have to rely on the RSV, with its Americanisms in words and spelling.

For the same reason the New American Bible (NAB) was printed. (Recently, "The Catholic Bible" was added in large print to its title.) The Jerusalem Bible is essentially in the jargon of Britain; and there was felt a need for something similar, but for Americans.

The NAB is not a new version. Catholics have been struggling to get it completed, literally, for decades. Preparing Bibles is not something which comes easy to them.

The New Testament (a revision of Rheims-Challoner based on the Latin Vulgate) was published in 1941. It was called the Confraternity Version.

But, in 1943, the famous encyclical on Scripture studies, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, was issued by Pope Plus XII, recommending translation from the original text. So work on the Old Testament was begun, based on the Hebrew. The work went very slowly (!) and was not completed (with the Apocrypha included) until 26 years later, in 1969.

Of course, the New Testament had to be re-translated, this time from the Greek text.

With the publication of the NAB in 1970, there exists, for the first time, a complete American Catholic Bible translated from the original languages. The translation team included fifty-nine Catholic and five Protestant scholars.

The Old Testament is based on the Hebrew and Aramaic (the Massoretic text), plus many variations based on the Septuagint, the Gumran Scroll, or imagination.

The Greek text used in the New Testament is Nestle-Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (25th ed., 1963), with some assistance from the United Bible Societies' Greek Text.

In some instances, it has strayed from the modern Greek Texts. For example, it uses brackets, to indicate what are called "doubtful readings of some merit." Such readings are found, for example, in *Matthew 5:5, 17:21, 21:44, 24:36, John 5:3, Ephesians 1:1.*

Other readings not found in the Nestle-Aland Text include *Luke 24:12, 40, 51.* At the end of Mark it has followed the Nestle-Aland Text by including both longer and shorter endings within the text section. There is a line, however, between these endings and no line between *Mark 16:8* and the longer ending. Besides these two endings it has also included, separated by a line from the shorter ending, the ending found in the Freer Logion. According to the note at this place, the longer ending "has traditionally been accepted as an inspired part of the Gospel," although "vocabulary and style argue strongly that it was written by someone other than Mark." The story of the woman taken in adultery is found in brackets at its traditional position in John even though the explanation in the footnote indicates it is out of place there.

Thus we see that the New American Bible is primarily based on Westcott-Hort / Nestle-Aland / UBS Greek Text style.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

The English-speaking world is today flooded with Bible translations.

In a *Moody Monthly* article, entitled "*Which Bible Translation Is Best for Me?*" John Kohlenberger wrote this:

"A generation ago few people asked, 'Which version of the Bible is best?' The Authorized, or King James, Version had been the most popular and widely read Bible for 350 years. But

an explosion of English Bible translations over the past 40 years has challenged the long reign of the King James Version. And the question 'Which version of the Bible is best?' is now a common concern. It is a question not easily answered. For every Bible translation there is someone who will say it is the best of all possible versions. And the search for the best version is crowded with 'experts' loaded with opinion, choked with rhetoric, confused by misused terminology, and short on objective information.

"In fact there is no 'best' translation . . . No translation is perfect, but most are 'for the greatest part true and sufficient.' So the question is not 'Which Bible is best?' But which of the many good translations is best for you?"—*John R. Kohlenberger, Moody Monthly, May 1987.*

It is openly admitted that, with Bibles, anything goes—as long as it makes sales.

A *USA Today* article reports that the American Bible Society—yes, the American Bible Society—has released an "MTV-like" video entitled "*Out of the Tombs.*" The article is entitled, "*Behold, Rap Bible Stories Are Born on Video,*" and describes this wonderful new production in these words:

"In *Out of the Tombs*, a linguistically direct translation of Mark 5:1-20, Jesus appears in a dark jacket and T-shirt to battle a drooling, baseball cap wearing demon. The desert scenes, flowing robes and stentorian voices of most Bible films have been traded in for gritty urban landscapes, street garb and rap-like narration.

"*Out of the Tombs* is the first in the society's new multimedia translations that use fast-paced, MTV-like images and contemporary music to tell Bible stories. 'We targeted music videos as a way to reach younger people,' says Fern Lee Hagedorn, director of the multimedia translations department.

"The American Bible Society would be the last to advocate not reading the Bible, but our mandate to make the Scriptures available to every man, woman and child wouldn't be fulfilled unless we used new forms of communication.

"The \$14.95 video is paired with a 20-page instructional booklet.

"Next on tape: the story of the Prodigal Son and the virgin birth story."—*USA Today, November 19, 1992.*

It is of interest that, each year, the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists donates about \$85,000 to the American Bible Society, to

do with as they wish. It would be far better if we ordered \$85,000 in foreign-language Bibles from them, and gave them to our overseas evangelists to distribute to those attending their meetings.

It has been about 3,475 years since Moses sat down and began writing the first page of the Bible. Ever since then, Satan has been trying, by every possible method, to destroy that book. You and I must stand resolutely in defense of God's Inspired Word, in spite of what others say or do.

Oh, my brother, my sister, let us stand true to God—to the end!

“To employ soft words and honeyed phrases

in discussing questions of everlasting importance; to deal with errors that strike at the foundations of all human hope as if they were harmless and venial mistakes; to bless where God disapproves, and to make apologies where He calls us to stand up like men and assert, though it may be the aptest method of securing popular applause in a sophisticated age, is cruelty to man and treachery to Heaven. Those who on such subjects attach more importance to the rules of courtesy than they do to the measures of truth do not defend the citadel, but betray it into the hands of its enemies. Love for Christ, and for the souls for whom He died, will be the exact measure of our zeal in exposing the dangers by which men's souls are ensnared.”—*Thornwell.*

“The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the Word of our God shall stand for ever.”

—*Isaiah 40:8*

“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My Words shall not pass away.”

—*Matthew 24:35*

“These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether these things were so.”

—*Acts 17:11*

“Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law.”

—*Psalms 119:18*

Appendix

A Variety of Additional Information

200 SPECIAL ERRORS IN THE MODERN VERSIONS

The present writer has searched for some of the most flagrant errors in the modern versions. It has been a laborious task. The collection below may not be complete, but at least it represents a large number of the worse changes in the King James Version.

The following passages are arranged from Genesis to Revelation. Since the Revised Standard purports to be the standard of the revisions, we will most frequently refer to it as an example. However, the great majority of the changed or omitted passages will generally be found in most of the other modern translations.

We will cite both Old and New Testament passage, but will particularly focus our attention on verses in the New Testament.

The purpose is to help you locate some of the most problematic passages in the new versions. The inclusions or omissions are not always quoted; but sometimes they are—especially when they are unusually blatant.

Quotations within parentheses are from the King James Bible. As usual, throughout this book, we have placed pronouns referring to the Godhead in initial caps.

1 - OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis 6:3—"My Spirit shall not abide in man for ever" (RSV). ("My Spirit shall not always strive with man.")

Genesis 11:1—"Few words" instead of "one language" (RSV). ("And the whole earth was of one language, and one speech.")

Genesis 12:3—"Be blessed" changed to "bless themselves." ("And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.") Also changed in *Genesis 18:18, 22:18, 26:4, 28:14.*

Genesis 49:10—"Until He come, to whom

it belongs." (" . . . until Shiloh come, and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be.")

Numbers 33:52a—"Pictures" changed to "carved idols" (NIV). / ("Ye shall destroy . . . all their pictures." [It is not appropriate today to hint that television and pornography might be bad.])

Job 19:26—"Then without my flesh I shall see God." ("After my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.")

Psalms 8:5—"Yet Thou hast made him a little lower than God" (NIV, NASV, etc.). ("For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels.")

Psalms 45:6—"Your divine throne endures forever and ever. Your royal scepter is a scepter of equity." ("Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the scepter of Thy kingdom is a right scepter.")

Psalms 48:10—"Thy right hand is full of victory." ("Thy right hand is full of righteousness.")

Psalms 72:11—"May all" instead of "Yea, all." ("Yea, all kings shall fall down before Him.")

Psalms 72:8—"May have" instead of "shall have." ("He shall have dominion also from sea to sea.")

Proverbs 16:3—"Commit to the Lord whatever you do, and your plans will succeed" (NIV).

Isaiah 26:3—"The steadfast of mind Thou wilt keep in perfect peace" (NASV). / ("Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on Thee" [KJV]).

Isaiah 32:2—"Princes shall rule in justice, each shall be like a hiding place from the wind." ("A man shall be as an hiding place from the wind.")

Jeremiah 31:22—"A woman protects a man," instead of "a woman shall compass a man." ("The Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, a woman shall compass a man." [This is referring to the virgin birth; *i.e.*, a woman shall produce a man-child, without copulation.])

Daniel 3:25—"A son of the gods" instead of

“the Son of God.” (“The form of the fourth is like the Son of God.”)

Hosea 13:9—“I will destroy you, O Israel, who can help you?” (“O Israel, thou has destroyed thyself; but in Me is thine help.”)

Micah 5:2—“Whose origin is from of old.” (“Bethlehem . . . out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel; Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.”)

Zechariah 9:9—“Lo your King comes to you; triumphant and victorious is He.” (“Behold, thy King cometh unto thee: He is just, and having salvation.”)

2 - NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew 1:16—Changed to “Joseph, father of Jesus” (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 1:19—“Resolved to divorce her quietly.” (“Joseph . . . not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily.”)

Matthew 1:25—“Firstborn” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 6:13—“For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen” is omitted (the Lord’s prayer).

Matthew 6:33—“Of God” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 8:29—“Jesus” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 9:13—“Repentance” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 12:35—“Of the heart” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 12:47—Whole verse is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 13:51—“Jesus saith unto them” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 16:3—“Oh ye hypocrites” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 16:20—“Jesus” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 17:21—Entire verse is omitted (NIV, etc.). (“Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.”)

Matthew 18:11—Entire verse is omitted (RSV, etc.). (“For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.”)

Matthew 19:9—“And whosoever marrieth her which is put away committeth adultery” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 19:17—“God” is omitted (RSV,

etc.).

Matthew 20:7—“And whatsoever is right that shall ye receive” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 20:16—“For many be called but few chosen” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 20:22—“And to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 23:14—Part or all of verse is omitted (RSV, etc.). (“Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows’ houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.”)

Matthew 25:13—“Wherein the Son of man cometh” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 27:35—“That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet” to the end of the verse is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 28:2—“From the door” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Matthew 28:9—“As they went to tell His disciples” [about the resurrection] is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 1:1—“The Son of God” is omitted (various versions).

Mark 1:2—“It is written in Isaiah the prophet” instead of “As it is written in the prophets” (NIV, etc.). (The NIV translates it “Isaiah the prophet” because it is in the Neutral Text. But Mark 1:2b is quoted from Malachi 3:1, not from Isaiah. Mark 1:3 is quoted from Isaiah. Therefore, the KJV (and its Majority Text) has the proper reading.)

Mark 1:14—“Of the kingdom” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 2:17—“To repentance” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 6:11—“Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 9:24—“Lord” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 9:42—“Little ones that believe in Me” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 10:21—“Take up the cross” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 11:10—“In the name of the Lord” is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 11:26—Entire verse is omitted (RSV, etc.). (“But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive you your trespasses.”)

Mark 12:29-30—“Of all commandments . . .

this is the first commandment" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 13:14—"Spoken of by Daniel the prophet" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 14:68—"And the cock crew" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Mark 15:28—Entire verse is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, He was numbered with the transgressors.")

Mark 15:39—"A son of God" instead of "the Son of God." ("The centurion . . . said, truly this was the Son of God.")

Mark 16:9-20—All nine verses are omitted ([RSV, etc.], solely because they are not in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus).

Luke 2:33—"Joseph" is changed to "His father" (RSV, etc.).

Luke 2:43—"Joseph and His mother" are changed to "His parents" (RSV, etc.).

Luke 2:49—"House" instead of "business" ("I must be about My Father's business").

Luke 4:4—"But by every Word of God" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 4:8—"Get thee behind Me Satan" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 4:41—"Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 7:31—"And the Lord said" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 9:54—"Even as Elias did" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 11:29—"The prophet" (referring to Jonah) is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 17:36—Entire verse is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 22:19—"Which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me" is omitted.

Luke 22:20—"Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in My blood, which is shed for you" is omitted.

Luke 22:20—"Cup which is poured" instead of "blood, which is shed" (NIV, etc.). ("This cup is the new testament in My blood, which is shed for you.")

Luke 22:31—"And the Lord said" is omitted (RSV, etc.). Satan hath desired to have you.

Luke 23:17—Entire verse is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.")

Luke 23:34—"Then said Jesus, Father forgive them; for they know not what they do" is stated in the RSV footnote as something which should be omitted.

Luke 23:38—"In letters of Greek and Latin and Hebrew" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 23:42—"Lord" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 23:45—"The sun was eclipsed." ("The sun was darkened.") [A full moon, called "the Passover moon," occurred at night during Passover time. A full moon cannot eclipse the sun; only a new moon can! *Desire of Ages*, 685: "The passover moon, broad and full, shone from a cloudless sky."]

Luke 24:6—"He is not here, but is risen" is omitted.

Luke 24:12—Entire lengthy verse (about what Peter saw at the tomb) is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 24:40—"And when He had thus spoken, He showed them His hands and His feet" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 24:49—"Jerusalem" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Luke 24:51b-52a—"Carried up into heaven. And they worshiped Him" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

("And it came to pass, while He blessed them, He was parted from them, and carried up into heaven. And they worshipped Him . . .")

John 1:14—"Begotten" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

John 1:17—"Moses gave us only the Law with its rigid demand and merciless justice" (Living Bible). ("For the law was given by Moses.")

John 1:18—"Begotten" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

John 1:27—"Preferred before Me" (speaking of Jesus) is omitted (RSV, etc.).

John 3:13—"Which is in heaven" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

John 3:15—"Should not perish" (regarding believers) is omitted (RSV, etc.).

John 3:16, 18—"Begotten" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

John 4:42—"Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

John 6:47—"On Me" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life.")

John 7:53-8:11—All 12 verses are omitted (RSV, etc.). (The woman taken in adultery.)

John 8:16—"Father" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

John 9:35—"Son of God" is changed to "Son of man" (RSV, etc.).

John 11:41—"Where the dead was laid" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

John 16:16—"Because I go to the Father" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

John 17:12—"In the world" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("While I was with them in the world, I kept them in Thy name.")

John 20:29—"Thomas" is omitted (RSV,

etc.).

Acts 2:30—"According to the flesh He would raised up Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 7:30—"Of the Lord" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 7:37—"Him shall ye hear" (speaking of Christ) is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 8:37—Entire lengthy verse is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("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 9:5-6—"It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 10:6—"He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 15:34—Entire verse is omitted (NIV, etc.). ("Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still.")

Acts 16:31—"Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 17:26—"Blood" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 20:25—"Of God" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 20:32—"Brethren" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 23:9—"Let us not fight against God" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 24:6-8—"And would have judged . . . to come unto thee" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 24:15—"Of the dead" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 28:16—"The centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Acts 28:29—Entire verse is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.")

Romans 1:16—"Of Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ.")

Romans 3:25—"In His blood" is omitted (NIV, etc.). ("Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood . . .")

Romans 5:2—"By faith" is omitted (RSV, etc.). (By whom also we have access by faith . . .)

Romans 6:22—"But now having been freed from sin and enslaved to God" (NASV). [This terrible error is repeated dozens of times in the modern versions! God's people are said, not to be "servants," but "slaves" of God! Con-

trast this error with John 8:32, 36; Revelation 5:10; 20:4; 22:5. *New Age Versions*, pp. 224-225, lists 49 New Testament texts where this horrible error is perpetuated. It is true that *doulos*, in the Greek, can mean either "servant" or "slave." But the context obviously shows that we are never enslaved to God. We always have free will.]

Romans 9:28—"In righteousness" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Romans 11:6—"But if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise work is no more work" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Romans 13:9—"Thou shalt not bear false witness" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Romans 14:6—"And he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Romans 14:9—"Both" and "rose" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Christ both died and rose.")

Romans 14:21—"Or is offended, or is made weak" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Romans 15:29—"Of the Gospel" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Romans 16:24—"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen." is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 Corinthians 1:14—"I thank God" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 Corinthians 5:7—"Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 Corinthians 6:20—"And in your spirit which are God's" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("For ye are brought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit which are God's.")

1 Corinthians 7:39—"By the law" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth.")

1 Corinthians 10:28—"For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 Corinthians 11:24—"Take eat" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Take eat; this is My body . . .")

1 Corinthians 11:24—"Broken for you" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("This is My body which is broken for you.")

1 Corinthians 11:29—"Lord's" is omitted (RSV, etc.). (" . . . not discerning the Lord's body.")

1 Corinthians 15:47—"The Lord" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("The second man is the Lord from heaven.")

1 Corinthians 16:22—"Jesus Christ" is

omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 Corinthians 16:23—"Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

2 Corinthians 4:6—"Jesus" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

2 Corinthians 4:10—"The Lord" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Galatians 3:1—"That ye should not obey the truth" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth.")

Galatians 4:3—"We were slaves to Jewish laws and rituals" (Living Bible). ("Were in bondage under the elements of the world.")

Galatians 4:7—"Through Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.). (" . . . an heir of God through Christ.")

Galatians 6:15—"In Christ Jesus" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("For in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything . . .")

Ephesians 3:9—"By Jesus Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Who created all things by Jesus Christ.")

Ephesians 3:14—"Of our Lord Jesus Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.")

Philippians 3:16—"Let us mind the same thing" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Philippians 3:20—"Wait for a Savior" instead of "look for the Saviour" (RSV, etc.).

Colossians 1:2—"And the Lord Jesus Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.")

Colossians 1:14—"Through His blood" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("In whom we have redemption through His blood.")

Colossians 3:6—"On the children of disobedience" is omitted (NIV, etc.). ("The wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience.")

1 Thessalonians 1:1—"From God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 Thessalonians 3:11—"Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

2 Thessalonians 1:8—"Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 Timothy 3:2, 12—"Can marry only once" instead of "must be the husband of one wife." [According to this false teaching, the bishop can marry only once in his lifetime.]

1 Timothy 3:16—"God" is omitted, or changed to "who" (RSV, etc.). ("And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh.")

1 Timothy 6:5—"From such withdraw thyself" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Men of corrupt minds . . . from such withdraw thyself.")

2 Timothy 1:11—"Of the Gentiles" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("I am appointed . . . a teacher of the Gentiles.")

2 Timothy 4:22—"Jesus Christ," or sometimes "Christ," is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Titus 1:4—"The Lord" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Hebrews 1:3—"He reflects the glory of God, and bears the very stamp of His nature." ("Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person." ["Being" and "reflecting" are very different.]

Hebrews 1:3—"By Himself" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("When He had by Himself purged our sins.")

Hebrews 2:7—"And didst set Him over the works of Thy hands" is omitted (some modern versions).

Hebrews 2:11—"Are all of one origin" (or "father") is added (RSV, etc.). ("For both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one." [This change makes Jesus and the human race have the same beginning.]

Hebrews 7:21—"After the order of Melchisedec" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Hebrews 10:30—"Saith the Lord" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("I will recompense, saith the Lord.")

Hebrews 10:34—"In heaven" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.")

Hebrews 11:11—"Was delivered" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Sarah . . . was delivered of a child.")

Hebrews 12:2—"Pioneer and perfecter" instead of "author and finisher." ("Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith." [Jesus is not one of the pioneers of our faith, He is the originator of it.]

James 5:16—"Faults" is changed to "sins" (RSV, etc.). ("Confess your faults one to another, and pray for one another . . .")

1 Peter 1:22—"Through the Spirit" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit.")

1 Peter 4:1—"For us" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh.")

1 Peter 4:14—"On their part He is evil spoken of, but on your part He is glorified" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 Peter 5:10—"Jesus" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 Peter 5:11—"Glory" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("To Him be glory and dominion . . .")

2 Peter 2:17—"Forever" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 John 1:7—"Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 John 2:7—"From the beginning" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("The Word which ye have heard from the beginning.")

1 John 4:3—"Christ is come in the flesh" is omitted (many modern versions). ("Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God.")

1 John 4:9—"Begotten" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

1 John 4:19—"Him" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("We love Him, because He first loved us.")

1 John 5:7-8—"In heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Jude 25—"Wise" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("To the only wise God our Saviour.")

Revelation 1:8—"The Beginning and the Ending" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("I am the Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending.")

Revelation 1:9—"Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Revelation 1:11—"I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Revelation 2:13—"Thy works" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("I know thy works and where thou dwellest . . .")

Revelation 5:14—"Him that liveth for ever and ever" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Revelation 6:1, 3, 5, 7—"And see" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Come and see.")

Revelation 11:17—"And art to come" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("O Lord God almighty, which art and wast, and art to come.")

Revelation 12:12—"Inhabiters of the earth" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Woe to the inhabiters of the earth . . .")

Revelation 12:17—"Christ" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("Which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.")

Revelation 14:5—"Before the throne of God" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("They are without fault before the throne of God.")

Revelation 16:3, 8, 10, 12, 17—"Angel" is omitted (RSV, etc.).

Revelation 16:17—"Of heaven" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("There came a great voice out of the temple of heaven.")

Revelation 20:9—"From God" is omitted

(RSV, etc.). ("Fire came down from God out of heaven.") [In describing the final death of the wicked, Ellen White quotes the KJV of this verse over 10 times.]

Revelation 20:12—"God" is changed to "the throne." (RSV, etc.).

Revelation 21:24—"Them which are saved" is omitted (RSV, etc.). ("The nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light . . .")

Revelation 22:14—"Wash their robes" instead of "do His commandments" (RSV, etc.). ("Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.")

THE TRUTH ABOUT MARK 16:9-20

The omission of Mark 16:9-20 from the modern versions constitutes the largest single omission of all. It deserves special attention.

The "experts" would have us believe that the ending of Mark clearly has no supporting evidence from the ancient manuscripts, translations, and early church "fathers."

"It is admittedly difficult to arrive at the conclusion that any of these readings is the original. But on the basis of the known manuscript evidence it seems more likely that either Mark ended at verse 8, or the real ending is not extant. Of these two views the former one is more compatible with the concept of a complete canon."—*Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, A General Introduction to the Bible, p. 373.*

Let us examine the evidence. First, there are the uncials (capital letter Greek manuscripts). The omission is found only in two uncials: the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

The experts tell us that the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are the purest ancient Bible manuscripts, especially since they so closely agree. But that is not true. We find that they disagree in over 3,000 places in the Gospels alone! (*Herman C. Hoskier, Codex B and Its Allies, Vol. 2, p. 1*).

Uncials were prepared for about ten centuries. The earliest of them are the Sinaiticus (Aleph), Vaticanus (B), Ephraemi (C), Alexandrinus (A), and Bezae (D). Scholars tell us that the ending of Mark 16 is omitted from many of these ancient codices. But we discover it is only missing from two of them: **Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.** In contrast **none of the other uncials omit the Mark 16 ending—and there are at least 18 of them!**

Then there are the cursives (lower case Greek manuscripts). All of these have the Mark 16 ending—and there are about 600 cursive copies of the book of Mark.

“With the exception of the two uncial manuscripts which have just been named, there is not one codex in existence, uncial or cursive, (and we are acquainted with, at least, eighteen other uncials, and about six hundred cursive copies of this Gospel), which leaves out the last twelve verses of St. Mark.

“The inference which an unscientific observer would draw from this fact is no doubt, in this instance, the correct one. He demands to be shown the Alexandrian (A), and the Parisian Codex (C), neither of them probably removed by much more than fifty years from the date of the Codex Sinaiticus, and both unquestionably derived from different originals; and he ascertains that no countenance is lent by either of those venerable monuments to the proposed omission of this part of the sacred text.

“He discovers that the Codex Bezae (D), the only remaining very ancient manuscript authority—notwithstanding that it is observed on most occasions to exhibit an extraordinary sympathy with the Vatican (B)—here sides with A and C against B and Aleph [Vaticanus and Sinaiticus].

“He inquires after all the other uncials and all the cursive manuscripts in existence, (some of them dating from the tenth century) and requests to have it explained to him why it is to be supposed that all these many witnesses, belonging to so many different patriarchates, provinces, ages of the church, have entered into a grand conspiracy to bear false witness on a point of this magnitude and importance? But he obtains no intelligible answer to this question.”—*John W. Burgon, quoted in Jay P. Green, ed., Unholy Hands on the Bible, Vol. 1, pp. 40-41.*

So we find that, in the ancient Greek manuscripts, 618 have the ending of Mark and two do not.

Then we come to the translations, and we find that only two of them had the omission; One was the Sinaitic Syriac, which, like the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, was prepared in Alexandria, Egypt. The other was the Codex Bobiensis, a Latin manuscript (Edward F. Hills, *Believing Bible Study*, p. 133).

Then there are the quotations in the early church “fathers.” None of them knew anything about the missing passage in Mark, with the exception of a few apostates.

Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons is one of several Ante-Nicene fathers whose extant writings contain quotations from *Mark 16:9-20*. He cites *Mark 16:19* in his polemical treatise, entitled *Irenaeus Against Heresies*, penned in approximately A.D. 177 (over a century and a half before Vaticanus and Sinaiticus).

Eusebius of Caesarea (who predicted that Constantine and Christ would reign together through eternity) knew about the omission, but did not care whether it was left in or not (*Colm Luibheid, The Essential Eusebius, p. 213*). (See *Great Controversy, p. 574*, for Ellen White’s comment on Eusebius.)

In one of his books, Burgon quotes from **30 different church “fathers” who knew that the ending of Mark was there.**

Then there are the lectionaries (quotations from the Bible which were read from the pulpit). The ending of Mark is in all of them.

“But the significance of a single feature of the lectionary, of which up to this point nothing has been said, is alone sufficient to determine the controversy. We refer to the fact that in every part of Eastern Christendom these same twelve verses—neither more nor less—have been from the earliest recorded period, and still are, a proper lesson both for the Easter season and for Ascension Day.”—*Burgon, Revision Revised, p. 40.*

Burgon summarized the ancient evidence:

“Similarly, concerning THE LAST 12 VERSES OF ST. MARK which you brand with suspicion and separate off from the rest of the Gospel, in token that, in your opinion, there is “a breach of continuity” (p. 53) (whatever that may mean), between verses 8 and 9. Your ground for thus disallowing the last 12 verses of the second Gospel is that B and Aleph [Vaticanus and Sinaiticus] omit them:—that a few late manuscripts exhibit a wretched alternative for them. Now, my method on the contrary is to refer all such questions to ‘the consentient testimony of the most ancient authorities.’ And I invite you to note the result of such an appeal in the present instance. The verses in question I find are recognized:

“In the second century,—by the Old Latin, and Syriac Versions [translations] by Papias; Justin M.; Irenaeus; Tertulian.

“In the third century,—by the Coptic and Sahidic versions: by Hippolytus; by Vincentius, at the seventh Council of Carthage; by the ‘Acta Pilati’; and the ‘Apostolical Constitutions’ in

two places.

"In the fourth century,—by Cureton's Syriac and the Gothic Versions; besides the Syriac Table of Canons; Eusebius; Macanus Magnes; Aphraates; Didymus; the Syriac 'Acts of the Apostles'; Epiphanius; Leontius; Ephraem; Ambrose; Chrysostom; Jerome; Augustine.

"In the fifth century,—besides the Armenian Versions, by codices A and C; by Leo; Nestorius; Cyril of Alexandria; Victor of Antioch; Patricius; Manjus Mercator.

"In the sixth and seventh centuries,—besides cod. D, the Georgian and Ethiopic Versions; by Hesychius; Gregentius; Prosper; John of Thessalonica; and Modestus, bishop of Jerusalem."—*John William Burgon, The Revision Revised, pp. 422-423.*

So the evidence is quite clear that Mark 16:9-20 really does belong on the end of the book of Mark.

The next question is how did it happen to become omitted? Because of John Burgon's research, we have some answers.

How could it possibly be that all the other Gospels end on a glorious note—and 24 of the New Testament books end with "Amen—yet Mark ends ingloriously with the words:

"And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid."—*Mark 16:8.*

There is evidence that the earliest arrangement of the four Gospels was John, Matthew, Luke, and Mark.

This placing of Mark last would cause the whole to end on a note of fear and trembling. "For they were afraid." But "God hath not given us the spirit of fear" (*2 Timothy 1:7*), so what is the solution?

One of the most fantastic theories devised by the "experts" is that Mark suddenly died at Mark 16:8—in spite of the testimony of several early "fathers," that he outlived the completion of His Gospel (*Hills, King James Version Defended, pp. 160-161*).

In order to find the answer to the problem, we need only look at the actual manuscripts of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

Because the data could seem complicated, we will place the key points in bold fact.

"If you had the Codex Vaticanus before you, each page (measuring 10" x 10½") would be seen to contain three columns of 42 lines each.

Whenever the respective scribe concluded the individual books within his codex, he would do so according to an established pattern. **After penning his final lines, he would accentuate the book's completion by purposely leaving the column's remaining space blank. The next book would begin at the top of the adjacent column.**

"When arriving at *Mark 16:9-20* however, we observe a pronounced departure from this otherwise consistent procedure. With *Mark 16:8* terminating on line 31, we note that **the remaining eleven blank lines are followed not by a fresh column with Luke 1, but rather by an additional 42 blank lines! This space of a whole column is striking as it constitutes the only such occurrence in the entire 759-page manuscript.**

"The reason you don't find this discussed by modern Greek scholars should be obvious. As these fifty-three lines could have accommodated the missing twelve verses, our 'ancient authority' is suddenly seen to be a dubious document at best."—*W.P. Grady, Final Authority, p. 49.*

When something is missing in an ancient manuscript, and there is space where it used to be, that space is called a *lacuna*. John Burgon explains the significance of this *lacuna*:

"The older manuscript from which Cod. B was copied must have infallibly contained the twelve verses in dispute. **The copyist was instructed to leave them out, and he obeyed; but he prudently left a blank space in memoriam rei. Never was blank more intelligible! Never was silence more eloquent!**

"By this simple expedient, strange to relate, the Vatican Codex is made to recite itself even while it seems to be bearing testimony against the concluding verses of St. Mark's Gospel, by withholding them: for it forbids the inference which, under ordinary circumstances, must have been drawn from that omission. It does more. **By leaving room for the verses it omits, it brings into prominent notice at the end of fifteen centuries and a half a more ancient witness than itself.** The venerable author of the original codex, from which Codex B was copied, is thereby besought to view.

"And thus, our supposed adversary (Codex B) proves our most useful ally; for it procures us the testimony of an hitherto unsuspected witness. The earlier scribe unmistakably comes forward at this stage of the inquiry, to explain that he at least is prepared to answer for the genuineness of these twelve concluding verses with which the later scribe, his copyist, from his omission of them, might unhappily be

thought to have been unacquainted.”—*John William Burgon, quoted in Green, Unholy Hands, p. 49.*

Grady provides further explanation:

“When examining Codex Sinaiticus we discover that the shenanigans are stranger yet. Each of the slightly larger pages (leafs) of this uncial manuscript (13½" x 14") contains four 2½"-wide columns of 48 lines respectively.

“However, when viewing the conclusion of Mark’s Gospel in this codex, even the novice will find his attention arrested by two pronounced signs of textual intrusion. The first of these concerns the presence of six pages unlike the other 3,64½ leaves in several particulars. This initial cause for suspicion is intensified further by the twofold discovery that one leaf contains *Mark 16:2-Luke 1:56* while the handwriting style for all six pages matches that of the Vatican Codex B.”

Grady’s source for that is *Burgon, Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established, pp. 298-299.*

What the above discovery reveals is that the omission of *Mark 16:9-20* in both the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus—was made by the same scribe! The scribe which made the Vatican codex is the one which made the six pages in Sinaiticus which omitted the ending of Mark. One man omitted the ending of Mark from both codices.

“It is noteworthy that this opinion regarding the interpolation of B’s scribe enjoys a rare concurrence between both sides of the debate. And furthermore, before we discover the content of these spurious leaves, let it be recognized that the real significance of this partisan theory is that the number of Greek codices hostile to *Mark 16:9-20* has been reduced by half!”—*Grady, op. cit., p. 50.*

Dr. Scrivener mentions the fact that **Tischendorf, who discovered the Sinaiticus and the first to examine both the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, was the first to declare that the Vaticanus scribe produced those six pages.**

“I have ventured but slowly to vouch for Tischendorf’s notion, that six leaves of Codex Aleph [Sinaiticus], that containing *Mark 15:2* to *Luke 1:56* being one of them, were written by the scribe of Codex B [Vaticanus]. On mere identity of handwriting and the peculiar shape of certain letters who shall insist? Yet there are parts of the case which I know not how to answer, and which have persuaded even Dr. Hort. Having now arrived at this conclusion our inference is simple and direct, that at least in

these leaves, Codex B [Vaticanus] make but one witness, not two.”—*Scrivener, Criticism of the New Testament, p. 337.*

Grady explains further:

“Should this codex be opened before you, the page containing Mark’s ending would constitute the recto of leaf 29 (or the front side of page 29 laid open to your right), containing the four columns of *Mark 16:2-Luke 1:18*. On your left would be the verso (or the back of leaf 28) displaying the four columns of *Mark 15:16-16:1*.

“When these eight columns are viewed in their adjacent setting, the second tell-tale evidence of scribal tampering becomes readily apparent. As if to illustrate the adage, ‘If at first you don’t succeed, try, try again,’ B’s [Vaticanus] scribe made a determined effort to cover his tracks by his subsequent elimination of *Mark 16:9-20* via the excision of several whole pages. This time, instead of leaving an entire column blank, he ventured on a solution that is not unfamiliar to the average student of today. With *Mark 16:8* concluding on line four of column six, and *Luke 1:1* situated atop column seven, our deceiver appeared to be home free.”—*Grady, op. cit., pp. 50-51.*

What the scribe did was this: When he got to the end of *Mark 16:8*, he left a suspiciously extra amount of blank space to the end of the book—more than were left at the end of the other books of the Bible. He was signaling that he had omitted something.

“But the writing of these six columns of St. Mark is so spread out that they contain less matter than they ought; whereas the columns of St. Luke that follow contain the normal amount. It follows, therefore, that the change introduced by the *diorthota* [B’s scribe] must have been an extensive excision from St. Mark:—in other words, that these pages as originally written must have contained a portion of St. Mark of considerable length which has been omitted from the pages as they now stand. If these six columns of St. Mark were written as closely as the columns of St. Luke which follow, there would be room in them for the omitted twelve verses.”—*Burgon, Traditional Text, p. 299.*

Yet, in spite of all this evidence, modern Bible translators keep removing *Mark 16:9-20* from their versions. The reason they do this is rather obvious. They are too lazy to check out the sources. Instead, they assume that Westcott and Hort knew what they were talking about.

From Nestle to the most recent translator, everyone blindly follows the theory of Westcott and Hort, that *Mark 16:9-20* is worthless and must be kept out of modern Bibles.

The only reason some modern Bibles have put the ending back into the text is to increase sales by complaining Christians.

DOCTRINAL FACTORS IN THE KING JAMES

Throughout this book, we have repeatedly seen that the King James Bible is the best English-language Bible in the world.

But there are two problems of which we should be aware:

When the translators of the King James came to certain passages, they assumed the verses should be translated in accordance with their preconception of the state of the dead and the punishment of the wicked. Although they were good men, not all the errors of Rome had been corrected in the minds of God's people back then.

The following five points are quoted from the present writer's book, *Life Only in Christ* (which is a rather complete set of Bible studies on the state of the dead, punishment of the wicked, and spiritualism):

• ***Matthew 10:28*: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."**

This proves the soul and the body are two different things? The body can be destroyed and the soul remain; and therefore, after the body is destroyed, the soul lives on forever?

1. This text teaches that both soul and body can be destroyed in hell. That is correct. Those who believe the immortal-soul doctrine think that the soul is immortal and will live forever. But this passage shows that idea to be false.

2. This text does not teach that the body and soul are two different entities, for this reason: Here, as in every other place in the New Testament, the word, translated "soul," in the KJV is from the Greek word, *psuche*. But an equal number of times, *psuche* was translated "life." That is what should be in this verse: "life," not "soul." To clarify this, here is *Matthew 16:25-26*:

"For whosoever will save his life [*psuche*]

shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life [*psuche*] for My sake shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul [*psuche*]? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul [*psuche*]?"

Psuche should have been translated "life" in both verses. When the word, "life," is substituted for "soul" in *Matthew 10:28*, there is no problem. The day is coming when the wicked will have their entire lives destroyed; they will be annihilated, and not live forever.

• **"Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise." *Luke 23:43*.**

According to this, Christ told the thief he would be with Christ that same day in Paradise?

It is of interest that we are told that, as soon as He died, Christ went to preach to the spirits in prison, but also that He went immediately to paradise. But both concepts are incorrect.

1. "Paradise" is where God's throne is (*Rev. 2:7* with *22:1-2*). Therefore, if Christ went to paradise that day, He went immediately to heaven where God the Father is.

But, on Sunday morning, He told Mary that He had not yet ascended to the Father (*John 20:17*).

In addition, the Bible says He arose from the dead on Sunday morning; and, after He arose, the women said, "Come, see the place where the Lord lay" (*Matt. 28:6*). It is clear that Christ was in the tomb from Friday afternoon until Sunday morning.

2. Note the punctuation of *Luke 23:43*. The early Bible manuscripts did not have the comma; but, instead, they read words together like this: *insteadranwordstogether*. Later translators used their best judgment in deciding where to place the commas, but they were certainly not inspired as were the original writers.

The commas are not over 400 years old; whereas the Inspired Writings themselves are nearly 2,000 years old. The location of the comma can change the meaning of the sentence.

In accordance with other information given about the death and resurrection of Christ, this comma ought to have been placed after "to-day" instead of before it. This would give the "to-day" a deep meaning: On the day of Christ's greatest humiliation, He could announce that the thief would be in heaven with Him! Thank the Lord!

• In the Bible, we find such phrases as “everlasting punishment” (*Matt. 25:46*), “everlasting fire” (*Matt. 25:41*), and “tormented day and night for ever and ever” (*Rev. 20:10*). This proves an eternally burning hell and an immortal soul?

The truth is quite different. The Greek and Hebrew words, sometimes translated “everlasting” or “for ever,” only mean a period of time until a certain thing is ended. Consider these points:

1. The New Testament words, translated “everlasting” and “for ever,” come from the Greek noun, *aion* (or from the adjective, *aionios*, derived from the noun). Learning how these words are used elsewhere in the Bible, we find their real meaning. Here are several examples:

Matthew 13:39—“The end of the world [*aion*].”—But how could something supposedly “endless” have an end? And, according to this verse, it *did* have an end.

Ephesians 1:21—Christ has been exalted above “every name that is named, not only in this world [*aion*], but also in that which is to come.”

1 Corinthians 2:7—Whitch “God ordained before the world [*aion*].”

Hebrews 5:6—“Thou [Christ] art a priest for ever [*aion*].” Yet Christ will only be a priest until sin has been blotted out.

Philemon 15-16—“Thou [Philemon] shouldst receive him [Onesimus] for ever [*aionios*] . . . both in the flesh, and in the Lord.” Is Philemon to take back Onesimus as his servant forever?

H.C.G. Moule, the well-known Greek scholar, makes this comment about Philemon 15-16:

“The adjective tends to mark duration as long as the nature of the subject allows.”—*The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*.

Jude 7—“Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them . . . suffering the vengeance of eternal [*aionios*] fire.” But those cities are not still burning. They are today under the south part of the Dead Sea. God turned “the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha into ashes” (*2 Peter 2:6*).

If the *aionios* fire of Sodom and Gomorrah, sent as a judgment from God to destroy the wicked living there, burned itself out in ashes and is no longer burning, we can conclude that the *aionios* fire of the final judgment on the wicked will do likewise.

2. *Olam* is the Old Testament equivalent to *aion* in the New Testament. Here are some examples:

Exodus 12:24—The Passover was to be kept “for ever [*olam*].” But it ended at Calvary (*Heb. 9:24-26*).

1 Chronicles 23:13—Aaron and his sons were to offer incense “for ever [*olam*]” and have an “everlasting [*olam*] priesthood” (*Ex. 40:15*). But that priesthood ended at the cross (*Heb. 7:11-14*).

Exodus 21:1-6—A servant who desired to stay with his master must serve him “for ever [*olam*].” Must he serve him through all eternity, after both reach heaven?

Jonah 2:6—Later describing his experience in the whale, Jonah said, “The earth with her bars was about me for ever [*olam*].” Yet this “for ever” was only “three days and three nights” long (*Jonah 1:17*).

2 Kings 5:27—Because Gehazi lied in order to enrich himself, Elisha said, “The leprosy therefore of Naaman shall cleave unto thee, and unto thy seed for ever [*olam*].” Was Gehazi’s family to never end, and that leprosy to be perpetuated for all time to come?

3. The Old Testament word, *olam*, and the New Testament word, *aion*, are equivalent terms. We know this to be true for two reasons: (1) The Septuagint, the ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament, always translates *olam* by *aion*. (2) Whenever an Old Testament passage containing *olam* is quoted in the New Testament, *aion* is used (*Heb. 1:8; 5:6; 6:20; 7:17, 21; 13:20; 1 Peter 1:25*).

Both words clearly have a very limited time value, and do not mean an eternal time length.

• Do the Bible passages, in which the word “hell” is used, show that the wicked go there as soon as they die and then remain there?

1. In the Old Testament, the word, “hell,” is always translated from one word. That word is *sheol*. *Sheol* means “the grave,” and never “a place of burning” or “hellfire.” *Sheol* simply means “the unseen state.” Study any analytical concordance, and you will nowhere find the idea of fire or punishment in the usage of *sheol*.

Jonah 2:1-2—This is a good example of how *sheol* is used. “Then Jonah prayed unto the Lord his God out of the fish’s belly . . . out of the belly of hell [*sheol*] cried I.” There is no hellfire in a whale’s stomach. The marginal reading of this text is “the grave.”

At death, everyone, both good and bad, goes

to *sheol*.

Psalm 89:48—“What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave [*sheol*]?”

Job 17:13—Regarding godly Job: “If I wait, the grave [*sheol*] is mine house.”

Psalm 9:17—Regarding the wicked: “The wicked shall be turned into hell [*sheol*].”

2. In the New Testament, the word, “hell,” is translated from three different words:

(1) *Tartaros*, which means “a dark abyss.” This occurs only in *2 Peter 2:4*. Satan and his angels have been cast out of heaven and down into the darkness of this world; and they are being “reserved” unto the day of judgment, a future time when they will receive their punishment.

(2) *Hades*, which means only “the grave,” is translated as “hell” ten times in the New Testament.

The Septuagint (which is the ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament) almost always translates *sheol* (the Old Testament Hebrew word for grave) by the word, *hades*. Therefore they have the same meaning.

Psalm 16:10—This is a prophecy of Christ in the grave, and says, “Thou [God] will not leave My soul in hell [*sheol*].” It is quoted in the New Testament as “hell [*hades*]” (*Acts 2:27*). It is clear that *sheol* and *hades* mean “the grave.” That is the meaning given to them by all Bible scholars.

Acts 2:27—This text speaks of Christ as being in *hades*. But we all agree that Christ did not go into hellfire! Christ went into the grave.

(3) *Gehenna* is the third word which, in the New Testament, is translated “hell.” This time “hell” is the correct translation!

This is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew word, *Hinnom* (the Valley of Hinnom), the name of a valley on the south side of Jerusalem used as the city dump. Garbage was there burned up.

Of the twelve times *Gehenna* is used, two facts stand out:

a. The “body” as well as the soul is said to be “cast into hell.” Twice the phrase, “the whole body,” is used (*Matt. 5:29-30, 10:28*).

b. In not one of those twelve instances does the text tell when the wicked will be “cast into hell.” The fiery judgment is simply described as a future event. Thus it is clear that the Bible never says that anyone who goes into hellfire—

goes there at death. Not once does it say that anyone is now suffering in the fire of hell.

Therefore, the fiery hell does not come right after death, but at some later time. The “whole body” is not cast into hellfire at death, but is placed in the grave.

The *Gehenna* passages indicate that the wicked are “cast into” the fire. The phrase, “cast into hell [*Gehenna*],” is used in six of the twelve times *Gehenna* is found in the New Testament. This is matching the parallel where refuse is cast into the fires of Gehenna Valley.

Is there no place where we are told when this hellfire occurs? Yes, there is: *Revelation 20* explains that, after the millennium, the wicked are raised to life; and, after the final judgment before the great white throne, they are cast into “the lake of fire” (*Rev. 20:12-15*). It is at that same time that “death and hell are cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death” (*Rev. 20:14*).

Does that lake of fire experience occur eternally? Obviously not; for at the same time that the wicked perish in the flames, “death and hell” are destroyed also! Lastly, we are told what that lake of fire experience actually is: “the second death.” It is not eternal life in misery, but the final obliteration of the wicked. There will be no endless misery to cause concern to God’s redeemed ones. The fire will burn out in a very short time, and go out.

Then, the righteous will come out of the city and the wicked will be ashes under their feet.

“For, behold the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.

“But unto you that fear My name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts.” *Malachi 4:1-3*.

• *Revelation 14:11* says, “The smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever.” How do you explain that?

The passage says this: “The smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark

of his name.”—*Revelation 14:11*.

This passage is taken with little change from an Old Testament prophecy about Idumaea (ancient Edom):

“And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever: from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever.” *Isaiah 34:9-10*.

Notice the points mentioned here: *First*, about the fire: (1) shall not be quenched; (2) night nor day; (3) smoke goes up for ever. *Second*, about the wasteland which shall afterward result: (1) from generation to generation it shall lie waste; (2) none shall pass through it for ever and ever.

Using the correct meaning of “for ever,” which we have discovered, we find that fire predicted by Isaiah to occur in Edom—did just that. It was a thorough fire which could not be quenched while it was burning. It burned night and day as long as it burned. The smoke from the fire went up as long as it burned. When the fire stopped, it would lie waste from generation to generation thereafter, and no one would pass through it. (If the fire did not cease, it could not afterward, as predicted, “lie waste.”)

Ancient Idumaea is a desolate wasteland today, and its cities are ruins. The prophecy was exactly fulfilled—yet that fire went out thousands of years ago. The smoke of that burning stopped when the fire went out.

With that in mind, we turn our attention to the equivalent prediction in *Revelation 14:11*; and, using the correct translation of *aionios* (“for ever”), we find that this verse agrees with all the others: The fire will burn only until the wicked burn up and are consumed. When the fire goes out, the smoke will cease also—otherwise the redeemed could not live on the earth amid smoke going up forever!

We must let the Bible agree with itself! The meek will inherit the earth (*Matt. 5:5, Ps. 37:11*), not the wicked! How could the redeemed enjoy the new earth if the wicked were endlessly burning and suffering on its surface?

To conclude this brief study, let me tell you of a man I met about thirty years ago, in Oregon. He was a lay evangelist; and I asked him how he got started. He told me he once had a friend with whom he shared our historic beliefs.

But his friend simply could not grasp the great truth that God does not burn people in hellfire without end. Yet this man was certain his friend was sincere and would accept the truth if it was presented to him clearly enough.

I asked him what happened. He said he studied with his friend for two years; and, during that time, he became a thorough Bible student. Then, one evening, he presented to his friend passages he found which described how hellfire will burn on the surface of the earth. His friend was convinced; for he saw that (1) the fire could not be now burning, and (2) it would have to be brief or the saints could not inherit the earth and live thereon through all eternity.

How thankful we can be that the Bible is so consistent with itself! The apparent problems are caused by the misunderstandings of those who translated the book. The King James translators did not understand that *aion* did not mean forever and that the grave was not hellfire.

The Bible does not say that the judgment fire will burn endlessly; for this blazing fire on the surface of the earth must go out, so God can create “a new earth” (*2 Peter 3:12-13* and *Rev. 20-21*). There must therefore be an end to the fire, else this earth could not be recreated—so the meek could inherit it and dwell on it through all eternity.

How wonderful it is to know that our God is a God of deepest love. Yes, it is true that the wicked must die; for they could never be happy in heaven. But how kind it is of Him to quickly end their miserable lives!

They will be raised after the millennium only long enough to learn the issues in the great controversy between good and evil and to understand how their lost condition was their own responsibility.

Then they will quickly cease to exist. There will be a few, like Hitler (and, of course, Satan and his angels!), who will suffer on for a time; but, for most, death will come very quickly.

The Bible nowhere says that souls are immortal; but, instead, it declares that “the soul that sinneth, it shall die” (*Ezekiel 18:4*).

A LIST OF ARCHAIC WORDS IN THE KING JAMES

There are, in some instances, words in the King James which are not properly understood today. However, when we search for them, we find that the actual number is not very large.

It would be nice if these words could be corrected. Unfortunately, when modern publishers attempt the task (as they did with the New King James Version), they go overboard—and insert a lot of Westcott-Hort errors.

Speaking of the 1881 English Revised Version, we are told:

“The revisers had a wonderful opportunity. They might have made a few changes and removed a few archaic expressions, and made the Authorized Version the most acceptable and beautiful and wonderful book of all time to come. But they wished ruthlessly to meddle. Some of them wanted to change doctrine. Some of them did not know good English literature when they saw it . . . There were enough modernists among the revisers to change the words of Scripture itself so as to throw doubt on the Scripture.”—*Herald and Presbyterian, July 16, 1924, p. 10 [Presbyterian church paper].*

It would be well to identify the primary archaic words in the King James Bible. The following list probably contains most of them. The Bible references are not, of course, exhaustive. In some instances, a word translated by one of those below has a different meaning in a different passage.

- Abroad - without, outside (Deut. 24:11, Judges 12:9)
- Advertise - Let you know, tell you (Num. 24:14, Ruth 4:4)
- Anon - immediately (Mark 1:30)
- Apparently - clearly (Num. 12:8)
- Artillery - weapons (1 Sam. 20:40)
- Book - indictment (Job 31:35)
- Bowels - heart (Gen. 43:30)
- By and by - at once (Mark 6:25)
- Careful - anxious (Jer. 17:8, Luke 10:41)
- Carelessly - secure (Isa. 47:8, Zeph. 2:15)
- Carriage - baggage (1 Sam. 17:22, Judges 18:21)
- Charity - love (1 Cor. 13)
- Coast - border (Ex. 10:4, Josh. 1:4, 17:9, Matt. 2:16)
- Comprehend - enclose (Isa. 40:12) / overcome (John 1:5)
- Convenient - needful, required (Prov. 30:8, Eph. 5:4, Philemon 8)
- Conversant - lived (Josh. 8:35) / went (1 Sam 25:15)
- Conversation - behavior (1 Peter 3:1-2)
- Convince - confute (Job 32:12) / convict (John 8:46)
- Cunning - skillful (Gen 25:27, 1 Sam. 16:16, 1 Chron. 22:15)
- Curious - skillfully woven (Ex. 28:8) / skillful (Ex. 35:32)
- Curiously - intricately (Ps. 139:15)
- Delectable - that they delight in (Isa. 44:9)
- Denounce - declare (Deut. 30:18)
- Discover - uncover (Ps. 29:9, Isa. 22:8, Micah 1:6)
- Dote - become fools (Jer. 50:36)
- Duke - chief (Gen. 36:15)
- Feebleminded - fainthearted (1 Thess. 5:14)
- Forwardness - readiness (2 Cor. 9:2)
- Furniture - saddle (Gen. 31:34)
- Halt - fall (Ps. 38:17) / go limping (1 Kgs. 18:21)
- Harness - armor (1 Kgs. 20:11, 22:34)
- Imagine - purpose, conceive (Gen. 11:6, Ps. 2:1, 10:2)
- Leasing - falsehood, lies (Ps. 4:2, 5:6)
- Let - hinder (Isa. 43:13) / prevented (Rom 1:13)
- Libertines - Freedmen (Acts 6:9)
- Meat - food (Gen. 1:29-30, Deut. 20:20, Matt. 6:25, John 4:32)
- Meat offering - meal offering, cereal offering (Lev. 2:1)
- Mortify - put to death (Rom. 8:13, Col. 3:5)
- Munition - stronghold, fortress (Isa. 29:7, 33:16, Nahum 2:1)
- Naughtiness - evil, iniquity (1 Sam. 17:28, Prov. 11:6, James 1:21)
- Naughty - worthless (Prov. 6:12) / bad (Jer. 24:2)
- Nephew - grandson (Judges 12:14, 1 Tim. 5:4) / descendant (Job 18:19)
- Occupied - used (Ex. 38:24, Judges 16:11)
- Occupier - dealer (Eze. 27:27)
- Occupy - deal, trade (Eze. 27:9, Luke 19:13)
- Outlandish - foreign (Neh. 13:26)
- Out of hand - at once (Num. 11:15)
- Overran - outran (2 Sam. 18:23)
- Peculiar - one's own possession (Ex. 19:5, Deut. 14:2)
- Person - be partial (Deut. 1:17, Prov. 28:21)
- Pitiful - compassionate (Lam. 4:10)
- Presently - at once (Prov. 12:16, Matt. 21:19, 26:53)
- Prevent - receive, go before (Job 3:12, Ps.

119:147, Matt. 17:25) / preceded (1 Thess. 4:15)
 Provoke - stir up (2 Cor. 9:2, Heb. 10:24)
 Publish - proclaim (Deut. 32:3, 1 Sam. 31:9)
 Purchase - gain (Ps. 78:54, 1 Tim. 3:13)
 Quick - alive, living (Num. 16:30, Ps. 55:15, 124:3)
 Quicken - give life (Ps. 119:50) / come to life (1 Cor. 15:36) / make alive (Eph. 2:1)
 Record - witness (Job 16:19, Phil. 1:8)
 Reins - kidneys (Job 16:13) / hearts (Ps. 7:9)
 Repent self - have compassion on (Deut. 32:36; Judges 21:6, 15)
 Replenish - fill full (Gen. 1:28, 9:1)
 Require - ask (Ezra 8:22)
 Reward - recompense, requite (Deut. 32:41, Ps. 54:5, 2 Tim. 4:14)
 Rid - deliver, rescue (Gen. 37:22, Ex. 6:6)
 Riotous - gluttonous (Prov. 23:20) / gluttons (Prov. 28:7)
 Road - raid (1 Sam. 27:10)
 Room - place (2 Sam. 19:13, 1 Chron. 4:41, Ps. 31:8, Luke 14:7)
 Secure - off its guard (Judges 8:11) / unsuspecting (Judges 18:7, 10)
 Securely - trustingly (Prov. 3:29)
 Slime - bitumen, tar (Gen. 14:10)
 Sottish - stupid (Jer. 4:22)
 Strait - small (2 Kgs. 6:1) / narrow (Isa. 49:20, Matt. 7:13)
 Straitly - carefully (Gen. 43:7)
 Straitness - distress (Deut. 28:53, 55, 57; Jer. 19:9)
 Suffer - let (Gen. 20:6, Matt. 19:14)
 Take thought - be anxious (1 Sam. 9:5, Matt. 6:25)
 Tale - number (Ex. 5:8, 18; 1 Sam. 18:27)
 Target - javelin (1 Sam. 17:6) / shield (1 Kgs. 10:16)
 Tell - number, count (Gen. 15:5, Ps. 22:17, Ps. 48:12)
 Translate - transfer (2 Sam. 3:10) / take up (Heb. 11:5)
 Unspeakable - inexpressible (2 Cor. 9:15)
 Usury - interest (Ex. 22:25, Lev. 25:36, Matt. 25:27)
 Vain - worthless (Judges 9:4, 11:3)
 Vex - wrong (Ex. 22:21) / harass (Num. 25:17) / violently grab (Acts 12:1)

Virtue - power (Mark 5:30, Luke 6:19)
 Volume - roll (Ps. 40:7, Heb. 10:7)
 Wealthy - spacious (Ps. 66:12) / at ease (Jer. 49:31)
 Witty inventions - discretion (Prov. 8:12)

Some will say that the King James Bible is not useable, since it has a few words in it which are not as familiar to us. However, it remains an excellent translation and perfectly understandable.

"The author has lived for a considerable time in Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and the Fiji Islands. In his experience, the indigenous people of these countries evidenced no problems in understanding God's Word in the commonly used KJV. And this—in spite of the fact that, to these people, English is a foreign language!

"Are these people intellectually superior to those of us living in Australia or New Zealand?"—*H.H. Myers, Battle of the Bibles, p. 193.*

THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THREE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

Here is the first portion of the Lord's Prayer in three English translations.

The first line is from the first *Anglo-Saxon translation*, prepared in King Alfred's time (A.D. 870-901).

The second line is from *Wycliffe's version* (A.D. 1382).

The third line is from the *King James Version* (A.D. 1611).

Uren Fader dhic art in heofnas
 Our Fadir that art in heuenes
 Our Father which art in heaven

Sic gehalyed dhin noma
 Halewid be thi name
 Hallowed be thy name

To cymcdh dhin nc
 Thi Kingdom comme to
 Thy Kingdom come

Sic dhin willa sue is in heofnas and in eardhs
 Be thi wille done as in heuen so in erthe
 Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven

Vren hiaf ofer wirthe sd US to daeg
 Gyve to us this dai oure breed ouer other

substance

Give us this day our daily bread

And forgef us scylda urna
And forgive to us oure dettis
And forgive us our debts

Sue we forgef an scuidgun vrum
As we forgyven to oure dettouris
As we forgive our debtors

And no inleadh vridk in costung
And leede us not in to temptacioun
And lead us not into temptation

Als gefrig vrich fro ifle
But de-yvere us fro yvel
But deliver us from evil

ADVENTIST APPROVAL OF MODERN VERSIONS

Pacific Union College may have been the first of our schools to recommend that all religion students purchase and use the newly released Revised Standard Version.

The use of modern versions in our church progressed slowly; but, when the October 1982 issue of *Ministry* magazine was issued, it carried an article, “*Use the Bible Your People Use*” by Charles Case, which counseled our pastors to use the King James in the pulpit—because that is what the church members wanted them to use.

In the same article appeared the findings of a *Ministry* survey, which it indicated that the great majority of church members in North America wanted their pastors to only use the King James Bible.

But gradually, changes came in. Modernists came into positions of influence and the concerns of the members were ignored. Modern Bible versions were repeatedly quoted in church articles and books. The *Sabbath School Lesson Quarterlies*, published by the General Conference for use throughout the world field, increasingly quoted from translations based on the modern critical Greek Texts.

Modern translations began to be quoted almost exclusively in the new Bible textbooks and workbooks, used in our schools—from the lowest to the highest grades.

In 1984, the following significant statement was published in the *United Bible Societies*

Yearly Report:

“The work of the Bible Society [United Bible Societies] acquired a new dimension with the setting up of a consultative committee made up of three representatives from the Roman Catholic, the Anglican, and Seventh-day Adventist churches. This committee will supervise the translation, reproduction, and distribution in the Seychelles.”—*United Bible Societies Report, 1984.*

A decade later, the South Pacific Division church paper, *The Record*, announced that it had been working, since 1990, with other denominations on a project to translate the New Testament into the ChiLanji language in Zambia.

“The project is interdenominational and involves Baptist, Seventh-day Adventist and Roman Catholic Churches.”—*The Record, May 1, 1993, p. 5.*

Unfortunately, in 1985 when the long-awaited *Seventh-day Adventist Hymnal* was published—the church members found it to be full of modernist Bible versions in the Scripture Readings at the back of the book.

Out of about 224 Scripture Readings and prayers intended for corporate worship, the King James Version came in seventh in frequency. It was quoted only 14 times in the 224 readings!

Eight different Bible versions were used, and guess which translation came in second place? The Roman Catholic Jerusalem Bible! This is incredible!

The New International Version was used more than any other, 68 times in all.

Reading #782 is a quotation of *John 3:16*—from the Jerusalem Bible!

Reading #730 is from the New International Version:

“Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace to men on whom His favor rests.”—*Luke 2:14 (NIV).*

That translation entirely twists the meaning of the glorious song of the angels—into a Calvinistic determinism, whereby God only selects a few to be saved. It should have read:

“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.”—*Luke 2:14 (KJV).*

Jesus died that all men might accept Him and be saved, not just certain ones.

“God our Saviour; who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.”—*1 Timothy 2:3-4 (KJV).*

Original sin is taught in Reading #756:

“Surely I have been a sinner from birth and sinful from the time my mother conceived me.”—*Psalm 51:5 (NIV)*.

It is a remarkable fact that, by the time our hymnal was published in 1985, Zondervan had, in its 1984 NIV edition, already gotten the translators to modify the offensive verse somewhat:

“. . . and in sin did my mother conceive me.”

“Sin is the transgression of the law” (*1 John 3:4*) is what the Bible says; a child who has only been conceived a few hours earlier and is microscopic in size is not a sinner!

THE OLD TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA

Here is a brief history of the Apocrypha. It was included in all the 16th-century English versions, including the KJV of 1611. The English Revised Version of the document was published in 1894.

With the exception of 1 and 2 Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh, these books are revered by Catholics as inspired and canonical Scripture. Rome calls them *Deuterocanonical*. The 4th Session of the Council of Trent on April 8, 1546, decreed that these books, “entire and with all their parts,” are “sacred and canonical” and pronounced an anathema on anyone who “knowingly or deliberately” rejects them. Though denied canonicity and authority, 1 and 2 Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh are included in Latin manuscripts of the Vulgate, and are printed as an appendix to the Bible in later editions.

The Lutheran churches, the Church of England, and the Zürich reformed churches hold that these books are useful, but not canonical.

In Luther’s German translation of the Bible, these books are segregated between the Old Testament and New Testament, with the title: “Apocrypha, that is, books which are not held equal to the sacred Scriptures, and nevertheless are useful and good to read.”

The Swiss Reformer, Oecolampadius, stated in 1530: “We do not despise Judith, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the two books of Esdras, the two books of Maccabees, the additions to Daniel; but we do not allow them divine authority with the other.”

Article Six of the famous Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England (1562) states that these books are read “for example of life and instruction of manners,” but the Church does not use them “to establish any doctrine.”

The position of the Calvinistic and other reformed churches is clearly stated in the Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), which says this:

“The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine Inspiration, are no part of the Canon of the Scripture; therefore they are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be otherwise approved or made use of than any other human writings.”

For your information, First Maccabees is the only worthwhile book in the Apocrypha. It is an actual historical account of part of the Maccabean Revolt. The rest of the Apocrypha, including 2 Maccabees, contains legendary material and cannot be trusted.

The Apocryphal books were produced between 250-150 B.C. Malachi was written around 400 B.C.

The early Christians clearly saw the foolishness in those books, and definitely rejected them from the Biblical canon of inspired books. The only reason they were later included in some post-Reformation Bibles was to appease Catholics who might want to purchase the Bibles.

As you may know, Rome requires their inclusion, intermingled all through the Old Testament, in all the Bibles they publish because those spurious books teach several Catholic errors, such as purgatory and prayers for the dead.

After ignoring the Apocrypha for centuries, Rome suddenly adopted them as inspired and canonical at the Council of Trent (1545-1563), because of the Catholic errors they supported. One of the popes pronounced a curse on anyone who should print a Bible without the Apocrypha in it.

Martin Luther had been thundering against the “indulgence scam”; but *2 Maccabees* appeared to support it:

“It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from sin.”—*2 Maccabees 12:46*.

People pay a lot of money for masses to be said for their dead relatives. All this is based on *2 Maccabees 12:46*.

But those poor souls are not shown another verse in *2 Maccabees*, which have the final words of the author:

“I also will here make an end of my narration. Which if I have done well and as it becometh other history it is what I desired: but if not so perfectly it must be pardoned me.”—2

Maccabees 15:38-39.

In other words, the author admitted the lack of divine Inspiration for his book. Paul said something far different:

“If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.”—*1 Corinthians 14:37.*

The Apostle Paul was an inspired prophet of God; whereas the author of 2 Maccabees was just someone who wrote a long letter.

The author of this book has prepared a special report on the errors in the Apocrypha, which is being printed in a four-page tract. But we will also reprint it below:

SPECIAL REPORT ON THE APOCRYPHA

There are those among us who think it is necessary for the people of God, in these last days, to study the Apocrypha. At the request of friends, this brief overview has been prepared in order to save our people a lot of work. After reading this, your curiosity about the Apocrypha will very likely be exhausted. How thankful we can be that there is so much beautiful light and truth in the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. In strong contrast, the Apocrypha is very, very empty.

With the exception of 1 Maccabees (a valid historical account), the Apocrypha is not worth reading.

THE INTERTESTAMENTAL PERIOD

The Old Testament Scriptures were completed when Malachi penned his book, about the year 400 B.C. From that time, down to the birth of Christ in 4 B.C., is about 400 years. During those years of Scriptural silence, there was a lot of activity in Palestine, both political and written.

From the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great (332 B.C.) to the destruction of the Temple (A.D. 70), there was considerable religious and political activity. Four events immensely affected the Jewish people: (1) the Babylonian captivity (605-538 B.C.), (2) the uprising under Antiochus Epiphanes (c. 175 B.C.), (3) the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple (A.D. 70), and (4) the Bar Cocheba revolt (A.D. 132-135).

Because of one or more of those events, many uninspired Jewish writings were pro-

duced. These writings include the *Apocrypha*, the *Pseudopigrapha*, and the *writings of the Qumran community of Essenes*. We will briefly look at each of these.

PART 1 - THE APOCRYPHA

The term, “Apocrypha,” means “something hidden” and usually refers to a group of writings that appeared in the Greek (Septuagint) translation of the Old Testament; but these were never accepted in the Hebrew canon. Both Jews and Christians always recognized that the Apocrypha was not divinely inspired.

The Apocrypha is several uninspired books which were added to the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament) about a hundred years before the birth of Christ.

Because the Apocrypha contains several Roman Catholic teachings, the papacy requires every faithful Catholic to accept the Apocrypha as fully inspired. Not to do so, according to a decree of the Council of Trent (April 18, 1546), is to be guilty of a mortal sin. Oddly enough, it was not until that date that the Vatican ever ruled that the Apocrypha was divinely inspired!

When the 16th-century Reformation began, it took time for the Protestants to successfully part with many of the errors and myths of Romanism. For this reason, some of the earliest Protestant Bibles had the Apocrypha in them,—although Christians have never accepted those writings as inspired.

Interestingly enough, Jerome only included the Apocryphal books in his Latin Vulgate at the insistence of the pope. Jerome did not believe they were divinely inspired.

WHY CHRISTIANS REJECT THE APOCRYPHA

There are several very good reasons why Christians do not accept the Apocrypha as divinely inspired writings:

1 - The Apocryphal books are not included in the Hebrew canon of Scripture.

2 - Though they are included in the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Old Testament), Jesus never quoted from them.

3 - The early Christian church totally rejected them from the canon.

4 - The writer of 1 Maccabees recognized that there was no prophet among the Jews at that time (1 Maccabees 4:46; 9:27; 14:41).

5 - They teach false doctrines:

- An angel says of the smoke of a burning

fish heart, that it “driveth away all kinds of devils.”

- God is urged, “Hear now the prayer of the dead of Israel” (Baruch 3:4).

- “It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins” (2 Maccabees 12:43-45).

6 - They contain major historical and geographical errors.

7 - Josephus, contemporary of John the Revelator, mentions the Apocrypha, but never considers it inspired.

8 - Philo Judaeus, Jewish leader at Alexandria during the time of the apostles, left a large collection of writings and quoted extensively from the Old Testament—but never from the Apocrypha.

9 - They lack the high spiritual tone and general excellence of the Biblical writings.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS

These are the books that Roman Catholics are required to accept as inspired of God, on pain of mortal sin if they do not do so:

HISTORICAL APOCRYPHAL BOOKS

1 Maccabees—This is the only worthwhile book in the Apocrypha. It is fairly reliable history and covers the Maccabean revolt against Antiochus Epiphanes, from 175 to 135 B.C.

This is an important historical book, and tells about the struggles of the Jews for religious and political liberty in the 2nd century B.C. The name is derived from Judas Maccabeus, the third son of Mattathias, a priest. (The word, “Maccabeus,” comes from the Hebrew word for “hammer.”)

Written in Hebrew by a Palestinian Jew about 100 B.C., it is our best source for the history of the first 40 years of the Maccabean wars and gives a reasonably dependable account of the period from Antiochus Epiphanes (175 B.C.) to John Hyrcanus (c. 135 B.C.). We are first told of events leading up to the Maccabean rebellion (1:1 to chapter 2); then about the military exploits of Judas (3:1-9:22) and his brothers, Jonathan (9:23-12:53) and Simon (13:1-16:24), who succeeded him in the ongoing struggle first for religious and political freedom. The emphasis of the book is on military activity; and little is told about the social, economic, and religious aspects of the period.

2 Maccabees—This book is a mixture of

history and legendary narratives, covering the period 175-160 B.C. An independent, divergent, and more elaborate account of events in 1 Maccabees 1-7, it was written by moralizing Jews about the 1st century B.C. and includes a variety of supernatural miracles which helped the warring Jews.

ETHICAL APOCRYPHAL BOOKS

Wisdom of Solomon—This book, written in Greek about 50 B.C. (probably at Alexandria), says that good living is best; and sin and idolatry are wrong. The author claims to be King Solomon.

Scholars who study ancient manuscripts declare that this book combines Old Testament teachings with Alexandrian ideas derived from Platonism and Stoicism.

Ecclesiasticus (also called Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach)—The theme is also about good living. In some passages, the book sounds like Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.

The most famous passage in Ecclesiasticus is a series of stories (chapters 44-50) beginning with the familiar words, “Let us now praise famous men.” Yet that is a concept foreign to true Scripture!

There are errors in both the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus.

LEGENDARY APOCRYPHAL BOOKS

Tobit—a legendary romantic narrative, said to have occurred during the Babylonian captivity and written about 200 B.C.

According to this novel, Tobit was a Jew living in Babylon who became blind (chapter 1:2); and, then, after a quarrel with his wife, he wished he might die. At the same time, a widow named Sarah, living in Ecbatana in Media, had seven husbands slain on her wedding night by a demon named Asmodeus. So she also prayed that she might die. The angel, Raphael, was then sent to help them both. Raphael comes to Azaria and lies to him, saying he is a man named Azarias. Leading him to the Tigris River, Raphael has him catch a large fish, the intestines of which later help banish the demon, Asmodeus, and cure Tobit's blindness. Arriving in Ecbatana, the angel helps Tobit find a lot of money; and he marries the woman who, according to the angel, was destined for him from all eternity (7:9). Yet Tobit was already married to another woman! Tobit then praises God (10-14).

Judith—The story of the bravery of Judith,

a Hebrew widow, written about 150 B.C.

In this totally fictitious story, after the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity, Nebuchadnezzar, the Assyrian king ruling from Nineveh, decided to punish the Jews for not assisting him in his conquest of Media. (As you know, Nebuchadnezzar was a Babylonian king, ruling from Babylon, and he was not alive after the Babylonian captivity.)

Holofernes, his Assyrian general, is said to have besieged the city of Bethulia; but, through trickery, Judith cuts off his head with his own sword while he is in a drunken stupor.

Additions to Esther—Fictitious stories, written about 150 B.C., are inserted in various places in the book of Esther; and part of a chapter and six other chapters are added at the end of Esther. A total of 107 verses are added.

Additions to Daniel—There are three of these. Here they are:

The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Holy Children—The prayer of Abednego, plus the song of the three Hebrews, because their prayer in the fiery furnace was heard. This is the first of the additions to Daniel and is inserted between Daniel 23 and 24 in the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and most Catholic Bibles.

As the three stand inside the fiery hot furnace, Azariah prays for help so they will not die (1-22). Then, when it comes (23-28), the three praise God for deliverance (29-68). Ignored is the fact that they had to be helped as soon as they were pushed into the fiery furnace!

Susanna and the Elders—A story about how Daniel saved Susanna from being condemned to death as a result of false accusations.

In the Vulgate, this religious romance follows the last chapter of Daniel and is numbered as chapter 13. It apparently was written in Hebrew in the 1st century B.C.

Two Jewish judges tried to seduce Susanna, the godly wife of Joakim, a prominent Babylonian Jew. When she refused, they accused her of adultery. Daniel rescued her by independently cross-examining each of the elders, proving their stories contradictory and fallacious.

Bel and the Dragon—This consists of two fabulous stories, written probably in Hebrew during the 1st century B.C. and included as chapter 14 of Daniel: (1) Daniel proves that Bel's priests and their families ate food offered to an idol. (2) After Daniel kills a dragon, he is then

put in the lions' den.

In the first story, the Babylonian priests of Bel (Marduk) have claimed that their heathen idol was eating the food presented to it. Daniel disproves this claim by sprinkling ashes on the floor, demonstrating that the 70 priests and their families would sneak in by a secret door and take the food.

In the second story, a great dragon was being worshiped by the people. Daniel kills it by feeding it a concoction of pitch, fat, and hair, boiled together. The creature bursts and dies. Because he did this, Daniel is cast (a second time) into a lions' den for not one, but six days. While there, he is miraculously fed by Habakkuk, the prophet, who is flown by an angel from Judea to Babylon for this purpose.

PROPHETIC APOCRYPHAL BOOKS

Baruch—This book purportedly was written by Jeremiah's scribe, Baruch, during the Babylonian exile. It is thought to have been written, in the first century A.D., by a Jew in order to warn his people that the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) happened because of the sins of the Jewish nation. The final chapter promises the restoration of Israel and predicts the humbling of all her oppressors.

Letter of Jeremiah (also known as the Epistle of Jeremy)—This book is included at the end of Baruch in ancient manuscripts. But it is a separate production, which non-Catholic scholars believe to have been written after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, to encourage them to remain true to Judaism.

In this manuscript, based on Jeremiah 10:11, the writer warns his people not to forsake Judaism, lest they experience another captivity.

PART 2 - THE PSEUDOPIGRAPHA

By order of the Council of Trent, the above books are all included in Roman Catholic Bibles. There are also five other books which are called the Pseudopigrapha.

Roman Catholics are not required to accept any of the following books, and they have never been considered canonical by any denomination.

3 Maccabees—This book of seven chapters is clearly folklore; it tells the story of the victory of Ptolemy IV Philopator, over Antiochus the Great at the Battle of Raphia (217 B.C.) in order to deliver the Jewish people.

4 Maccabees—This brief book urges the

Jews to practice temperance and self-control by studying the Torah.

Prayer of Manasseh—You will recall that King Manasseh was carried to Babylon; and, while there, he repented and was restored to his throne (2 Kings 21:1-18; 2 Chronicles 33:1-20).

This Pseudopigraphal document, written in Hebrew about 100-150 B.C., purports to be Manasseh's prayer while in captivity. It is not considered canonical even by Catholics.

1 Esdras—Written by an Egyptian Jew about 150 B.C., this book is often described as historical fiction. Neither Catholics nor Protestants accept it as canonical. 1 Esdras purports to tell more about portions of 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

It is best known for its account (1 Esdras 3:5-4:63) of three young bodyguards of Darius I who, one day, sought the best answer to the question, What is the strongest thing in the world? The first said, "Wine is strongest." The second said, "The king is strongest." The third said, "Women are strongest, but truth is victor over all things." At this, the people applauded him and cried, "Great is truth, and strongest of all." Does that sound like anything worth reading? This event is supposed to have given Zerubbabel the opportunity to obtain from Darius the command to resume building on the Temple in Jerusalem (4:48-57).

A point of confusion needs to be mentioned here. In Catholic Bibles, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah are called 1 and 2 Esdras. But, of course, the Pseudopigraphal books, 1 and 2 Esdras, are quite different!

In the Latin Vulgate, 3 and 4 Esdras are included as an appendix to the New Testament, as is the Prayer of Manasseh.

2 Esdras—This book apparently was written by Christians between A.D. 150 and 250. It speaks of the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles (chapters 1-2), in chapter 1 and verse 30, and is similar to Matthew 23:37; chapter 1 and verse 37 is similar to John 20:29).

Chapters 3-14 are supposed to have been written by someone named Salathiel, who is identified with Ezra. It is thought that the book was written by a Christian and named "Ezdras" in order to get the Jews to read it. At its end (14:48), Ezra is supposed to have been translated to heaven, without experiencing death.

Jubilees—Written in Hebrew apparently by

a Pharisee or Essene about 125 B.C., Jubilees teaches that the coming Messianic kingdom will gradually develop until both man and nature will reach perfection, happiness, and peace. At that time, everyone will live a thousand years; and, at death, all will then go to heaven. A fragment of this work was discovered among the Dead Sea scrolls in Qumran Cave I.

First Enoch (or Ethiopic Enoch)—This is a compilation, partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramaic, of the works of several authors who were Pharisees. It is called "Ethiopic Enoch" because our only source is an Ethiopian version.

It has a variety of teachings, some contradictory, about the coming Messiah and his kingdom: It will be eternal on earth and in heaven and will begin after the last judgment (37-71); it will be eternal only on the earth, beginning after the last judgment (1-36); it will be temporary and on earth, and will be followed by the last judgment (91-104).

The evil one is Azazel who "hath taught all unrighteousness on earth and revealed the eternal secrets which were (preserved) in heaven, and which men were striving to learn" (9:6).

Second Enoch (Slavonic Enoch)—Extant only in a Slavonic version, this manuscript has some similarity to First Enoch, but also to early Christian literature. Part of it is thought to have been written by Christians in a later century A.D.

Second Baruch—A compilation of several works, this book declares that men are saved solely by their works and that the Messianic kingdom is soon to be established; then Israel will be a world empire with Jerusalem as its capital. Probably written during the first or second century A.D., it is extant only in a Syriac version.

Third Baruch—This book, probably written in the second century A.D., advocates a belief in seven heavens and three classes of angels who intercede for three classes of men.

Fourth Ezra—Probably written about the end of the first century A.D., this book teaches that Israel is great, the Jews are God's only people, the law was a special gift to them after its rejection by other worlds, and that God loves the Jews more than any other people.

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs—This book, which may have been written by a Jew during the Maccabean rule, teaches that through the Jews all the Gentiles will be saved. The promised Messiah will come through the

tribe of Levi, not Judah. Part of this book was found among the Dead Sea Scrolls in Qumran Cave I.

Sibylline Oracles—This is a work comprised originally of 15 books and several fragments containing oracles developed by Jews and probably also Christian authors, from the 2nd century B.C. to about the 5th century A.D.

Assumption of Moses—Probably written during the 1st century A.D. by a patriotic Jew, this work originally had two different books: the *Testament of Moses* and the *Assumption*. The author teaches that the ten tribes will return and rejoin Judah and Benjamin, and eventually Israel will be the greatest nation on earth.

Psalms of Solomon—This is a collection of 18 psalms which declare that Israel is righteous and all other nations are wicked. It probably was written in Hebrew in the first century B.C.

PART 3 - THE QUMRAN DOCUMENTS

It is believed that the Jews who lived in the Qumran Community, near the Dead Sea (1st century B.C.-1st century A.D.), were Essenes. In addition to preparing copies of Old Testament books, they also wrote several original documents; only a few of these are complete enough to be useful.

The Manual of Discipline—This is the most important of the non-Biblical books found at Qumran. It contains the rules and regulations of the group which had a democratic organization, but no private ownership of property or even money. Strict rules include making false or foolish statements, interrupting another's speech, or sleeping during a meeting. Everyone was required to eat together. Initiation rituals, water purification rites, etc. are included. The rules are similar to the Essene rules which were described by Philo and Josephus.

The Habakkuk Commentary (1Qp Hab.)—Habakkuk 1 and 2 are said to be prophecies which were fulfilled in the times in which the writer lived.

The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness (1QM)—Rules of warfare are outlined, which the faithful Jews are to obey in their soon-coming war against evil forces.

The Damascus Document—Discovered in a Genizah (manuscript storeroom) of a Cairo synagogue near the close of the 19th century, this document parallels rules and teachings found in the *Manual of Discipline* and *Habak-*

kuk Commentary.

Consider how empty and dreary your life would be, if you did not have the precious Bible and Spirit of Prophecy! The Inspired Writings are your path to heaven. Stay on the path. Nothing else is safe.

FROM THE ENGLISH REVISED TO THE NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION A LIST OF 134 BIBLE TRANSLATIONS

There has been a deluge of new translations in the 20th century. Some have been very strange.

For example, Jordan's Cotton Patch Version substitutes contemporary Southern U.S. people, places, and parties for the Biblical ones! Corinth becomes Atlanta in *1 Corinthians 1:2*, Jews become "whites," and Gentiles become "Negroes."

Several different Sacred Name versions have been published, frequently, in order to rival one another, with competing ancient names for God and Christ.

Such has been the flood of modern translations, that it is difficult to keep track of them. In the following list you will find 134 translations, from 1893 to 1973.

The translations are arranged by the date the entire Bible was published. Earlier parts of important translations are listed under that date. If only the New Testament has been translated, it is, of course, listed under its date. If no complete New Testament or Old Testament exists, then the date of the first portion is used. When known, the name of the translator is given. Additional data is given within parentheses, when it significant enough.

For additional information, consult the following:

- Margaret T. Hills, ed., *The English Bible in America: A Bibliography of Editions of the Bible and the New Testament Published in America, 1777-1957*. New York: The American Bible Society and the New York Public Library, 1961.

- A.S. Herbert, *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible, 1525-1967*. London.

- The British and Foreign Bible Society, London.

- The American Bible Society, New York.

1893 **Revised Version** (New Testament, 1881; Old Testament 1893; today called

196 The King James and the Modern Versions

- English Revised Version**).
- 1900 Hayman's Epistles. The Epistles of the New Testament. An attempt to present them in current and popular idiom, by Henry Hayman.
- 1901 **American Revised Version** (English Revised Version, with a few changes by a team of U.S. scholars, today called the **American Standard Version**).
- 1901 Modern American Bible. The New Testament. The Modern American Bible. By Frank Schell Ballantine.
- 1901 Moffatt's Historical New Testament. The Historical New Testament, by James Moffatt (a different translation from Moffatt's later translation, and not as influential).
- 1901 Way's Epistles. The Letters of St. Paul to Seven Churches and Three Friends. Translated by Arthur S. Way.
- 1901 Young People's Bible. The Young People's Bible or the Scriptures Corrected, Explained, and Simplified. By Harriet Newell Jones.
- 1902 **Rotherham: Emphasized Bible**. The Emphasized Bible. By Joseph Bryant Rotherham. Old Testament (1902), New Testament (1897).
- 1902 Godbey's New Testament. By W.B. Godbey.
- 1902 Twentieth Century New Testament: The Holy Bible in Modern English. By Ferrar Fenton.
- 1903 **Weymouth's New Testament: The New Testament in Modern Speech**. By Richard Francis Weymouth.
- 1904 Worrell's New Testament. By A.S. Worrell.
- 1905 Lloyd's New Testament: The Corrected English New Testament. By Samuel Lloyd.
- 1906 Forster.
- 1907 Bourne's Gospels. By A.E. Bourne.
- 1907 Moulton's Modern Reader's Bible: The Modern Reader's Bible. By Richard G. Moulton.
- 1908 Rutherford's Epistles. By W.G. Rutherford, London, 1908.
- 1909 The Bible in Modern English.
- 1909 Weaver New Testament. By S. Townsend Weaver.
- 1910 Cunard's. By F.W. Cunard.
- 1914 Numeric New Testament. Edited by Ivan Panin.
- 1914 Cunnington's New Testament. By E.E. Cunnington.
- 1916 McFadyen. By John Edgar McFadyen.
- 1917 Jewish Publication Society Bible. By Jewish Publication Society (Jewish).
- 1918 Anderson New Testament. By H.T. Anderson.
- 1919 The Messages of the Bible. Edited by Frank K. Sanders and Charles F. Kent.
- 1919 The Adelphi New Testament. By T. Foshier Unwin.
- 1921 Common Speech. By T.W. Pym.
- 1921 Shorter Bible. By Charles Foster Kent.
- 1922 Plainer Bible for Plain People. By Chaplain Frank Schell Ballantine (Amish).
- 1923 **Riverside New Testament**. By William C. Ballantine.
- 1923 Robertson. By A.T. Robertson.
- 1924 Labor Determinative Version.
- 1924 Montgomery's Centenary Translation—By Helen Barrett Montgomery.
- 1925 Askwith's Psalms. By E.H. Askwith.
- 1925 People's New Covenant. By Arthur E. Overbury (Christian Science).
- 1925 Children's Bible. By Henry A. Gherman and Charles Foster Kent.
- 1926 The Western New Testament. By T. Foshier Unwin.
- 1926 **Moffatt: A New Translation of the Bible**. By James Moffatt.

- 1927 Kent's Student's Old Testament. By Charles Foster Kent.
- 1927 **Smith-Goodspeed: The Bible. An American Translation.** Old Testament by J.M. Powis Smith; New Testament by Edgar J. Goodspeed.
- 1928 Christian's Bible. By George N. LeFevre.
- 1928 Czarnomska Version. By Elizabeth Czarnomska.
- 1928 Spiritualist's Matthew. Edited by J.W. Potter (spiritualist).
- 1928 The Psalms Complete. By William Wallace Martin.
- 1929 The Book of Job and Ecclesiastes.
- 1929 Gowen's Psalms. By Herbert H. Gowen.
- 1930 The Book of Mark. By Loux.
- 1932 Kleist's Memoirs of St. Peter: The Memoirs of St. Peter, or the Gospel according to St. Mark. By James A. Kleist.
- 1933 Torrey's Four Gospels. By Charles Cutler Torrey.
- 1934 Royds' Epistles and Gospels. By Thomas Fletcher.
- 1934 Old Testament in Colloquial English.
- 1934 Wade: The Documents of the New Testament. By G.W. Wade.
- 1935 **Westminster Version. By Cuthbert Lattey (RC).**
- 1937 Cornish's St. Paul from the Trenches. By Gerald Warre Cornish.
- 1937 Greber's New Testament. By Johannes Greber.
- 1937 Martin's New Testament. By William Wallace Martin.
- 1937 **Spencer's New Testament.** By Francis Aloysius Spencer (RC).
- 1937 **Williams' New Testament.** By Charles B. Williams.
- 1938 Book of Books. By R. Mercer Wilson (New Testament).
- 1938 Battenweiser's Psalms. By Moses Battenweiser.
- 1938 Clementson's New Testament. By Edgar Lewis Clementson.
- 1939 Oesterley Psalms. By W.O.E. Oesterley.
- 1940 St. Mark in Current English. By Mary L. Matheson
- 1941 The Book of Genesis Complete. The Ephraemaeon Version.
- 1941 Twelve Minor Prophets.
- 1944 Callan's Psalms.
- 1944 Wand's New Testament Letters. By J.W.C. Wand.
- 1945, 1948 **Knox.** Monsignor Knox (RC).
- 1945 Stringfellow's New Testament. By Ervin Edward Stringfellow.
- 1946 **Lenski**—By R.C.H. Lenski.
- 1947 Eerdmans' Psalms.
- 1947 Swann's New Testament. By George Swann.
- 1948 Letchworth New Testament.
- 1949 **Basic Bible: Basic English** (Basic English is a system of simplified English with a primary vocabulary of 850 words, devised by C.K. Ogden as an international auxiliary language and as an aid in learning English. In 1940 a committee, under the direction of S.H. Hooke of the University of London, produced an independent translation of the New Testament, using the 850 words in the primary vocabulary of basic English, to which 50 special Bible words and 100 others were added.)
- 1949 Leslie's Psalms. By Elmer A. Leslie.
- 1950 The New Testament of our Messiah and Saviour, Yahshua. Sacred Name Version.
- 1951 Authentic Version.
- 1951 Vernon's Mark. By Edward Vernon.
- 1952 **New Testament in Plain English.** By Charles Kingsley Williams. ("Plain

198 The King James and the Modern Versions

- English” is a simplified form of the English language, based on a list of 1,500 fundamental and common words that make up ordinary English speech, plus some 160 or 170 others that are explained in a glossary at the end of the volume.)
- 1952 Penguin Bible. By E.V. Rieu.
- 1952 **Revised Standard Version** (New Testament, 1946. Old Testament with Complete Bible, 1952. Apocrypha, 1957).
- 1954 Kissane’s Psalms. By Monsignor Edward J. Kissane (RC).
- 1954 Kleist and Lilly’s New Testament. By James A. Kleist, S.J. (Gospels), and Joseph L. Lilly, C.M. (Acts to Revelation) (RC).
- 1954 Kleist and Lynam’s Psalms. By James A. Kleist, S.J. and Thomas James Lynam (RC).
- 1955 Fides Translation (Psalms) (RC).
- 1955 Schonfield’s Authentic New Testament. By Hugh J. Schonfield (Jewish).
- 1956 Laubach’s Inspired Letters. By Frank C. Laubach (Romans-Jude), written in short, clear sentences with a limited vocabulary of about 2,000 words.
- 1957 Concordant Version.
- 1957 **Lamsa’s**. By George M. Lamsa. Philadelphia: A.J. Holman Co.
- 1958 Hudson: The Pauline Epistles. By James T. Hudson.
- 1958 Meissner’s Gospels. By Lawrence Meissner.
- 1958 **Phillips’ New Testament: New Testament in Modern English**. By J.B. Phillips (Introduction by C.S. Lewis, 1951. A corrected edition, 1957. First published in England, 1947. The Gospels, translated into modern English by J.B. Phillips, c. 1951. First published in 1952. The Young Church in Action; a Translation of the Acts of Apostles by J.B. Phillips, 1955. Book of Revelation, 1957. Gospels, a corrected edition, 1958. Four Prophets: Amos, Hosea, First Isaiah, Micah; a modern translation from the Hebrew, by J.B. Phillips, 1963. Second revised edition of the New Testament, 1973)
- 1958 Tomanek’s New Testament. By James L. Tomanek.
- 1959 Cressman: St. Mark. By Annie Cressman.
- 1959 **Modern Language Bible (Berkeley)**—Gerrit Verkuyl, editor-in-chief and translator of the New Testament section (Berkeley Version of the New Testament, 1945).
- 1960 The Children’s “King James” Bible. By Jay Green (wording) and “Peter” Palmer (stories); translated from the Textus Receptus.
- 1961 New World Translation (Jehovah’s Witnesses).
- 1961 Noli’s Greek Orthodox New Testament. By Fan S. Noli.
- 1961 One Way: The Jesus People New Testament. By Olaf M. Norlie.
- 1961 Simplified New Testament and Psalms. By Olaf M. Norlie (New Testament) and R.K. Harrison (Psalms, for teenagers).
- 1961 **Wuest’s Expanded New Testament**. By Kenneth S. Wuest.
- 1962 Children’s Version. The text is a simplification and modernization of the KJV.
- 1962 New Jewish Version: The Torah: The Five Books of Moses (Jewish).
- 1963 **Beck’s New Testament: The New Testament in the Language of Today**. By

- William F. Beck.
- 1963 Gelineau's Psalms. By Joseph Gelineau (Jewish).
- 1963 The Holy Name Bible. By A.B. Trama. This translation is understood to have been made by A.B. Trama and reprinted at his expense. The version attempts to restore Semitic proper names to their Aramaic or Hebrew form and to clear up difficulties in the text in the light of possible Semitic background.
- 1964 **Anchor Bible**. Edited by William F. Albright and David N. Freedman (individual translators for books).
- 1964 Hadas' Psalms: The Book of Psalms for the Modern Reader. By Gershon Hadas.
- 1965 **Amplified Bible**. By Frances E. Siewert.
- 1965 Bruce's Expanded Paraphrase. By F.F. Bruce.
- 1966 Burke: God Is For Real, Man. By Carl F. Burke. New York: Association Press (some Bible passages in heavy slang).
- 1966 **Jerusalem Bible** (RC).
- 1966 Living Scriptures. By Jay Green (based on Textus Receptus).
- 1966 **Today's English Version: Good News for Modern Man** (ABS edition).
- 1967 Dale's New World. By Alan T. Dale (New Testament).
- 1967 Liverpool Vernacular Gospels: The Gospels in Scouse. By Dick Williams and Frank Shaw ("a rollicking, carefree interpretation of some Gospel passages").
- 1968 Cotton Patch Version (Southern U.S. dialect version). By Jordan.
- 1968 Hanson's Psalms in Modern Speech. By Richard S. Hanson.
- 1968 Restoration of Original Name New Testament (Sacred Name version, using Yahvahshua as the name for Jesus Christ, based on Rotherham's Version).
- 1969 **Barclay's New Testament**. By William Barclay.
- 1969 Children's New Testamen. By Gleason H. Ledyard.
- 1970 The Mercier New Testament. By Kevin Condon (RC, translated from critical Greek Texts).
- 1970 **New American Bible** (Genesis, 1948; Vol. I, Genesis-Ruth, 1952; Vol. III, Sapiential or Wisdom Books, 1955; Vol. IV, Prophetic Books, 1961; Vol. II, Samuel-Maccabees, 1969, RC).
- 1970 **New English Bible with the Apocrypha**. (New Testament, 1961; 2nd ed., 1970. The Old Testament and Apocrypha, 1970).
- 1971 Blackwelder's Exegetical Translation: Letters from Paul. By Boyce W. Blackwelder.
- 1971 **Living Bible**, Paraphrased. By Kenneth Taylor (Living History of Israel, a paraphrase of Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, 1970. Living Prophecies: the Minor Prophets paraphrased with Daniel and the Revelation, 1965, 1967. Living New Testament Paraphrased, 1967. Living Letters: the paraphrased Epistles, 1967, c. 1962).
- 1971 **New American Standard Bible**.
- 1972 The Bible in Living English. By Steven T. Byington.
- 1973 The Translator's New Testament. British and Foreign Bible Society. (35 Bible scholars and 18 missionary linguists prepared this translation in order "to make available, to those translators of the New Testament into their own mother tongue who depend on

200 The King James and the Modern Versions

English for access to the sources of Biblical scholarship, such help as is necessary for the making of effective translations in the languages of today.” Includes Notes and a Glossary. Based on

the United Bible Societies’ Greek Text, 1966.)

1973 The Better Version of the New Testament. By Chester Estes.

1973 Common Bible (Joint Protestant-RC Bible, with Apocrypha).

1973 New International Version

“In the Bible the will of God is revealed. The truths of the Word of God are the utterances of the Most High. He who makes these truths a part of his life becomes in every sense a new creature. He is not given new mental powers, but the darkness that through ignorance and sin has clouded the understanding is removed. The words, ‘A new heart also will I give you,’ mean, ‘A new mind will I give you.’ A change of heart is always attended by a clear conviction of Christian duty, an understanding of truth. He who gives the Scriptures close, prayerful attention will gain clear comprehension and sound judgment, as if in turning to God he had reached a higher plane of intelligence.

“The Bible contains the principles that lie at the foundation of all true greatness, all true prosperity, whether for the individual or for the nation. The nation that gives free room for the circulation of the Scriptures opens the way for the minds of the people to develop and expand. The reading of the Scriptures causes light to shine into the darkness. As the Word of God is searched, life-giving truths are found. In the lives of those who heed its teachings there will be an undercurrent of happiness that will bless all with whom they are brought in contact.”

—EGW, *Review and Herald*, December 18, 1913