

# BIBLE HISTORY

## A Defence of the Received Text

|           |   |           |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>THE DOCTRINE OF PRESERVATION .....</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| 1.1       | THE NEED FOR INFALLIBLE PRESERVATION .....  | 2         |
| 1.2       | THE OVERTHROW OF THE DOCTRINE OF PRESERVATION .....                               | 3         |
| <b>2</b>  | <b>THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS (RECEIVED TEXT) .....</b>                                  | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>3</b>  | <b>THE CRITICAL TEXT .....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| 3.1       | OLDER IS BETTER .....   | 4         |
| 3.2       | THE GENEALOGY OF BIBLE FAMILIES .....   | 5         |
| 3.2.1     | <i>Hypothetical Manuscripts</i> .....   | 5         |
| 3.2.2     | <i>Early dating of the Peshitta</i> .....   | 6         |
| 3.2.3     | <i>Mixtures</i> .....   | 6         |
| 3.3       | WHY OLDER IS NOT NECESSARILY BETTER .....   | 7         |
| 3.4       | HOW DARE THEY CHANGE STORM BOY .....  | 8         |
| 3.5       | THE ECLECTIC TECHNIQUE FOR CT COMPILATION .....                                   | 8         |
| 3.5.1     | <i>Internal Evidence of readings</i> .....  | 9         |
| 3.5.2     | <i>The Shorter Reading is to be preferred</i> .....                               | 10        |
| 3.5.3     | <i>Harder reading is to be preferred</i> .....                                    | 11        |
| 3.6       | DID ERASMUS USE ECLECTIC TECHNIQUES? .....  | 11        |
| <b>4</b>  | <b>THE CONFLAGRATION OF TRANSLATIONS .....</b>                                    | <b>13</b> |
| 4.1       | DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE AND LITERAL TRANSLATION .....                                 | 14        |
| 4.2       | SHOULD WE TRANSLATE AT ALL? .....   | 14        |
| <b>5</b>  | <b>THE FORMATION OF THE BIBLICAL CANON. ....</b>                                  | <b>16</b> |
| 5.1       | INCLUSION OF THE APOCRYPHA IN THE ORIGINAL 1611 CANON OF THE KJV .....            | 16        |
| 5.2       | THE RELIABILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON .....                                  | 17        |
| 5.3       | OLD TESTAMENT CANON – IS THE APOCRYPHA SCRIPTURE? .....                           | 17        |
| <b>6</b>  | <b>QUESTIONS .....</b>  | <b>19</b> |
| 6.1       | AM I A KJV-ONLYIST? .....   | 19        |
| 6.2       | DOES IT REALLY MATTER ANYWAY? .....   | 20        |
| 6.3       | CAN YOU BE SAVED IF YOU READ THE NIV? .....                                       | 20        |
| 6.4       | WHAT ABOUT READABILITY? .....   | 21        |
| 6.4.1     | <i>Is the KJV archaic?</i> .....  | 21        |
| 6.4.2     | <i>Older words generally more specific in meaning than newer easy words</i> ..... | 21        |
| 6.4.3     | <i>What's wrong with using a dictionary?</i> .....                                | 22        |
| 6.5       | WHAT ABOUT DEVOTIONAL READING? .....  | 24        |
| 6.6       | WHAT SHOULD WE DO WITH OUR MODERN TRANSLATIONS? .....                             | 26        |
| 6.7       | THE INTEGRITY OF THE KING JAMES TRANSLATION .....                                 | 27        |
| 6.8       | WHAT ABOUT ALL THE ERRORS IN THE KJV? .....                                       | 28        |
| <b>7</b>  | <b>QUOTES FROM WESTCOTT &amp; HORT .....</b>                                      | <b>30</b> |
| 7.1       | QUOTES FROM WESTCOTT .....  | 30        |
| 7.2       | QUOTES FROM HORT .....  | 31        |
| <b>8</b>  | <b>CONCLUSION .....</b>   | <b>31</b> |
| <b>9</b>  | <b>LINKS USED AS REFERENCES .....</b>   | <b>32</b> |
| <b>10</b> | <b>DEFINITION OF TERMS .....</b>  | <b>34</b> |
| <b>11</b> | <b>TRIBUTE TO DEAN BURGON .....</b>   | <b>44</b> |

## 1 The Doctrine of Preservation

For over 350 years the English-speaking world has recognised the King James Version as the Holy Bible. In all of that time the untold numbers of Christians who have been brought to salvation have understood that the King James Version (KJV) was the Holy Bible the perfect word of God. People for most of these years understood that God had guarded and preserved his scriptures from ancient times until their day.

This concept is understood as the doctrine of preservation of scripture. This is clearly explained in the scriptures.

*"But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Pet. 1:25*

And God will preserve it, even until the end of the earth.

*Mt 5:18 For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*

Jesus said that his words would be preserved.

*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. (Matthew 24:35)*

Therefore if God has preserved his scripture then it is reasonable for us to look for his divine hand in the transcription and translation of the scripture. To say that the original text is inspired, but the transmission is human, circumstantial, fallible and deteriorated over the generations of copying is to deny that divinity of preservation.

### 1.1 The need for infallible preservation

To say that the transcription or translation has been incomplete, fallible or faulty is to make the statement that the original autographs were inspired of no account because there can be no guarantee that the text was not corrupted at some point in time between when the original autograph was written and the time of the earliest known manuscripts. Therefore we must argue that if we do not have infallible transcription and infallible translation then we do not have an infallible Bible.

Verbal-plenary inspiration is a strawman doctrine of the classroom, unless it is paralleled by equal doctrine of verbal-plenary preservation." (Robert Barnett, *The Word Of God On Trial*; n.p, n.d; 23.)

If we are to hold to the argument that the original autographs were inspired but the transcriptions and translations were not, and that over the years accumulated errors gradually eroded the purity of the text, then this places enormous weight on the earliest manuscripts and virtually no weight on the later manuscripts. We would expect to see a gradually deteriorating text which reflects less and less the purity of the original text. Conversely if we believe that the transcription and translation are inspired we can expect to see the Scripture as an unbroken preservation of an unchanging stable document.

*"For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." Psa. 119:89*

If we accept an unchanging stable document then we do not favour earlier manuscripts over later manuscripts. The fact that they have been preserved as Scripture over many generations and can demonstrate a heritage and pedigree actually gives the later translations and manuscripts further authenticity as Gods word. We should expect to see all of the translations and manuscripts reconciling, and those that don't may be exposed as frauds and rejected.

## **1.2 The overthrow of the doctrine of preservation**

In the early 1900's the era of Modern Textual Criticism was ushered in by Westcott and Hort who created a new version of the Greek text which became known as the Critical Text. All modern translations either directly use this Critical Text or are based on it and use the same eclectic techniques. Even the New King James Version I have discovered, despite the claims in its preface departs considerably from the Textus Receptus. Only the KJV uses the Textus Receptus otherwise known as the Received Text. All attempts made by the modern translations, including the New King James Version to "correct" the KJV have introduced worse anomalies and errors than they supposedly remedy. The Critical Text was produced using modern rational scientific theories of textual criticism and was purely an academic work. Notions of faith that God had preserved his immutable word in the Received Text and the KJV were rejected out of hand in favour of scientific method.

This view is expressed clearly in one of the main web sites for modern textual studies and criticism which be found at [The Encyclopaedia of New Testament Textual Criticism](#) site by Rich Elliot. It advances the following precept for textual criticism.

*It should be stressed that textual criticism, unlike any other Biblical discipline, should not be faith-based. The goal must always be the highest possible degree of scientific objectivity. This is simply a logical necessity.*

As a result of this attitude, which denies the hand of God and lauds science, we have effectively replaced a Bible which remained stable for in excess of a thousand years with a Bible which changes with the fads and whims of our modern culture. The Bible has become a chaos of translations, each vying for their share in the multi-million dollar Bible market.

This paper attempts to scratch the surface of how this situation came to exist and presents the argument for the retention of the KJV as the Holy Bible, the immutable word of God.

## **2 The Textus Receptus (Received Text)**

The King James Version and those English bibles which precede it were all translated from a published Greek text of the Bible called the Textus Receptus which is Latin for Received Text. Let's begin by comparing the method used by Erasmus in the early 1500's to produce the Textus Receptus with the technique used by Hort to assemble the Critical Text.

Consider first that there are over 5000 manuscripts in the Greek and over 8000

manuscripts in the Latin Vulgate available. This in itself is a miracle of God when you compare the fact that most ancient works very rarely have more than 10 copies to work from. Not only that, but there are 10's of thousands of ancient letters and articles available which quote the New Testament to the point where the entire New Testament could be constructed with these alone. Added to this fact is that the vast majority of these texts agree, which is why they are referred to as the Majority Texts. In fact 95% of texts fall into this category. Erasmus' monumental work reconciled these majority texts eliminating typographical errors where a copyist had missed letters or words, or where they had lost their place and jumped forward to the wrong passage thereby missing out passages of text. In this pursuit it was obvious which texts were genuine copies with genuine typographical errors and which were frauds. We are to expect frauds as Paul warned us in 2 Th 2:2.

*That ye be not soon shaken in mind, **or** be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by **word**, nor by **letter** as from us.*

The task although enormous was not complex or hard to fathom. The fraudulent manuscripts were quickly cast aside by Erasmus and the typographical errors in the majority texts were reconciled out to arrive at a pure text which has become the Received Text.

### **3 The Critical Text**

Fenton J Hort was an English New Testament scholar who in the 1880's produced, with Brooke Foss Westcott, a major critical text of the Greek New Testament. Hort had a peculiar hatred for the Received Text and deliberately set out to destroy it. (See Quotes below). The discovery of two manuscripts more ancient than any of the majority texts gave him this opportunity.

#### **3.1 Older is Better**

Hort put forward the argument that the older a manuscript is, the more accurate it must be; and the more recent it is the more error must have been introduced through transcription error. This approach ignores any possibility that God has inspired and preserved the transcription of the Greek text through the ages or that God inspired the translations into the Aramaic (Peshitta) and the Latin (Latin Vulgate) and English (AV). Hort believes that the Received Text has significant errors in it ie. It needs to be fixed. ie. It's broken. When Christ himself said the Scripture cannot be broken. Hort ignores the necessity for an unchanging Scripture over the generations and advances a genealogy or family tree of the Scriptures, where the early autographs (no longer extant) being the most pure, followed by Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus being of high quality and then following down the generations with increasingly degraded texts until we get to the Received Text with its accumulated generations of copyist errors. In other words he is saying that God has not preserved the Scripture but has allowed it to degrade continually throughout the generations.

Hort treated his edition of the Greek Text like he would any other academic pursuit and did not consider the matter of immutability of God when coming up with his theories. Even aside from the doctrines of immutability and preservation, he had no

physical evidence that an older manuscript is better than a more recent one. It's quite likely that these two codexes, Sinaiticus and Vaticanu could have been laid aside and been unused because of their inferiority whilst the high quality manuscripts were continually used and wore out.

This is borne out by the fact that the two Codexes vary from each other more considerably than virtually any other two manuscripts. These codexes are called Uncials which are the earlier Greek codexes (Manuscripts in Book form) all written in upper case Greek. The miniscules are later Greek codexes written in Greek Proper case with breathings. The miniscules number in the thousands whereas the Uncials number in the hundreds. The thousands of miniscule Codexes show remarkable consistency with 95% of them being extremely consistent even over the passage of centuries. Also the Majority Text which are mostly miniscules show remarkable consistency to the Latin Vulgate (Not to be confused with Jerome's Catholic Latin Vulgate) which dates back well before Erasmus to 150AD as does the Peshitta (Aramaic translation) which even predates the Greek Uncial Codexes by almost 200 years.

### 3.2 The Genealogy of Bible Families

This technique calls for the organising of Biblical Texts into families with parent texts and child texts. These can then be plotted into a family tree of bibles. It goes like this. Let's say you have a manuscript and it is copied with errors in it. And then it is copied by hundreds of other people so that all of these copies have the same error in it as the first copy. This whole stream of copies becomes a family of texts. In this way he came up with a genealogy of bible texts. The four main families are the Syrian, Neutral, Western, and Alexandrian. The Syrian is Hort's name for the Byzantine texts which are essentially the Majority Text manuscripts. The idea of this genealogy tree is that the further up the ancestry of the tree we go the more accurate are the texts. Having established this seemingly plausible theory Hort then went on to argue that the Syrian text was a recension, which means that it is conflated from earlier texts. These earlier texts were the Neutral and Western texts. This was said to have been done in about 300 AD by Lucian to create an official Greek text. Using his genealogy tree Hort then went on to use the Neutral and Western texts and with one fell swoop ruled out all of the Syrian (Byzantine-Majority) texts.

Problems quickly surfaced with Hort's tree.

#### 3.2.1 Hypothetical Manuscripts

In order to demonstrate an unbroken lineage of manuscripts from the latest manuscripts going back to the single autograph it was necessary for Hort to invent hypothetical manuscripts which must have been in existence once but are no longer available. The hypothetical manuscript appears frequently in the genealogy tree. For example if Manuscript A is conflated with Manuscript B to make Manuscript D,E & F, but there are elements in D which are not in either A or B then there must be a hypothetical Manuscript C to fill in the tree.

The logical conclusion in this situation is that A and B are inferior texts which have omitted passages, whereas D, E, and F are a superior more complete and

accurate manuscripts. However to avoid this obvious conclusion Hort invented C in order to legitimise A & B. This reminds us of Darwin's evolution tree which pictured hypothetical creatures which have never been found in the fossil record.

### 3.2.2 Early dating of the Peshitta

This caused considerable problems for Hort. At that time the Peshitta was commonly recognised to originate in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Century. The problem with this dating is that the Peshitta contains elements of the Syrian text which did not appear in the Alexandrian or Western texts. It was therefore necessary for Hort to redate the Peshitta to the 4<sup>th</sup> century when these elements were supposedly added in by Lucian.

Hort often redated manuscripts so that they would fit in with the family lineage which Hort had devised. This approach to science reminds us of the spurious use of carbon dating to position fossils conveniently into the evolutionary tree. Hort was prone to redate as late texts any manuscripts which supported the Syrian text. If they supported the Alexandrine or Western texts they were dated as earlier texts. Then having dated the manuscripts as later texts they could then be ruled out by the "Older is better" rule.

### 3.2.3 Mixtures

A family genealogy is traced back through the generations through the father's line only. To try and present both the fathers and the mothers along with all permutations of these in the same diagram is impossible. However the admission of mixtures in the Bible Genealogy necessitates this. By saying that a family line of texts is conflated from two or more other families of texts we must then present all of the combination of ancestors of these families of texts. ie. The Tree grows into branches both upwards and downwards. The result is a diagram which is completely incomprehensible.

Needless to say the Bible genealogy tree was quickly abandoned by the science of Textual Criticism even though it was instrumental in establishing the older is "better" mantra. In fact it is generally recognised by scholars on both side of the argument that it was never actually used by Hort in producing his new Critical text. He used it to great effect however in destroying the credibility of Textus Receptus and authenticating his Critical Text.

In fact the whole issue of families of texts is very questionable. It is far more acceptable to think of a single large and consistent stream of texts with occasional offshoots of corrupt or dubious texts. Where for example are the hundreds of Greek texts which continue to this day the Alexandrian family or the Western family tradition of texts? There aren't any. Each of these "families" has only 1 or 2 or a handful of texts which quickly died out. Even identifying a manuscript to be in a particular family is a dubious one. For example Codex B and Codex Aleph are in the Alexandrian family and yet they differ from each other in over 3000 places. It is more correct to say that these texts are "only children" with no descendants.

### 3.3 Why older is not necessarily better

If we are to say that the older manuscript is better, then we ignore the testimony of all of the manuscripts and translations which are more recent. We adopt the older manuscript virtually without question. The fact is that there are many instances in history where the Scriptures have been corrupted. Therefore we need to validate each and every manuscript before we consider its testimony. The following quote from Hort shows that he did not go through this exercise.

*"It will not be out of place to add here a distinct expression of our belief that even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes." (Westcott and Hort, "The New Testament in the Original Greek", London: Macmillan and Co., 1881, Vol. 2, p. 282)*

This flies in the face of Paul's testimony that many would corrupt the word  
*2Co 2:17 For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God:*

It also flies in the face of history where many records show that the scripture has been corrupted. Hort nevertheless did not manage to reject a single manuscript (even the spurious ones) but included the most disparate manuscripts for consideration in his edition. He ignores the testimony of the scholars before him who were aware of the alternate readings and rejected them out of hand. It appears that the only manuscripts he rejected were those which he considered to be later manuscripts.

The stories that Erasmus did not have access to older manuscripts are a lie. He travelled the world during the course of his life reviewing manuscripts. He was aware of Codex B which is Codex Vaticanus and had rejected it as an inferior text. Codex Sinaiticus was found in a rubbish bin in a monastery according to Tischendorf. Erasmus may not have known about this manuscript, but he was aware of its alternate readings from other sources and had also rejected them. To state that Westcott & Hort in the 1880's had access to more, older and better manuscripts than Erasmus did in the 1500's is sheer nonsense. The number of Uncials which wore out or were lost since the 1500's would have definitely exceeded the number of Uncials found since the 1500's.

If older is better, then what should we do if we find a still older manuscript? Should we then go and alter the Bible to reflect the still older and better manuscript?

In fact older documents have surfaced since Westcott & Hort. In the 1950's the Bodmer papyri were discovered which date back to well before the Uncial Codexes Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. Lo and behold they support the Byzantine readings to a remarkable extent. But did our Textual scholars go back and correct the Westcott & Hort text and retranslate the English bible to reflect the discovery of the older Bodmer papyri and change it back to how it was in the Received Text. No they did not. In very many cases the papyri contain readings which were in both the Sinaiticus and the Majority texts but which were rejected using the techniques of lower Textual criticism in favour of the Hort's favourite codex Vaticanus. So the very arguments used to justify superseding the Received Text have been abandoned to protect the Critical Text which has now become the new untouchable "received text".

If the older manuscripts were correct then why did God allow those readings to die out over the following generations only to be reintroduced in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century? The more obvious explanation is that these were spurious corrupt texts which were rejected and ignored by scholars over a thousand years ago. This is the testimony of Dean John Burgon who devoted his life in the defence of the Received Text made the following comments about Vaticanus and Sinaiticus:

*"I have convinced myself by laborious collation that they are the most corrupt of all. They are the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated and intentional perversions of truth which are discoverable in any copies of the word of God. They exhibit a fabricated text...[and are] shamefully mutilated"*

These are the primary texts which have made up the Critical Text and from which the NIV and our other modern translations have been derived. The NIV refers in thousands of places where the received text has been indented to separate it from the rest of the text or omitted altogether with the comment in the margin that "The oldest and best manuscripts omit ..." (Apparently the original 1972 Edition of NIV stated the "The 2 oldest and best manuscripts omit ...", meaning Vaticanus and Sinaiticus)

So are we going to believe that Hort in the 1880's has better techniques than scholars who created the majority of miniscule Codexes and translated the Peshitta and the Latin Vulgate? Are we going to believe him when he tells all of those generations who used these texts "Sorry fellows, but you've been using an inferior Bible all these centuries"?

### 3.4 How dare they change Storm Boy

If someone said "I've found an old manuscript in Colin Thiele's Attic and discovered that actually Storm Boy was printed off incorrectly for these past few decades. We have to fix it up and change bits and take bits out". Who would listen to them? Nobody. In fact there would be an outcry and sound rejection of such an attempt.

Everybody who owns the book knows how the story goes. Who's to say why the manuscript was in the attic. Maybe Colin Thiele rejected that one and sent the correct one to the publisher. But our steadfast Church overseers at the turn of the last century championed by Bishop Westcott didn't see things this way with the Bible. They believed the Older is Better mantra without question and quickly wheeled in the Critical Text.

### 3.5 The Eclectic Technique for CT compilation

Using the logic of the Bible genealogy tree Hort then ended up with seven Uncial Codexes. From these codexes he then had the unenviable task of reconciling them into some sort of credible text. Here is a set of quotes which describe the troubles Burgon and Hort must have faced when producing the Revised New Testament. These comments are by Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD reproduced at [www.revisedstandardversion.net/text/WNP/index.html](http://www.revisedstandardversion.net/text/WNP/index.html).

|   |
|---|
| As to B and Aleph, we have already noted Hoskier's statement that these two MSS |
|---|

disagree over 3,000 times in the space of the four Gospels. Simple logic imposes the conclusion that one or the other must be wrong over 3,000 times—that is, they have over 3,000 mistakes between them. (If you were to write out the four Gospels by hand do you suppose you could manage to make 3,000 mistakes, or 1,500?) Aleph and B disagree, on the average, in almost every verse of the Gospels. Such a showing seriously undermines their credibility.

Burgon personally collated what in his day were "the five old uncials" (Ⲁ, A, B, C, D). Throughout his works he repeatedly calls attention to the *concordia discors*, the prevailing confusion and disagreement, which the early uncials display between themselves. Luke 11:2-4 offers one example.

*"The five Old Uncials" (ⲀABCD) 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; 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.*<sup>[20]</sup>

Mark 2:1-12 offers another example.

*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**?*<sup>[21]</sup>

Hort, also, had occasion to notice an instance of this *concordia discors*. Commenting on the four places in Mark's Gospel (14:30, 68, 72a,b) where the cock's crowing is mentioned he said:

*"The confusion of attestation introduced by these several cross currents of change is so great that of the seven principal MSS ⲀA B C D L Ⲁ no two have the same text in all four places."*<sup>[22]</sup>

He might also have said that in these four places the seven uncials present themselves in **twelve** different combinations (and only A and Ⲁ agree together three times out of the four). If we add W and Ⲁ the confusion remains the same except that now there are thirteen combinations. Are such witnesses worthy of credence?

So how did he unravel this mess and decide which reading to adopt when the manuscripts varied so considerably?

He developed a set of rules which has become the Eclectic method for Modern Textual Criticism. These rules are as follows:

1. Internal Evidence of Readings
2. The Shorter Reading is to be preferred
3. Harder to read texts are to be preferred

### 3.5.1 Internal Evidence of readings

This rule evaluates the intrinsic evidence that the disparity was caused by a deliberate alteration of the variant texts. In resolving these, the editor assesses each text for the probability that the author of the text would have written the text. The reading which

weights the highest probability is selected. In other words the editor evaluates what reading makes the best sense, best fits the context, and conforms to the author's style and purpose. Here's the official definition:

*Intrinsic evidence = "T.C. Polarity evidence of readings as most likely the one the author would have written (based on style, etc.)".*

This all sounds very scientific and clever but what it amounts to is that it effectively gives the editor complete flexibility in discarding or choosing texts according to his own bias.

### 3.5.2 The Shorter Reading is to be preferred.

This rule presupposes that in transcription, corruptions by interpolation are more numerous than corruptions by omission owing to the scribe's tendency to elaborate the text as they copy. Hort invented this rule himself and is not borne out by the evidence which shows consistently that weary scribes have a tendency to skip passages to get the job done, and are also inclined to abbreviate passages. Although interpolation is a common occurrence when revising or paraphrasing a text, the same is not true when copying a text. Colwell did a study of the Papyri to show that errors by omission were several times more prevalent than errors by interpolation. He states: *p66 has 54 leaps forward, and 22 backward; 18 of the forward leaps are haplography. P75 has 27 leaps forward, and 10 backward. P45 has 16 leaps forward, and 2 backward. From this it is clear that the scribe looking for his lost place looked ahead three times as often as he looked back. In other words, the loss of position usually resulted in a loss of text, an omission*

Errors by interpolation from copying are also far easier to identify because it results in repeated text within the manuscript. These errors are very easy to correct.

Where copyists have deliberately inserted concepts which are not in the original, they are in fact revising the text. Such a crime would be grounds for discarding the entire manuscript as untrustworthy. I am sure the Erasmus would have very quickly done so and that no such manuscripts were used in compiling the Textus Receptus.

The application of the Shorter Reading is to be preferred rule has resulted in 64,000 words being removed from the Westcott & Hort text. Whole verses are missing in many cases. This violates the last words of the Bible.

*Re 22:19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and [from] the things which are written in this book.*

Don't men read this passage and tremble before it? Many of the words which Hort took out were actually in the Sinaiticus Codex but were not included in the Critical Text because they were not in the favoured Vaticanus. Hort's invention of the shorter reading rule enabled him to do this but I doubt that this rule will provide him much excuse in the judgement when Rev 22:19 is read to him.

### 3.5.3 Harder reading is to be preferred

Hort also invented this rule on the unproven idea that scribes had a tendency to streamline and simplify the readings. Hort offered no statistics or studies to prove this presumption. Nevertheless, if it could be shown that a scribe had revised the text in this way then it should be grounds for dismissing the manuscript altogether, thereby making the argument for the harder reading of no account. For Hort to acknowledge that he is even considering such a text should be grounds for rejecting the whole Modern Eclectic technique. Nevertheless he was a persuasive man and the Church leaders of the day believed this with little question.

So we see that the Modern Eclectic technique allows for the selection of virtually any old manuscript to be used as a source text with the Older is Better rule. The internal evidence of readings which states that readings must be weighed not counted allows the editor to choose for himself which reading seems most appropriate. The shorter reading is preferred rule has allowed for large amounts of text to be removed. The harder reading is preferred rule is also open to human interpretation as to which reading the editor believes is harder and therefore allows him to choose that reading. And to think that all of these rules and techniques are considered by the majority of people to be more robust modern scholastic techniques.

### 3.6 Did Erasmus use eclectic techniques?

Some will argue that Erasmus used eclectic techniques in that he chose text from several different manuscripts. However this is not the case. Erasmus worked before the modern eclectic techniques of lower criticism were devised. He simply didn't need them because he worked from manuscripts which were already highly convergent. Erasmus worked from five of the most highly reputable manuscripts available at the time. His was not an exercise of choosing readings between different texts but rather an exercise of identifying typographical errors. His only rule he required was a simple comparison and reconciliation of the texts. Out of his five manuscripts, four might be identical and one might have a typographical error. Therefore he did not need to invent modern arbitrary rules for Lower Textual Criticism to help him decide which reading to adopt. Some of his manuscripts did not contain the whole of the NT so it was necessary to have the five manuscripts to generate a complete New Testament. These five manuscripts were a good cross section of the mainstream of the Greek texts available. The Chairman of the 1881 Revision Committee Bishop Ellicott, who was actually a critic of the Received Text (although you would wonder why from this quote) said this:

*"The manuscripts which Erasmus used differ, for the most part, only in small and insignificant details from the bulk of the cursive manuscripts. 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 . . . That pedigree stretches back to remote antiquity. The first ancestor of the Received Text was at least contemporary with the oldest of our extant manuscripts, if not older than any one of them."*

Erasmus drew upon years of experience to select these five manuscripts which he retained in his possession to produce the first edition of Textus Receptus. However he had access to many more manuscripts for cross checking. It is true that the first

edition was rushed and contained minor typographical errors and possibly parts of Revelation translated back to Greek from the Latin (This is a common criticism put forward for proponents of the Critical text which I have not been able to confirm). However Erasmus then spent the next 20 years of his life travelling the world researching and comparing manuscripts and produced further editions to correct these minor errors and omissions. Critics of the TR point to the variations between the Stephens text used by the KJV translators and the original TR of Erasmus. However these are all extremely minor alterations such as changes to the Greek spelling and typographical errors. Sometimes the order of words is changed or insignificant connecting words like 'the' or 'to' are added or removed. They rarely contain the alteration of whole passages or significant words.

It is fair to say that Erasmus did not rely on the majority of texts in all cases. He did not "count" the texts in order to determine which was correct as some have claimed. (Remember we're talking about minute corrections here not major words or passages). He also considered other factors such as the geographic spread of the texts. If a reading agreed amongst manuscripts sourced from a wide geographic spread it could safely be preferred over the larger number of manuscripts within a single location. Also the testimony of the translations was considered. If a passage was translated into large numbers of translations then the equivalent reading which is in a minority of Greek texts could also be preferred. Notice that Erasmus and his superior's motive for selecting from minority Greek texts (not corrupt Greek texts) was to strive to unify the Bible to preserve an unbroken tradition across the entire Christian world. In this they worked according to Gods will which is to preserve his word.

The much disputed text of 1 John 5:7,8 is a case where Erasmus might be accused of eclecticism.

*For there are three that bear record in **heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.***

The bold text was not included in Erasmus' five manuscripts or in the majority of Greek texts. However the church leaders of the day had a quandary. The passage existed in their Latin Vulgate Bible which they received in their youth that they believed through faith. They had the responsibility of endorsing the Erasmus Greek edition. They had a conflict of faith vs. science much as we do today. Erasmus agreed to include the passage if he could find adequate manuscript support for it, which he did. He then included the extra words in later editions. Strong arguments for both its inclusion and exclusion from the Bible can be made. In matters where it is difficult to honestly decide a matter one way or another we must resort to faith. Faith that Erasmus and his superiors made a more informed and correct decision in the 1500's than critics in the 1900's are in a position to make. Faith, that the many editors of the Textus Receptus in the years following were correct in ratifying its inclusion. Faith that the translators of the KJV were correct in ratifying its inclusion by translating it into English, and faith that God has his controlling hand on the Scripture and is preserving it completely even until our generation. On the other hand - if we agree with the comments above regarding the Critical Text - how can we have faith in the arguments of Westcott & Hort and other modern critics who have used contrived techniques to

destroy the reputation of the Received Text and introduced a distorted Critical Text? As I have been arguing, our decisions and beliefs must be made by Faith, (which is invariably supported by true science), not by science alone.

The fact that the passage in 1 John 5:7,8 is the only major contentious point in all of the Received Text is a testimony to the accuracy and faithfulness of the text as a whole. Other points of contention are extremely minor nature.

#### 4 The conflagration of Translations

The critic of Christianity points to the huge number of translations in the English which are available, and concludes "How can there be one God and so many different versions of his Word". This is a standard ploy of other religions and atheists who wreak havoc by comparing the various translations, pointing out the inconsistencies between them. These critics also weaken the faith of many fledgling Christians because they are not equipped to answer their arguments.

However the following points should be noted:

1. Only one major version is literally translated exclusively from the Received Text.
2. Only one version is authorised as Holy Scripture by the general assembly of the church.
3. Only one version maintains a consistent unbroken, unchanging biblical tradition.

That version is the King James Version.

All other translations are translated from Westcott & Hort or its derivative Nestle & Aland. The NIV constantly casts doubt on passages of scripture with regular comments in the margin such as: 'Many mss.(manuscripts) do not contain this verse.' , 'The best manuscripts read.' , 'The earliest mss read.' , 'Some ancient mss add.' , 'Some mss insert.' , 'Many ancient authorities read.' , 'Not found in most of the old mss.' , 'Some late manuscripts.' , 'Some manuscripts and certain Jews.' , 'Some manuscripts do not have...'. The NIV prints some of the doubtful passages in the footnotes and sometimes indents doubtful passages to separate them from the rest of the text. Techniques such as this destroy the unshakeable authority of the Bible and turn it into a text book. This is the type of vacillation that you would expect in a text book on evolution with statements such as 'latest research indicates...' , 'eminent scientists say...' , 'the theory has been advanced...' , 'its not unreasonable to assume...'.

The New King James Version despite the claims of the preface departs from the Textus Receptus frequently and appears to gain a lot of its influence from the modern translations such as RSV. It also repeatedly refers to the Critical Text in the margins usually by saying "NU-text omits ...". This thereby serves to weaken the authority of those particular words or verses.

These arguments should be enough to reject modern translations and return to the tried and true King James Version. How can we use a translation where the source of the text is the severely weakened and distorted Westcott & Hort Greek text?

The problems for the modern translations have only just begun however. We now have to examine the techniques of translation which have been employed by many of the translations. In many ways discussing the techniques of translation is not necessary and only distracts us from the weightier argument of the underlying text. In fact it is unlikely that anyone who has been presented with the arguments put so far and has rejected them as incorrect or unimportant will balk at any further arguments about translation.

#### **4.1 Dynamic Equivalence and Literal Translation**

However for the sake of the argument let's compare the techniques of translation; Dynamic Equivalence and Literal Translation. A literal translation translates from the original language by selecting the closest word in the English to the equivalent Greek or Hebrew. Occasionally two English words are required to describe the equivalent Greek word. Additional words are occasionally inserted which were not in the original Greek in the interests of good grammar. In the KJV these are always italicised to alert the reader that the words have been added to the Greek. Dynamic Equivalence on the other hand translates thoughts for thought. Allowing Dynamic Equivalence opens up a Pandora's box of problems and grey areas. The following concerns must be raised: What are the boundaries of the thought? Is the thought the length of the phrase, the length of a sentence, the length of a verse, or the length of several verses. In other words what amount of text is being translated in one go?

Has the translator properly understood the thought in the original language?

How much elaboration is allowed to express the thought in the new language before it becomes a paraphrase, or for that matter a commentary? It's ironic that Westcott & Hort went to pains to adopt the shorter reading is preferred rule only to have it outdone by the elaborations of dynamic equivalence.

#### **4.2 Should we translate at all?**

Anyone who knows two languages will know how difficult it is to express thoughts from one language into another. They will tell you that many of the nuances are lost. The original languages are filled with colourful word images and puns which do not translate into the new language. Some words lose or change their meaning outside of the context in which they were originally written. Sometimes the new language has no equivalent words into which the word can be translated. So we must ask the question. Is it legitimate to translate at all? The answer must obviously be yes because the apostles endorsed the Greek Septuagint translation and quoted and referred to it on numerous occasions as Scripture.

Having decided that it is permissible to translate we should then ask whether we should create a new translation into a new language. Often the language or dialect may be too primitive to receive the translated Scripture. If this is the case then we should not attempt to translate into that dialect or language. As an example I read about of a translation into a South East Asian language where the translation read, "Behold the pig of God that takes away the sin of the world". And another which was translated "Wash me and I will be whiter than a coconut kernel". Rationale being, that sheep and snow were not known to the people and had no cultural relevance or background. Far better, is to leave the Scripture alone and teach the people what snow is and what a sheep is. If we want the people to read the Scripture then let

them be educated in English, German or Greek so that they can learn the Scriptures, otherwise they can learn from their preacher. The English language was too crude to receive the Scripture until the 1500's when the language underwent a major transformation during the renaissance. Up until that time the people had to rely on the priests to teach them the things of God from the Latin language. Sadly, these priests did a very poor job at this and will have to answer to God for their poor shepherding.

Having decided that we are going to translate into a new language we must then apply some rules and boundaries to guide the work of translation to ensure that the translation is faithfully reproducing the original language. When a teacher expounds the Scripture it is clear to all who hear him speak which words are his own human interpretation and which are reading from the divinely inspired text. These boundaries between interpretation and inspiration are blurred in dynamic equivalence or paraphrased translations. The reader must continually cross-check back to the literal translation to verify which bits are added in.

However, even a certain amount of human interpretation is required for literal translation when choosing a word in the new language. So there must be a boundary applied to translation. We must know where to draw the line. How much human interpretation is to be allowed before the point is reached where the translation is no longer the Holy Word of God but an interpretation of man such as is found in a commentary or paraphrase? In other words should our translation be word for word, phrase for phrase, verse for verse, passage for passage, chapter for chapter, general feel of the book for general feel. There can only be one answer to this. The boundary must be the word. If we stray from this boundary then there is no other marker to draw our line against. The argument for the word is entirely biblical.

*"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you". -Deuteronomy 4:2.*

*"Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar" - Proverbs 30:5-6*

The thoughts of God are not in our domain. We may be regenerate Christians, experienced in the things of God. We may love and seek his thoughts day and night. But can we claim to completely understand the thoughts which are being given in the Scripture, which are the very thoughts of God?

*Isa 55:8 For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. Isa 55:9 For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.*

*Ro 11:34 For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?*

Should we filter Gods thoughts through our thoughts? Our thoughts are persistently flawed. This is particularly so of the scholars and wise of the world.

*1Co 3:18 ¶ Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise.19 For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.20 And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.21 ¶ Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours; And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.*

*Ps 94:11 The LORD knoweth the thoughts of man, that they [are] vanity.*

## **5 The Formation of the Biblical Canon.**

Do we have all of the Bible? Are all the books of the Bible inspired? Many groups try to assault the perfection and credibility of the Scripture by bringing up the Apocrypha and the assembly of the Canon. They argue that the books of the Bible are not necessarily the correct books of the Bible, that the canon is some kind of arbitrary compilation by men.

### **5.1 Inclusion of the Apocrypha in the original 1611 canon of the KJV**

Textual scholars who advance these arguments do so it would seem to cast doubt on the doctrine of preservation. They attempt to discredit the KJV because it contained the Apocrypha in its original 1611 version (It was subsequently taken out of future editions). However these same men invariably use the same canon as is shown in the KJV. Why doesn't the Critical Text for example include in its canon the Book of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas which were in Codex Sinaiticus, or 1 & 2 Clement which were in Codex Alexandrinus. And why haven't the translators of our modern bibles who worked from the Critical text included the Apocrypha in our modern translations, given that Codex Sinaiticus includes these books. Codex Vaticanus also includes the Apocryphal books, except for 1 & 2 Maccabees and The defaulter of Manasseh. Proponents of the CT are happy to deride the KJV for containing the apocryphal books in the original edition of 1611 whilst never mentioning that their own precious Uncials themselves contained them. In any event they were never presented in the KJV as Scripture and were included as historical documents between the Testaments. The Westminster confession states

*III. The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the Canon of Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.*

In 1599, twelve years before the King James Bible was published, King James said in somewhat cruder fashion about the Apocrypha:

*"As to the Apocriphe bookes, I OMIT THEM because I am no Papist (as I said before)..."*

## 5.2 The reliability of the New Testament canon

Others point out the instability of the New Testament canon. They point to all the intrigues of assembling the Canon, debates raging over the centuries about which books should be in and which should be out. Even our father Luther denied Hebrews, James, Revelation, Esther, Jonah and Jude. However in all of this they are focused on the weaknesses of men and not on the guiding hand of God who has guarded his Scripture throughout the generations. The Mormons are adept at this argument as having weakened the evidence of a guiding hand of God on the canon they can then admit their own book of Mormon as scripture.

A common argument is that men sat down and voted which books would be included in the Canon. The fact is that the Canon has been in its current form since 367 AD when Athanasius the Bishop of Alexandria compiled them. In fact he didn't compile them he simply endorsed and legitimised the list that had been established for decades prior to that. Analyses of the patristic citations confirm that even back to 200 AD the books in the existing canon were commonly considered as Scripture.

1800 years is a long, long time to prove the endorsement of the New Testament Canon. Nobody except New Age Gnostics really believe that the books of Thomas, Jade, Judas, Thaddeus, of the Infancy, of the Preaching of Peter, of the Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Pastor of Hermas, the Revelation of Peter, the Revelation of Paul, the Epistle of Clement, the Epistle of Ignatius, the Gospel of Mary, the Gospel of Nicodemus and of Marcion should be included in the Canon. And which books do the critics think should be taken out of the Canon? Revelation, Hebrews or Jude? The evidence of the patristic citations and lectionaries are overwhelming for the inclusion of these books.

## 5.3 Old Testament Canon – Is the Apocrypha scripture?

Actually the New Testament canon is debated even less than is the Old Testament Canon where an excellent case can be made for the inclusion of the Apocrypha. The Old Testament Canon gradually grew up and developed as a list of books in the same organic way as the New Testament Canon did. It did not fall out of heaven with a big lightning bolt and wrapped in ribbons as critics of the Bible Canon would wish for. Yet Christ endorsed the Scripture as they were compiled at the time. Notice that he did not mention the inter-testament writings such as Maccabees.

*Luke 24:44 And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.*

*45 Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures*

Supporters of the Apocrypha point out that the Apocrypha was included in the Septuagint which was the Bible the apostles used. However it is also true to say that we have no evidence that the Apocrypha was included in the Septuagint in the apostle's day. The earliest manuscripts of the Septuagint date back only to the 4<sup>th</sup> century. These manuscripts contain differing lists of the apocryphal books. Also there are no quotes from these books by Jesus or the apostles. It is also highly likely that Jesus used the Hebrew text of the Bible, not the Septuagint when he made the above

statement of Luke 24:44. The Hebrew Old Testament Canon did not include the Apocryphal books. Romans states that the Hebrews are responsible for maintaining and preserving the scriptures. Therefore it is perfectly reasonable to resort to their Canon.

*Ro 3:2 Much in every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles (scriptures) of God.*

The church fathers often quote the deuterocanonical books however this is not in itself an admission that they considered them Scripture. We cannot use this argument as evidence that the texts are Scripture. We often quote from other books in our own literature even though we do not consider that they are Scripture. Judging from the context of the citations however there is indication that even in the earliest of days that there was a distinction between the high esteem of the Apocryphal books as compared to the sacredness of the Scriptures.

Many articles on the web point out doctrinal, historical and geographical discrepancies between the Apocryphal books and the Bible. Many of their authors actually claim that they are not Scripture. Also they generally attest and confirm that the Word of God ceased to be declared to men after the unbroken testimony of the prophets ceased in 400 BC. Perhaps the most telling factor of all is that they are all written in Greek whereas the rest of the Old Testament is written in Hebrew with small sections of Aramaic. Even the Prayer of Azariah which is inserted into Daniel 3 in some translations has no Semitic origins. This is another area where the more you study, the more convinced you become that the Apocrypha should not be considered as Scripture. It is still perfectly acceptable to use them for devotional, inspirational, or historical purposes as we do in modern days with our many, many books.

Different lists of the Apocrypha are also included in various translations. Luther included them in the German bible but did not claim that they were sacred Scripture. Different lists of the Apocrypha were also included in various combinations at different times of the Peshitta and the Old Latin Vulgate. The principle which has been previously explained, that the translation of the Bible should bring into reconciliation the various universal testimonies of the manuscripts and the translations should equally be applied to the Canon. If we do this, then the existing Old Testament Canon stands as universally accepted and included in the great body of the translations, lectionaries and compilations of Scripture as well as the original Hebrew Canon known to Christ. This cannot be claimed for the Apocryphal books as they have only occasionally been included at certain times and in certain lists and translations.

The deuterocanonical books of the Apocrypha are another difficult area where excellent arguments for both their inclusion and exclusion can be made. In these cases we need to resort to faith. Faith that God has omitted them from the Bible for a good reason and for his good purpose. In any event we again need to apply faith that the Scriptures which we have been given are perfect, truthful and complete. As has been stated throughout; our faith must precede our learnedness. In the arena of faith the simple of the world precede the wise.

*Lu 10:21 In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the*

*wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.*

## 6 Questions

Here is a list of questions and issues which are often raised regarding the KJV and modern translations.

### 6.1 Am I a KJV-Onlyist?

Invariably anybody who stands for anything in this world is labelled an "ist" of one kind or another. Those who have no absolute standards and who take a fast and loose approach with the Bible are quick to drag out labels for those that do.

I believe that the KJV is the only Holy Bible for English speakers and that all other modern versions have been corrupted. The fact that English words have fallen into disuse is no argument for changing the KJV. Why should the KJV which was produced during the period of time when the English language was at its height be changed or replaced to reflect a degenerated language of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Our English language is in serious decline with Biblical concepts becoming increasingly difficult to convey in modern terminology. As Christians we must resist this tide and remain educated in the old English. This was done in ancient times when the church preserved the Latin language for a thousand years after it died out of common use. After the barbarian hordes over-ran the decaying Roman Empire in the fifth century it was the church that preserved sacred knowledge through the dark and middle ages by maintaining the education of the clergy and others in the language of Latin in Europe and the west, and Greek in the East.

The KJV-Only position which I advocate does not deny the holiness of previous English translations such as the Bishops bible. Nor does it claim that God will never raise up another team of translators in the future to perform a further translation into English. It simply claims that a suitable translation from the Received Text has not been done since the KJV was produced. Nor is there any need to produce another translation as the KJV is perfectly adequate. A KJV-Only believer might allow another edition of the KJV to update a more current word which is directly equivalent to the obsolete word, however most KJV-Only believers would say that the English world will never again see a gathering of scholars of the skill of the KJV translators who have greater mastery of the Greek and Hebrew and the other translations who could be entrusted or ordained with such a task. A KJV-Only believer opposes the confusion and multiplication of translations which continue with each decade that passes and demonstrate increasing departures and variations from the text once delivered.

Unfortunately many extreme views are forwarded in defence of the KJV. I suppose that many KJV-Only supporters are also bibliolatrists, legalists, dogmatists and every other kind of 'ist' imaginable. I suppose that many of them rant and rave, accusing other brethren who don't see things their way. Many of them may even belong to weird fundamentalist cults, however many do not. We must not use this argument as a mechanism for discrediting and ignoring sound arguments such as those presented

by Dean Burgon whose work "Revision Revised" exposes Westcott & Hort's work and remains unanswered to this day.

## 6.2 Does it really matter anyway?

I know that most people wouldn't even bother to read this type of material. If they did, then the almost universal reaction would be "Well it doesn't really matter anyway". Or they might hold onto some easily understood argument to justify their acceptance of modern translations. The complacency of the modern western church is almost legendary in the annals of human history. If the corruption of the Holy Bible does not move people in the church to outrage and indignation then what will? If the distortion of the Scriptures does not matter then what does?

In fact this is the state of the modern Christian in the western world. Nothing really matters to the sleeping Christian. The day of judgement is around the corner. The bridegroom is approaching. The wolves are at the door.

None of this matters to the modern Christian as he switches on the telly and grabs another bag of chips. The modern Christian has even lost the ability to detect a corruption of the Scripture. He is without discretion and has lost the ability to discriminate truth from error except it be in its most blatant and outrageous form.

*A man who owns only one watch ... knows what time it is,  
But a man who has two watches ... is never quite sure.*

Only by returning to a strict and pedantic adherence to the Bible can we hope to regain this ability and arrest the slide into the destruction which invariably comes from tampering and twisting the Scriptures.

*2Pe 3:16 As also in all [his] epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as [they do] also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.*

## 6.3 Can you be saved if you read the NIV?

Many will ask. What about all of those who have been saved who have grown up with modern translations? Has God given them a Bible or not? Are they Christian or not? Of course they are. This is nonsense. This argument is a smokescreen. There have been huge numbers of Christians saved over the centuries who could not even read. They believed the Word of God as it was taught to them by their preachers. The question we should be asking is having been confronted with the evidence that modern translations are inferior, is it not a matter of obedience that we should read the more accurate word of Scripture? If we had two road maps, one which was very accurate and another that was error prone, wouldn't we choose the accurate one, even if it was slightly harder to read. If our food was a little on the nose, would we eat it? If our drinking water was a little bit polluted, would we drink it? Why should it be any different with the Scriptures? Surely a polluted Bible is worse for us than polluted food or water.

An argument often advanced is that the NIV, for example, is able to teach a Christian

all of the fundamentals and precepts which are required for salvation. This may be true but it is also a smokescreen. An analogy of this is the Earth which is able to cope with an enormous amount of pollution and destruction at the hands of man and still be able to sustain life. This is a testimony to the resilience of the earth. The fact that the earth is resilient does not make it acceptable to pollute it. Nor does it make it unnecessary for us to attempt to clean up the mess. By way of analogy the word of God has been polluted at the hands of man, despite this it is still able to provide salvation. This does not absolve us from the responsibility of at least preventing further deterioration of the text and at best, returning to a purer text.

## 6.4 What about readability?

### 6.4.1 Is the KJV archaic?

Supporters of modern translations say that the KJV was great for Elizabethan English but now in this 20<sup>th</sup>, 21<sup>st</sup> century it is archaic and irrelevant. Nobody makes this claim about the writings of Shakespeare. The literary world hasn't churned out hundreds of representations and paraphrases of Hamlet to aid the modern reader in understanding it.

Actually the KJV is not written in Elizabethan English. This can be clearly seen by comparing the language of the KJV with its preface and with the writings of Shakespeare. It is written in biblical English which very closely follows the structure of the Greek. It is simpler in structure and style than Elizabethan English. It uses far fewer words than Elizabethan English (or NIV English for that matter). It was certainly not the English of the day. To learn this Biblical English required as much discipline in those days as it does in our day. In many ways it is easier to learn now than it would have been in those days. The King James Version has had a huge influence on the development on our modern forms of English which are now actually closer in pattern and style to the KJV than Elizabethan English was.

### 6.4.2 Older words generally more specific in meaning than newer easy words

Much criticism is made of the thee's and thou's of the KJV, and it is true that these are archaic words. In fact they were considered archaic in the early 1600's when the KJV was translated. These words were still being used in literary circles but in common usage they were rarely used. The distinction between 'ye' and 'you' was not understood and the words were being used interchangeably until today when 'you' has superseded the word 'ye'. These words were proper grammatical forms which were used by the KJV translators in order to correctly communicate the grammatical forms of the original languages.

### Modern usage

|                 | Subjective |        | Objective  |        | Possessive         |                    |
|-----------------|------------|--------|------------|--------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Person          | Singular   | Plural | Singular   | Plural | Singular           | Plural             |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> | I          | we     | me         | us     | adj:my/nom:mine    | adj:our/nom:ours   |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> | you        | you    | you        | you    | adj:your/nom:yours | adj:your/nom:yours |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> | he/she/it  | they   | him/her/it | them   | his/hers/its       | theirs             |

**KJV usage**

| Person          | Subjective |        | Objective  |        | Possessive        |                    |
|-----------------|------------|--------|------------|--------|-------------------|--------------------|
|                 | Singular   | Plural | Singular   | Plural | Singular          | Plural             |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> | I          | we     | me         | us     | adj:my/nom:mine   | adj:our/nom:ours   |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> | thee       | ye     | thou       | you    | adj:thy/nom:thine | adj:your/nom:yours |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> | he/she/it  | they   | him/her/it | them   | his/hers/its      | theirs             |

adj. = adjective nom. = nominative

The tables above show how the distinction between the second person singular and plural forms has disappeared today. In the KJV the thee's and thou's distinguish the second person singular from the second person plural. So the KJV may be archaic in this respect however it is also correct. As an example Christ said

*Joh 3:7 Marvel not that I said unto thee (Nicodemus), Ye (All people) must be born again.*

So you might say that not much of the sense is lost, however some sense has been lost. The issue is that the KJV is exact and excellent grammatically and is faithful in emulating the constructs of the original languages. (See the Does it really matter? Section)

#### 6.4.3 What's wrong with using a dictionary?

Language is constantly changing. Words are used differently depending on what part of the world you live in. So should we have to continually update the Bible to keep it relevant. No! The Bible should be unchanging as God is unchanging. If we were to take up any other kind of discipline such as Geology, Kite flying, Chemistry or Stamp collecting we would need to master the lingo and terminology of that discipline. Why should it be any different for the discipline of the Bible? There are only a few hundred words in the KJV which we may need to consult a dictionary to understand. When we do this we discover that many of the words that have been chosen by modern translators to be used in place of the archaic word, do not in fact mean the same thing. In any event we find that if we look at a list of NIV words we would need to reach for the dictionary anyway. Here are some words from the NIV.

Algum, belial, bier, brayed, breaching, calamus, capital (not a city), carnelian, citron, clefts, colonnades, coney, cors, curds, dandled, dragnet, dropsy, emasculate, festal, filigree, fomenting, forded, fowler, gadfly, galled, gird, goiim, henna, homers, hoopoe, ignoble, incur, indignant, jamps, jowls, libations, loins, magi, manifold, maxims, mina, naught, omer, oracles, overweening, peals (noun, not the verb), pinions, phylacteries, porphyry, portent, potsherd, proconsul, Praetorium, pretext, profligate, qualm, ramparts, ratified, ravish, rabble, rawboned, reposes, retinue, rifts, roebucks, rue, satraps, sated, sistrums, spelt, tamarisk, tetrarch, terebinth, tresses, vassal, vaunts, verdant, vexed, wadi, wanton, wield, winnowing.

In actual fact the NIV has a larger vocabulary, and on average has more syllables per word than the KJV, which makes the KJV easier for school children who are learning to read than the NIV.

Unfortunately the translators intent on making the bible easier to read invariably substitute a KJV word for a word which is more understandable, but which is less specific and often incorrect. Whereas the KJV reader might be compelled to consult his dictionary and find out what exactly the word means and thereby grow in knowledge; the casual reader of a modern version just reads over the easier word without question.

Lets examine this extract of the Report Of The Special Seminary Committee On A Thorough Study Of The New King James And Other Bible Versions April 1983 from the Baptist Missionary Association. According to the introduction of the report

*In April of 1982 a resolution was passed by the B.M.A. of America giving the faculty of the Baptist Missionary Association Theological Seminary the challenging assignment of making a thorough study of The New King James Version of the Bible, and the almost superhuman task of forming a judgmental decision of its true value, and of reporting the findings of the special committee through the various denominational papers.*

So let's have a look at an extract from this thorough, almost superhuman study.

*In the Old Testament good examples of the change from archaic words that are no longer understood are found in Exodus 25-28; "knops" is made clear by "knobs," 25:33-35; "taches," by "clasps," 26:6,11; fillets, by "bands," 27:10,11; "ouches of gold," by "settings of gold," 28:13,14;and "habergeon," by "coat of mail," 28:32. There are many other such Old Testament improvements in language form, but these will suffice for examples.*

I looked up the definitions of the old words in the dictionary and various encyclopaedias to see if they would suffice as examples as claimed. This is what I found.

Knops are small decorative knobs whereas the reader might otherwise think they were large plain knobs.

Taches are knobs or belaying pins behind which a curtain may be restrained which is something quite different to a clasp.

Fillets might be bands if we are talking about tying up a maiden's hair, but if we're talking about tabernacle architecture they are rods or rails which connect pillars.

Ouches are settings for gems and jewels whereas a setting is a more general word which means to lay out an item or items in a specified position. Also to use the phrase "set them in a setting of gold" is bad grammar. It is not possible to set stones into something without that something being a setting. So the word "setting" becomes redundant. Correct grammar would be to say "set them in gold". However the KJV Bible is being exact in its language by using the term ouches.

Habergeon is a particular type of coat of mail of Egyptian origin which covers the neck and descends to the middle of the body and is lined with thickly woven linen. No doubt it also has a particular type of weave in the chain. The reader of the modern translation who only reads "coat of mail" would miss these details.

So we see how the Biblical words are generally very exact whereas the modern words are very casual and general. So I really don't think the modern language forms are an improvement. They might be easier to read but they are far less descriptive.

So much for BMA's superhuman effort.

Here are some comparisons between the NIV and KJV:

| KJV Word    | Meaning  | NIV               | Meaning                           | Comments  |
|-------------|--|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Succour     | To help in times of difficulty   | Help              | To aid or assist                  | Succour is help specifically in times of difficulty whereas help is a general assistance for any reason |
| God Speed   | God given Prosperity in an undertaking;  | Welcome           | Greeting – kind or glad reception |   |
| Damnation   | Eternal punishment in Hell   | Condemnation      | Censure, Judicial conviction      |   |
| Infallible  | Incapable of erring  | Convincing        | Able to firmly persuade           | Acts 1:13   |
| Fornication | Voluntary sexual intercourse between unmarried people                                | Sexual immorality | Morally evil in sexual matters    | Fornication is far more specific in definition  |
| Adultery    | Voluntary sexual intercourse of married person with a person other than their spouse | Sexual immorality | Morally evil in sexual matters    | Adultery is far more specific in definition.  |
| Blasphemed  | Impious or profane talk  | Maligned          | Speak ill of, slander             | NIV also uses dishonour revile  |

A quick search on the Internet with the search string 'Comparison KJV NIV' will list a huge number of sites which will point out the alarming omissions and changes which have been made to the Bible by the Minority Text of the NIV. One particularly worrying tendency of the NIV to refer to Christ as 'the One' rather than he. 'The One' is a New Age term.

### 6.5 What about devotional reading?

I'm not sure what this means. But I assume this means that because the modern Bible is apparently easier to read that therefore the reader gains more inspiration and grows in his devotion. Are we to say from this viewpoint that our Christian ancestors struggled to reach the heights of devotion that we are able to achieve in this day because they did not have our modern easy versions. Remember that critics of KJV claim it was archaic even when it was published in 1611 because it had its roots in the Bishops Bible.

From my own experience I have tried to read the paraphrases and modern translations and have got so frustrated with the question "Does the Bible really say that?" and having to go back and check the literal translation, that I abandoned them altogether and returned to the literal translation.

I don't find the KJV any less devotional in the Psalms than the modern translations. Here is a comparison between KJV and the New Living Translation.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>KJV ¶ &lt;&lt;To the chief Musician upon Gittith, A Psalm of David.&gt;&gt; O LORD our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth! who hast set thy glory above the heavens.</p> <p>2 Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger.</p> <p>3 ¶ When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; 4 What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? 5 For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour.</p> <p>6 Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet: 7 All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; 8 The fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas. 9 O LORD our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!</p> | <p>NLT Psalm 8 For the choir director: A psalm of David, to be accompanied by a stringed instrument. 1 O LORD, our Lord, the majesty of your name fills the earth! Your glory is higher than the heavens. You have taught children and nursing infants. To give you praise. They silence your enemies who were seeking revenge. 3 When I look at the night sky and see the work of your fingers-- the moon and the stars you have set in place-- 4 what are mortals that you should think of us, mere humans that you should care for us? 5 For you made us only a little lower than God, and you crowned us with glory and honor. 6 You put us in charge of everything you made, giving us authority over all things-- 7 the sheep and the cattle and all the wild animals, 8 the birds in the sky, the fish in the sea, and everything that swims the ocean currents. 9 O LORD, our Lord, the majesty of your name fills the earth!</p> |
|--|---|

I like that the babies speak the strength of God to still the enemy rather than silencing the enemy. The word "still" reminds me of a raging angry sea which is made calm and still. I like the word "consider" thy heavens rather than look at them. It tells me that David is gazing into the heavens and contemplating on them rather than just looking at them. The use of the word mortals and mere humans rather than man and son of man feels sort of clinical and detached almost disdainful. Hang on; "son of man" that's a name that Christ often used for himself. I wonder if this Psalm is somehow a prophecy of Christ? No can't be because NLT says "mere human" and Jesus wasn't a mere human.

Also "dominion" and "under his feet" are more poetic than "in charge" and "given authority".

What a relief too that as a reader of KJV I do not have to worry about whether or not men are only a little bit lower than God or not. If I was reading NLT I would definitely have to interrupt my devotion to go and check that one in my RSV; no that would be no help to me, that says God too. OK, I'll check my NIV, that says heavenly beings. My KJV says angels. It's all so confusing. So then we amateurs get out our Hebrew

Lexicons and try and unravel what Elohim means and then we find that Elohim has been translated as God 2433 times and only once as angels by the KJV translators. Oh no! we think with our magnificent minds. The KJV translators made a mistake and God has given us a wonderful amazing revelation, that we're only a bit lower than God. However if we'd looked into it a bit deeper we'd have discovered that Paul uses the Greek for angels, *aggelos* when he quotes Psalm 8 in Hebrews 2, so the KJV translators are obviously aware of nuances and contexts in the Hebrew that have escaped the other translators. If Paul uses angels, then I am pleased that the KJV translators do as well. Oh why didn't I just stick with the KJV to begin with and save myself all of this confusion. Notice also that the KJV refers to the son of man as 'him' not 'us'.

Well at least I took the time out of my devotion to check on the NLT statement that we are a made a little lower than God. But if I'm your average casual reader or a 1<sup>st</sup> generation Christian doing my devotional reading I might not know to check this out and so am left thinking that humanity is just a bit lower than God. If that's the case, then my devotion has gone seriously off the rails.

## 6.6 What should we do with our Modern Translations?

Up until a few years ago I was a student primarily of the NIV however over time I was more and more utilising the NKJV because I found it more reliable in my studies. I also used the Living Bible from time to time but abandoned it many years ago because I didn't like its style and I found that it continually gave incorrect slants on the Scripture. Since researching this paper I have recognised the flaws in the NKJV and have returned to KJV. I have been overjoyed at returning to the Bible that I grew up with and learned from since I was a teenager. To think that less than two weeks before I was confronted with this issue I had said to my wife. "I think I'll get rid of these old clunkers. I don't use them anymore" (referring to the KJV. )

Now I have to work out what to do with my modern translations. Are they worth keeping?

Given the arguments above I have to conclude that they have very little value. There might be a case for referring to them if the KJV is difficult to figure out, in order to get ideas about what the KJV might mean. In other words we use them as a commentary in support of our study of the Holy Bible. The study notes in the NIV are very good and so it is probably worth keeping my NIV study bible for those. I find that I refer to my Oxfords concise dictionary frequently to help me with understanding some of the more obscure KJV words and have been amazed to discover that many of the words actually mean something quite different to what I thought they meant. An example is:

*Rom 1:28 And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient;*

'Reprobate' is used in the KJV. I thought this meant rebellious. However according to my Oxford it actually means:

*Express or feel disapproval of, censure, cast off by God, excluded from salvation, hardened in sin*

Perhaps this is not politically correct because NIV has used 'depravity' which means something quite different:

*Moral corruption, wickedness, innate corruptness of human nature*

Certainly the context of the verse favours the word 'reprobate'. Taking the time to consult the dictionary to check up KJV has considerably enriched my Bible study and given me new insights as well as educating me.

As far as the paraphrases go and liberal translations such as the New Living Translation or New World Translation, I think that they are so riddled with error that they pose more harm than good and should be disposed of.

I can understand that for those without a background with the KJV who is a recent convert to Christianity that it will seem like a major adjustment for them to abandon their modern translation and take up the KJV. But I contend that it will take very little effort and adjustment to come to terms with the thee's and thou's of the KJV. Psalm 8 above is an example. There is nothing particularly difficult about the text. In fact the mightest and visitest and passeth add distinction to the text. You really feel like you are reading something special and holy when you read the KJV. It has an aura about it that is missing from the contemporary texts.

I encourage all readers of this document to step out in faith and take up the King James Version. Many people claim that the KJV is easier to memorise than the modern texts. The KJV has a wealth of dictionaries and concordances developed over hundreds of years which provide support for rich bible study. These resources lose much of their effectiveness when applied to modern translations because so many of the words are different. This is especially true with concordances. Trying to locate phrases when you've been using a multiplicity of translations becomes very difficult.

The KJV student also saves a lot of time because they do not have to juggle several translations, comparing and analysing each translation. Perhaps the most compelling reason for adopting the KJV as the only Bible is that the KJV only student is less inclined to take an eclectic approach to reading the Bible. He does not read something and say, 'Oh that's a translation error'. He does not pick and choose between translations, selecting for himself the translation which best presents or agrees with his point of view. He simply accepts the words of the KJV in faith. I'm not saying by this that all KJV only people are in the truth and that all modern Bible readers are in error. I'm simply advocating the straightforward trust and confidence in the one translation of the KJV. To take an eclectic pick and choose approach to reading the Scripture is a twisting of the words of Scripture and should not be done.

## **6.7 The integrity of the King James translation**

The experienced Bible student who is familiar with the King James Version has been down the path of checking modern translations many times and has found the KJV to be reliable time and again. Almost instinctively he uses the modern translations less and less. Even the Greek and Hebrew lexicons are used less, as confidence in the KJV grows.

There's a saying which has been adopted by the computer industry. "A little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing". We use it to describe users who learn a little bit about the computer system and think that they can go in and change the program. All they succeed in doing is introducing bugs and computer crashes and wreck the

program. This is like us with our Lexicons. We look into our Lexicons and come out with statements like "Well that's a bad translation. The translators really should have translated it this way or that way" In this pursuit all we succeed in doing is confusing ourselves and others and messing up the Scriptures and wasting time as we try and redo the work of some of the most brilliant and godly scholars ever assembled. There's no space here to go into the credentials of the KJV translators, but there is little doubt that they were without peer in the English language either before or since. It's an exercise in futility to think that we could even scratch the surface of the weight of reasons and deliberations which went into their selection of one English word over another in the KJV.

In contrast to the KJV some of the modern translations are produced by only one man with no one to crosscheck the work of his translation for bias. In extreme cases the author of the modern translation has spent a couple of years in seminary learning Greek. With this inadequate training he starts translating the New Testament in his spare time until a publisher picks up the work, copyrights and publishes it. It sells quite well so two years later the author begins translating the Old Testament from the Hebrew. How can we justify setting aside our KJV for even 5 minutes to take up a translation such as this. (The discerning reader will recognise that I'm speaking of 'The Message')

## 6.8 What about all the errors in the KJV?

It is important that we must concede that there were transcriptional errors by scribes. If there were not then every manuscript would have to be identical and there would be no need for Erasmus to come along and correct the typographical errors. It would be inconsistent not to apply the same principle to the translation of the KJV to recognise that there are translational errors in the KJV. However as I have earlier stated I believe that the credentials of the KJV translators are on a completely different level to those critics of the KJV who wave their lexicons around and say, "See the KJV is wrong". The doctrine of preservation shows that God has endorsed the KJV and has preserved his word in its pages. This might seem like circular reasoning or that I am claiming that the translators are infallible, but this is not the case. I'm saying that God is infallible and has inspired the translators of the KJV every bit as much as he inspired the original writers of the Bible and the translators of the Septuagint in the apostle's day.

The following statements were made about scripture in the New Testament. This scripture was itself hundreds and sometimes 1000's of years old and had been copied countless times and even translated into the Septuagint Greek by Ptolemy (who was no more a man of God than King James was) in about 250 BC.

*Mar 12:10 And have ye not read this scripture; The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner:*

*Rom 10:11 For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.*

There is no suggestion in the New Testament that the Old Testament scripture may have contained translation or copying errors. So by what authority do we suggest that our copied and translated KJV scripture may have copying or translation errors?

The fact is that the translators of the KJV were greater scholars even than the authors

of the lexicons. They considered the testimony of the other translations and upheld the holiness and perfection of the Scripture. The protector of the Protestant faith appointed them to their task at the height of the reformation and at the peak of the English language. They conducted their task with humility and integrity. Were they perfect men? No of course not. But God is perfect, and he guided them perfectly in the translation of his word. Which God-fearing man or woman amongst us will pit their scholastic abilities and divine anointing against the scholastic abilities and divine anointing of the KJV translators in order to say "The KJV translators got it wrong; it needs to be corrected"? Even the KJV translators did not assert themselves above the translators before them to say that the previous translations needed to be corrected. How much less should we proudly exalt ourselves? Do we really think that everything in our modern world is better, more accurate, more superior, more scientific, more scholastic, more knowledgeable, better researched than the work of men before us. Do we think that somehow we can feed all the manuscripts into a computer and have it spit out the perfect word of God at the other end?

The critic will say that there were five editions of the 1611 KJV which were produced to correct translation errors. These were 1613, 1616, 1617, 1743 and 1769. Apparently 20,000 alterations were made in this time. However just a little bit of research will show that these were all minor editing changes in spelling or typographical corrections. The spelling in the English language had not stabilised until the mid 1600's. Alterations of the case of certain letters, eg. spirit to Spirit. Very rarely some typographical errors caused by mistakes in typesetting resulted in words being omitted in the earlier versions. I read somewhere that one of the early KJV editions actually said. Thou shalt commit adultery.

In fact the most contentious change to be found in all of the editions of the KJV is in the latest edition in 1881.

*Nahum 3:16 -- Thou hast multiplied thy merchants above the stars of heaven: the cankerworm spoileth, and flieth away.*

The newer KJV Bibles use "fleeth away". Apparently there was some confusion as to whether the cankerworm is a flying insect or a worm. I have trouble visualising a worm fleeing so I prefer the original rendering (as is invariably the case). Still I'm grateful that with the KJV we are not debating the weightier matters such as the deity of Christ or the virginity of Mary as we do when we debate the modern translations.

Scrivener produced a volume which documents the changes made to the KJV where it can be clearly seen how minute the changes are. We are not calling into question the immutability of Gods Word when we talk about changes to spelling or correction of typographical errors. Whereas we are if entire words and passages are deliberately and judiciously removed as is the case with the modern translations.

One of the "enormous" errors which the KJV is accused of is in Acts 12:4 where pascha is translated as Easter. Critics of the KJV do not seem to be aware that Passover is an English word which did not originate until Wycliffe derived it in 1526. Prior to that the word pascha was used in both Greek and Latin for both the pagan celebration of Easter and the paschal supper much as we do today where the Christian celebrations of the death and resurrection of Christ are mingled with the Pagan fertility rites of eggs and rabbits under the same name of Easter. The fact that

the KJV translators are justified in translating the word as Easter is demonstrated by the context of the verse:

*Ac 12:3 And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also. (Then were the days of unleavened bread.) 4 And when he had apprehended him, he put [him] in prison, and delivered [him] to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people.*

This verse shows that Herod imprisoned Peter during Unleavened Bread and intended to keep him prisoner until after pascha. This is a problem if pascha is the Jewish Passover because the Jewish Passover occurs prior to the days of Unleavened Bread. Therefore Herod would have to have been intending to imprison Peter for a year which is obviously not the case from the context of the verse. The obvious explanation is that the Roman occupiers were keeping their pagan Easter holiday which was towards the end of Unleavened Bread that year and Herod didn't want to have to deal with Peter until after his holidays. The KJV translators are therefore justified in translating pascha into Easter when describing the pagan festival and Passover when describing the Jewish festival.

I should also make the point that there have been zero revisions of the King James Version of the bible and only four editions 1611, 1638, 1769 and 1881 although some would like to argue that these were revisions. Compare that to the Nestle-Aland greek text which is in its 27<sup>th</sup> edition already after only 100 years and the astronomical numbers of version, revisions, editions, paraphrases and parodies such as the Australian bible.

## 7 Quotes from Westcott & Hort

### 7.1 Quotes from Westcott

These quotes are taken from "A., Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, MacMillan and Co., London, 1903, vols. I,II."

1890 Mar. 4th - Westcott: "No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history - I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did - yet they disclose to us a Gospel. So it is probably elsewhere."

Aug. 11th - Westcott he wrote: "I never read an account of a miracle but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some want of evidence in the account of it."

Sept. 29th - Westcott to Hort: "As to our proposed recension of the New Testament text, our object would be, I suppose, to prepare a text for common and general use...With such an end in view, would it not be best to introduce only certain emendations into the received text, and to note in the margin such as seem likely or noticeable - after Griesbach's manner?...I feel most keenly the disgrace of circulating what I feel to be falsified copies of Holy Scripture, and am most anxious to provide something to replace them. This cannot be any text resting solely on our own judgment, even if we were not too inexperienced to make one (An admission that they were inexperienced); but it must be supported by a clear and obvious preponderance of evidence. The margin will give ample scope for our own ingenuity or principles...my wish would be to leave the popular received text except where it is

clearly wrong." (Life, Vol.I, pp.228,229).

June 4th - Westcott to Lightfoot: "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. The rules though liberal are vague, and the interpretation of them will depend upon decided action at first." (Life, Vol.I, p.391).

## 7.2 Quotes from Hort

These are reproduced from Hort, A.F., Life and Letters of Fenton J.A. Hort, MacMillan and Co., London, 1896, vols. I,II.

(Life, Vol.I, p.52). 1858 Oct. 21st - Further I agree with them in condemning many leading specific doctrines of the popular theology as, to say the least, containing much superstition and immorality of a very pernicious kind...The positive doctrines even of the Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue...There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible" (Life, Vol.I, p.400).

1860 Apr. 3rd - Hort: "But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. I must work out and examine the argument in more detail, but at present my feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable." (Life, Vol.I, p.416).

Oct. 17th - Hort: "I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus'-worship have very much in common in their causes and their results." (Life, Vol.II, p.50).

1867 Oct. 17th - Hort: "I wish we were more agreed on the doctrinal part; but you know I am a staunch sacerdotalist, and there is not much profit in arguing about first principles." (Life, Vol.II, p.86). (A sacerdotalist is one who holds to the belief that priests act as mediators between God and humans.

1867 Nov. 4th - Hort: "I went down and spent a Sunday with Westcott...We came to a distinct and positive understanding about our Gk. Test. and the details thereof. We still do not wish it to be talked about, but are going to work at once, and hope we may perhaps have it out in little more than a year." (Life, Vol.I, p.264). (That's not long)

1860 May 1st - Hort to Lightfoot: "If you make a decided conviction of the absolute infallibility of the N.T. practically a sine qua non for co-operation, I fear I could not join you, even if you were willing to forget your fears about the origin of the Gospels." (Life, Vol. I, p.420).

1862 Apr. 30th, May 1st - Hort: "It seems to be clearly and broadly directed to maintaining that the English clergy are not compelled to maintain the absolute infallibility of the Bible. And, whatever the truth may be, this seems just the liberty required at the present moment, if any living belief is to survive in the land." (Life, Vol.I, p.454).

In late 1851 Hort wrote to a friend: 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 . . . Think of that "vile" Textus Receptus leaning entirely on late MSS.; it is a blessing there are such early ones.<sup>42</sup> (He was 21 at the time and had little knowledge of the Greek, as compared to Erasmus who could read Greek since he was 4)

## 8 Conclusion

No man can grasp the intricacies of history which have culminated in the KJV Bible which we have today. Nor can any man fathom the purposes of God leading and working with entire populations over the centuries to preserve his word. Nor can any man fathom the deceptions of Satan over the centuries who is always at work trying to subvert the Word of God. But we should have the capacity to detect when someone is trying to spuriously alter the Scripture which we have received from childhood, and resist him or her. If someone was trying to break into our house to take our Bible and burn it, we would hide it and keep it safe. Why then do we let someone come in and take the very words out of the book and discredit the book? But this is what we have done, and worse, we cheer them on and want more & more translations which are ever more liberal and casual. These things should not be.

God holds the church and each of us responsible for guarding the Scripture and defending it against alteration, manipulation and distortion. The Jews at least were faithful in preserving the Oracles of God of the Old Testament. The church is responsible for the preservation of the Oracles of God of the New Testament. How abysmally and sadly she has failed and continues to sink further into failure.

The church is not responsible for altering and changing the Scripture to try to match what we think elusive original manuscripts would have said. The original manuscripts will never be found and even if one were found, how would we verify that it was an original and not a copy. The original manuscript is nothing more than a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. You might think that you're getting closer to it but then another argument is advanced or another study is done, or another manuscript or papyrus is discovered and you find that you're no closer to it at all and have to start all over again. Then our children have to waste their time going through it all again to try and figure out what their fathers have done with the Word of God. With every generation that passes, the story becomes more and more intricate and the original manuscript fades ever further into remote antiquity. Let's not chase mirages and phantoms but instead hold true to the book which is hard copy under our noses.

If each of us hold true and unwavering to the Scripture which we have received from our childhood, and if every generation from the first century to this and unto the end of the age does the same, then we are worthy participants in God's promise to preserve his Word until all things be fulfilled. All of those who alter or twist the Scriptures, or endorse those who do, are opposed to the will of God.

## **9 LINKS USED AS REFERENCES**

Describes how the New King James Version does not faithfully represent the received text as is claimed in its preface <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/whatabout-nkjv.html>

Comprehensive 12 lessons defending the Textus Receptus and Authorised Versions. <http://www.purewords.org/kjb1611/html/holland.htm>

Descriptions of the types of manuscripts which the New Testament is recorded on. [http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AnS/religious\\_studies/NTBib/textual.html](http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AnS/religious_studies/NTBib/textual.html)

A huge work by Edward Hills which demonstrates the thorough work of TR defenders. Covers a large array of the issues

[http://www.biblebelievers.com/KJV\\_Defended\\_Hills.html](http://www.biblebelievers.com/KJV_Defended_Hills.html)

Discussions on the readability of the KJV <http://www.av1611.org/kjv/kjveasy.html>  
<http://www.geocities.com/brandplucked/langKJB.html>

Excellent article which highlights the futility of the modern Bible students tendency to question the translation of the KJV  
[http://www.biblebelievers.com/Gipp/answer/gipp\\_answer\\_47.html](http://www.biblebelievers.com/Gipp/answer/gipp_answer_47.html)

Another huge work defending the KJV with particular emphasis on the Old and New Testament manuscripts. <http://www.biblebelievers.net/BibleVersions/kjcfv1.htm>

I got the "man with two watches" quote from this web site. Heaps of articles defending the KJV. Not always delivered in the best spirit unfortunately.  
<http://www.blessedquietness.com/journal/resource/kjvcont.htm>

This was the primary web site which I used to write my document. Heavy going but well worth the effort. I have tried to condense many of the arguments and present them in a more understandable way.

<http://www.blessedquietness.com/journal/resource/hortpapr.htm>

The Lectionaries are a huge resource which are largely unresearched. This website gives some background on what they are but doesn't contribute to the argument greatly except as evidence of a continual and strong Byzantine .

<http://www.skypoint.com/~waltzmn/Lectionary.html#Text>

I was very impressed with this article defending the translation of Easter rather than Passover by KJV in Acts 12:4 <http://av1611.com/kjbp/articles/moorman-easter.html>

Fascinating but overly elaborate article on the churches preservation of the Latin language for over 1000 years. This article shows the importance of preserving our own English in order to preserve our knowledge

<http://www.memoriapress.com/articles/Deadlanguage.html>

SBS page which outlines the "Lost Worlds: Who wrote the last testament" series which claims that Tischendorf stole Codex Sinaiticus

<http://www.sbs.com.au/whatson/index.php3?id=564>

Remarkable and well researched article which describes the spirited defence by the Waldenses of the Old Latin Vulgate (Italic) bible against the Catholic Jerome's Vulgate bible. This article argues that there are only two streams of bibles the corrupted stream which flows from Sinaiticus and Vaticanus through to Jerome's Vulgate and on to our Modern translations. And the other stream being the Majority Text through to the Italic Bible, Received Text of Erasmus and through to the KJV.

<http://members.aol.com/dwibclc/waldbib.htm>

Good FAQ page here which also addresses some of the common claims of mistakes in the KJV <http://av1611.com/kjbp/faq.html>

An excellent case for inclusion of 1 John 5:7 is found at <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/1john57.htm> .

A brief biography of Dean John Burgon segments of which have been used in Section 11 Tribute to Dean Burgon. <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/revisionrevised.htm>

Sums up the position of Dean Burgon with regards to the Revision of the Bible <http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/dbs0804.htm>

Article from the BBC about the support of the Australian Bible by the Archbishop of Sydney. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/3004112.stm>

Note: My pastor asked for a bibliography. I sent him this list of internet links. Obviously this list was not authoritative enough because he did not subsequently ask to read my reports. I admit that I am not a scholar and have not referenced my report properly. My apologies to any authors who read this work and recognise their material in its text. Please write to me with any objections and I will remove the offending material or alter it to correctly acknowledge the author.

## 10 DEFINITION OF TERMS

|                     | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   |
|---------------------|---|--|
| <b>Alexandrian</b>  | Hort Text Type  | Despite the wild disparities between Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus they are both considered to be of the Alexandrian family by Hort   |
| <b>Alexandrinus</b> | Codex A   | Uncial manuscript which has the Byzantine Text in the Gospels and the Alexandrian elsewhere (Strouse). It was not relied upon as heavily as Aleph and B by Westcott & Hort.  |
| <b>Apocrypha</b>    | Writings or statements of questionable authorship or authenticity | Catholics call these books Deuterocanonical and include them in their canon whereas Protestants call these books the Apocrypha. The Apocrypha makes up various lists of the following books. First Book of Esdras, Second Book of Esdras, Tobias, Judith, Additions to Esther, Wisdom, Baruch, Epistle of Jeremiah, Book of Susanna, The Book of Bel and the Dragon, Prayer of Manasseh, First Book of Maccabees, Second Book of Maccabees, Sirach, Prayer of Azariah. They have been included in various combinations in various versions of various translations |
| <b>Autograph</b>    | A manuscript in the author's handwriting.                         | Some claim that the original manuscripts are infallible but the copies are not. This is a convenient position for those who wish to deny the infallibility of scripture given that there are no original manuscripts which remain in existence.  |

|                              | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Bezae Cantabrigiensis</b> | Codex D   | Just about the only example of the supposed Western family of texts. Kenyon says, "Codex Bezae is the most peculiar Manuscript of the New Testament, showing the widest divergences, both from the Alexandrian and Received type text."  |
| <b>Bodmer Papyri</b>         |   | See papyri   |
| <b>Byzantine</b>             | Majority Text   | 90-95% of manuscripts show remarkable similarity and are called Byzantine, Traditional of Majority text. Hort invented the term Syrian text to describe these manuscripts.   |
| <b>Codex</b>                 | A manuscript of written or printed sheets bound together as in a book.  |  |
| <b>Conflation</b>            | Variant texts combined into one   |  |
| <b>Copy</b>                  | To make a reproduction of the original.   | A copyist does not revise the text.  |
| <b>Critical Text</b>         |   | Hort's eclectic technique of modern lower Textual Criticism was used to assemble the Critical Text from the oldest Uncials Codex Aleph, A, B, C, D. This was printed and published in 1881 and became the basis for all Modern Translations. See Westcott, Hort & Nestle-Aland |
| <b>Cursive</b>               | Having the successive letters joined together:  | As in the case of the miniscules   |
| <b>Deuterocanonical</b>      | Means "Books added to the Canon"  | See Apocrypha  |
| <b>Dittography</b>           | A particular form of scribal error, in which a scribe accidentally repeats a letter or sequence of letters which should be written only once. Most such errors can be easily detected |  |
| <b>Dynamic Equivalence</b>   | To translate thought for equivalent thought   | This type of translation attempts to reconstruct the original meaning of the thought in the new language   |
| <b>Eclectic</b>              | Made up of or combining elements from a variety of sources:   | Hort applied a number of rules to choose between variant readings of the Uncial Codexes Aleph A, B, C, D. Some of these rules were very subjective.  |
| <b>Edition</b>               | The entire number of copies of a publication issued at one time or from a single set of type.   | An edition may or may not be a revision. In this document I have used edition to denote editions which are not revisions but which correct minor typographical and spelling errors   |

|                            | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Comment</b>  |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Ephraemi Rescriptus</b> | Codex C   | Written originally in the 5th century and containing the whole of both Testaments it was in the 12th century converted into a palimpsest. That is, the original writing was washed out, and some works of a certain Ephraim Syrus were written over it. Many leaves also were thrown away. It now contains parts of all the NT books except for II Thessalonians and II John. Much of the original writing has been discerned. (Kenyon). Strouse says the text is mixed but pro-Byzantine. Kenyon (as we would expect) speaks of this Byzantine presence being due to "its correctors."<br>Burgon would rank this codex behind Alexandrinus as having the fewer corruptions among the "five old uncials". |
| <b>Exemplar</b>            | Manuscript that is worthy of copying  |   |
| <b>External evidence</b>   | Evidence based on the readings found in the manuscripts (as opposed to internal evidence, which based on the nature of the readings).     | External evidence is based on the number and nature of the witnesses supporting a particular reading. It also refers to the reputation of the manuscript as a whole rather than the contained text. Compare this to Internal evidence which disregards the reputation of the manuscript and evaluates the reading on it's own intrinsic qualities.  |
| <b>Genealogy</b>           | Hort's Origins of the Bible   | Being a big fan of Charles Darwin, see quotes. Hort took his ideas to invent a family tree of Bible families. Scholars no longer give any credence to this unproven theory.   |
| <b>Haplography</b>         | The loss of letters in a text. It occurs when a scribe skips ahead one or more letters in a manuscript, omitting the intervening letters. |   |
| <b>Higher criticism</b>    | The scientific study of writings to determine their origin and meaning  |   |
| <b>Hort</b>                | Fenton J Hort.  | English New Testament scholar who produced, with Brooke Foss Westcott, a major critical text of the Greek New Testament. Hort was known for his theological depth and knowledge of the writings of the early Church Fathers. Hort was educated at Cambridge, where he joined a group of biblical scholars including Westcott...   |
| <b>Immutable</b>           | Not subject or susceptible to change  | When related to God we say Unchangeable or Inalterable  |
| <b>Inerrancy</b>           | Free from any kind of untruth or error.   |   |
| <b>Infallible</b>          | Incapable of erring or failing  |   |

|                                      | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Internal evidence of readings</b> | Evidence of readings based on the differences between the readings, not between the manuscripts in which they were found.   | Does not consider the reputation or quality of the manuscript which contains the reading; but simply compares the readings and picks the one which has the higher probability of being correct. There are two types of internal evidences: transcriptional and intrinsic probability |
| <b>Intrinsic probability</b>         | Probability that a reading is most likely the one the author would have written (based on style, etc.)  |  |
| <b>Italic Bible</b>                  | Another term for the Old Latin bible particularly as used by the Waldenses in Northern Italy.   |  |
| <b>Jerome's Vulgate</b>              | Jerome, in an effort to come up with an official Latin bible produced his Latin translation. He began translating the Old Testament from the Septuagint but changed to the Hebrew and Aramaic as a source text. His work was completed in 405 BC however the use of this translation was largely ignored or else was vigorously opposed by Christians particularly the Waldenses. The Bible gained acceptance in certain parts of the west. It was not till over 1000 years later in around 1546 that the Council of Trent declared that Jerome's Vulgate was the only authentic Latin text of the scriptures for the Catholic Church. This persisted until the 1960's, when worship in vernacular languages was permitted. |  |
| <b>Latin Vulgate (Old Latin)</b>     | From the earliest times the Bible was translated into Latin. There is no evidence to suggest that the New Testament was not translated into Latin in the first century when the first transcriptions of the Bible into Greek were being made. Today there are more extant manuscripts in the Latin than there are in Greek. The study of these Latin translations has been seriously neglected in modern textual criticism and their testimony largely ignored in favour of the study of the Greek manuscripts on account of the largely unproven understanding that the original manuscripts were all written in Greek. The Latin Vulgate is regularly confused with Jerome's Vulgate.                                     |  |
| <b>Lectionaries</b>                  | A book or list of Scripture readings that forms a part of a church service to be read at church services during the year  | These are the most understudied area of Biblical Textual Criticism. Colwell has done a study on them and discovered that the majority of lectionaries were extremely close to the Textus Receptus  |
| <b>Literal Translation</b>           | To translate word for word into another language  |  |

|                        | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Comment</b>   |
|------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Lost Books</b>      | New Testament Apocrypha  | Various books which some claim should have been included in the New Testament and were suppressed by the Church fathers. Including books such as Shepherd of Hermas, 1 Clement, 2 Clement which are variously included in Codex Sinaiticus & Codex Vaticanus. Also includes other books such as the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Mary. Many have New Age and Gnostic proponents  |
| <b>Lower criticism</b> | The study of existing manuscripts of Scriptures to determine the original text   |  |
| <b>LXX</b>             | Designation for the Greek Septuagint on account of the seventy translators who were appointed by Ptolemy to translate it | See Also Septuagint  |
| <b>Majority</b>        | Byzantine  | See Byzantine Text   |
| <b>Majuscules</b>      | Uncials  |  |
| <b>Manuscript</b>      | A book, document, or other composition written by hand   |  |
| <b>Miniscule</b>       | Greek text with lowercase letters and breathings which steadily replaced the Uncials from the 10th century onwards       | There are approximately 2,813 NT Greek minuscule manuscripts known to us today. These copies range in date from the ninth to sixteenth centuries, were produced on vellum or paper, and were written in cursive or a lower-case, flowing hand. They are the best representatives of the medieval ecclesiastical text, that is, the Byzantine text. Only 150 - 200 of these depart in any significant manner from the traditional Byzantine Text. A process called transliteration occurred in the 9th century which saw the conversion of the Uncials into miniscules. It was the custom during this process to destroy the Uncial exemplars after transliterating them into the miniscule. Therefore only manuscripts of a poor standard would have survived. Dr. Jakob van Bruggen (quoted in INTT) says :<br>"In the codicology the great value of the transliteration-process in the 9th century and thereafter is recognized. At that time the most important New Testament manuscripts written in majuscule script were carefully transcribed into minuscule script. It is assumed that after this transliteration-process the majuscule was taken out of circulation . . . The import of this datum has not been taken into account enough in the present New Testament textual criticism. For it implies, that just the oldest, best and most customary manuscripts come to us in the new uniform of the minuscule script, does it not?" |

|                            | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Comment</b>   |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Mixture</b>             |  | As texts invariably exhibit elements of more than one text type it is necessary to describe them as contaminated mixtures. We then must trace the ancestor texts of the family tree which then becomes a network of bibles which looks more like a maze or spiders web than a tree. This is basically where everyone throws their hands in the air and wishes they'd never brought up the idea of genealogy of texts. Modern scholars of textual criticism have abandoned the genealogy theory   |
| <b>MSS</b>                 | shorthand for Uncial Manuscripts. MS singular                              |  |
| <b>mss</b>                 | shorthand for miniscule Manuscripts ms singular                            |  |
| <b>Nestle-Aland</b>        |  | Nestle-Aland continued on Westcott & Hort's work on the Critical Text and is now in its 29th edition.  |
| <b>Neutral</b>             | Hort Text Type   | A hypothetical text type invented by Hort which supposedly predated the Alexandrian Text type and from which the Alexandrian texts were supposedly derived. The designation of Neutral is designed to indicate that it has no particular bias and is most closely aligned to the original. Theoretically if a Neutral text was found it would look very similar to the Critical Text. Most scholars since Hort have dismissed the possibility of the Neutral text type ever having existed.  |
| <b>p66</b>                 | One of the Bodmer papyri   | see also papyri. The p66 designation indicates that this was the 66th papyri found of the New Testament. Approximately 88 papyri mostly just fragments have been identified and catalogued since Hort's work in the late 1800's  |
| <b>Papyri</b>              | scrolls written on papyrus   | The earliest writings of the New Testament are found in the papyri. As they require dry climates to survive the centuries, most remaining papyri are found in Egypt and none from Europe. The most famous of these is p66 the Bodmer Papyri which provides evidence of Byzantine readings prior to the 400 AD recension of Lucian to form the Syrian text which Hort claimed was the origin of those readings. Most of these date back to the 3rd century or earlier. H. A. Sturz surveyed all the available papyri to discover that the papyrus-supported 150 Byzantine readings which were abandoned by the Critical text. |
| <b>Parchment</b>           |  | tanned animal skins upon which manuscripts were written. A finer parchment was made from calfskin called vellum  |
| <b>Patristic citations</b> | A quoting of an authoritative source for substantiation by a Church father | Over 100,000 quotations of the bible by the church fathers are in existence. Burgon assembled 80,000 of these which demonstrate that the Byzantine text type was in existence prior to 400AD   |

|                       | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Comment</b>   |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| <b>Peshitta</b>       | The Aramaic bible  | <p>The Peshitta is the official bible of the church of the east. It is written in Aramaic. The Eastern church believe that much of the original New Testament was written in Aramaic and translated into Greek in the first century by Hellenistic Christians. This is not altogether impossible given that Christ and the disciples spoke Aramaic. The earliest complete manuscript dates to 464 AD however the Syriac translations reach back further than that. There is debate about the date of origin of the Peshitta which is important because Hort claimed that it must be after 400 AD to justify the Byzantine readings which it contains which Hort claim Lucian originated for his ecclesiastical document.</p> <p>Hort does not go on to propose a theory as to why the editors of the Peshitta in the East have decided to change their Aramaic bible and insert additional Byzantine readings to match the additional Byzantine readings that Lucias decided on for the Greek in the West. No record of any collaboration between the two traditions is to be found.</p> |
| <b>Preserved</b>      | <p>To maintain in safety from injury, peril, or harm; protect.</p> <p>To keep in perfect or unaltered condition; maintain unchanged.</p> |  |
| <b>Pseudepigrapha</b> | <p>Spurious writings, especially writings falsely attributed to biblical characters or times.</p>  | <p>Catholics call these books Apocrypha and include The Books of Adam and Eve, The Apocalypse of Moses, The Apocalypse of Adam, The Book of Adam, The Second Treatise of the Great Seth, 1 Enoch, 2 Enoch, Gilgamesh The Flood Narrative From the Gilgamesh Epic, Melchizedek, The Testament of Abraham, Joseph and Aseneth, Revelation of Moses, The Assumption of Moses, The Martyrdom of Isaiah, The Ascension of Isaiah, The Revelation of Esdras, The Book of Jubilees, Tales of the Patriarchs, The Letter of Aristeas, The Book of the Apocalypse of Baruch,</p>  |
| <b>Reading</b>        | One or more words  | found at a particular location in a text   |
| <b>Received Text</b>  |  | <p>Printed Greek Text. Erasmus edited it in the early 1500's It was printed and published in 1514 following the delivery of the first Greek font for the printing press. It is a Byzantine text type and represents the majority of manuscripts in existence. Textus Receptus is based on the vast majority (90%) of the 5000+ Greek manuscripts in existence. It agrees with the earliest versions of the Bible: Peshitta (AD150) Old Latin Vulgate (AD157). These Bibles were produced some 200 years before the minority Egyptian codices favoured by the Roman Church and the Critical Text. It with the vast majority of the 86,000+ citations from scripture by the early church fathers.</p>  |

|                     | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   |
|---------------------|---|--|
| <b>Recension</b>    | A critical revision of a text incorporating the most plausible elements found in varying sources.   | The Lucianic recension describes the construction of the Syrian text type by Lucian in 400 AD. There is no evidence that this actually occurred but is an invention by Hort to place the Byzantine Text type to a later date than the Alexandrian and Western text types. Although Hort was quick to disparage Lucian's theoretical recension as an ecclesiastical tampering by the religious establishment, he himself produced a recension with his Critical Text. In any event the almost universal evidence of mixtures in the genealogy demands that all of the text types are recensions. In fact he is actually saying that Lucian invented the inserted Byzantine readings and that they did not exist prior to 400AD.   |
| <b>Reticulation</b> | A connection on a family tree between two different lineages such that a child node has two parents. Strict trees do not have reticulation, and reticulated trees are technically networks. Reticulation is the result of contamination or mixture. |  |
| <b>Revise</b>       | To reconsider and change or modify  | A translation should never change the original   |
| <b>Scroll</b>       | A manuscript written on a roll of parchment or papyrus  |  |
| <b>Septuagint</b>   | Translation of the Old Testament into the Greek language  | Translated in approximated 250BC this is the Old Testament most used in the Hellenistic Christian Church. Examples of the Septuagint are found in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus. Origen's Hepaxla contains the Septuagint. Oldest available versions of the Septuagint contain differing books of the Apocrypha see also LXX  |
| <b>Sinaiticus</b>   | Codex Aleph   | Sinaiticus was written about 350 - 370 AD. It contains part of the OT and all of the NT plus the Epistle of Barnabas and Shepherd of Hermes. It has four columns per page and forty-eight lines per column. It is written on vellum. Constantine Tischendorf discovered this famous MS in 1844 in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai. It was found in a load of wastepaper about to be burned. Tischendorf suggested that it was one of 50 copies prepared by Constantine in 331 and sent by Justinian to this convent named after his mother. It was sold to the Russians and then to the British Museum in 1933. Its text is a mixture of Alexandrian and Western families (Strouse). Actually SBS showed a documentary on 22nd February 2004 which showed a receipt written out by Tischendorf promising to return Sinaiticus, which he never did. I daresay it wasn't actually found in the wastepaper basket either. Hort conceded that the scribe of Vaticanus "reached by no means a high standard of accuracy." |

|                                    | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Sinaiticus</b>                  | Codex Aleph   | Using the TR as a basis of comparison, Burgon found that Sinaiticus in the four Gospels alone omitted 3,455 words, added 839, substituted 1114, transposed 2299, modified 1265. Thus in all 8972 words are affected. (D. A. Waite in An Answer to Stewart Custer). Waite says further, "it is found that at least ten revisers, between the 4th and the 12th centuries busied themselves with the task of correcting its many and extraordinary perversions of the truth of Scripture." Yet this is one of the two main pillars of our modern versions. The SBS documentary observed the Byzantine readings in the margins claiming that the arbitrary additions into the margins by the scribes (revisers) had somehow found their way into our bible. This type of misinformation is what the public have to contend with. |
| <b>Stemma</b>                      | A method of textual criticism based on preparing a family tree of manuscripts (stemma) and evaluating variant readings based on the stemma. | See also genealogy   |
| <b>Syrian</b>                      | Hort's Byzantine  | Hort argued that the Byzantine Text was a conflation produced in the 5th century by Lucian. He called this text type the Syrian and said that it was conflated from the Neutral and Western text types. Having argued that the Syrian text type was conflated, he could dismiss them in favour of alleged older manuscripts  |
| <b>Textual criticism</b>           | Comparison of a particular text with related materials in order to establish authenticity   |  |
| <b>Textus Receptus</b>             | Latin for Received Text   | see Received Text  |
| <b>Traditional Text</b>            |   | see Byzantine Text   |
| <b>Transcription</b>               | To make a full and complete written or typewritten copy   |  |
| <b>Transcriptional probability</b> | Probability that a reading is most likely to be variant due to the accidental or deliberate alteration by the scribe                        |  |
| <b>Translate</b>                   | To render in a different language   | In this paper I have advocated for Literal translation   |

|                                   | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Uncials</b>                    |   | <p>From the 4th century papyri scrolls were replaced with Codexes written on parchment. Initially the writing was in Uncials which are upper case rounded letters. They are written in columns with 12 letters in each column. There are no spaces or punctuation marks. The codexes are labelled as Aleph, A, B, C, D etc. Codex Aleph, A, B, C, D are the five older &amp; better manuscripts from which our modern translations have spawned. Burgon gives the following summary. The serious deflections from the Received Text which may include anything from one word, to a phrase, to a verse, to several verses are numbered below.</p> <p>A Alexandrinus - 842<br/> C Ephraemi Rescriptus - 1798<br/> B Vaticanus - 2370<br/> Aleph Sinaiticus - 3392<br/> D Bezae - 4697</p> <p>They seriously disagree with each other as well.<br/> also called majuscules</p>  |
| <b>Variant</b>                    | Any reading that differs from a corresponding reading in another text, particularly one that differs from an edition of the Textus Receptus.  |  |
| <b>Vaticanus</b>                  | Codex B   | <p>This is the chief pillar of our modern critical Greek Testaments - whether they be called Westcott and Hort, Nestle, Nestle-Aland, United Bible Society, etc. It is common today to read that a given modern translation (see NIV preface) or Greek text is based on an "eclectic" text. This is to give the impression that the "best readings" from many sources were used including the TR. This must be exposed as being totally misleading. Codex B was the primary text used by Westcott and Hort to compile the CT. This remains the case to this day, and it is only departed from with the greatest reluctance. Vaticanus was written around 350 - 370 AD and has been in the Vatican Library since 1481. It contains most of the OT, and most of the NT, except for part of Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles and Revelation. It is mixed but is mainly Alexandrian family type.</p> <p>It contains the "Epistle to Barnabas" and the OT Apocrypha</p> |
| <b>Verbal Plenary Inspiration</b> | Verbal" meaning that the Holy Spirit guided the writers of the Bible in the very words that they used. "Plenary", meaning fully or completely as to the fact that every word was inspired by God from beginning to end. |  |
| <b>Version</b>                    | 1. A description or account from one point of view, especially as opposed to another or 2, A translation from another language  | Many KJV purists will not use the KJV designation because they think that this makes the Bible just another account of the scripture. So they use KJB instead. However the 2nd definition is perfectly correct in this context   |

|                 | <b>Definition</b>     | <b>Comment</b>  |
|-----------------|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Westcott</b> | Westcott, Brooke Foss | 1825–1901, English prelate and scholar. From 1870 to 1890 he was regius professor of divinity at Cambridge. With F. J. A. Hort, he published <i>The New Testament in the Original Greek</i> (2 vol., 1881). From 1890 until his death he was bishop of Durham. He was known for his many scriptural commentaries. His involvement with W-H was really at Hort's insistence and for Hort's benefit. He added a solid and reputable image without adding much else to the New Critical Text |
| <b>Western</b>  | Hort Text Type        | Codex Bezae is the only manuscript of note in this family of texts which are known for their paraphrasing. There are very few texts in this family  |

## 11 Tribute to Dean Burgon

The author of *The Revision Revised*, John William Burgon (1813-1888), was one of the greatest British Bible scholars of the 19th century. He was Gresham Professor of Divinity at Oxford, Fellow of Oriel College, vicar of St. Mary's (the university church); and during the last 12 years of his life, he was Dean of Chichester. In the latter half of the 1800s, Burgon defended the Bible as the infallible and inerrant Word of God, inspired to its very jots and tittles, and he fought a manly battle against the encroachment of theological modernism.

When the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament was published, together with the English Revised Version, in 1881, Burgon exposed its errors in a series of articles that appeared in the *Quarterly Review*. These were later incorporated into the book *'The Revision Revised'* which appeared in 1883. This monumental work has been largely unanswered by defenders of the CT and the Revised Versions.

The series of messages on biblical inspiration that Burgon preached at Oxford University in 1860 are apologetic masterpieces.

*"At the root of the whole mischief of these last days lies disbelief in the Bible as the Word of God. This is the fundamental error"*

*"Either the whole Bible is inspired, the Words as well as the sentences, the syllables as well as the Words, the letters as well as the syllables, every 'jot' and every 'tittle' of it, or the whole of it must be abandoned, since no part of it can be certainly depended upon as an infallible guide."*

DEAN BURGON