

## The Earliest Manuscripts

### The Papyrus Manuscripts

**B**efore the discoveries of the papyri and their exhaustive collation by scholars such as Colwell, Sturz, Zuntz, and Pickering, some scholars of the nineteenth century believed that the ‘Majority text’ was a fourth century recension and did not represent *the earliest* manuscripts. In 1881 Hort contended, “...all distinctively Syrian readings may be set aside at once, certainly originating after the middle of the third century.”<sup>31</sup> This idea of ‘the lateness’ of the Majority text was repeated in textbooks like Kenyon’s, who in 1937 echoed, “The relatively late date... must now be taken as established. The [Majority] text may be dismissed from further consideration.” However he added, “If it can be shown, that the readings which Hort called ‘Syrian’ existed before the fourth century, the keystone would be knocked out of the fabric of his theory.”<sup>32</sup>

Out it comes! Harvard scholar, Hills writes, “This...[theory] has been abandoned by most present day scholars.”<sup>33</sup> The ninety-six papyri (with the exception of P3, 4, 7, and 14) were all discovered *after* 1890. Pickering observes:

In Hort’s day...the early papyri were not extant—had they been the W-H theory could scarcely have appeared...Each of the early papyri (A.D. 300 or earlier) vindicates some Byzantine [KJV] reading... Bodmer II shows some Syrian readings to be anterior

to corresponding [Aleph and B] readings...[T]he early papyri vindicate Byzantine readings in 660 (or 885) places where there is a significant variation.<sup>34</sup>

Pickering cites H.A. Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism*, and summarizes his research concerning the superiority of the KJV text-type, based on the discoveries in the papyri.

H.A. Sturz...surveyed all the available papyri... each new MS discovered vindicated added Byzantine readings...The magnitude of this vindication can be more fully appreciated by recalling that only about 30% of the New Testament has early papyri attestation...[I]f we had at least three papyri covering all parts of the New Testament, all of the 5000+ Byzantine readings rejected by the critical (eclectic) texts would be vindicated by early papyrus...Henceforth no one may reasonably or responsibly characterize the Byzantine text-type as being...late...[A]lthough modern editors continue to reject these readings, it can no longer be argued that they are late.<sup>35</sup>

A.F.J. Klijn, in his book *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels*, compared Aleph and B (fourth century) readings with the papyri (second century). Pickering added to his research and compared the *Textus Receptus* to Aleph and B. He concluded that the KJV readings (TR) dominated the early papyri to a greater percentage than the readings of Aleph and B, seen in the new versions.

PAPYRI	ALEPH	B	TR
P45	19	24	32
P66	14	29	33
P75	9	33	29
P45,66,75	4	18	20
P45,66	7	3	8
P45,75	1	2	2
P66,75	0	8	5
P45	2	1	1
P66	2	3	5
P75	2	3	4
Total	60	124	139

John 1-14							
	W	D	C	A	Aleph	B	TR
<b>P75</b>	45%	38.9%	48.5%	45.6%	44.6%	50.4%	51.2%

\*(Note: Even P75 which is touted as the great ally of Aleph & B, agrees here with the TR to a *greater* extent.)

SUMMARY			
P45 has	TR 33 places	B 25 places	Aleph 21 places
P66 has	TR 38 places	B 32 places	Aleph 16 places
P75 has	TR 33 times	B 36 times	Aleph 11 times
Total	104	93	48

Together P45, 66, and 75 have:	TR	20 places
	B	18 places
	Aleph	4 places
Two of these papyri agree with the:	TR	20 places
	B	13 places
	Aleph	8 places
One of these papyri follows:	TR	69 places
	B	62 places
	Aleph	36 places

Pickering concludes, “[T]he TR has more early attestation than B and twice as much as Aleph—evidently the TR reflects an earlier text than either B or Aleph.”<sup>36</sup>

Other scholars’ findings reveal results which vindicate the KJV readings, which in the 1870’s were considered ‘later’.

- G. Zuntz in *The Texts of the Epistles* writes, “[KJV type] readings previously discarded as late are [in] P46...[A]re all Byzantine readings ancient?...G. Pasquali answers in the affirmative...Papyrus 46 and 45 support the Majority text reading...”<sup>37</sup>
- Metzger says, Papyrus 75 supports the majority text dozens of times. In relation to the [majority] text, P46 (about A.D. 200), shows that some readings...go back to a very early period...P66 [has] readings that agree with the [majority]...text type.<sup>38</sup>
- Hills notes, “Byzantine readings which most critics have regarded as late, have now been proved by Papyrus Bodmer II to be early readings.”<sup>39</sup>
- *The Journal of Theological Studies* (London: Oxford University Press) N.S., vol. II, 1960) p. 381 says, “Papyrus 66 supports the readings of the Majority text.”
- Comfort writes, “[S]ome of the N.T. papyri that have been discovered show remarkable similarity with later MSS. In fact, several of the extant early papyri are related to many later MSS (fourth century and beyond) or at least share a common ancestor.”<sup>40</sup>
- Carson, a KJV detractor who felt 10% of its readings were late now concedes, “with new discoveries this percentage is still falling.”<sup>41</sup>
- Colwell found that as early as A.D. 200 scribes were altering manuscripts, changing them from a Majority-type text to a minority type. He notes,

“The Bodmer John (P66) is also a witness to the early existence of many of the readings found in the [KJV]. Strangely enough to our previous ideas, the contemporary corrections in that papyrus frequently change a [KJV] reading to a... [new version type]. This indicates that at this early period readings of the ... [new version type] were supplanting the...[KJV type].”<sup>242</sup>

Colwell’s discovery that the *earliest* manuscript, P66, had corrections on it, which change a KJV type reading to a new version type reading, shows that the KJV was anterior to the minority type text.

The following are but a handful of the verses in which the earliest manuscripts, the papyri of the first, second, and third century, side with the Byzantine Majority-type KJV readings, rather than the minority Aleph and B (fourth century) readings of the new versions.

VERSE	KJV	NEW VERSIONS
Mark 5:42	Majority plus P45	Aleph & B
Mark 7:35	Majority plus P45	Aleph & B
Luke 13:2	Majority plus P75	Aleph & B
Luke 24:47	Majority plus P75	Aleph & B
John 4:29	Majority plus P66, 75	Aleph & B
John 5:37	Majority plus P66	P75, Aleph & B
John 7:39	Majority plus P66	P75, 66, & Aleph
John 10:19	Majority plus P66	P45, 77, Aleph & B
John 10:31	Majority plus P66	P75, Aleph & B
John 11:22	Majority plus P45, 66	P75, Aleph & B
John 12:9	Majority plus P66, 75, B2	Aleph
John 14:14	Majority plus P66, Aleph	P75, B
John 7:41	Majority plus P66, Aleph	P66, 75, B
John 9:6	Majority plus P66, 74, Aleph	B (Hort follows B)

VERSE	KJV	NEW VERSIONS
John 13:36	Majority plus P66, Aleph	B
1 Cor. 9:21	Majority plus Aleph C, P46 verb	Aleph & B
2 Cor. 7:14	Majority plus P46, Aleph C	Aleph & B
John 8:51	Majority plus P66	P75, Aleph & B
John 9:28	Majority plus P66	P75, Aleph & B
John 11:21	Majority plus P45, P66, (word order)	P75, Aleph & B
John 11:32	Majority plus P45	P66, 75, Aleph & B
John 14:5	Majority plus P66	B
1 Pet. 5:8	Majority plus P72	B

(Expanded Appendix B is included at the end of this book, citing some of the thousands of instances in which the earliest papyri discoveries reveal KJV readings, while the new versions have readings from later manuscripts.)

A typical example of the use of the earliest manuscripts by the KJV is seen in the last chapter of Luke. In this chapter, for decades the NASB omitted or brackets nearly 100 words based on *one* fifth century manuscript, D, and Westcott's now defunct 'theory of interpolation'. These verses are in all of the other manuscripts, including the second century P75, the fourth century Aleph, B, and W, as well as A, C, L, and 33. The witness of the Majority text coupled with the early attestation of second to fourth century uncials certainly outweighs *one* highly corrupt fifth century manuscript. The NASB footnote, when explaining its gaps says, "Some manuscripts insert..." A more accurate footnote would read, "All manuscripts insert...except one."

Attesting to the deity of Christ and his post-resurrection appearances, Matthew 28:17 records, "they worshipped him, but some doubted." In Luke's last chapter, the NASB 'doubters' removed, 1.) "they worshipped him," 2.) his Ascension and 3.) two eyewitness accounts of his resurrection and the record of his care for them. The 'doubters' doubt if verses 12 and 40 really happened.

LUKE 24	NASB OMITTED	NASB ADDED
verse 1	"...and certain others with them"	
verse 5		"One"
verse 12	[Then arose Peter and ran unto the sepulchre and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself of that which was come to pass.]	
verse 17	"and are sad?"	
verse 26		"the" (to Christ)
verse 36	"and said unto them Peace be unto you" Footnote mistakenly says, "Some ancient MSS insert."	
verse 40	["And when he had said this, He showed them his hands and his feet."] Footnote mistakenly says, "many manuscripts do not contain this verse."	
verse 42	"and of a honeycomb"	
verse 44	switches "the" to "My" contradicting John 12:49, 50; 17:8	
verse 51	"And carried up into heaven"	
verse 52	"And they worshipped him"	
verse 53	"blessing"	

Within the confines of just one chapter, the NASB lined up in queue with standard New Age teaching. Historians admit manuscript D was truncated by Marcion, Mme. Blavatsky's mentor, and has now been resurrected in the last days for the religion of the Antichrist. Note the following five New Age doctrines taught in Luke 24 by the NASB for decades.

1. God becomes the *impersonal* "One" of Hinduism; he is not concerned if you are "sad," nor would he greet your fearfulness with the calming, "Peace be unto you." (He would probably appear saying—"Boo"—.)
2. "Christ" becomes "the Christ," a position not a person.
3. Jesus did not ascend; he was just a man. He left them to travel to India (or, as the Mormons insist, to America.)
4. Since he was just a *man*, they did not worship him.
5. The "suffering for sins" evident by the nail-prints, is 'doubted by *some*', lining up with the bloodless creeds of the New Age.

If you want to follow manuscript D in Luke, as the NASB and old Nestle's did, get your pen and cross out another 121 words from the last chapter, another 229 words from the last three chapters, 1,552 of the 19,941 words in Luke altogether, and another 4,000 words in the Gospels and Acts. Conforming to D, you will make 13,781 changes in your New Testament, perhaps more, depending on which of the 10 correctors of D you follow. Be sure to remember to change to D's Gnostic Ebionite reading in Luke 3:22. Here, the first century New Agers changed the verse so that 'the Christ' pole descends on Jesus at his baptism and leaves him on the cross. This is why manuscript D must change Luke 24. You'll now be in company with Madame Blavatsky, the senior New Age Luciferian, who thinks D should be followed, because it was sculpted by Marcion. After my book, *New Age Bible Versions*, in 1993 exposed the NASB's error in following manuscript D, its editors embarrassingly patched it in their 1995 edition. No 'recall' was published for the decades of dangerous, erring editions.

## Other Early Witnesses

In addition to the second and third century papyri, which



show that the KJV text-type dominated the early church, Codex W (fourth century) and Codex A (fifth century) support the KJV. In addition, the Sinaitic Syriac Version (third century), the Gothic Version (fourth century) and the Peshitta Syriac (now dated much earlier than the fifth century) agree with the KJV. (Syriac and Gothic scriptures actually existed much earlier than these standard dates.) One scholar reminds the new version editors:

You talk of ‘Antiquity’. But you must know very well that you actually mean something quite different. You fasten upon...two perhaps three...documents of the IV and V century...[T]hose are 1, 2, 3, or 4 specimens of Antiquity, not antiquity itself...[Y]ou use Aleph and B, why not A, C or D, [you] use the old Latin or the Coptic, why not the Peshitta or the Sahidic. [You] quote Origen or Eusebius, why not Didymus, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Basil, Chrysostom, Theodoret, the Gregories, or the Cyrils...The Traditional Text receives more support from the early Church Fathers than does the critical text.<sup>43</sup> [at a ratio of 2:1 before A.D. 350 and 3:1 for important passages.]

The following writers pre-date Aleph and B and attest to KJV-type readings in the *early* church.

A.D.				
100-150	150-200	200-250	250-300	300-400
<i>Didache</i>	<i>The Gospel of Peter</i>	Clement	Gregory of Thaumaturgus	Athanasius
Diognelus	Athenagouis	Tertullian	Novatian	Macarius
Justin Martyr	Hegesippus	Origen	Cyprian	Magnus
	Irenaeus	Clementinus	Dionysius	Eusebius
		Hippolytus	Achelaus	Hilary
				Didymus
				Basil
				Titus of Bostra
				Cyril of Jerusalem
				Gregory of Nyssa
				Apostolic Canons & Constitutions
				Epiphanius
				Ambrose

## “Men of High Degree...”

Men of high degree are a lie: to be laid in the balance they are altogether lighter than vanity. Psalm 62:9

New version editors exhibit gross unfamiliarity with recent papyrological scholarship (i.e., one of the very oldest papyrus in the world, P66, has predominantly KJV readings). They appear also to be in the dark concerning the numerical preponderance of the Majority Text. Repeating the rhetoric of their timeworn 1937 edition college textbook, they pass *passé* accounts on to the unwary. Edwin Palmer, chief editor of the NIV, delivers his unversed version of the facts.

The KJV translators...all they had to work with was a handful of copies of the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament books. These were very late copies dating from a thousand (!) years after the New Testament was written... many more Greek manuscripts had been preserved and were subsequently discovered—in fact, more than five thousand of them...even to about A.D. 200.<sup>44</sup>

(!) to use his style. Is he unaware that: 1.) Of these 5000, all but a fraction of 1% agree with the KJV against his NIV and 2.) The A.D. 200 manuscript also agrees with the KJV against his NIV. Proof—the Greek text used by the NIV (Nestle’s 25th/UBS 1st, 1963) was later changed in nearly 500 places in the 1979 Nestle’s 26th/UBS 3rd edition—to agree with the KJV. The NIV committee foresaw some of these, but ignored many others.

Other new version editors also voice their ‘varnished’ view of the facts:

- Calvin Linton, NIV Committee member repeats Palmer’s varnished version: “[T]he first ancient Greek manuscript of the New Testament was not available in English until 1628.”<sup>45</sup>
- Ralph Earle, another NIV committee member discloses his sciolism by stating, the KJV “...is a text based primarily on late medieval manuscripts. Fortunately now we have a little over 5000 Greek

manuscripts...[W]ith thousands of Greek manuscripts of the N.T. now at our disposal, we can reach a high degree of certainty with regard to the probability of the best text.<sup>746</sup>

- Lewis Foster, NIV and NKJV committee member echoes, “But we have great assurance of knowing what the originals said because of the number of copies of the Bible available...[M]ore manuscripts are known today than were used in the making of the KJV. Today’s judgment is better because we have more information...<sup>47</sup>

But they choose to ignore the vast “number” of manuscripts and the latest “information.”

Why, as we have seen, do world-class scholars refer to the new versions and their editors as “unscientific,” “unscholarly,” “incompetent” and far adrift from the realities of manuscript history?<sup>48</sup> Even Hort, chief architect of their ‘New’ Greek text, admits in a letter to a friend:

I am afraid I must have talked big and misled you when you were here, for I really know very little of Church History.<sup>49</sup>

Actually, the members of new version committees are selected by their chief editors to show a broad representation of denominations, thereby broadening their versions’ market. Those chosen may be Greek grammarians, but most are in no sense eminent paleographers, papyrologists, codicologists, historians (or most importantly, Spirit-led Christians). The NASB committee list remained a closely guarded secret for over 30 years, lest conservative Christians catch a glimpse of the liberal membership. (However, Dr. Frank Logsdon has renounced his participation. At numerous speaking engagements he denounced his part in what he now perceives to be a heretical version. “I may be in trouble with God” because of it, he confesses.) The editors of the new versions are not qualified by the endless hours of pouring over the ancient manuscripts, as were Burgon, Colwell, Hoskier, and scores of others. In fact, as committee member Lewis Foster admits, they are

not involved with actual manuscripts or facsimiles at all:

The New Testament translators may choose to differ from the decision founded in the Greek text [i.e. Nestles/UBS] he is using, but he does not deal with the manuscripts themselves. He works indirectly through the use of the modern Greek text.<sup>50</sup>

Moving from a discussion of the Majority and minority type manuscripts themselves, we now move on to the critical editions of the Greek N.T. or as Foster called it ‘the modern Greek text’. These reduce the hundreds of thousands of variant readings in the Greek manuscripts to a ‘manageable’ 6000 or so variants.

31 *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*, p. 117.

32 *The Text of the Greek Bible*, pp. 203-212, 321-322.

33 *King James Version Defended*, p. 179.

34 *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, p. 224.

35 *Ibid.*, pp. 77, 184, 202.

36 *Ibid.*, pp. 55-56, 220.

37 *The Text of the Epistles*, p. 55.

38 *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, pp. 64, 66, et al..

39 Dean Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, p. 54.

40 *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the Bible*, p. 11.

41 *The King James Version Debate*, p. 111.

42 E.C. Colwell, “The Origin of Text-types of New Testament Manuscripts,” *Early Christian Origins*, ed. Allen Wikgren (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961), pp. 128-138.

43 *The Revision Revised*, pp. 245, 70.

44 Kenneth L. Barker (ed.), *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1986), p. 142.

45 *Ibid.*, p. 27.

46 *Ibid.*, pp. 54, 57.

47 Lewis Foster, *Selecting a Translation of the Bible* (Cincinnati, OH: Standard Publishing), pp. 15, 66.

48 See notes 2, 3, 5 et al..

49 Arthur Hort, *The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, Vol. I, p. 233.

50 *Selecting a Translation of the Bible*, pp. 14, 15.

## The Modern Greek Editions

### **The Battle in the Bookstore: The Critical Greek Text**

**T**he action is in the aisles of the bookstores and in the snaring ‘net’ of the internet in this spiritual war, where two highly disparate types of critical Greek Texts are available today. The first, representing the Majority text is the *Textus Receptus*, from which the KJV was translated. (*The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text* by Hodges and Farstad must be rejected since it follows von Soden’s collation of *only* 414 of the 5000+ manuscripts and ignores the older Andreas line of Revelation manuscripts.)

The agent in the aisle and on the internet, representing the minority type text, is called the Nestle-Aland twenty-eighth edition or the United Bible Societies fifth edition. The Nestle’s and UBS editions differ from the *Textus Receptus* in nearly 6000 places. This skimpier ‘Raider’s Digest’ version scuttles enough words, verses and chapter sections to crowd a complete anthology on Christian creeds.

### **Nestle’s Makes the Very Best...**

...Chocolate, not Greek texts. Hort’s heir was Eberhard Nestle, who in 1898 cloned the text for the next generation. In

1927 his son Erwin became warden, reforming its critical apparatus in minor ways and making a dozen or so changes in the text, yet guarding the minority ‘spectre’ of Hort’s kin. In 1950, custody was transferred to Kurt Aland, who with the help of Matthew Black, Bruce Metzger and Allen Wikgren, re-committed allegiance to the Westcott-Hort text type.

A verbatim translation of the Nestle-Aland text, with all of its deletions, would shock even the most liberal reader and could never be sold as a ‘New Testament’. [The closest actual translation of it are the super-liberal NEV, TEV, NRSV and Catholic Bibles, all of which use many of Nestle’s manuscript D readings.] Consequently, other versions which are based on Nestle’s, such as the ESV and NASB, ‘borrow’ some ‘Majority’ readings from the *Textus Receptus* in order to be marketable (e.g., John 7:53 and 8:1-11). Nestle’s own statement, in his preface, cautions the reader that it is *not* the ‘Traditional’ Greek Text, but a “Kind of New Textus Receptus.”<sup>51</sup> Its advocates even caution the unlettered, who would take such a text and pronounce, “The Greek says...” For example, Philip Comfort, collaborator on *The New Greek-English Interlinear New Testament—NRSV* yields:

This text however is by no means ‘inspired’ or ‘infallible’ as many scholars will readily attest. In fact, some scholars have openly criticized UBS3/NA26 as trying to gain the reputation of being the new ‘Textus Receptus’; and other scholars are discouraged that this **new** text still looks so much like the Westcott-Hort text.<sup>52</sup>

Of the UBS3/NA26, other researchers conclude:

[It is] the Greek text pieced together.<sup>53</sup>

[T]he edition Nestle-Aland is clearly non-Byzantine.<sup>54</sup>

It is of utmost importance to the true text of the Bible to oppose their minority Greek text and to support the traditional Greek text which basically is the text underlying the *King James Version* of the New Testament.<sup>55</sup>

Changes in both the Nestle’s text and the critical apparatus

have been made over the years. The NASB is based loosely on Nestle's 23rd edition (1959), but the *NASB Greek Interlinear* is marketed with Nestle's 21st edition (1951). In the recent Nestle's twenty-sixth edition (1979) the chameleon becomes a cobra with a whopping 712 changes in the Greek text. These drastic changes were a response to the cry of scholars who saw the mounting evidence of the papyri discoveries stacking up on the side of the KJV. Consequently, nearly 500 of these changes were 'white flags', retreating back to the pre-Westcott and Hort *Textus Receptus* readings. Now every third page reflects some sort of back-to-the *King James Version* reading. This about-face leaves Greek-o-philes footless, often armed only with their 1951 NASB-Nestle's Interlinear.

Resting on this Achilles heel, their case is further crippled by the Introduction to Nestle's 26th edition. It no longer boasts of *Theta*, *Vaticanus*, *Sinaiticus*, or *Caesarean* families of manuscripts. Verses which had previously been discarded based on 'conflation', 'assimilation' or 'harmonization' suddenly pop back into the text. "The body of the Lord Jesus" even pops up in Luke 24:3. "The age of Westcott and Hort is definitely over," the Introduction says.<sup>56</sup> Scholars are aware of this shift, yet the pews are still piled high with NIVs, ESVs, NASBs, NKJVs, *Living Bibles*, *New Jerusalem Bibles*, NRSVs, etc.. Comfort's extensive collation for his recent book, *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament* prompted him to say:

Although the NASB translators had claimed consideration was given to the latest available manuscripts with a view to determining the best Greek text (cited by Kubo and Specht in *So Many Versions?*, 173), the evidence does not bear this out. On the contrary, the NASB does not reflect the impact of the latest available manuscripts.<sup>57</sup>

## The Apparatus Criticus

Kenneth W. Clark, noted textual scholar and author of "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variations in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament" in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, warns dabblers, as well as seasoned translators, of "pursuing the retreating mirage of the originals."<sup>58</sup> Yet pastors with post-graduate degrees, too sophisticated to use a bookstore variety

Greek interlinear, are clutching their Greek edition published by the British and Foreign Bible Societies or by *Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt*. These contain a critical apparatus, that is, footnotes which enumerate which manuscripts attest to or omit a certain questionable reading. This gives the pastor, teacher or translator a *sense* that they can judge for themselves which reading is best, based on their (typically limited) exposure to the manuscripts themselves. Comfort talks about this teeter-tottering.

For example some translators may have used a specific edition of the Nestle's text, but they deviate from the text at will choosing to follow here and there a variant reading cited in the apparatus.<sup>59</sup>

The swaying state of the new versions and their minority text is caused, in part, by this random rocking back and forth to the apparatus, not content to 'nestle' in the text.

Another crisis has now been uncovered as their 'critical' cushion crashes to the concrete, leaving unsupported, fans of the eclectic minority text. Colwell, University of Chicago's late President, gives us a frightening peek behind the closed doors of a meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature as he reports on the *discovery* by the International Greek New Testament Project (IGNT) of the 'sorry' state of the critical apparatus.

[C]areful study shows that the textual evidence in these editions cannot be used in the IGNT apparatus, since they fail to cite witnesses completely, consistently or accurately.<sup>60</sup>

Other noted scholars have concluded "the critical apparatus...misleads the user and presents a distorted view of the evidence."<sup>61</sup> Eberhard Nestle's son, Erwin, said, "My father knew quite well that a certain one sidedness adhered to his text." This new version critical apparatus cites only 7% of the cursives, .02% of the lectionaries, 24% of the church fathers and 33 % of the versions.

The crumbling cause of the minority text mounts debris in the margin, as each subsequent *printing* of the Nestle's 26th edition shows changes in the critical apparatus. Its eighth printing affected Hebrews 6:7-9, 15-17, Ephesians 1 and 2, and Thessalonians 1.



Comfort says, “In future printings, we should see...[affected] John 18:36-19:7, John 2:30-37, 46-3:2, John 13:15-17, Acts 2:30-37, 46-3:2, John 5:26-29, 36-38.”<sup>62</sup>

These changes are due to the historically weak foundation on which Nestle’s readings lie. Nestle’s omission of Matthew 21:44 is a typical example. It is based on three witnesses—D (fifth century), 33 and Lucifer of Cagliari. (The latter is not a legitimate witness since he quotes verse 43, not 42, 44, or 45.) The verse in question is in every known Codex, five from the second and third century, eight from the fourth, seven from the fifth and all other manuscripts following. It is in the ancient Syrian, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Curetonian, Harkleian, Peshito, Old Latin and Vulgate versions. A few other brief examples represent the irrational judgments which have abounded in various editions of Nestle’s Greek text.

- Each of the gospels had at least six instances in which Nestle’s ignored the oldest manuscripts. It disregarded the oldest readings in such places as Luke 16, Romans 5, 8, 9, 12, 15, Matthew 22, 27, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Galatians 1, 2, 3, Ephesians 3, Colossians 1, and Revelation 11 (e.g., I Corinthians 13:3 in Nestle’s reads like manuscript C (5th century) rather than P46, Aleph, B (2nd and 4th century) and the Majority).
- “Jesus” was omitted in scores of places, such as Matthew 4:23, where its omission is based on only one manuscript; *all* other MSS have Jesus.
- Based on D (5th century) alone, 38 critical words (15%) were omitted from the last chapter of Luke. Nestle’s followed ‘D’ alone many times. Ironically, however, D has John 5:34, yet Nestle’s *omits* them.

## United Bible Society: UBS 3rd & 4th Edition

The uncertainty, rampant in the state of these critical editions, is further evident in the UBS 3rd & 4th edition, *The Greek New Testament*. The disputability of their text is even ‘codified’ by their editors in the Introduction.

By means of the letters A, B, C, and D, enclosed within ‘braces’ { } at the beginning of each set of textual

variants, the Committee has sought to indicate the **relative** degree of certainty, arrived at...The letter A signifies the text is virtually certain, while B indicates that there is **some** degree of doubt. The letter C means there is a **considerable** degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus contains the superior reading, while D shows that there is a **very high degree of doubt** concerning the reading for the text.<sup>63</sup>

Much like Nestle's dramatic turn around, the UBS third edition was forced to make 500 changes from its second edition. Since there were *no* manuscript discoveries in that interim, Pickering observes, "It is hard to resist the suspicion that they are guessing." *The New International Version* (NIV) followed the UBS first edition (1966), thereby missing hundreds of updates.

### "A New Age in the Church"

Who are these guessers? The UBS Vice President is Roman Catholic Cardinal Onitsha of Nigeria. The executive committee includes Roman Catholic Bishop Alilona of Italy. Among the editors was Roman Catholic Cardinal Carlo 'Maria' Martini of Milan. In the past, Catholics would not work with Protestants in the work of bible translation, because Catholics translated using the Greek manuscript Vaticanus (B), as seen in Jerome's Latin Vulgate. Protestants, until 1881, used the Majority Greek Text. Now that liberal Protestants are using the Vatican Manuscript also, Catholics are saying (Vatican II):

Catholics should work together with Protestants in the fundamental task of biblical translation...[They can] work very well together and have the same approach and interpretation...[This] signals a **new age** in the church...<sup>64</sup>

This began in 1943 when Papal encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* called for an ecumenical bible. It said:

[T]hese translations [should] be produced in cooperation with separated brothers.<sup>65</sup>

Subsequently, Jesuit scholars moved on to editorial positions in the previously Protestant *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Their work on the UBS/Nestle's text and influence in biblical scholarship has biased so many 'new' readings that the recent Catholic *New American Bible* was translated directly from UBS/Nestle, rather than the traditional Catholic Latin Vulgate. Its introduction notes:

In general, Nestle's-Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (25th edition, 1963) was followed. Additional help was derived from *The Greek New Testament* (editors Aland, Black, Metzger, Wikgren) produced for the use of translators by the United Bible Societies in 1966.<sup>66</sup>

Since both the Catholic and 'New' Protestant bibles are now based on *the identical* critical Greek texts (UBS/Nestle,) which are based on the same 1% minority Greek Manuscripts (*Vaticanus, B*), the Catholic doctrinal bend in the ESV, NIV and NASB and other 'New' bibles is substantial. (This is documented in Chapter 8 and elsewhere.) Hand-in-hand, Catholics and unwary Protestants, with their Gnostic Vatican manuscript under their arm, are being steered into the waiting arms of the one world church of the Antichrist. Dean Stanley, host of the revision committee meetings as Dean of Westminster, applauds this subtle work of the new versions in preparing for 'amalgamation'.

[T]he revision work is of the utmost importance...in its indirect effect upon a closer union of the different denominations.<sup>67</sup>

## Women Rule Over Them: UBS 5th edition

“As for my people, children are their oppressors, and **women** rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to **err**, and **destroy the way of thy paths.**” Isa 3:12

The latest editions of the corrupt minority Greek texts, used by unwary Bible students and pastors, were edited by Barbara Aland, second wife of Kurt Aland. In the early 1970s he abandoned his first wife and their three children to marry the attractive and youthful Barbara, twenty-two years his junior. Many were moved

by “His divorce from his wife, whom Althea and I greatly admired, and his marriage to his brilliant assistant who became director of the institute, for which Kurt had given his life...” (Eugene Nida, *Fascinated by Language*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 103, 104). The NASB 1995 was based upon the Nestle-Aland 26th edition, which appeared in 1979 and was developed under the shadow of the Alands’ trust.

Barbara Aland had studied in Rome at the Catholic Pontifical Biblical Institute. In the early 1980s she became a member of Aland’s critical text committee and the Director of the Catholic/Protestant Institute for New Testament Textual Research, which edits and publishes the corrupt Greek texts underlying new versions. The goal of the Institute is to find old corrupt editions of the Bible to bolster evidence for weakening the true bible’s text. Catholic monasteries and Egyptian rubbish heaps are the habitual haunts for their grave digging. For example, the latest 2012 edition of Nestle-Aland 28th edition litters its apparatus with ‘new evidence’ for questioning the reading for Rev. 13:18, which identifies the number of the mark of the Beast as 666.

Barbara Aland’s name appears as editor of the three critical editions upon which upcoming modern versions and current textual criticism are based:

1. The current 2014 United Bible Societies’ *The Greek New Testament*, 5th edition, with its concise apparatus.
2. The 2012 *Novum Testamentum Graece*: Nestle-Aland 28th edition, with a revised critical apparatus, which is even weaker than that of the 27th edition, thirty changes to the text of general epistles, and the addition of papyrus 117-127 (e.g. 26th ed. had 92 papyrus and 28th edition has 127).
3. The *Editio Critica Maior*, on which the UBS 5th edition was based, purports to be a thorough examination of manuscripts.

The ESV and HCSB were based upon the 1993 USB 4th corrected edition and the Nestle-Aland 27th edition, both textually like the 26th edition, yet very much under her leadership as director of the Institute which published these editions. Changes to all of these editions are silently made between editions.

As late as 1999 Barbara Aland founded a society for the study of the interpreters of Plato. See chapter 38 of *New Age Bible Versions* for a thorough discussion of Plato and his anti-biblical new age philosophies.

She retired in 2004, turning the Institute over to Holger Strutwolf, author of the critical *Original Text and Textual History*, as well as, *Parallel Pericopes of the Synoptic Gospels*. He teaches “metaphysics” at the university and writes positively about the Gnostic writers of the early centuries. His essay on *Scribal Practices* in John Kloppenborg’s book, *Editing the Bible*, demonstrates his dead dependence on Westcott and Hort’s methodology and dictum (i.e. that the shorter reading is the original) despite Royse’s demonstration in *Scribal Habits* that the fuller reading is the original. The hunt to devour the Holy Bible continues. The wolf is a devourer, so of course, the shorter reading is preferred, with words swallowed up, which exalt our beloved Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ. In the city of Westphalia, Germany, where the institute has its home, the Anabaptists, who preserved the pure Bible text in the 1500s, were tortured, starved, and murdered in cages, which *still* hang high from the tall exterior walls of its ‘churches’.

The twenty-first century birthed the soulless computer generated Coherence Based Genealogical Method (CBGM) to construct the Greek *Editio Critica Maior*. Hard drive generated hard facts now give a “renewed appreciation” for the King James text and find the W-H method “totally inadequate” and undeserving of “the reverence which has been accorded it.”<sup>69</sup> Unfortunately, in practice, W-H “exert[s] considerable control in the application.”<sup>70</sup> The new computer methodology has spawned dozens of changes to their already corrupt text, NA28. New versions therefore dilute the KJV warning in 2 Peter 3:10 that “the earth also and the works that are therein shall be **burned up**.” The ESV, NIV and others deny destruction and say, ‘be exposed,’ ‘discovered,’ ‘laid bare’ and ‘disclosed.’

Based not on any Greek manuscripts, but on a few late Coptic manuscripts, the CBGM now pretends the earth “will **NOT** be exposed.” Look for such serious alterations in bibles coming out after 2022, when more changes appear in the **NA29**, **UBS6** and in the final anticipated ECM edition in 2030.

## New Inconsistent Versions (NIV, ESV, NASB, NEB, etc.)

To determine the consistency of manuscript use in the new versions, six verses were selected at random from within the short compass of a few pages of the bible, that is, the last nine chapters of I Corinthians. My collation of the manuscript evidence shows new version editors using Majority or KJV readings when no doctrinal issues are involved (three out of three verses). This might be expected since a large part of even new versions must contain the traditional bible readings in order to be sold as ‘bibles’. However, they used random minority text type readings when an opportunity arose to present New Age philosophy or demote God or Christ. The inconsistent choice of witnesses throughout these six verses will be evident upon study by the reader. Note particularly that the favored manuscripts in item four and five are diametrically opposite.

NEW VERSIONS	MANUSCRIPTS	DOCTRINES
1. I Cor. 7:15	<b>Ignores:</b> Aleph <b>Follows:</b> P46, B and Majority	
2. I Cor. 8:3	<b>Ignores:</b> Aleph, B and Majority <b>Follows:</b> P46	P46 reads, “If any man loves he is known” rather than the other reading “if any man loves God, he is known by him.”
3. I Cor. 10:9	<b>Ignores:</b> P46 and Majority <b>Follows:</b> Aleph and B	Denies the deity of Christ by not identifying him as the rock that accompanied the Israelites in the desert.
4. I Cor. 11:24	<b>Ignores:</b> Majority <b>Follows:</b> P46, B and Aleph	Denies Christ was “broken for you.”
5. I Cor. 13:3	<b>Ignores:</b> Aleph, B and P46 <b>Follows:</b> Majority	
6. I Cor. 14:38	<b>Ignores:</b> P46, Majority, B <b>Follows:</b> Aleph	

Again, we see the New Age menu of ‘brotherly love’, the denial of the perpetual deity of Christ and his sacrifice for sins, served to unsuspecting Christians. In I Corinthians 10:9, new versions, following old editions of Nestle’s Greek, use “Lord” despite the earlier and weightier attestation of “Christ.” The recent switch in the Nestle’s 26th edition to the KJV, P46 and Majority text reading of “Christ”, marks the new versions as obsolete. New version collaborator, Philip Comfort, comments concerning the apparent doctrinal bias:

Some scribes from the fourth century onward must have had a theological problem with the reading ‘Christ’ and thus tried to neutralize it to ‘Lord’ or ‘God’. I say fourth century because not one witness prior to the fourth century attests to the reading ‘Lord’ or ‘God’. The earliest MS, P46 and several church fathers attest to the reading of ‘Christ’. Later MSS and later church fathers attest mainly to the reading ‘Lord’. However a majority of MSS persist in keeping the reading Christ.<sup>68</sup>

By randomly extending the investigation a few more pages, **over half** of the new version verses are seen to have followed the **exact opposite** evidence as the other half. The remainder exhibit gross inconsistency in the use of witnesses. (The “accepted principles of the science of textual criticism,” used to justify this ‘shell game’, are hardly worth the printer’s ink to list them. They are illustrations of Timothy’s “science, falsely so called” and can be summarized in one sentence—“I believe the writer is probably more likely to have said this.”) Not only do they choose to follow different manuscripts half of the time, but the NIV and NASB disagree as to which ones to follow. The ESV, HCSB, and most new versions are equally inconsistent.

NEW VERSIONS	MANUSCRIPTS
7. 1 Cor. 15:49	<b>Ignores:</b> P46, Aleph, Majority <b>Follows:</b> B
8. 1 Cor. 15:54	<b>Ignores:</b> P46 and Aleph <b>Follows:</b> Aleph (corrector), B
9. 2 Cor. 1:10	<b>Ignores:</b> P46 <b>Follows:</b> Aleph and B
10. 2 Cor. 1:11	<b>Ignores:</b> P46 and B <b>Follows:</b> Aleph
11. 2 Cor. 1:12	<b>Ignores:</b> Majority <b>Follows:</b> P46, Aleph and B
12. 2 Cor. 2:1	(NIV) <b>Ignores:</b> Aleph and Majority <b>Follows:</b> P46 and B (NASB) <b>Ignores:</b> P46 and B <b>Follows:</b> Majority
13. 2 Cor. 2:17	<b>Ignores:</b> P46 <b>Follows:</b> Aleph and B
14. 2 Cor. 3:2	<b>Ignores:</b> Aleph <b>Follows:</b> P46 and B
15. 2 Cor. 3:9	(NASB) <b>Ignores:</b> B and Majority <b>Follows:</b> P46 and Aleph (NIV) <b>Ignores:</b> P46 and Aleph <b>Follows:</b> B and Majority
16. 2 Cor. 8:7	(NASB) <b>Ignores:</b> Aleph and Majority <b>Follows:</b> P46 and B (NIV) <b>Ignores:</b> P46 and B <b>Follows:</b> Aleph and Majority
17. Gal. 1:3	<b>Ignores:</b> P46 and B <b>Follows:</b> Aleph
18. Gal. 1:8	(NIV) <b>Ignores:</b> P51 and B <b>Follows:</b> Aleph (NASB) <b>Ignores:</b> Aleph <b>Follows:</b> P51 and B



NEW VERSIONS	MANUSCRIPTS
19. Gal. 1:15	(NIV) <b>Ignores:</b> P46 and B <b>Follows:</b> Aleph (NASB) <b>Ignores:</b> Aleph <b>Follows:</b> P46 and B
20. Gal. 4:25	<b>Ignores:</b> P46 and Aleph <b>Follows:</b> B
21. Gal. 4:28	<b>Ignores:</b> Aleph and Majority <b>Follows:</b> P46 and B
22. Gal. 6:2	(NASB) <b>Ignores:</b> P46 and B <b>Follows:</b> Aleph and Majority (NIV) <b>Ignores:</b> Aleph and Majority <b>Follows:</b> P46 and B
23. Gal. 6:13	<b>Ignores:</b> P46 and B <b>Follows:</b> Aleph

**“The Original Greek says...”**

The next time this fictitious phrase is flipped at you, by a modern day Ananias, attempting to advance his ascendancy and authority, simply say:

‘Save you to be ‘slain in Spirit’ like Sapphira, tell me— which Greek? In Matthew 13:28, we see the following disparity’:

- Nestle’s follows Manuscript C
- UBS follows Manuscript B
- *Textus Receptus* follows Manuscripts L, W, 1, 13, pm, vg, sy.

So, which Greek? Aleph1, Aleph2, Aleph3, B1, B2, B3, C, L, W, *Textus Receptus*, Westcott and Hort, Scrivener, Alfred, Griesbach, Elzevir, Erasmus, Tischendorf, Lachman, Souter, von Soden, Hodge-Farstad, Nestle’s-Aland, (If so which edition between 1 and 26?, which printing of the 26th?) UBS-Aland, Black, Metzger,

Wikgren (Which edition between 1 and 5?) or the Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators.

A complete list of manuscripts and critical texts will bury the booster in words, with the epitaph, “It’s Greek to me.”

In conclusion, recent scholarship demonstrates that the majority of manuscripts, as seen in the traditional text represented in the *King James Bible*, represent the earliest, broadest (numerically and geographically) and most consistent edition of the New Testament. On the other hand, the new versions and their underlying unsettled Nestle-Aland type eclectic text, use later readings, representing a narrow “fraction of 1%” of the extant manuscripts, from one locale. They typify Satan’s meager and shaky attempt to counterfeit the written “word of God” (II Corinthians 2:17, Hebrews 4:12)—just as he tries to counterfeit the living “Word of God” (Revelation 19:13, Isaiah 14).

51 Nestle, Ervin and Aland, Kurt, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Biblelansalt, 1960), pp. 40, 41.

52 *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*, p. 24.

53 *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, p. 221.

54 Jacob Van Bruggen, *The Ancient Text of the New Testament* (Winnipeg: Premier, 1976), p. 33.

55 D.A. Waite, *Heresies of Westcott & Hort* (Collingswood, NJ: Bible for Today, 1979), p. 41.

56 *Novum Testamentum Graece*, p. 43.

57 *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*, p. 195.

58 K.W. Clark, “The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament,” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXV (1966), p. 15.

59 *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*, p. 16.

60 E.C. Colwell, “International Greek New Testament Project: A Status Report,” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVII, 192 note 13 as cited in *Identity of the New Testament Text*, p. 237.

61 *Ibid.*, p. 223.

62 *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*, p. 23.

63 Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, Allen Wikgren, (eds.), *The Greek New Testament* (NY: United Bible Societies, 1966), pp. x-xi.

64 Patrick Henry, *New Directions in New Testament Study* (Philadelphia: the Westminster Press, 1979), pp. 232-234.

65 *New American Bible* (NY: The World Publishing Co., 1970), p. vii.

66 *Ibid.*, p. ix.

67 David Schaff, *Life of Philip Schaff* (NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1897), p. 378.

68 *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*, pp. 142-143.

69 Jeffrey T. Riddle, “The Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM),” *Trinitarian Bible Society, Quarterly Record*, (April-June, 2021): pp. 12-19.

70 Historical and Philological Correlations and the CBGM as Applied to Mark 1:1 (reltech.org)

## Inspiration & Preservation

### Have it your way

“...hold the pickle...and the ascension.” The diversity of ‘opinion’ and preference in relation to the readings in the minority Greek text is symptomatic of the subjective relativism which has swept into the church from a world brimming over with it. New Ager Vera Alder says of the ‘New’ world religion:

It is likely that a new kind of religion will develop in which each man will discover and work out his own sermons for himself.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps Matthew 17:21, 18:11, Acts 8:37, Romans 16:24, and scores of other verses are not in your sermon (or your NIV, ESV, etc.). The Old Testament lament, “...every man did that which was right in his own eyes,” still sounds today. Seth, an entity now being channeled in New Age circles echoes: “There is no authority superior to the guidance of a person’s inner self.”<sup>2</sup> This wizard ‘peeps’ as cultists and textual scholars ‘mutter’ the same monotonous declamation. Hare Krishna devotees listen to see if a bible verse has a “ring of truth.”<sup>3</sup> Hort used his “instinctive” powers to determine if a verse had a “ring of genuineness.”<sup>4</sup> J.B. Phillips touts the reader of his forward to the *NASB Interlinear Greek-English New Testament* to “try to make his own translation,” looking for *The Ring of Truth* (the title of his autobiography). Westcott recommends using your “intuitive powers” as a sounding board.<sup>5</sup> For your first try,

the following verses are given with their corresponding manuscript variations (on the left) and manuscript evidence (on the right).

**Colossians 2:2**

του Θεου και Πατρος και του Χριστου	Byz D <sup>c</sup> K <i>pm</i> Lect
του Θεου και Πατρος του Χριστου	Aleph <sup>b</sup> Ψ <i>pc sy</i> <sup>h</sup>
του Θεου Πατρος και του Χριστου	0208 1908 <i>sy</i> <sup>p</sup>
του Θεου Πατρος του Χριστου	A C <i>it</i> <sup>pt</sup> <i>sa</i> <sup>pt</sup> <i>bo</i>
του Θεου Πατρος Χριστου	Aleph 048
του Θεου Χριστου	P <sup>46</sup> B (alone of MSS)
του Θεου	D <sup>b</sup> H P 436 1881 <i>sa</i> <sup>pt</sup>

(at least seven further variations)

**Matthew 10:3**

Θαδδαιος	Aleph
και Θαδδαιος	B <i>pc vg cop</i>
και Λεββαιος	D 122 <i>d k</i>
και Λεββαιος ο επικληθεις Θαδδαιος	Byz C <sup>2</sup> K L W X Δ Θ Π 1 <i>pl sy p, h. pal</i>

**Matthew 13:28**

οι δε αυτω λεγουσιν	B 157 <i>pc cop</i>
οι δε δουλοιειπον αυτω	Byz L W Θ 1 13 <i>pm vg sy</i> <sup>h</sup>
οι δε δουλοι αυτω λενουσιν	C (NESTLE)
λεγουσιν αυτω οι δουλοι	D <i>it (sy<sup>c, s, p</sup>)</i>
οι δε δουλοι λεγουσιν αυτω	Aleph (USB)

**Matthew 15:14**

οδηγοι εισιν τυφλοι τυφλων	Byz C W X Δ Π 0106 <i>pm q</i>
οδηγοι εισιν τυφλοι	Aleph <i>cop sy</i> <sup>c</sup>
οδηγοι εισιν τυφλων	B D 0237
τυφλοι εισιν οδηγοι	Aleph <sup>c</sup> L Z Θ 1 13 33 <i>al lat sy p, h</i>
τυφλοι οδηγοι εισιν τυφλων	K <i>pc sy</i> <sup>s</sup>

**Mark 12:17**

και αποκριθεις	W 258 <i>al</i>
ο δε Ιησους	Aleph B C L Δ Ψ 33 <i>pc sy (p) cop</i>
και αποκριθεις ο Ιησους	Byz P <sup>45</sup> A N X Γ Π Φ 1 13 <i>pm sy (s), h</i>
αποκριθεις δε ο Ιησους	D 700 <i>pc lat</i>
αποκριθεις δε	Θ 565

**Romans 6:12**

αυτη		p <sup>46</sup> D E F G d f g m
ταις επιθυμιας αυτου		Aleph A B C <i>al</i> lat cop
αυτη εν ταις επιθυμιας αυτου		Byz K L P Ψ pm

**I Thessalonians 3:2**

και διακονον	τον θεον	Aleph A P Ψ pc lat cop
και                    συνεργον		B 1962
και                    συνεργον	τον θεον	D 33 b d e mon
διακονον και συνεργον	τον θεον	G f g
και διακονον τον θεον και συνεργον ημων		Byz K <i>pl</i> sy <sup>p,h</sup>

**Luke 9:10**

τοπον ερημον		Aleph <i>al</i> sy <sup>c</sup>
κωμην λεγομενην Βηθσαιδα		D
πολιν καλουμενην Βηθσαιδα		p <sup>75</sup>
πολιν καλουμενην Βηθσαιδα		Aleph <sup>c</sup> B L Ξ
		33 <i>pc</i> cop
τοπον ερημον πολεως καλουμενης Βηθσαιδαν		Byz A C W (1)
		13 <i>pm</i> sy(p),h
κωμην καλουμενην Βηθσαιδαν εις τοπον ερημον		Θ

**Luke 12:18**

παντα τα γεννηματα μον		Aleph D <i>it</i> (sy <sup>s,c</sup> )
παντα τον σιτον και τα αγαθα μου		p <sup>75c</sup> B L 070 1 (13) <i>pc</i>
		cop
παντα τα γεννηματα μον και τα αγαθα μου		Byz A Q W Θ Ψ <i>pm</i> vg
		sy <sup>p,h</sup>

**John 8:51**

τον λογον μου	433 <i>pc</i>
τον εμον λογον	p <sup>75</sup> Aleph B C D L X W Ψ 0124 33 <i>al</i> cop
τον λογον τον εμον	Byz P <sup>66</sup> E G K Γ Δ Θ Λ Π 1 13 <i>pm</i> lat syr

One might not actively give voice to Shirley MacLaine’s, “We are not under the law of God. We are the law of God!” But picking and choosing what should be in God’s bible is tantamount to following Luciferian David Spangler who said:

The evolution of the race is for every man not to learn to obey the law but to be the law...We can take all the scriptures....and have a jolly good bonfire...Once you are the truth, you do not need it externally represented.<sup>6</sup>

So...maybe some Christians only throw in the fire several dozen scriptures relating to the deity of Christ or Acts 8:37 on the eunuch's salvation. These flares may not make a forest fire, but will smolder in our spirits, searing the soul toward God and parching our spiritual progress.

How great a matter a little fire kindleth. James 3:5

### ***Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers: The Voice of Strangers***

My 1,200 page book, *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*, was written as a sequel to *New Age Bible Versions*. It continues my lengthy investigation into currently used Greek and Hebrew editions, lexicons, and grammars. Chapter 20, "The Wobbly Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Crutch," documents the doctrinal quirks and unsteady hand of the monks of the Greek Orthodox church in transmitting God's word in perfect detail in the Greek manuscript tradition, now sold as so-called 'Majority Text' editions. My sequel also explores and critiques current editions of the *Textus Receptus* including: 1.) the so-called Beza edition, printed by the Trinitarian Bible Society, 2.) George Ricker Berry's Interlinear edition of Stephanus, and 3.) Zodhiates various editions, and others. These all disagree very slightly with each other and with the ancient Greek, which agrees with the King James Bible. For example, "Jesus Christ our Lord" begins Romans 1:3 in the ancient Greek and the KJV. In Berry's and the TBS edition of the *Textus Receptus*, as well as in the NIV, ESV, and NASB, our Saviour is senselessly shoved to the end of verse 4, where all grammatical and spiritual meaning is lost.

The book also critiques in detail the corrupt Greek and Hebrew grammars and lexicons underlying new versions, modern criticism, and faulty word 'definitions,' such as those by James Strong (*Strong's Concordance*), W.E. Vine, Spiros Zodhiates, Kenneth Wuest, Marvin Vincent, A.T. Robertson, Walter Bauer, Frederick Danker, Moulton and Milligan, R.C. Trench, J. Henry Thayer, Liddell-Scott, and Logos and other Bible software. The corrupt Hebrew texts and lexicons underlying new versions are examined, such as the corrupt Hebrew lexicons by Gesenius, Brown, Driver, and Briggs. Hebrew editions used by new version editors, such

as the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, are critiqued. The better Hebrew texts and their various printed editions, such as the Ben Chayyim editions, are examined and critiqued in detail.

## Preservation Promised: “The word is very nigh unto thee”

It is obvious that the word of God in its perfect state may not reside in any one of the *ancient Greek manuscripts* extant today. Even Bruce Metzger admits:

“[T]he disquieting possibility remains that the evidence available to us today may, in certain cases be totally unrepresentative of the distribution of readings in the early church.”<sup>7</sup>

The carnal spirit of Gnosticism, that is, the desire for hidden knowledge others do not have, is prevalent in the New Age *and* the church. New Agers try to get a word from ‘God’ through some ‘hidden’ wisdom from ‘far off’ gurus living ‘beyond the sea’. Christians, likewise, too often try to get forbidden “private interpretation” from faulty Greek and Hebrew editions, or search for the ‘hidden’ meaning of a word in Greek lexicons from ‘far off’ Egyptian manuscripts from ‘beyond the sea’. But the Lord has said:

For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not **hidden** from thee, [in ancient Greek, which you don’t understand] neither is it **far off** [in the 5700 or so manuscripts held in the Vatican or in museums around the world]. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say Who shall go up for us to heaven and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? Neither is it **beyond the sea** [buried in some yet to be found papyri] that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us and bring it unto us that we may hear it and do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth [Is the Greek in your mouth?] and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it.  
Deuteronomy 30:11-14

“The word is very nigh unto thee...that thou mayest do it.”  
However, by pushing the scriptures out of our laps and back into

a yet undiscovered dirt mound from the first century, we avoid the “sharp” pruning of the word of God. We prune it—before it prunes us.

The bible repeatedly speaks of God’s promise to preserve his word—not, however the paper on which the Autographs were written, nor early copies of these originals. God commanded Jeremiah to throw his ‘originals’ in the river! (Jeremiah 51:63)

Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away. Matthew 24:35

The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever. Isaiah 40:8

Now go, write it before them in a table and note it in a book that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever. Isaiah 30:8

My words which I have put in thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed, saith the Lord from henceforth and forever. Isaiah 59:21

...the word of God which liveth and abideth forever.  
I Peter 1:23

The word of God was not only preserved after those pieces of fragile paper were destroyed, it *precedes* them.

For ever, O LORD, Thy word is settled in heaven.  
Psalm 119:89

For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me. John 17:8

The Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak... Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak. John 12:49-50



## Muslim Mentality Mounting

The Christian doctrine of the preservation of scriptures is at striking odds with the beliefs of the New Age and pagan sects. The first doctrine of Buddhism is ‘the doctrine of Impermanence’, *anicca, Pali*, which says, “All things are impermanent.”<sup>8</sup> The Hindu and Gnostic world view, particularly as seen in today’s New Age movement, shows a disdain for matter and the material world, calling it *maya*, an illusion. Skeptical translators and diffident church doctrinal statements scoff at the doctrine of the preservation of scriptures or deny that “all scripture is given by inspiration of God,” not just the ‘originals’—just like the Khomeini.

AYATOLLAH KHOMEINI OF IRAN	CALVIN LINTON NIV TRANSLATOR
“No translation accurately transmits the messages of the Koran only the original is infallible.” <sup>9</sup>	“No translation can be a perfect reproduction of the original.” <sup>10</sup>

Like doubting Thomas, they say, “Except I see in *my* hands the prints of the *originals*...I will not believe.” The error of this stance is rooted in an unacquaintance with the biblical definition of ‘scripture’. When used, the term always refers to copies, not the original paper. Timothy (II Timothy 3:15), the Bereans (Acts 17:11) and the eunuch (Acts 8:32) did not have the original in their possession yet they “searched” and “knew” “the scriptures.”

The new versions themselves deny that God’s promise of perfect preservation extends beyond the originals. Although the verb “is” is implied in this verse in every Greek manuscript, *The Living Bible* concurs with the Khomeini.

All scripture **is** given by inspiration of God. KJV

The whole Bible **was** given to us from God. LB

Observe how new versions dismantle the following verse attesting to God’s promise to preserve a “pure” bible “for ever.”

The words of the LORD are **pure** words...Thou shalt

keep them, O LORD, thou shalt **preserve** them from this generation **for ever**. Psalm 12:6, 7 KJV

O LORD, you will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever. NIV

Thou wilt preserve him from this generation forever. NASB

## Inspiration and the KJV

The title page of the New Testament in the original King James Bible of 1611 stated that it was “translated out of the original Greek and with the former translations diligently compared.” The vast libraries and private collections of England at that time, according to the translators, contained perfect, perhaps medieval, copies of the originals, as well as good former and foreign translations. God supplied their “need,” as he promised. If we no longer have ready access to the originals, it is because we no longer “need” them. Koine Greek, a language of commerce in the first centuries, has been replaced by English as the international medium of communications. God is not out of date. Acts 2 demonstrated the Holy Ghost’s involvement in giving the word of God to “every nation under heaven,” not just to the Greeks.

Even the academic evidence for the inspiration of the KJV is mounting. Recent discoveries in the Ugaritic language have prompted recent translators to return to the KJV Old Testament renderings in some places. In Psalm 68, the KJV’s “rideth upon the heavens,” was found in the Ugaritic. The ESV and NASB retains the outdated, “rides through the deserts.” (This sounds more like the Antichrist!) The NIV translators update to the KJV rendition and note, the KJV reading, “must have been a ‘guess’ from the context since this word normally signifies desert.” In Isaiah 41, the lexicons previously indicated *‘tishta’* meant ‘see’; now the Ugaritic shows that it means ‘fear’—the KJV reading all along. Larry Walker, NIV translator, comments on the KJV’s dismissal of the lexicons saying, “...it is merely coincidence that the KJV and NIV came out with the same translation, because the NIV translators had access to this information unknown to the KJV translator.”<sup>11</sup> Even the italics in the KJV are being vindicated by recent

discoveries. Its ten italicized words in I John 2:23 were discovered hundreds of years later in what scholars perceive to be the most accurate ancient Greek manuscript. Several ancient MSS have the italicized ‘the church’ in I Peter 5:13.<sup>12</sup>

‘Guesses’ or God, fear or faith, haughty or humble. These are the perpetual options for the Christian. The lineage and transmission of the scriptures in English, terminating in the King James Bible, are traced word by word in my 1,200 page book, *In Awe of Thy Word*, beginning with the first century Gothic scriptures.

My book *Hazardous Materials* closes with chapter 31, “Seven Infallible Proofs of the King James Bible’s Inspiration.” It contains a verse-by-verse analysis of the scriptures which promise inspiration and preservation, proving, as Edward Hills concluded, that the King James Bible is God’s preserved repository of the pure ‘Received Text.’ Since “all scripture is given by inspiration of God,” chapter 30 of that book traces God’s hand in giving the “scriptures” to “every nation under heaven.” My work to find, collate, and print pure scriptures in *all* languages can be seen at [purebiblepress.com](http://purebiblepress.com) or [avpublications.com](http://avpublications.com).

1 Vera Alder, *When Humanity Comes of Age* (NY: Samuel Weiser, 1974), p. 209.

2 Texe Marrs, *Dark Secrets of the New Age* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1987), p. 196.

3 *The Mystical Maze*, p. 156.

4 *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*, p. 66; *The Life of Hort*, p. 227.

5 *History of the Canon*, p. 56; *Religious Thought in the West*, pp. 204, 78; *The Life of Westcott*, Vol. I, p. 2.

6 Russell Chandler, *Understanding the New Age* (Dallas, London: Word Publishing, 1988), pp. 285-286.

7 *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, p. 217.

8 David Johnson, *A Reasoned Look at Asian Religions* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Bethany House Publishers, 1985), p. 123.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 151.

10 *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation*, p. 18.

11 *Ibid.*, pp. 97-98.

12 *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the Bible*, p. 176.