

THE KJV-NIV DEBATE

by
Dr Jeffrey Khoo

Lecture Notes



FAR EASTERN BIBLE COLLEGE
SINGAPORE

No part of this syllabus may be reproduced in any manner for distribution without the written permission of Far Eastern Bible College, 9A Gilstead Road, Singapore 309063.

The KJV-NIV Debate

by

Dr Jeffrey Khoo

Academic Dean, Far Eastern Bible College

www.febc.edu.sg

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

A 21st Century Battle for the Bible

KJV-Only or KJV-Superiority

Ruckmanism

Dean Burgon/Trinitarian Bible Society

IMPORTANT DOCTRINES ON THE BIBLE

The Inspiration of the Bible

Three Views on Inspiration

Natural Inspiration

Partial Inspiration

Total Inspiration

Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration

Biblical Meaning of Inspiration

Verbal and Plenary Inspiration

Dean Burgon on Inspiration

Inspiration and Translation

Are Translations Inspired?

Accuracy in Translations

The Canonicity of the Bible

Meaning of Canon

Identification of Canon

Books of the Canon

The Transmission of the Bible

Transmission of the OT

Method of OT Transmission

Significance of OT Transmission

Transmission of the NT

Periods of NT Transmission

Papyrus Period

Uncial Period

Minuscule Period

Types of Scribal Errors in NT Transmission

- Errors of the Eye
- Errors of the Ear
- Errors of the Mind
- Errors of Judgment

The Preservation of the Bible

- Psalm 12:6-7 on Bible Preservation
- Westminster Confession on Bible Preservation
- Dean Burgon Society on Bible Preservation
- Significant Remarks on Bible Preservation by Scholars
 - Dr Edward F Hills
 - Dr William Whitaker
 - Dean John William Burgon
- Arguments for Preservation
 - Preservation of the OT
 - Jesus Confirmed the Preservation of the OT
 - Faithful Scholars Affirmed the Preservation of the OT
 - Preservation of the NT
 - Shakespeare, the Bible, and Preservation
- The Textus Receptus and Bible Preservation
 - Basic Steps of Bible Preservation
 - Textus Receptus Editors and Providential Guidance

The Translation of the Bible

- Westminster Confession on Translation
- The Bible in World Languages
- Methods of Translation
 - Formal Equivalence Method
 - Dynamic Equivalence Method
- William Tyndale on Accurate Translating

THE GREEK TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Manuscript Text-type

- Byzantine Text-type
- Alexandrian Text-type

The Critical Text

- Alexandrian Manuscripts
 - Codex Sinaiticus
 - Codex Vaticanus
 - Proof of Corruption
- The Westcott-Hort Text
 - Their Critical Edition of the Greek NT
 - Origin and Nature of the Critical Text
 - Problems of the Critical Text
 - Their Textual Critical Theory
 - Premise of the Critical Theory

Critique of the Critical Theory
Their Heretical Beliefs
Denial of the Historicity of the Creation Account
Denial of the Sole Mediatorship of Christ

The Eclectic Text
Influence of Westcott and Hort on Modern Evangelical Scholarship

Legacy of Westcott and Hort in Modern Editions of the Greek NT
The United Bible Societies' Greek NT
The Nestle-Aland Greek NT
Vestiges of Westcott and Hort in Modern Versions of the English Bible

The Editors of the Critical Text
Carlo M Martini
Eugene Nida
Bruce Metzger
Kurt Aland

The Traditional Text
The Byzantine/Majority Text
The Textus Receptus/Received Text
The Preserved Text
The "Jesus Papyrus" (Magdalen GR 17)

A SURVEY OF ENGLISH BIBLE TRANSLATIONS

Pre-KJV Versions
Wycliffe's Translation
Tyndale's Translation
Coverdale's Translation
The Great Bible
The Geneva Bible

Post-KJV Versions
Revised Version
American Standard Version
Revised Standard Version
New English Bible
Today's English Version/Good News For Modern Man
Living Bible
New American Standard Bible
New International Version

A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION

The NIV is Based on a Corrupt Text

- The NIV Preface
- UBSGNT and NA
- Conclusion

The NIV Casts Doubt on God's Word

- The Woman Taken in Adultery (John 7:53-8:11)
- The Last Twelve Verses of Mark (Mark 16:9-20)

The NIV Scissors Out God's Word

- Entire Passages Questioned
- Entire Verses Omitted
- Portions of Verses Omitted

- In Matthew
- In Mark
- In Luke
- In John
- In Acts
- In Romans
- In 1 Corinthians
- In 2 Corinthians
- In Galatians
- In Ephesians
- In Philippians
- In Colossians
- In 1 Thessalonians
- In 2 Thessalonians
- In 1 Timothy
- In 2 Timothy
- In Hebrews
- In James
- In 1 Peter
- In 1 John
- In Revelation

- The Johannine Comma Removed (1 John 5:7-8)

The NIV Attacks Vital Doctrines of the Christian Faith

- Attack on the Eternal Generation of God the Son
- Attack on the Virgin Birth of Christ
- Attack on the Theanthropic Person of Christ
- Attack on the Eternal Punishment of Sinners in Hell
- Attack on Christ as the Judge Who is God

The NIV Mistranslates God's Word

- Mistranslation of Ps 12:7 on the Preservation of God's Word
- Mistranslation of Isa 49:12 on God's Promise to the Chinese
- Mistranslation of 2 Thess 3:6 on Secondary Separation

The NIV Opposes a Strictly Messianic Fulfillment of Isa 7:14 in its Study Bible

THE SUPERIORITY OF THE KING JAMES OR AUTHORISED VERSION

The KJV is Superior Because it is Based on the Preserved Text

The KJV is Superior Because of its Godly and Able Translators
The KJV Translators were Men of Great Piety
The KJV Translators were Men of Great Learning

The KJV is Superior Because it is an Accurate Translation

The KJV is Superior Because it is Faithful to Historic Protestant Theology

SOME FAQ'S (FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS) ABOUT THE KJV-ONLY ISSUE

RECOMMENDED LITERATURE FOR FURTHER STUDY

1a Introduction

1b. A 21st Century Battle for the Bible

1c. There is a new battle for the Bible today. It is the battle for the Authorised or King James Bible and its underlying Hebrew and Greek texts over against the many modern versions and their corrupted texts. This battle seeks to recapture for the Church the traditional text and the doctrine of Bible preservation.

2c. The battle is essentially between two opposing camps: the exclusivists (one Bible) versus the inclusivists (many Bibles). The former believes the King James Version (KJV) to be the most faithful, accurate, and trustworthy Bible in the English language, and thus promotes its exclusive use. The latter believes that most, if not all, Bible versions are in one way or other acceptable despite inherent corruptions, and that the church can safely use any of them. Of course, in either camp there are different shades of views. But generally the battle lines have been drawn quite clearly; either one is for or against the exclusive use of the KJV.

3c. Since the top-selling Bible versions are the KJV and NIV, the battle is primarily between these two. The inclusivists usually promote the NIV over against the KJV. This book will thus examine these two versions. Which Bible version should Bible-believing and Bible-defending Christians use? The KJV or the NIV?

2b. KJV-Only or KJV-Superiority?

Before we begin our study proper, I would like to first of all identify FEBC's KJV position. There are basically two types of KJV-only groups: (1) the Peter Ruckman group, and (2) the Dean Burgon group.

1c. Ruckmanism

Peter Ruckman is president of Pensacola Bible Institute (not to be confused with Pensacola Christian College). He holds to the view that the KJV was given by inspiration of God and believes that it is superior to the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. Others who hold to this view are Texe Marrs, and Samuel Gipp. This position is erroneous because inspiration in the light of 2 Tim 3:16, and 2 Pet 1:21 is applicable only to the original writers (Moses, Matthew, John et al), original writings (66 books of canonical Scripture), and original languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek). Most books which attack the KJV-only position use Ruckman as the locus of attack. There are many KJV advocates who are against Ruckman's views, but these are unwittingly or unfairly lumped together with Ruckman by KJV opponents. If by "KJV-only," Ruckmanism is meant, then we are not "KJV-only." Instead of "KJV-only," I prefer the term "KJV-superiority."

More on Ruckman can be found in David Cloud's booklet—*What About Ruckman?* (Oak Harbor: Way of Life Literature, 1995). You may want to look at some of his writings in the FEBC library.

2c. Dean Burgon/Trinitarian Bible Society

The Dean Burgon group of KJV advocates hold to a KJV-superiority view. This position is generally represented by D A Waite, President of the Dean Burgon Society, in his book—*Defending the King James Bible: A Fourfold Superiority* (Collingswood: Bible For Today, 1996), and the literature of the Trinitarian Bible Society. Others who belong to this group are Edward F Hills, David Otis Fuller, Thomas Strouse, and David Cloud. FEBC holds to this KJV-superiority view which is best expressed under section II.A of the Articles of Faith of the Dean Burgon Society.

1d. “We believe in the plenary, verbal, Divine inspiration of the sixty-six canonical books of the Old and the New Testaments (from Genesis to Revelation) in the original languages, and in their consequent infallibility and inerrancy in all matters on which they speak (2 Timothy 3:16-17; 2 Peter 1:21; 1 Thessalonians 2:13).”

2d. “We believe that the Texts which are the closest to the original autographs of the Bible are the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text for the Old Testament, and the Traditional Greek Text for the New Testament underlying the King James Version (as found in ‘The Greek Text Underlying The English Authorized Version of 1611’ as published by The Trinitarian Bible Society in 1976).”

3d. “We believe that the King James Version (or Authorized Version) of the English Bible is a true, faithful, and accurate translation of these two providentially preserved Texts, which in our time has no equal among all of the other English Translations. The translators did such a fine job in their translation task that we can without apology hold up the Authorized Version of 1611 and say ‘This is the Word of God!’ while at the same time realizing that, in some verses, we must go back to the underlying original language Texts for complete clarity, and also compare Scripture with Scripture.”

2a. Important Doctrines on the Bible

1b. The Inspiration of the Bible

1c. Three Views on Inspiration

1d. Natural Inspiration

The Bible is inspired literature in the same way the works of Shakespeare are “inspired.” The Bible is like any ordinary book written by man, and subjected to humanistic methods of study, analysis

or interpretation. John D Crossan of the so-called *Jesus Seminar* says the Bible is “a mixture of myth, propaganda, and social convention.” To such, the Bible is seen as a glorified *Aesop’s Fables*. This view is held by the modernists.

2d. Partial Inspiration

The Bible is inspired only when it touches on matters of faith and salvation, but in the areas of science, history or geography, it can make mistakes. This is the position adopted by schools such as Fuller Theological Seminary. David Hubbard—former president of Fuller—said, “Where inerrancy refers to what the Holy Spirit is saying to the churches through the biblical writers, we support its use. Where the focus switches to an undue emphasis on matters like chronological details, the precise sequence of events, and numerical allusions, we would consider the term misleading and inappropriate” (“What We Believe and Teach,” Fuller Theological Seminary, 1983). This view is held by moderate liberals and neo-evangelicals.

3d. Total Inspiration

The Bible in its 66 books is the divinely inspired Word of God, absolutely without error in whole and in part. The Constitution of the Life Bible-Presbyterian Church states, “We believe in the divine, verbal and plenary inspiration of the Scriptures in the original languages, their consequent inerrancy and infallibility, and, as the Word of God, the Supreme and final authority in faith and life.” This is the view of conservative evangelicals and fundamentalists.

2c. Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration in 2 Tim 3:16

1d. Biblical Meaning of Inspiration

The word “inspired” is the Greek θεόπνευστος (*theopneustos*) which literally means “God breathed.” It is thus not “manspiration,” but “Godspiration.” God used human writers to pen His words. These men were specially chosen by God, and perfectly guided by the Spirit to put on paper the very words of God, and to do so without any error (2 Pet 1:21).

2d. Verbal and Plenary Inspiration

1e. Verbal Inspiration: Every word of the Bible is inspired (Matt 5:18).

2e. Plenary Inspiration: The Bible as a whole is inspired (2 Tim 3:16).

3d. Dean Burgon on Inspiration

“The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the Word of God, not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike the utterance of Him that sitteth upon the throne, faultless, unerring, supreme.”

3c. Inspiration and Translation (taken from D A Waite, “The Meaning of Biblical Inspiration,” pamphlet #2237T [Collingswood NJ: The Bible for Today, nd].)

1d. Are Translations Inspired?

“Does God ‘breathe out’ the words in the Spanish translation? Does He ‘breathe out’ the words in the French, or Russian, or English, or Japanese, or Italian, or Chinese? *No, He does not.* Strictly speaking, the words of the translations are not ‘breathed out’ or ‘inspired,’ but ‘translated’ words. God spoke in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek words. God ‘breathed out’ these Words in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek. So, strictly speaking, the only Words that were ‘breathed out’ or ‘inspired words’ were the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Words God gave to the writers.”

2d. Accuracy in Translations

“We have the Words of God in English, or in Spanish, or in Italian, or in Portuguese, or in Russian, etc. This is true only in accurate translations like the King James Bible in the English language.

“God gave us His Words by a process of inspiration which will never again be repeated. God wants His Inspired Words of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek to be accurately translated into all the languages of the world (Rom 16:26, Acts 2:11). God expects us to find the most accurate Bible in our own language (In English, it is the King James Bible), and then read it, study it, preach from it, memorize it, live by it, and practice it the rest of our lives!”

4c. Recommended Reading: Edward F Hills, *Believing Bible Study* (Des Moines IA: The Christian Research Press, 1977), 1-53.

2b. The Canonicity of the Bible

1c. Meaning of Canon

The word “canon” literally means “a straight rod,” or “a ruler.” When applied to the Scriptures, it means the list of divinely inspired books—the

Word of God—which serves as the only basis for faith and practice in the life of the Church.

2c. Identification of the Canon

1d. At Pentecost, God did not present the whole Bible to the Church neatly wrapped with a ribbon. The canon of the OT was already confirmed (cf Luke 24:44, Luke 11:49-51), but not so for the NT. The books of the NT were written one at a time during the course of the first century. Many other books were written at that time. Which were the canonical books?

2d. The canon was arrived at by consensus of God's people who were indwelt and led by the Holy Spirit (John 16:13). The Council of Carthage (397) after a period of discussion, identified the sacred books by name. There were exactly 27 of them. The list presented was no innovation, but an official statement of what the Church had already accepted as canonical Scripture. It was a grassroot acceptance of the many churches that have been planted worldwide, and not just by a single church or denomination. There was an ecclesiastical consensus. The Westminster Confession states: "We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverent esteem of the Holy Scripture. And the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is, to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God: yet notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts" (I.V)

3c. Books of the Canon

The Canon thus consists of a total of 66 books as stated in the Westminster Confession: "Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these: OF THE OLD TESTAMENT—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Song of Songs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—The Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John; The Acts of the Apostles, Paul's Epistles: Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, The Epistle to the Hebrews, The Epistle of James, The First and Second Epistles of Peter, The

First, Second, Third Epistles of John, The Epistle of Jude, The Revelation of John. All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life” (I.II).

3b. The Transmission of the Bible

We have today the 39 books of the OT and 27 books of the NT. The Church accepts them as the inerrant and authoritative Word of God. The question is: Do we have the right text of those books since we do not have the autographs (ie the original books)? The answer is a definite yes.

1c. Transmission of the OT

1d. Method of OT Transmission

The OT was written over a period of 1500 years. The Lord used specially appointed people (eg Moses, David, Solomon, and the prophets) to write the OT Scriptures. The Lord by His Spirit inspired these men to pen his words infallibly and inerrantly. The OT was faithfully transmitted and preserved till the time of Jesus. Rom 3:1-2 tells us that to the Jews were entrusted the safekeeping and guarding of the Hebrew OT. Just how did the Jews safeguard the Scriptures to ensure that there would be no or minimal copying errors in the OT Scriptures? There were 8 rules applied by the scribes in copying the Scriptures:

1e. Preparation of a clean parchment taken only from the skin of clean animals.

2e. Each column consists of at least 48 lines, and contains no more than 60 lines. Lines must be drawn before any copying is done.

3e. The ink used must always be black, and is prepared according to a special recipe.

4e. The scribe is not allowed to write from memory. He must have an authentic copy before him. Before writing, he must first read and pronounce aloud each word. This is to prevent any duplications, or omissions of words.

5e. Whenever he has to write God’s name (ie, Elohim), he must first clean his pen. But before writing the name “Jehovah” (KJV “LORD”), he will have to wash his whole body. This is the kind of carefulness and reverence shown to God’s Word.

6e. Strict rules govern the forms of the letters, spaces between letters, words, and sections, the use of the pen, and the colour of the parchment etc.

7e. If there is a need to correct the manuscript, it must be made within 30 days after the work is finished; otherwise the manuscript would be considered worthless. One mistake on a page condemned the whole page, and if there are three mistakes in any page, the entire manuscript is destroyed.

8e. The proofreading involves the laborious process of counting every word and every letter in the manuscript to ensure that it matches with the original. If there is an omission or addition of just one letter, or if one letter touched another, the manuscript was condemned and destroyed at once. (H S Miller cited by D A Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, 24-6.)

2d. Significance of OT Transmission

1e. Miller said that the above historic rules of OT transmission “show how sacred the Holy Word of the Old Testament was to its custodians, the Jews (Rom 3:2), and they give us strong encouragement to believe that we have the real Old Testament, the same one which our Lord had and which was originally given by inspiration of God” (Ibid, 26).

2e. Dr Robert Dick Wilson, co-defender of the faith with J Gresham Machen at Princeton Seminary in the 1920's, and proficient in over 40 languages, wrote: “In 144 cases of transliteration from Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian and Moabite into Hebrew and in 40 cases of the opposite, or 184 in all, the evidence shows that for 2300 to 3900 years the text of the proper names in the Hebrew Bible has been transmitted with the most minute accuracy. That the original scribes should have written them with such close conformity to correct philological principles is a wonderful proof of their thorough care and scholarship; further, that the Hebrew text should have been transmitted by copyists through so many centuries is a phenomenon unequalled in the history of literature. ... The proof that the copies of the original documents have been handed down with substantial correctness for more than 2,000 years cannot be denied” (*A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* [Chicago IL: Moody Press, 1959], 70-1).

2c. Transmission of the NT

1d. Periods of NT Transmission

The period of transmission covers 1400 years from the time of composition (1st century) to the invention of the printing machine (15th century). The history is divided into 3 periods: (1) Papyrus period (1st -

4th century), (2) Uncial period (4th-9th century), and (3) Minuscule period (9th-15th century).

1e. Papyrus Period

Papyrus manuscripts are continuing to come to light. A very important one just discovered is the Papyrus “Magdalen GR 17” which we will discuss later. There are a total of 97 papyri according to the 4th edition of the UBSGNT.

Papyrus is found in Egypt, and is still being produced today more for tourists than for copyists. (I encourage you to go take a look at the few printed papyri in our Greek/Hebrew classroom.) It comes from a large water plant by that name. The soft tissue-strips within the stem are used to make papyrus sheets. A papyrus sheet has 2 layers consisting of the horizontal and vertical strips. Writing is done on the smoother side where the grain is horizontal.

What is the length of a papyrus scroll? 2 and 3 John (13 and 14 verses respectively) would cover 1 column of 1 page of a papyrus (usually 1 page has 2 columns). Jude and Philemon would have taken 2 columns on a sheet. Revelation would have taken a scroll 15 feet long, Mark 19 feet, John 23 feet, Matthew 30 feet, Acts and Luke 32 feet. It is impossible on papyrus to have a complete scroll of the NT. It would take a 200 feet scroll to contain the whole NT. The papyrus scrolls are therefore circulated separately. This tells us 3 things: (1) the ignorance of a particular book does not mean it does not exist, (2) the scroll form makes it difficult to look up references, and (3) the scarcity of copies and difficulty in referring to specific passages, encouraged people to memorise the Scriptures.

Besides scroll-type papyrus manuscripts, there are also codices. These are book-type papyrus manuscripts. The sheets are stacked together and sewn at the edge. This form existed from the 3rd century onwards. Some suggest that Christians were the ones who invented the codex form. Obviously, this form allows for frequent reading and easier referencing of the Scriptures.

2e. Uncial Period

Uncial manuscripts are Greek manuscripts written in capital letters on vellum or parchment (ie leather usually calf-skin). There are about 300 extant uncial manuscripts; the more well-known ones are these:

1f. Codex Sinaiticus (⌘)

Discovered by Tischendorf in St Catherine’s monastery in 1844. There are 4 columns per page.

Contains the complete NT and has much of the OT in Greek. Dated to about 350 AD (determined by the style of writing).

2f. Codex Alexandrinus (A)

Stored in the British Museum. Dated to about 400-450 AD. It is the longest and best known uncial manuscript. Contains the whole NT except for most of Matthew and some parts of John and 2 Corinthians. There are 2 columns per page. The gospels have the Byzantine text-type reading, while the others correspond to the Alexandrian text-type.

3f. Codex Vaticanus (B)

Kept in the Vatican library. It was found in 1481. Dated to about 350 AD. There are 3 columns per page. Contains both OT and NT, and Apocrypha. But almost the whole of Genesis, and the Pastoral Epistles, and Revelation are missing.

4f. Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C)

“Rescriptus” means “to write again.” Parchments were expensive, so people in those days recycled used parchments and wrote on top of the erased face. C was a biblical manuscript which had been erased and Ephraem—a 4th century Church Father—wrote a sermon on the recycled parchment (or *palimpsest*). Contains parts of the NT except 2 Thessalonians and 2 John which are missing. Dated to about 450 AD.

5f. Codex Bezae (D)

Located in the Cambridge University Library. Dated to the 6th century. Contains the Gospels and Acts in Greek and Latin.

3e. Minuscule Period

The minuscules appeared a little later than the uncials. A demand for books saw a change in writing styles. Minuscule or cursive writing was a lot faster than uncial writing. The letters are smaller, and in formal running hand. Over 90% of the 5,000 extant Greek texts are from Byzantine Text type. And out of a total of about 2,800 minuscules, 99% belong to the Byzantine text-type which underlies the KJV.

2d. Types of Scribal Errors in NT Transmission

Since there were no printing or photostating machines in those early days, the production of copies of the NT manuscripts was done painstakingly by hand, word for word. This tedious process would invariably result in some copying errors experienced even today by typists on electronic typewriters or computers. Many errors are accidental but there are those that are intentional. The common types of copyist errors in the transmission of the Greek NT are as follows:

1e. Errors of the Eye

1f. Wrong Word Division

This can easily occur because some manuscripts do not leave spaces between words. How would you divide this string of letters?

1g. HAVEYOUSEENABUNDANCE

2g. GODISNOWHERE

2f. Mistaking One Word for Another

This can happen especially when words are all in the capital letters. Eg: Π and TI, M and ΛΛ.

3f. Words with Similar Endings

This is an error when the scribe's eye skips over words or sentences to the next similar word or sentence.

4f. A word which occurs once but is copied twice, or a word which occurs twice but is written only once.

2e. Errors of the Ear

This occurs during dictation. A wrong pronunciation of a word by the reader can lead to the writing of the wrong word by the scribe or copier.

3e. Errors of the Mind

This occurs when the scribe, having memorised a portion of scripture, fails to remember accurately the verse or passage when putting it on paper.

4e. Errors of Judgment

Words or notes written on the margin of an older manuscript were sometimes accidentally incorporated into the text of a new manuscript. Abbreviations can also be mistaken for something else. Eg: ΘΣ (GOD) and ΟΣ (HE WHO). It is likely that the change 1 Tim 3:16 from “God” (TR/KJV) to “He” (WH/NIV) was an intentional one to obfuscate the deity of Christ.

4b. The Preservation of the Bible

1c. Psalm 12:6-7 on Bible Preservation

1d. Ps 12:6-7 says, “The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.” Other passages are Pss 33:11, 100:5, 111:7-8, 117:2, 119:89,152,160; Isa 40:8, 59:21 (John Owen called this verse “the great charter of the church’s preservation of truth”); Matt 5:18, 24:35; 1 Pet 1:23,25; Rev 22:18-19.

2d. What do the “keep,” and “preserve” mean?

1e. שָׁמַר (*shamar*) means “to keep,” “to guard,” or “to observe.” The basic idea is “to exercise great care over” (TWOT sv “שָׁמַר,” by J E Hartley). It is used 461 times in the OT, and most of the time with reference to paying careful attention to the Word of God. In Ps 12:7, it has to do with the safeguarding of the purity of God’s Word. God ensures the protection of His Word from perversion.

2e. נָצַר (*natsar*), a synonym for the above, means “to watch,” “to guard,” “to keep,” “to preserve.” It is used about 60 times in the OT, and when used in connection to God’s Word, it has the concept of “guarding with fidelity” (TWOT, sv “נָצַר,” by W C Kaiser). The faithfulness of God in guarding His Word from corruption is the intrinsic idea of the word here in Ps 12:7.

3d. What does Ps 12:6-7 mean?

D A Waite comments, “The word ‘them’ in verse seven refers back to ‘the words of the LORD.’ That is a promise of Bible preservation. God has promised to ‘PRESERVE’ His ‘PURE WORDS.’ This promise extends “*from this generation* [that is, that of the Psalmist] *FOR EVER.*” That is a long time, is it not? God is able to do this, and He has done it! He has kept His Words even more perfectly, if that is possible, than He keeps the stars in their course and the sun, moon, and all the other heavenly bodies in their proper place”

(Defending the King James Bible: A Fourfold Superiority
[Collingswood NJ: The Bible For Today, 1992], 6-7). An excellent defence of Ps 12 in support of Bible preservation is found in Shin Yeong Gil, “God’s Promise to Preserve His Word: An Exegetical Study of Psalm 12:5-7,” ThM thesis, Far Eastern Bible College, 1999.

2c. Westminster Confession on Bible Preservation

“The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which, at the time of the writing of it, was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, *and by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages*, are therefore authentic; so as, in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them” (I.VIIIa).

3c. Dean Burgon Society on Bible Preservation

“We believe that the Texts which are closest to the original autographs of the Bible are the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text for the Old Testament, and the Traditional Greek Text for the New Testament underlying the King James Version (as found in “The Greek Text Underlying the English Authorized Version of 1611” as published by The Trinitarian Bible Society in 1976).

“We believe that the King James Version (or Authorized Version) of the English Bible is a true, faithful, accurate translation of these two *providentially preserved* Texts, which in our time has no equal among all of the other English Translations. The translators did such a fine job in their translation task that we can without apology hold up the Authorized Version of 1611 and say ‘This is the Word of God!’ while at the same time realizing that, in some verses, we must go back to the underlying original language Texts for complete clarity, and also compare Scripture with Scripture” (Articles of Faith, II.A).

4c. Significant Remarks on Bible Preservation by Scholars

1d. Dr Edward F Hills

Dr Hills who has a ThD from Harvard said this:

1e. “If the doctrine of *divine inspiration* of the Old and New Testament Scriptures is a true doctrine, the doctrine of the *providential preservation* of these Scriptures must also be a true doctrine. It must be that down through the centuries God has exercised a special, providential control over the copying of the Scriptures and the preservation and use of the original text have been available to God’s people in every age. God must have done this, for if He gave the Scriptures to His Church by inspiration as the perfect and final revelation of his will, then it

is obvious that He would not allow this revelation to disappear or undergo any alteration of its fundamental character”

“ . . . if the doctrines of the *divine inspiration* and *providential preservation* of these Scriptures are true doctrines, then the textual criticism of the New Testament is different from that of the uninspired writings of antiquity. The textual criticism of any book must take into account the conditions under which the original manuscripts were written and also under which the copies of these manuscripts were made and preserved. But if the doctrines of the divine inspiration and providential preservation of the Scriptures are true, then THE ORIGINAL NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS WERE WRITTEN UNDER SPECIAL CONDITIONS, UNDER THE INSPIRATION OF GOD, AND THE COPIES WERE MADE AND PRESERVED UNDER SPECIAL CONDITIONS, UNDER THE SINGULAR CARE AND PROVIDENCE OF GOD” (*The King James Version Defended* [Des Moines IA: The Christian Research Press, 1984], 2).

2e. “If we ignore the providential preservation of the Scriptures and defend the New Testament text in the same way that we defend the texts of other ancient books, then we are following the logic of unbelief. For the special, providential preservation of the holy Scriptures is a *fact* and an important fact. Hence when we ignore this fact and deal with the text of the New Testament as we would with the text of other books, we are behaving as unbelievers behave. We are either denying that the providential preservation of the Scriptures is a fact, or else we are saying that it is not an important fact, not important enough to be considered when dealing with the New Testament text. But if the providential preservation of the Scriptures is not important, why is the infallible inspiration of the original Scriptures important? If God has not preserved the Scriptures by His special providence, why would He have infallibly inspired them in the first place? And if the Scriptures are not infallibly inspired, how do we know that the Gospel message is true? And if the Gospel message is not true, how do we know that Jesus is the Son of God?

“It is a dangerous error therefore to ignore the special, providential preservation of the holy Scriptures and to seek to defend the New Testament text in the same way in which we would defend the texts of other ancient books. For the logic of this unbelieving attitude is likely to lay hold upon us and cast us down into a bottomless pit of uncertainty. ...

“The Bible teaches us that faith is the foundation of reason. *Through faith we understand* (Heb. 11:3). By faith we lay hold on God as He reveals Himself in the holy Scriptures and make Him the starting point of all our thinking. ...

“Like the Protestant Reformers therefore we must take God as the starting point of all our thinking. We must *begin* with God. Very few Christians, however, do this consistently. For example, even when a group of conservative Christian scholars meet for the purpose of defending the Textus Receptus and the King James Version, you will find that some of them want to do this in a rationalistic, naturalistic way. Instead of beginning with God, they wish to begin with facts viewed apart from God, with details concerning the New Testament manuscripts which must be regarded as true (so they think) no matter whether God exists or not. ...

“Conservative scholars . . . say that they believe in the special, providential preservation of the New Testament text. Most of them really don’t though, because, as soon as they say this, they immediately reduce this special providential preservation to the vanishing point in order to make room for the naturalistic theories of Westcott and Hort. As we have seen, some say that the providential preservation of the New Testament means merely that the same “substance of doctrine” is found in all the New Testament documents. Others say that it means that the true reading is always present in at least one of the thousands of extant New Testament manuscripts. And still other scholars say that to them the special, providential preservation of the Scriptures means that the true New Testament text was providentially discovered in the mid-19th century by Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort after having been lost for 1,500 years.

“If you adopt one of these false views of the providential preservation of Scriptures, then you are logically on your way toward the denial of the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures. For if God has preserved the Scriptures so carelessly, why would he have infallibly inspired them in the first place? It is not sufficient therefore merely to *say* that you believe in the doctrine of the special, providential preservation of holy Scriptures. You must *really* believe this doctrine and allow it to guide your thinking. You must begin with Christ and the Gospel and proceed according to the logic of faith. This will lead you to the Traditional text, the Textus Receptus, and the King James Version, in other words, to the common faith” (*Believing Bible Study*, 216-20).

2d. Dr William Whitaker

Dr Whitaker who was Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge in the 16th century affirmed the doctrine of the providential preservation of Scripture: “If God had permitted the scripture to perish in the Hebrew and Greek originals, in which it was first published by men divinely inspired, he would not have provided sufficiently for his church and for our faith. From the prophetic and

apostolic scripture the church takes its origin and the faith derives its source . . . We must hold, therefore, that we have now those very ancient scriptures which Moses and the other prophets published, although we have not, perhaps, precisely the same forms and shapes of the letters” (taken from Douglas W Taylor, “Pure Words, Preserved Words: The Doctrine of Providential Preservation,” *Australian Beacon* [July 1995]: 3).

3d. Dean John William Burgon

Burgon a graduate of Oxford and dean of Chichester whom we quoted above on Bible inspiration has this to say about preservation: “If you and I believe that the original writings of the Scriptures were verbally inspired by God, then of necessity they must have been *providentially preserved* through the ages” (taken from Jack Moorman, *Modern Bibles—the Dark Secret* [Los Osos CA: Fundamental Evangelistic Association, nd], 41).

5c. Arguments for Preservation

1d. Preservation of the OT

1e. Jesus Confirmed the Preservation of the OT

We know that the OT was providentially preserved down through the ages because Jesus Himself said so. We can infer from Jesus’ words in Matt 5:18 that every jot and tittle of the OT up till His time was faithfully transmitted and preserved without error. He considered the 39 OT books He had, comprising the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings, to be the inspired Word of God (Matt 4:4, Luke 24:27, 24:44).

2e. Faithful Scholars Affirmed the Preservation of the OT

1f. Dr Edward F Hills on Preservation

“During His earthly life the Lord Jesus Christ appealed unreservedly to the very words of the Old Testament text (Matt 22:42-45; John 10:34-36), thus indicating His confidence that this text had been accurately transmitted. ... [In Matt 5:18, and Luke 16:17] our Lord assures us that the Old Testament text in common use among the Jews during His earthly ministry was an absolutely trustworthy reproduction of the original text written by Moses and the other inspired authors. Nothing had been lost from that text. ...

“Moreover, our Saviour’s statements are also promises that the providential preservation of the Old Testament text shall never cease or fail. That same Old

Testament text which was preserved in its purity during the Old Testament dispensation shall continue to be faithfully preserved during the New Testament dispensation until this present world is brought to an end . . . The true Old Testament text shall be preserved in the Church *till all be fulfilled*. So our Lord has promised, and today the Holy Spirit gives to all true believers the assurance that their Saviour has kept and will keep His promise. As the believer reads the extant text of the Old Testament Scriptures, the Holy Spirit prepares his heart to receive its message with confidence and to recognize with gladness that the Old Testament as it exists today is a trustworthy reproduction of the Old Testament text that was first written down by inspired authors and then used by Jesus in the days of His earthly ministry” (*Believing Bible Study*, 6-7).

2f. Dr Robert Dick Wilson on Preservation

“The results of those 30 years’ study which I have given to the text has been this: I can affirm that there’s not a page of the Old Testament in which we need have any doubt. We can be absolutely certain that substantially we have the text of the Old Testament that Christ and the Apostles had and which was in existence from the beginning” (*Which Bible?*, 1st ed, 80-1, cited by Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, 35).

2d. Preservation of the NT

Dean J W Burgon wrote of the preservation of the NT through the multitude of manuscript copies: “The provision, then which the Divine Author of Scripture is found to have made for the preservation of His written Word, is of a peculiarly varied and highly complex description, First—By causing that a vast multiplication of Copies should be required all down the ages,—beginning at the earliest period, and continuing in an ever-increasing ratio until the actual invention of Printing,—He provided the most effectual security imaginable against fraud. True, that millions of the copies so produced have long since perished; but it is nevertheless a plain fact that there survive of the Gospels alone upwards of one thousand copies in the present day” (*Revision Revised* [Collingswood NJ: Dean Burgon Society Press, nd], 8-9).

3d. Shakespeare, the Bible, and Preservation

John Lea compared the Bible with Shakespeare’s writings, and had this to say, “It seems strange that the text of Shakespeare, which

has been in existence less than two hundred and eight years, should be far more uncertain and corrupt than that of the New Testament, now over eighteen centuries old, during nearly fifteen of which it existed only in manuscript. ... With perhaps a dozen or twenty exceptions, the text of every verse in the New Testament may be said to be so far settled by general consent of scholars, that any dispute as to its readings must relate rather to the interpretation of the words than to any doubts respecting the words themselves. But in every one of Shakespeare's thirty-seven plays there are probably a hundred readings still in dispute, a large portion of which materially affects the meaning of the passages in which they occur" (taken from Josh McDowell, *Evidence that Demands a Verdict* [San Bernadino CA: Campus Crusade for Christ,], 19-20).

6c. The Textus Receptus and Bible Preservation

1d. Basic Steps of Bible Preservation

"The defense of the Textus Receptus, therefore, is a necessary part of the defense of Protestantism. It is entailed by the logic of faith, the basic steps of which are as follows:

1e. "First, the Old Testament text was preserved by the Old Testament priesthood and the scribes and scholars that grouped themselves around that priesthood (Deut. 31:24-26).

2e. "Second, the New Testament text has been preserved by the universal priesthood of believers, by faithful Christians in every walk of life (1 Peter 2:9).

3e. "Third, the Traditional Text, found in the vast majority of the Greek New Testament manuscripts, is the True Text because it represents the God-guided usage of this universal priesthood of believers.

4e. "Fourth, the first printed text of the Greek New Testament was not a blunder or a set-back but a forward step in the providential preservation of the New Testament. Hence the few significant departures of that text from the Traditional Text are only God's providential corrections of the Traditional Text in those few places in which such corrections were needed.

5e. "Fifth, through the usage of Bible-believing Protestants God placed the stamp of His approval on this printed text, and it became the Textus Receptus (Received Text)" (Hills, *King James Version Defended*, 193).

2d. Textus Receptus Editors and Providential Guidance

“Hence, as orthodox Protestant Christians, we believe that the formation of the Textus Receptus was guided by the special providence of God. There were three ways in which the editors of the Textus Receptus, Erasmus, Stephanas, Beza, and the Elzevirs, were providentially guided.

1e. “In the first place, they were guided by the manuscripts which God in His providence had made available to them.

2e. “In the second place, they were guided by the providential circumstances in which they found themselves.

3e. “Then in the third place, and most of all they were guided by the common faith. Long before the Protestant Reformation, the God-guided usage of the Church had produced throughout Western Christendom a *common faith* concerning the New Testament text, namely, a general belief that the currently received New Testament text, primarily the Greek text and secondarily the Latin text, was the True New Testament Text which had been preserved by God’s special providence. It was this common faith that guided Erasmus and the other early editors of the Textus Receptus” (Ibid.)

7c. Recommended Reading: Edward F Hills, *The King James Version Defended* (Des Moines IA: The Christian Research Press, 1984), 90-111; *Way of Life Encyclopedia of the Bible and Christianity*, sv “Preservation—Bible.”

5b. The Translation of the Bible

1c. Westminster Confession on Translation

God originally gave the Old Testament in Hebrew/Aramaic, and the New Testament in Greek. “But because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God, who have right unto, and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded, in the fear of God, to read and search them, therefore *they are to be translated into the vulgar (ie “common,” or “vernacular”)* language of every nation unto which they come, that, the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship Him in an acceptable manner; and, through patience and comfort of Scriptures, may have hope” (I.VIIIb).

2c. The Bible in World Languages

The Almanac of the Christian World (1991-2 ed) has the following Bible translation statistics: (1) Bible Portions: 899 languages, (2) Testaments: 715, and (3) Complete Bibles: 314. We thank the Lord for the translation of His Word into so many languages of the world. This is surely in partial fulfillment of Christ’s Great Commission to His Church in Matt 28:18-20.

However, the Church must be concerned not just in the *quantity* of translations but also in the *quality* of translation. The quality of translation has to do with translational methodology.

3c. Methods of Translation

1d. Formal Equivalence Method

This is the literal approach which translates the words of the original language into *the equivalent words* of the receptor language. It is a word-for-word translation. The Scripture itself employs this method of translation. Matt 1:23 translates the Hebrew עִמָּנוּ אֵל (*Immanu El*) in Isa 7:14 as Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός (*Meth' hemon ho theos*), literally, "God with us." Another example is Ps 22:1 אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֵי לַמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי (transliterated "*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani*" in Matt 27:46) which is translated by Matthew as Θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

The formal equivalence method of translation is the only acceptable method of translation for the Holy Scriptures because of the Scripture's verbally inspired nature. Since every word of the Bible is inspired of God, it goes without saying that a translation of His Word must be done as literally as possible, reproducing accurately in the receptor language what is written in the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts. The operating principle of this method of translation is "as literal as possible, as free as necessary." In other words, it is not an interlinear or woodenly literal approach. This philosophy of translation has been the standard for most Bible translators throughout the centuries. But today, we are introduced to a new approach called the dynamic equivalence method.

2d. Dynamic Equivalence Method

G W and D E Anderson—editorial consultants of the Trinitarian Bible Society—commented, "In recent years, however, there has arisen a group of scholars who no longer believe in the importance, and often the inerrancy and inspiration, of the individual words of Scripture. These men believe instead that it is the thoughts or the truth behind the words that is important. ... This view is called the dynamic view of Scripture; transferred into the realm of translation, this is referred to as dynamic equivalence. The aim in dynamic equivalence translation is not word-for-word accuracy, but thought-for-thought equivalence."

The dynamic approach is thus not really Bible translation, but Bible *interpretation*. The meaning of the text is no longer solely dependent on the original text itself, it is now also made dependent on the thinking of the translator. In dynamic equivalency, it is "the translator's job is to create a lively Bible by his clever rephrasing of Scripture into colloquial language. 'Equivalency no longer means that

the translator strives as perfectly as possible for an equal transfer of the words and structure of the original. Rather, the emphasis is on a general equivalency, with the translator having great freedom to restate, change, add to, and take away from the original writings” (David W Cloud, *Dynamic Equivalency: Death Knell of Pure Scripture* [Oak Harbor WA: Way of Life Literature, nd], 4).

How does the dynamic equivalence method work? A revealing example may be found in the *Good News For Modern Man* or the *Today's English Version* (1966): By using the dynamic equivalence method, the TEV leaves out the word 'blood' (Gk: *haima*) in no less than 10 places when it refers to the blood of Christ (Acts 20:28; Rom 3:25, 5:9; Eph 1:7, 2:13; Col 1:14, 20; 1 Pet 1:19; Rev 1:5, 5:9). In the name of dynamic equivalence, they have changed what is specifically and literally “blood” to “death,” or some other word. 1 Peter 1:18-19 reads: “Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.” It is important for us to understand that we are not simply saved by the death of Christ, but the death of Christ which involves the shedding of His precious blood. If Jesus had died by drowning or strangulation, His death would be of no value. The blood is a very important element in the doctrine of the atonement. “There is a fountain filled with blood, drawn from Immanuel’s veins, and sinners plunged beneath that flood, lose all their guilty stains.” By removing the word “blood” in those places, the TEV has effectively taken away the significance of the blood of Christ for our salvation.

4c. William Tyndale on Accurate Translating

“I call God to record against the day we shall appear before our Lord Jesus, to give a reckoning of our doings, that *I never altered one syllable of God's Word* against my conscience, nor would this day, if all that is in the earth, whether it be pleasure, honour, or riches, might be given me.”

3a. The Greek Text of the New Testament

The heat of the debate over the Bible versions has to do primarily with the Greek Text. The KJV is based on the Traditional Text, while most modern versions are based on the Critical Text. Till today, there are two clear-cut attitudes toward the Greek Text: (1) the Pro-Critical/Westcott-Hort Text attitude, and (2) the Pro-Traditional/Received Text attitude. There are a lot of differences between these two texts and attitudes. Which Greek Text best represents the apostolic autographs? Is it the Traditional Text or the Critical Text? Which attitude faithfully promotes a reverent and faithful study of the Scriptures?

1b. The Manuscript Text-type

Generally speaking, the extant NT manuscripts fall into 2 broad categories:

1c. Byzantine Text-type

This Text-type is also called the Traditional Text or the Majority Text. It is called perjoratively the Syrian Text by Westcott and Hort. This text family is found in the majority of the manuscripts. It is the text-type on which the Textus Receptus or Received Text is based. More than 90% of extant manuscripts agree with the TR. This is the text which underlies the KJV.

2c. Alexandrian Text-type

The text family is numerically small. Chiefly represented by the Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus which are allegedly the earliest and most reliable manuscripts we have today. This is the text on which the modern translations, like the NIV, are based.

2b. The Critical Text

This Text is also called the Westcott-Hort Text, the Neutral Text, or the Eclectic Text, and is represented in published form by the United Bible Societies' *Greek New Testament* edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M Martini, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren (UBSGNT), and the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* (NA).

How did this Text come about? G W Anderson offers a succinct introduction: "During the 19th and 20th centuries . . . another form of Greek New Testament has come into the forefront and is used for most modern New Testament translations. This Critical Text, as it is called, differs widely from the Traditional Text in that it omits many words, verses and passages which are found in the Received Text and translations based upon it.

"The modern versions are based mainly upon a Greek New Testament which was derived from a small handful of Greek manuscripts from the 4th century onwards. Two of these manuscripts, which many modern scholars claim to be superior to the Byzantine are the Sinai manuscript and the Vatican manuscript (c. 4th century). These are derived from a text type known as the Alexandrian text (because of its origin in Egypt); this text type was referred to by the textual critics Westcott and Hort as the 'Neutral Text'. These two manuscripts form the basis of the Greek New Testament, referred to as the Critical Text, which has been in widespread use since the late 19th century. In recent years there has been an attempt to improve this text by calling it an 'eclectic text' (meaning that many other manuscripts were consulted in its editing and evolution), but it is still a text which has as its central foundation these two manuscripts" (*The Greek New Testament*, [London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1994], 2).

1c. The Alexandrian Manuscripts

These manuscripts originate from the Egyptian capital city of Alexandria. Alexandria is mentioned in Acts 6:9 where Stephen debated with the Jews from Alexandria who questioned the deity of Christ, and in Acts 18:24 we are introduced to Apollos who, though highly educated and knowledgeable of the OT, had a very shallow understanding of who Christ

really was, and had to be taught and corrected by a Christian lay couple—Aquila and Priscilla. The Scripture seems not to place Alexandria in a good light. In the 4th century, Arius, a pastor in Alexandria, denied the eternity of Christ, and taught that Jesus had a beginning by misinterpreting the term “only begotten” (John 1:14,18, 3:16). There was at least one shining testimony in Alexandria, namely, Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, who opposed Arius and his heresy.

1d. Codex Sinaiticus (§)

1e. “In the year 1844, ... in quest of manuscripts, Tischendorf reached the Convent of St. Catherine, on Mount Sinai. Here observing some old-looking documents in a basketful of papers ready for lighting the stove, he picked them out, and discovered . . . a complete New Testament, a large portion of the Septuagint, the Epistle of St. Barnabas, and a fragment of the Shepherd of Hermas. After this, he was allowed to copy the manuscript, and the Codex was in course of time presented to the Emperor. ...

“Before the discovery of this [so called] important manuscript, Tischendorf had issued seven editions of his Greek Testament. ... The eighth edition was constructed with the help of the newly discovered Sinaitic manuscript (§) and his attachment to the treasure that he had rescued proved too much for him. He altered his seventh edition in no less than 3,369 instances, generally in compliance with the Sinaitic copy, ‘to the scandal,’ as Dr. Scrivener justly remarks, ‘of the science of Comparative Criticism, as well as his own discredit for discernment and accuracy.’ . . . we cannot regard him [Tischendorf] as a man of sober and solid judgment. His zigzag course does not impress us with the soundness of any position upon which he found himself throughout it” (Edward Miller, *A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* [Collingswood NJ: Dean Burgon Society, 1979 reprint], 24-5).

2e. “Note that this manuscript, which has so powerfully influenced the men who developed modern textual critical theories, was discovered in a waste paper basket in an Orthodox monastery. Even the benighted monks dwelling in this demonically oppressed place counted it only worthy of burning! Dr. James Qurollo observes, ‘I don’t know which of them had the truer evaluation of its worth—Tischendorf, who wanted to buy it, or the monks, who were getting ready to burn it!’

“It is important to note that the Sinaiticus shows plain evidence of corruption. Dr. F.H.A. Scrivener, who published in 1864 *A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus*, testified: ‘The Codex is covered with alterations of an obviously correctional character—brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of

them systematically spread over every page, ... many of these being contemporaneous with the first writer” (David W Cloud, *Modern Versions Founded Upon Apostasy* [Oak Harbor WA: Way of Life Literature, 1995], 17).

2d. Codex Vaticanus (B)

1e. “As its name shows, [the Vaticanus] is in the Great Vatican Library at Rome, which has been its home since some date before 1481. ... A correspondent of Erasmus in 1533 sent that scholar a number of selected readings from it, ... Napoleon carried the manuscript off as a prize of victory to Paris, where it remained till 1815, when the many treasures of which he had despoiled the libraries of the Continent were returned to their respective owners. ... In 1843 Tischendorf, after waiting for several months, was allowed to see it for six hours. ... In 1845 . . . Tregelles was allowed indeed to see it but not to copy a word. His pockets were searched before he might open it, and all writing materials were taken away. Two clerics stood beside him and snatched away the volume if he looked too long at any passage! . . . In 1866 Tischendorf once more applied for permission to edit the MS., but with difficulty obtained leave to examine it for the purpose of collating difficult passages. ... Renewed entreaty procured him six days’ longer study, making in all fourteen days of three hours each; and by making in all fourteen days of three hours each; and by making the very most of his time Tischendorf was able in 1867 to publish the most perfect edition of the manuscript which had yet appeared. An improved Roman edition appeared in 1868-81. . . .” (Frederic Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, 4th ed [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939], 138-9).

2e. “Kenyon’s idea that Tischendorf could publish a satisfactory edition of Vaticanus after having examined it for only 42 hours under the above conditions must be some sort of joke! Even the so-called improved edition was carelessly produced, as a number of textual scholars have pointed out” (Cloud, *Modern Versions Founded Upon Apostasy*, 19).

3e. “B and \aleph , have within the last twenty years established a tyrannical ascendancy over the imagination of the Critics, which can only be fitly spoken of as a blind superstition. It matters nothing that all four are discovered on careful scrutiny to differ essentially, not only from ninety-nine out of a hundred of the whole body of extant MSS. besides, but even *from one another*. This last circumstance, obviously fatal to their corporate pretensions, is unaccountably overlooked. And yet it admits of only one satisfactory explanation: viz. that *in different degrees* they all exhibit a fabricated text. Between the

first two (B and Ⓝ) there subsists an amount of sinister resemblance, which proves that they must have been derived at no very remote period from the same corrupt original. ... And be it remembered that the omissions, additions, substitutions, transpositions, and modifications, *are by no means the same* in both. It is in fact *easier to find two consecutive verses in which these two MSS. differ the one from the other, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree.*”

“Ⓝ B . . . are . . . most *scandalously corrupt copies extant*-- exhibit *the most shamefully mutilated* texts which are anywhere to be met with--have become by whatever process (for their history is wholly unknown), the depositories of the largest amount of *fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and intentional perversions of Truth*,--which are discoverable in any known copies of the Word of God” (J W Burgon, *The Revision Revised* [Collingswood NJ: Dean Burgon Society Press, 1883], 12,16).

4e. Proof of corruption

1f. Let me just cite one demonstration by Dean Burgon of the corruption in the 5 uncials Westcott-Hort considered to be most reliable. These 5 uncials are codices: (1) Sinaiticus (Ⓝ), (2) Alexandrinus (A), (3) Vaticanus (B), (4) Ephraemi Rescriptus (C), and (5) Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D). The passage being examined is the Lord’s Prayer in Luke 11:2-4. The results are as follows:

1g. D inserts Matt 7:7, “Use not vain repetitions as the rest: for some suppose that they shall be heard by their much speaking. But when ye pray . . .”.

2g. B and Ⓝ removed 5 words “Our,” and “which art in heaven.”

3g. D omits the definite article “the” before “name,” adds “upon us,” and rearranges “Thy Kingdom.”

4g. B removes the clause, “Thy will be done, as in heaven, also on the earth.” Interestingly, Ⓝ retains these words, but adds “so” before “also,” and omits the article before “earth” agreeing for once with A, C, and D.

5g. Ⓝ and D changed the form of the Greek word for “give.”

6g. ⊞ omits definite article before “day by day.”

7g. D, instead of the 3 last-named words, writes “this day” (from Matt), substitutes “debts” for “sins” (also from Matt), and in place of “for we ourselves” writes “as also we” (again from Matt).

8g. ⊞ shows great sympathy with D by accepting two-thirds of this last blunder, exhibiting “as also [we] ourselves.”

9g. D consistently read “our debtors” in place of “every one that is indebted to us.”

10g. B and ⊞ canceled the last petition “but deliver us from evil,” going against A, C, and D.

2f. Dean Burgon wrote, “So then, these five ‘first-class authorities’ are found to throw themselves into *six different combinations* in their departures from S. Luke’s way of exhibiting the Lord’s Prayer,—which, among them, they contrive to falsify in respect of no less than 45 words; and yet *they are never able to agree among themselves as to any single various reading*: while *only once* are more than two of them observed to stand together,—viz. in the unauthorized omission of the article. In respect of 32 (out of the 45) words, *they bear in turn solitary evidence*. What need to declare that it is *certainly false* in every instance? Such however is the infatuation of the Critics, that the vagaries of B are all taken for gospel. Besides omitting the 11 words which B omits jointly with ⊞, Drs. Westcott and Hort erase from the Book of Life those other 11 precious words which are omitted by B only. And in this way it comes to pass that the mutilated condition to which the scalpel of Marcion the heretic reduced the Lord’s Prayer some 1730 years ago, (for mischief can all be traced back to *him!*), is palmed off on the Church of England by the Revisionists as the work of the Holy Ghost!” (*Revision Revised*, 34-6).

2c. The Westcott-Hort Text

1d. Their Critical Edition of the Greek NT

1e. Origin and Nature of the Critical Text

“The year 1881 was marked by the publication of the most noteworthy [untrustworthy] critical edition of the Greek Testament ever produced by British scholarship. Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901), and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-92) issued two volumes entitled, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. [By] utilizing previous collections of variant readings, they refined the critical methodology developed by Griesbach, Lachmann [German modernists], and others, and applied it rigorously, but with discrimination, to the witnesses to the text of the New Testament. . . The [so-called] Neutral Text is, in the opinion of Westcott and Hort, most free from later corruption and mixture, and comes nearest to the text of the autographs. It is best represented by codex Vaticanus (B), and next by codex Sinaiticus (S). [According to them] the concurrence of these two manuscripts are very strong, and cannot be far from the original text” (Bruce Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2d ed [New York: Oxford University Press, 1968], 129, 133; words in parenthesis mine).

2e. Problems in the Critical Text

1f. Many verses and passages found in the writings of the Church Fathers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries are missing in the Alexandrian manuscripts of the Critical Text. What is significant is that these readings absent in the Alexandrian manuscripts are found in the majority of manuscripts which date from the 5th century onwards. One example is Mark 16:9-20. This passage is cited by early Church Fathers Irenaeus and Hippolytus (2nd century), and is in almost every manuscript of Mark’s Gospel from AD 500 onwards, but missing in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

2f. The Critical Text differs from the Traditional Text in over 5,000 places. The Vaticanus omits 2,877 words in the gospels, and the Sinaiticus, even more, 3455. “Westcott and Hort, published their Greek text that rejected the *Textus Receptus* in 5,604 places. . . This included 9,970 Greek words that were either added, subtracted, or changed from the *Textus Receptus*. This involves, on the average, 15.4 words per page in the Greek New Testament, or a total of 45.9 pages in all. It is 7% of the total of 140,521 words in the *Textus*

Receptus Greek New Testament (Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, 40). These omissions do affect doctrine and faith. For example, the Critical Text omits the deity of Christ in 1 Tim 3:16: WH:

“Ὁς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί (NIV: “He appeared in a body”); TR: Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί (KJV: “God was manifest in the flesh”).

Dean Burgon has convincingly proven that the manuscripts Westcott and Hort hailed to be almost like the autographs are among the most corrupt copies of the NT in existence (for in-depth study, read J W Burgon, *The Revision Revised: A Refutation of Westcott and Hort’s False Greek Text and Theory* [Collingswood NJ: Dean Burgon Society Press, nd], 1-110). The Revised Version (1881) was substantially based on the Westcott-Hort Text. The RV has not stood the test of time. Although still printed by Cambridge University Press, it is no longer popular.

2d. Their Textual Critical Theory

1e. Premise of the Critical Theory

The basic premise of Westcott and Hort’s theory of textual criticism is that the oldest manuscripts are the most accurate or reliable. “In the 1860’s the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus became available to Biblical scholars, and in 1881 Westcott and Hort advanced the theory that the New Testament text was preserved in an almost perfect state in these two fourth century manuscripts. ...

“Westcott and Hort devised an elaborate theory, based more on imagination and intuition than upon evidence, elevating this little group of MSS to the heights of almost infallible authority. Their treatise on the subject and their edition of the Greek N.T. exercised a powerful and far-reaching influence, not only on the next generation of students and scholars, but also indirectly upon the minds of millions who have had neither the ability, nor the time, nor the inclination to submit the theory to a searching examination” (*The Divine Original* [London: Trinitarian Bible Society, nd], 4).

In their own words, Westcott and Hort theorised, “it is our belief (1) that readings of \aleph B should be accepted as the true readings until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary, and (2) that no readings of \aleph B can safely be rejected absolutely, ... especially where they receive no support from Versions or Fathers” (B F Westcott and F J A Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek* [New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882], 225).

Based on their theory that \aleph and B are superior, they omit such precious passages as the *pericope de adultera* (John 7:53-8:11), the last twelve verses of Mark, and the Johannine *comma* (1 John 5:7f). In fact, the number of verses taken out of the Bible amounts to that of 1-2 Peter.

2e. Critique of the Critical Theory

There is a fundamental error in Westcott and Hort's textual critical theory. The error lies in "the assumption that the reliability of these 4th century documents was in proportion to their age. There were no doubt bad copies in every age, some corrupted by accident, some by ignorance and some by design. These two exhibit the most amazing number of incorrect readings.

"These two MSS and a few others containing a similar text present in a weakened form many of the passages of Holy Scripture which speak most plainly of the deity of the Son of God. The trend of Biblical scholarship in the 19th and 20th centuries has been towards a 'humanitarian' view of the person of Christ. It does not surprise us that many modern scholars should welcome the support of these two ancient documents, but it saddens us to see so many earnest evangelical Christians ready to accept without question a theory so destructive of the faith once delivered to the saints.

"In the words of a great 19th century scholar, 'To cast away at least nineteen-twentieths of the evidence, and to draw conclusions from the petty remainder is not less than a crime and a sin, not only by reasons of the sacrilegious destructiveness exercised upon the Holy Scriptures, but because such a treatment is inconsistent with conscientious exhaustiveness and logical method.'

"The Sinai and Vatican manuscripts represent a small family of documents containing various readings which the Church as a whole rejected before the end of the 4th century. Under the singular care and providence of God more reliable MSS were multiplied and copied from generation to generation, and the great majority of existing MSS exhibit a faithful reproduction of the true text which was acknowledged by the entire Greek Church in the Byzantine period A.D. 312-1453. This text was also represented by the small group of documents available to Erasmus, Stephens, the compilers of the Complutensian edition of other 16th century editors. This text is represented by the Authorised Version and other Protestant translations up to the latter part of the 19th century" (*The Divine Original*, 5).

3d. Their Heretical Beliefs

1e. Denial of the Historicity of the Creation Account

1f. Hort supported Darwin's theory of evolution: "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" (Hort, *Life*, I:416).

2f. Westcott believed the first 3 chapters of Genesis to be mythical: "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" (Westcott, *Life*, I:78).

2e. Denial of the Sole Mediatorship of Christ

1f. Hort acknowledged the worship of Mary is legitimate: "I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus'-worship have very much in common in their causes and their results" (Hort, *Life*, II:50).

2f. Westcott took delight in Mary-worship and idolatry: "After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighbouring hill. ... Fortunately we found the door opened. It is very small, with one kneeling place; and behind a screen was a 'Pieta' the size of life (ie a Virgin and dead Christ). ... Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours" (Westcott, *Life*, I:81).

3c. The Eclectic Text

With the entrance of the Westcott-Hort (WH) edition of the Greek NT, the foundation of the systematic corruption of the Bible has been laid. Since that time, Bible scholars echo Westcott and Hort. [Sad to say, among them are evangelicals, even fundamentalists. They may have done so unwittingly. I trust they will turn around if they will carefully evaluate what Dean Burgon, hitherto neglected, had written, and humbly allow the Spirit to guide them to know which is really God's Word kept intact.] They say that the TR/KJV is unreliable and outdated. We need new translations of the Bible. Among other lesser known ones, the Revised Standard Version (RSV, 1952), New American Standard Bible (NASB, 1971), and New International Version (NIV, 1978) have been the key players in following the WH philosophy of

textual criticism and Bible translation. Now, on which Greek NT edition was the RSV, NASB, and NIV based? Were they based on the WH tradition or on the TR?

1d. Influence of Westcott and Hort on Modern Evangelical Scholarship

1e. Harold Greenlee commented, “All things considered, the influence of W-H upon all subsequent work in the history of the text has never been equalled. ... With the work of Westcott and Hort the T.R. was at last vanquished . . . [and] the textual theory of W-H underlies virtually all subsequent work in N.T. textual criticism” (*Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* [Grand Rapids MI: Wm B Eerdmans, 1964], 77-8).

2e. D A Carson confessed, “the vast majority of evangelical scholars . . . hold that in the basic textual theory Westcott and Hort were right, and that the church stands greatly in their debt” (*The King James Version Debate* [Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1979], 75).

2d. Legacy of Westcott and Hort in Modern Editions of the Greek NT

Unable to refute the arguments leveled against the WH text and theory, anti-KJVists attempt to distance themselves from WH by arguing that modern English translations are not based on WH. One NIV-advocate for instance pointed out that the NIV is not based on the WH text but an “eclectic” text. It is true that the NIV claims to be based on a so-called eclectic text: “The Greek text used in translating the New Testament was an eclectic one. ... Where existing manuscripts differ, the translators made their choice of readings according to accepted principles of New Testament textual criticism. ... The best current printed texts of the Greek New Testament were used” (NIV “Preface”).

The NIV translators say they use an eclectic text, and then a few sentences down, they say that the best current printed Greek NT texts were used. Questions: (1) What is the eclectic text? Who edited and published this text? (2) Which are the best current printed texts of the Greek NT? (3) Is the eclectic text actually the best current printed texts of the Greek NT? And (4) what “accepted” principles of NT textual criticism did they employ?

It will be seen that the NIV (representative of the modern versions) has its roots in the WH text and textual critical theory. As admitted in the NIV preface, the best printed editions of the Greek NT available today were used; the “best ones” in their view being those published by the United Bible Societies and Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. These are the “scholarly” editions. The other printed

edition of the Greek NT is none other than the venerable *Textus Receptus* which modern scholars, parroting WH, consider inferior.

1e. The United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (UBSGNT)

The UBSGNT is founded on the WH text. The preface to its first edition states, "The Committee carried out its work . . . on the basis of Westcott and Hort's edition of the Greek New Testament." It is significant to note that the 1st and 2nd editions relegated John 7:53-8:11 from its original and traditional place, to the end of the Gospel. This to show that the passage is considered non-authentic. This clearly reveals a WH attitude in accepting without question the testimony of \aleph and B which do not have the pericope of the woman taken in adultery. The 3rd edition however transposed "the pericope John 7.53-8.11 from the end of the Gospel to its traditional location, with the double brackets retained." Perhaps the editors are now admitting their error in rejecting the pericope. In any case, the double brackets are retained. What do these double brackets mean? "Double brackets in the text indicate that the enclosed passages which are usually rather extensive, are known not to be a part of the original text" (Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Matthew Black, Carlo M Martini, Bruce M Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds, *The Greek New Testament*, 4th rev ed [Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994]). They still refuse to accept the authenticity of the pericope.

2e. The Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament (NA)

The NA is exactly the same as the UBSGNT except for its fuller critical apparatus. It is said the UBSGNT is meant for the translator, while the NA for the exegete (NA27, 45*). The NA like the UBSGNT owes a great deal to the WH text: "It is well known how he [Eberhard Nestle] compared the editions of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Weymouth" (Ibid, 44*). Nestle himself admits that his text is heavily influenced by Westcott and Hort. The "origin of the text itself was clearly traceable . . . particularly in passages where the special theories of Westcott-Hort had dominant influence in its formation" (NA26, 39). It is thus no surprise that Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11 are also assigned double brackets to indicate their non-genuineness as in the UBSGNT.

3d. Vestiges of Westcott and Hort in Modern Versions of the English Bible

1e. NIV-advocates say that it is erroneous to connect the NIV with Westcott and Hort. To do so invites the ridicule of

engaging in scholarship of the “Steamship Age.” Are KJV supporters really so out of touch with the so-called advances of Biblical scholarship? Actually, to say that the NIV is not influenced whatsoever by Westcott-Hort is denial at its height. Gordon Fee, though a TR/KJV opponent, honestly confessed that “*all* subsequent critical texts [ie UBSGNT, NA] look far more *like WH* than like the TR” (“The Textual Criticism of the New Testament,” in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed Frank E Gaebelein [Grand Rapids MI: Regency Reference Library, 1979], I:428). And it is on such critical texts that the modern versions are based. G W Anderson of The Trinitarian Bible Society in his booklet—*The Greek Text of the New Testament*—has rightly observed, “In recent years there has been an attempt to improve this text by calling it an ‘eclectic’ text (meaning that many other manuscripts were consulted in its editing and evolution), but *it is still a text which has as its central foundation these two manuscripts* [ie, \aleph and B].”

2e. In actual fact, the usage of the term “eclectic” to apply to a text is a misnomer. Actually there is no such thing as an Eclectic Text, but an Eclectic *Method*. What is this method all about? Harry A Sturz explains and critiques, “This method endeavors to have no favorite manuscript and no preferred type of text. ... [However] the eclectic approach, though quite objective in the sense of being willing to consider all readings, is admittedly very subjective in that much depends on the personal element in the evaluation of the evidence. ... textual scholars have given lip-service . . . but in practice they do not appear to carry out the theory or the method with consistency, especially with regard to the consideration of Byzantine [Majority Text] readings. Therefore, for all practical purposes, because of the low esteem in which the text is still held by most critics, a Byzantine reading does not generally receive much consideration even under the eclectic method” (*The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Criticism* [Nashville TN: Thomas Nelson, 1984], 16-8).

3e. Gordon Fee, who is anti-TR/KJV, himself corrected this confusion: “[In] Modern textual criticism, the ‘eclecticism’ of the UBS, RSV, NIV, NASB etc., ... *recognizes that Westcott-Hort’s view of things was essentially correct*, but it is not nearly so confident as they that the early text of Alexandria is ‘neutral’.” It is thus clear that Westcott and Hort continue to have an hypnotic hold on modern-day textual critics and Bible translators in terms of their textual critical thinking. Following the lead of Westcott and Hort, the NIV translators took a low view of the Traditional Text having scissored out many precious verses of the Bible. Such an attitude is reflected by J Harold Greenlee who wrote, “the general impression which is

given by readings which are characteristically Byzantine is that they are inferior and not likely to be original” (*Introduction to New Testament Criticism*, 91).

4e. Although later editions of the critical text did attempt to move away from the WH text toward an “eclectic” text, it is evident that the vestiges of WH remain. The textual critical methodology of WH for the most part are still being employed by these modern editors. For example, the UBSGNT editors are absolutely certain that the *pericope de adultera* (John 7:53-8:11) is not a part of the Gospel. What is their basis? They say, “the passage is absent from the earlier and better manuscripts” (ie Vaticanus and Sinaiticus among other like ones). Note that the same comment against the authenticity of John 7:53-8:11 is found in modern versions like the NIV: the NIV has this note above the passage, “[The earliest and most reliable manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have John 7:53-8:11.]” So how can it be concluded that the NIV for instance is not based on WH? Other examples are the last 12 verses of Mark, and 1 John 5:7-8. All decisions made have been consistently against the TR and KJV. We will discuss more about the authenticity of the above passages later on.

4c. The Editors of the Critical Text

It is unfortunate that evangelical and fundamentalist scholars have fallen prey to the views of Westcott and Hort. The masters of the WH tradition were primarily the liberal scholars. Alfred Martin, former vice-president of Moody Bible Institute, wrote, “At precisely the time when liberalism was carrying the field in the English churches the theory of Westcott and Hort received wide acclaim. There are not isolated facts. Recent contributions on the subject—that is, in the present century—following mainly the Westcott-Hort principles and method, have been made largely by men who deny the inspiration of the Bible” (“A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory,” ThD diss, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1951, 70). It is surprising then that evangelicals and fundamentalists are so gullible as to become their disciples. Men like A T Robertson, and B B Warfield have unwittingly fallen into the Westcott-Hort trap, leading many of their students into the same. Terence Brown, ex-secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society, said, “Many liberal and evangelical scholars alike embraced the basic theory of Westcott and Hort and in a very short period, through the colleges, schools and pulpits of the English-speaking world, the theory became embedded in the minds of many, as if it were a proved and demonstrated fact” (“What is Wrong with the Modern Versions of the Holy Scriptures?”, Trinitarian Bible Society, article #41).

David Cloud tells us of the unbelief and apostasy of the editors of the critical/eclectic text in his book—*Modern Versions Founded Upon Apostasy* (Oak Harbor WA: Way of Life Literature, 1995), 42-50.

1d. Carlo M Martini (1908-)

Martini is the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Milan. He is Professor of NT Textual Criticism at the Pontifical Bible Institute in Rome. *TIME* Magazine (Dec 26, '96) listed him as a possible candidate in line for the papacy. Another *TIME* article reported that Martini brought together 100 religious leaders from around the world to promote a new age, one-world religion.

2d. Eugene Nida (1914-)

Nida is the father of the dynamic equivalency theory of Bible translation. As to his view of Bible inspiration. Nida says, “. . . God’s revelation involved limitations. . . Biblical revelation is not absolute and all divine revelation is essentially incarnational. . . Even if a truth is given only in words, it has no real validity until it has been translated into life. . . The words are in a sense nothing in and of themselves. . . the word is void unless related to experience” (*Message and Mission*, 222-8). Nida’s view on the inspiration of the Bible is Barthianistic.

3d. Bruce Metzger (1914-)

Metzger is Professor of NT at Princeton Theological Seminary. He serves in the board of the American Bible Society and is the head of the ecumenical RSV/NRSV translation committee of the apostate National Council of Churches in USA. Metzger was also the chairman for the *Reader’s Digest Condensed Bible* or “the Butcher’s Bible” because 40% of the Bible has been “chopped off.” It is no surprise that the warning of Rev 22:18-19 has also been conveniently deleted in this Bible. Metzger is a modernist who denies the historicity of the book of Genesis, and the uniqueness of the Synoptic Gospels.

[Testimony: Metzger is looked up to by many evangelicals. I must say that I had a good dose of Metzger when I was a student at FEBC. One ex-FEBC lecturer in a course on NT Introduction used Metzger’s book on textual criticism as his text, and another who taught the Gospels and Acts quoted him favourably concerning the origin of the gospels. Grace Theological Seminary was where I earned my Master of Divinity degree. Looking at Grace, it was unfortunate that the Seminary in the late ‘80s invited Metzger to lecture to its students. Where is Grace Seminary today? It is no longer respected as a conservative/fundamentalist institution. Grace has done away with its highly prized ThM and ThD programmes. Its revised MDiv programme reflects a less stringent academic curriculum. The seminary has not enjoyed as much endorsement from fundamentalists as it once did, and things have not been looking up. There is a lesson to be learned!]

4d. Kurt Aland (1915-)

Kurt Aland and his wife Barbara are chief editors of the NA Greek NT. *Aland has an extremely low view of the TR and of the doctrine Biblical inspiration.* He said, “This idea of verbal inspiration (i.e., of the literal and inerrant inspiration of the text), which the orthodoxy of both Protestant traditions maintained so vigorously, was applied to the Textus Receptus with all of its errors, including textual modifications of an obviously secondary character (as we recognize them today)” (*The Problem of the New Testament Canon*, 6-7).

3b. The Traditional Text

What do we mean by the term “traditional text?” The Trinitarian Bible Society explains:

1c. The Byzantine/Majority Text

“During the first century following the resurrection of Christ, God moved men to pen His Word (2 Peter 1.21). The result was a group of letters and books, written in *Koine* Greek (called the ‘original autographs’). These letters and books were copied and recopied through the centuries and distributed throughout the world. These copies comprise the manuscripts of the New Testament. Over 5,000 of these Greek manuscripts have survived to this day. The great number of these Greek manuscripts supports what is called the Byzantine textual tradition, Byzantine because it came from all over the Greek-speaking world at that time. These Byzantine manuscripts make up what is called the Traditional Text of the New Testament” (G W Anderson, *The Greek New Testament* [England: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1994]).

2c. The Textus Receptus/Received Text

“The best printed representation of this Byzantine Text type is the Textus Receptus (or Received Text). In addition to the manuscripts, we also have available many works in which numerous Church Fathers quoted from the manuscripts. The work of John Burgon has established that the basic text used by numerous Church Fathers is the same as the text now known as the Byzantine Text.

“The Textus Receptus was compiled from a number of Byzantine manuscripts by numerous editors from the early 1500s. There were editions from textual editors such as Erasmus, Stephens, Beza, the Elzevir brothers, Mill and Scrivener. These editions differ slightly from one another but still are regarded as the same basic text. Certain editions were popular in different countries and provided the basis for New Testament translations. The Textus Receptus (as it later became known) was the text used by Tyndale and in turn by the translators of the English Authorised (King James) Version of 1611 and other Reformation era translations” (Ibid).

3c. The Preserved Text

In summary, the Traditional Text is called the Byzantine Text or the Majority Text. It is “Byzantine” because most of the manuscripts originate from the Byzantine empire (ie the empire that succeeded the Roman in about AD 300). Moreover, the majority of the extant manuscripts are of the Byzantine text-type. There are slightly over 5,000 extant Greek NT manuscripts, and 90% of them belong to this text-type. The Byzantine text finds “its chief representative: the Textus Receptus (TR). Most textual students of the New Testament would agree that the TR was made from a few medieval manuscripts, mostly Byzantine” (Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-Type*, 14). That is why Dean Burgon called it the “Traditional” text. Hills who took the same line as Burgon concluded, “therefore the Byzantine text found in the vast majority of the Greek New Testament manuscripts is that true text. To reject this view is to act unreasonably. It is to fly at the facts.” Hills continued by chiding those who reject the Majority Text, “Those who reject this orthodox view of the New Testament text have rejected not merely the facts but also the promise of Christ always to preserve the true New Testament text and the doctrines of the divine inspiration and providential preservation of the Scripture implied in this promise” (quoted by Sturz, *ibid*, 16). The Traditional Text is the text that was used by most of the churches for 1800 years till Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort came into the picture with their minority text. It can thus also be called the Preserved Text.

The Traditional or Preserved Text is superior because it (1) has been accepted by the churches at large, and (2) can be retraced in history to go all the way back to the original manuscripts of the Greek NT (Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, 40). D A Waite provides the following historical links of the Traditional/Preserved/Received Text (*Ibid*, 44-8):

- (1) All of the Apostolic Churches used the Received Text.
- (2) The churches in Palestine used the Received Text.
- (3) The Syrian Church at Antioch used the Received Text.
- (4) The Peshitta Syriac Version (150 AD) used the Received Text.
- (5) Papyrus #66 used the Received Text.
- (6) The Italic Church in Northern Italy (157 AD) used the Received Text.
- (7) The Gallic Church of Southern France (177 AD) used the Received Text.
- (8) The Celtic Church in Great Britain used the Received Text.
- (9) Church of Scotland and Ireland used the Received Text.
- (10) The Pre-Waldensian churches used the Received Text.
- (11) The Waldensians (120 AD and onward) used the Received Text.
- (12) The Gothic Version of the 4th century used the Received Text.
- (13) Codex W of Matthew in the 4th and 5th century used the Received Text.
- (14) Codex A in the Gospels (in the 5th century) used the Received Text.
- (15) The vast majority of extant New Testament manuscripts all used the Received Text. This includes about 99% of them, or about 5,210 of the 5,255 manuscripts.
- (16) The Greek Orthodox Church used the Received Text.
- (17) The present Greek Church still uses the Received Text.
- (18) The churches of the Reformation all used the Received Text.

- (19) The Erasmus Greek New Testament (1516) used the Received Text.
- (20) The Complutensian Polyglot (1522) used the Received Text.
- (21) Martin Luther's German Bible (1522) used the Received Text.
- (22) William Tyndale's Bible (1525) used the Received Text.
- (23) The French Version of Oliveton (1535) used the Received Text.
- (24) The Coverdale Bible (1535) used the Received Text.
- (25) The Matthews Bible (1537) used the Received Text.
- (26) The Taverners Bible (1539) used the Received Text.
- (27) The Great Bible (1539-41) used the Received Text.
- (28) The Stephanus Greek New Testament (1546-51) used the Received Text.
- (29) The Geneva Bible (1557-60) used the Received Text.
- (30) The Bishops' Bible (1568) used the Received Text.
- (31) The Spanish Version (1569) used the Received Text.
- (32) The Beza Greek New Testament (1598) used the Received Text.
- (33) The Czech Version (1602) used the Received Text.
- (34) The Italian Version of Diodati (1607) used the Received Text.
- (35) The King James Bible (1611) used the Received Text.
- (36) The Elziver Brothers' Greek New Testament (1624) used the Received Text.
- (37) The Received Text in the New Testament is the [Traditional] Text—the text that has survived in continuity from the beginning of the New Testament itself. It is the only accurate representation of the originals we have today!

4c. The "Jesus Papyrus" (Magdalen GR 17)

We have been repeatedly told that the oldest and most reliable manuscripts are the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus codices. They are the best representatives of the autographs. The falsity of this claim is evinced in the recent discovery of a papyrus called Magdalen GR 17 kept in Magdalen College, Oxford University. This is reported in the December 1996 issue of the Baptist Reformed Fellowship Journal. In his book—*The Jesus Papyrus*—published by Weidenfeld-Nicolson (England) and Doubleday (New York) Dr Carsten Peter Thiede wrote that the Magdalen GR 17 "is to be dated to a point within the lifetimes of eyewitnesses to Christ. ... This makes the 'Magdalen' papyrus one of the oldest known fragments of the new Testament, and 'one of the most important documents in the world.'" In other words, the papyrus can be dated to about AD 60 or earlier. He concluded this to be so based on the style of handwriting which was that of the mid-first century, similar to the manuscripts found at Qumran. Further, the papyrus was printed on both sides (ie front and back), a common printing-form of the 1st century AD.

The Magdalen GR17 consists of 3 small fragments, and is a portion of Matthew's Gospel (Matt 26:7-8, 26:10, 14-15, 22-23, 31-33). Among other things, what is significant is the Magdalen's bearing on the identification of the traditional text. Hereunder is the BRF report on "Papyrus Magdalen GR17 and the Textus Receptus":

"In the analysis of GR17 undertaken under the laser-scanning microscope, certain definite results concerning particular Greek letters that had originally been written on the GR17 were obtained which enabled the

researchers to conclude that the papyrus followed a certain form of textual reading. A comparison of this reading with the ‘Post-Westcott-Hort’ text of the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* indicated a salient difference.

“Authors Thiede and D’Ancona . . . point out that GR17 has, on the last 4 words of Matthew 26:22 a reading which is disparate from modern standard critical editions of the Greek New Testament which are of course, all ‘Westcott-Hort’ based eclectic text, the basis of all modern translations.

“It is apposite therefore at this point to compare GR17 with a ‘Westcott-Hort’ reading, and juxtapose both in parallel against the old Textus Receptus.”

St. Matthew 26:22 last 4 words

Westcott-Hort	λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕκαστος
Papyrus GR17	λέγειν αὐτῷ ἕκαστος αὐτῶν
Textus Receptus	λέγειν αὐτῷ ἕκαστος αὐτῶν

There is no need for you to know Greek in order to see the difference, and to note the significance. We have here a very early 1st century manuscript which agrees with the Textus Receptus over against the Westcott-Hort Text! This confirms Burgon’s observation all along—the Westcott-Hort Text is a corrupted text, the early age of its primary manuscripts notwithstanding.

4a. A Survey of English Bible Translations

The books referred to for this section were: (1) F F Bruce, *History of the Bible in English*, 3d ed (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Philip W Comfort, *The Complete Guide to Bible Versions* (Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1991); Jack P Lewis, *The English Bible from KJV to NIV: A History and Evaluation*, 2d ed (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991); and Laurence M Vance, *A Brief History of English Bible Translations* (Pensacola: Vance Publications, 1993).

In this study, we will attempt to familiarise ourselves with the major English Bible translations that have been produced. The KJV is really the watershed translation. As such we will divide our discussion on the English Bibles into 2 main periods: pre-KJV and post-KJV. There is significant difference between the versions that come before and those that come after the KJV.

1b. Pre-KJV Versions

1c. Wycliffe’s Translation

1d. John Wycliffe (c 1330-1384) was the most famous Oxford theologian of the 14th century.

2d. He was called “The morning star of the Reformation” for his attacks against the heresies of the Roman Catholic Church. The RCC has kept the people in spiritual darkness and bondage by keeping the Bible away from them.

3d. He was the first to translate the whole Bible into English. He did this to rescue the people from the tyranny of the Church of Rome. The translation was done not from the Hebrew and Greek, but from the Latin Bible—Jerome’s Vulgate.

4d. A group of pastors known as the Lollards used Wycliffe’s translation to read and preach the Word to the common folk.

2c. Tyndale’s Translation

1e. William Tyndale (1494-1536) studied the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures when he was at Oxford University.

2e. He completed translating the NT in 1525. 15,000 copies were printed and distributed in England.

3e. The Church of England then under the Roman Catholic Church refused to allow the people to read the English NT. For translating the Scriptures, the Church branded Tyndale a criminal. A warrant was issued for his arrest.

4e. In prison, he wrote this letter to the Marquis of Bergen, “I believe, right worshipful, that you are not unaware of what may have been determined concerning me. Wherefore I beg your lordship, and that by the Lord Jesus, that if I am to remain here through the winter, you will request the commissary to have the kindness to send me, from the goods of mine which he has, a warmer cap; for I suffer greatly from cold in the head, am afflicted by a perpetual catarrh, which is much increased in this cell; a warmer coat also, for this which I have is very thin; a piece of cloth too to patch my leggings. My overcoat is worn out; my shirts are also worn out. He has a woollen shirt, if he will be good enough to send it. I have also with him leggings of thicker cloth to put on above; he has also warmer night caps. And I ask to be allowed to have a lamp in the evening; it is indeed wearisome sitting alone in the dark. But most of all I beg and beseech your clemency to be urgent with the commissary that he will kindly permit me to have the Hebrew bible, Hebrew grammar, and Hebrew dictionary, that I may pass the time in that study. In return may you obtain what you most desire, provided that it be consistent with the salvation of your soul. But if any other decision has been taken concerning me, to be carried out before winter, I will be patient, abiding the will of God, to the glory of the grace of my Lord Jesus Christ, whose spirit (I pray) may ever direct your heart. Amen.”

5e. Tyndale was later condemned to death. He was strangled and burnt at the stake. His dying words were: “Lord, open the King of England’s eyes.”

3c. Coverdale's Translation

1d. Myles Coverdale (1488-1569) was a graduate of Cambridge University who became an Augustinian priest.

2d. Influenced by the Reformation movement, he broke away from the Roman Catholic Church. From England, he fled to the Continent where he found Tyndale and there helped Tyndale with his translation work.

3d. Coverdale continued Tyndale's work and completed translating the Old Testament. The whole Coverdale Bible was completed in 1535.

4d. By that time, the King of England had already broken all ties with Rome, and was eager to see an English Bible. Coverdale's Bible received the king's approval. Tyndale's prayer was answered; the Lord had opened the eyes of the king of England.

4c. The Great Bible

1d. In 1537, another Bible was published in England called the Matthew's Bible. It was the work of Thomas Matthew (1500-55) who was a friend of Tyndale.

2d. Thomas Matthew was not a translator but an editor of the Bible. He combined the Tyndale and Coverdale translations to form a complete Bible.

3d. Published in 1539, it received the king's authorisation for public use.

4d. It is called the Great Bible for its size and cost.

5d. The Great Bible was later revised in 1568 and became known as the Bishop's Bible.

5c. The Geneva Bible

1d. The persecution of the reformers by the Roman Catholic Church led many of them to seek refuge in Geneva. It was in the great city that William Whittingham (1524-79)—Calvin's brother-in-law, and Knox's successor as pastor of the English Church in Geneva—translated the NT in what was to become the Geneva Bible.

2d. Whittingham used the Textus Receptus (Stephanus' edition), and next to Tyndale became the version that had the most influence on the KJV.

- 3d. The study notes of the Geneva Bible was both Calvinistic and anti-Catholic.
- 4d. It became very popular with the people because it was inexpensive and handy.
- 5d. The King James Version eventually replaced the Geneva Bible.

2b. Post-KJV Versions

The KJV was the undisputed Bible of the English world since 1611. But a turning point came in the late 19th century. It was a period of time when theological liberalism was at its height. Not only were the fundamentals of the Christian Faith being attacked, but the Word of God itself was being altered by men such as Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort. In 1881 Westcott and Hort produced their edition of the Greek NT. This Greek edition differed greatly from the Greek text underlying the KJV. It was based on corrupted and unreliable manuscripts, namely, the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus as exposed by Dean Burgon. A multitude of English versions based on the Westcott and Hort text soon followed. Notwithstanding, the KJV still remained the most widely used English Bible. Many of these new versions have died a natural death (according to Rev Timothy Tow: a “diseased death”), but the KJV has stood the test of time and continues to be top on the bestseller’s list (some reports say that the KJV now occupies 2nd spot behind the NIV).

1c. Revised Version

1d. The RV of 1885 (NT: 1881) was the first version that sought to “correct” the KJV. This was so desired because of the emergence of the new critical text of Westcott and Hort which differed significantly from the Textus Receptus underlying the KJV. The WH Text differed from the TR in 5,604 places.

2d. Among those invited to produce the RV were apostates and heretics. Egs:

1e. Westcott and Hort themselves.

2e. John Henry Newman—#1 Roman Catholic theologian in the English-speaking world at that time.

3e. G Vance Smith—a Unitarian (ie one who denies the doctrine of the Trinity).

3d. The errors of the WH Text from which the RV was translated were ably exposed by Dean J W Burgon in his book—*The Revision Revised* (1883). Eg, in the WH Text, Luke 23:34: “And Jesus said, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do” is absent; and a marginal note says, “some ancient authorities omit.” Burgon, in holy indignation, wrote against this blatant attack on God’s Word, “These

twelve precious words . . . Drs. Westcott and Hort enclose within double brackets in token of the ‘moral certainty’ they entertain that the words are spurious. And yet these words are found in *every known uncial and in every known cursive Copy*, except four; besides being found in *every ancient Version*: and, *what*,—(we ask the question with sincere simplicity),—what amount of evidence is calculated to inspire undoubting confidence in any existing Reading, if not such a concurrence of Authorities as this? . . . We forbear to insist upon the probabilities of the case. The Divine power and sweetness of the incident shall not be enlarged upon. We introduce no considerations resulting from Internal Evidence. True, that ‘few verses of the Gospels bear in themselves a sure witness to the Truth of what they record, than this.’ (It is the admission of the very man [ie Dr Hort] who has nevertheless dared to brand it with suspicion.) But we reject his loathsome patronage with indignation. ‘Internal evidence,’—‘Transcriptional Probability’,--and all such ‘chaff and draff,’ with which he fills his pages *ad nauseam*, and mystifies nobody but himself,—shall be allowed no place in the present discussion” (*Revision Revised*, 82-3).

4d. Other missing verses were John 5:3f, Acts 8:37, and 1 John 5:7. Many readers of the RV were greatly disturbed by the excision of the Trinitarian verse from the Bible. They felt that the doctrine of the Trinity had been undermined. It is no wonder that the RV never caught on, and not surprisingly since gone out of print.

2c. American Standard Version

1d. The ASV of 1901 was a revision or the American edition of the RV.

2d. One helpful feature about the ASV is in its paragraph divisions.

3d. As with the RV, it did not measure up to the standard set by the KJV, and is cast aside.

3c. Revised Standard Version

1d. The RSV (1952) is a revision of the ASV.

2d. An ecumenical Bible translated by 32 scholars (this includes a Jewish rabbi) from various modernistic denominations belonging to the National Council of Churches. Read “Rome and the RSV” by Dr Hugh Farrell (Trinitarian Bible Society).

3d. Testimony: When I was baptised in a Lutheran Church on Dec 25, '74, I was given a Bible with my name embossed on it. It was the RSV. Did this Bible nourish my hungry soul? No it did not for after 2

years I backslided from the Lord. I have no doubt that it was partly due to spiritual malnutrition.

4d. In the original edition, John 7:53-8:11 on the woman taken in adultery was taken out from the main text and placed on the margin. The last 12 verses of Mark were excised entirely. Today we have them back in the rightful places. Why?

5d. The RSV of course did not sit very well with the fundamentalists. The “virgin” of Isa 7:14 was made “a young woman.” This is a blatant attack on the Virgin Birth of Christ. For a defence, see my paper, “The Sign of the Virgin Birth,” *The Burning Bush* 1 (1995): 5-33.

6d. Bruce Metzger and company produced a revision of the RSV called New RSV (1989). In support of the feminist movement, it has replaced generic masculine nouns/pronouns with gender-inclusive terms.

4c. New English Bible

1d. The NEB (1970) was a British work published by the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses.

2d. The translation committee consisted of those from UK Protestant Churches, viz the Church of England, Church of Scotland, the Churches of Wales and Ireland, the Methodist, Baptist, and Congregational churches, and the Society of Friends.

3d. Most of the verses relegated to the margin in the WH text are also found only in the margin of the NEB. There are thus missing verse numbers.

4d. The NEB denies that Gen 3:15 (NEB: “I will put enmity between you and the woman, between your brood and hers. They shall strike at your head, and you shall strike at their heel.”) is the first gospel divinely predictive of the virgin-born Messiah. Look at the NEB’s corruption of Gen 3:15:

1e. “thy seed and her seed” is changed to “your brood and hers.”

2e. The singular “it” (he) is changed to “they;” and “his” is changed to “their.”

3e. Why? There can be no other reason but to deny that Gen 3:15 is Messianic, divinely predictive of the Lord Jesus Christ.

5d. It also attacked the prophecy of the virgin birth in Isa 7:14 following the steps of the RSV. The NEB translates the word “virgin” as “a young woman is with child.”

5c. Today’s English Version / Good News for Modern Man

1d. The NT of the TEV (1966) was translated by Robert Bratcher, and published by the American Bible Society. The complete Bible came out in 1976 and was renamed the Good News Bible.

2d. This version attacks the blood of Christ. In 10 places the word “blood” has been replaced by the word “death” (Acts 20:28, Rom 3:25, 5:9, Eph 1:7, 2:13, Col 1:14, 20, 1 Pet 1:19, Rev 1:5, 5:9). The Greek αἷμα (*haima*) means “blood” not “death.” If Jesus’ death was a bloodless one, it would have been in vain, for “without shedding of blood there is no remission” (Heb 9:22 cf 1 Pet 1:19).

3d. It employs the dynamic equivalence method of translation. Dr Tan Wai Choon criticised the TEV: “a translation of this type is not really a translation at all but a paraphrase and commentary. Very little of the TEV (*i.e. the Good News Bible*) is literal. Almost every verse has been injected with the opinion of the translator as to what he thinks the Greek text means, rather than what it says. ... Aside from its basic failure to provide a literal translation, it is simply not accurate” (“What’s Wrong with the Good News Bible?” FEBC Press, nd, np). *The sound criticism above applies equally to the NIV which adopts the same erroneous method of translating Scripture.* It is unfortunate that Dr Tan in the same article promoted the NIV. In so doing, he contradicted himself.

6c. Living Bible

1d. The *Living Bible* (1971) was translated by Kenneth Taylor. It is not based on the original languages, but on a paraphrasing of the ASV.

2d. According to Taylor, paraphrasing is “to say something in different words than the author used. It is a restatement of the author’s thoughts, using different words than he did.” This is a most unacceptable method of translating the Scriptures. It is deceptive to name it the “Living Bible.” It is neither “Bible” nor “Living.” Such a paraphrase should be called “The Deadly Bible.” I heard a Bible professor at an ETS (Evangelical Theological Society) meeting say that if he wanted to find out *what the Scripture does not mean*, he would consult the *Living Bible*.

3d. Consider the vulgar and inappropriate language used: Gen 13:17, God tells Abraham to “hike in all directions;” 1 Sam 20:30, Saul reviling Jonathan, “You son of a bitch!;” 2 Sam 13:11, “Come to bed with me, my darling;” Isa 41:24, “Anyone who chooses you needs

to have his head examined;” Zech 8:9, Jehovah says, “Get on with the job and finish it;” Matt 11:19, “You complain that I hang around with the worst sort of sinners;” Mark 2:16, “How can He stand it, to eat with such scum;” John 9:34, “You illegitimate bastard;” John 11:49, “You stupid idiots;” Acts 4:36, “Barny the Preacher.”

4d. The *Living Bible* has sold at least 40 million copies. In 1996 they released the *New Living Translation* which is not much of an improvement from the old one. See David Cloud, “The New Living Translation: A Weak Rendering of a Corrupt Text,” *O Timothy* 13 (1996): 1-11.

7c. The New American Standard Bible

1d. The NASB (1971) is another revision of the ASV, prepared by 32 scholars who believed in the inspiration of the Bible, and published by the Lockman Foundation.

2d. It is a literal translation of the Scriptures which sought to be “as close as possible to the actual wording and grammatical structure of the original writers.”

3d. Although it has adopted a correct translational methodology, it failed in using a correct text. Dr Frank Logsdon who was one of the NASB translators, and who wrote the preface, later renounced the version he helped produce. He renounced all attachment to the NASB because it was based on the Westcott and Hort text. One may ask, “Well, didn’t he know it in the first place?” Logsdon testified, “Well up to that time I thought the Westcott and Hort was the text. You were intelligent if you believed the Westcott and Hort. Some of the finest people in the world believe in that Greek text, the finest leaders that we have today. You’d be surprised; if I told you you wouldn’t believe it. They haven’t gone into it just as I hadn’t gone into it; [they’re] just taking it for granted. ... But I finally got to the place where I said, ... ‘I’m in trouble, I can’t refute these arguments; it’s wrong; it’s terribly wrong; it’s frightfully wrong; and what am I going to do about it? . . . I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard’” (See “From the NASV to the KJV,” by S Franklin Logsdon. For a list of words/verses omitted in the NASB, see D K Madden, *A Critical Examination of the New American Standard Bible* [Australia: Privately printed, 1981].)

8c. New International Version (1978)

See below.

5a. A Critical Evaluation of the New International Version (NIV)

The NIV is said to be the best-selling Bible version today. Many Christian book shops in Singapore are well-stocked with the NIV but not the KJV. We receive reports that buyers are going for the NIV rather than the KJV. FEBC Bookroom stocks only the KJV. A few distributors here have contacted FEBC to enquire if we would take over their KJV Bibles at a good discount because they are not moving. To me, this is disturbing news. Although the NIV may be written in modern-day English, it is a dangerous version because it is based on an eclectic text with all its inherent corruptions, and on a dynamic equivalence method of translation. Sadly, certain Bible-Presbyterian Churches have thrown out the KJV for the NIV, and have recommended its use for public worship and private devotions.

This section seeks to expose the NIV for what it is: a version based on the corrupt Westcott-Hort text and theory, and a skewed translation methodology which renders not a literal, accurate translation but a subjective, opinionated interpretation of the Scriptures.

1b. The NIV is Based on a Corrupt Text

1c. The NIV Preface

According to the NIV preface, “The Greek text used in translating the New Testament was an eclectic one.” NIV advocates deny that their version is based on the Westcott-Hort text. One local champion of the NIV said, “most if not all versions after the RSV are based on an eclectic text, and not on the UBS or Nestle-Aland text.” This statement is inaccurate and incorrect.

2c. UBSGNT and NA

The eclectic text is the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament (UBSGNT), and the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament (NA).

1d. Evidence

1e. The UBSGNT acknowledges that its committee carried out its work “on the basis of Westcott and Hort’s edition of the Greek New Testament” (4th ed, viii).

2e. The NA edition considered the TR to be the “poorest form of the New Testament Text” (so Westcott and Hort). Eberhard Nestle in an attempt to overthrow the traditional text based his critical text “on the editions of Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, and Weymouth” (26th ed, 39). What level of influence did the Westcott-Hort text have on the NA edition? The “origin of the text itself was clearly traceable . . . particularly in passages where the special theories of Westcott-Hort had dominant influence in its formation” (Ibid, 41). Although the NA renames itself as an “eclectic” text (Ibid, 42-3), the vestiges of WH remain; it is a stain difficult to remove.

2d. Corroboration

1e. D K Madden wrote, “The translators of the New International Version state on page 8 of the Preface that they have used an eclectic (which according to the Oxford Dictionary implies borrowing freely from various sources) Greek text. This may be so, but an examination of their work clearly indicates that their choice of text has been greatly biased in favour of Nestle’s Greek text which in turn is notorious for its adherence to the Westcott and Hort methods of textual criticism.”

2e. Radmacher and Hodges correctly pointed out that “The so called ‘new textus receptus’—the N/A and UBS editions—do not differ a whole lot from the text produced by Westcott-Hort in 1881” (Earl Radmacher and Zane C Hodges, *The NIV Reconsidered* [Dallas: Redencion Viva, 1990], 142-3). They also said, “The NIV as well as the NASB, NEB, JB, RSV, TEV, etc., simply adopt what is *today’s* ‘textus receptus’” which is “found in the two most widely printed editions of the Greek New Testament: the 26th edition of the Nestle/Aland text and the 3rd edition of the United Bible Societies text” (Ibid, 139).

3e. Anderson and Anderson wrote, “twentieth century scholars have chosen, ... to abandon the Traditional Text in favour of a text based on these two Alexandrian manuscripts. The newest edition of this text is the United Bible Society’s Third Edition. Although the New International Version translators were free to consider and incorporate readings from other Greek texts (thus rendering the basis of the New International Version New Testament an ‘eclectic’ text), it appears that they followed the United Bible Society’s Third Edition for the New Testament work” (G W Anderson, and D E Anderson, *New International Version* [London: Trinitarian Bible Society, nd], 16).

4e. Kenneth Barker, General editor of the NIV, said that the eclectic text is the UBSGNT and NA.

3c. Conclusion

There were only 3 printed editions of the Greek New Testament that the NIV translators could use: (1) Textus Receptus (TR) published by the Trinitarian Bible Society which underlies the KJV, (2) UBSGNT, and (3) NA. It is clear that they either used the UBSGNT or the NA. It is thus naive to say that the NIV is not at all based on Westcott and Hort.

2b. The NIV Casts Doubt on God's Word

1c. The Woman Taken in Adultery (John 7:53-8:11)

The story of the woman taken in adultery in John 7:53-8:11 is called the *pericope de adultera*. Modernistic scholars have attempted to remove this whole passage from the Bible. According to Westcott, "This account of a most characteristic incident in the Lord's life *is certainly not a part* of John's narrative." Not only has it been said that the *pericope de adultera* was not a part of John's Gospel, both Westcott and Hort insisted that the story "has *no right to a place* in the text of the four Gospels."

The Westcott-Hort based NIV has this misleading statement concerning the authenticity of John 7:53-8:11: "[The earliest and most reliable manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have John 7:53-8:11]." What are these so called "earliest" and "most reliable" manuscripts which do not have the *pericope de adultera*? They are Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, both 4th century manuscripts. Those who reject the *pericope de adultera* do so on a presuppositional bias that these 2 codices which omit it are superior manuscripts.

Are the above codices really reliable? One will do well to remember that these are the same 2 codices which attacked the doctrine of the Trinity by removing the *Johannine Comma* (1 John 5:7f). According to Dean Burgon, a godly and renowned Bible defender of the last century, the codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are among "the *most corrupt* copies in existence." Burgon wrote, "I am able to demonstrate that every one of them singly is in a high degree corrupt, and is condemned upon evidence older than itself" (for a full discussion, refer to John William Burgon's *The Revision Revised* [Collingswood NJ: The Bible For Today, 1981 reprint], 548 pp). Although the above two codices may be "earliest" they are by no means "most reliable."

There is abundant evidence in support of the authenticity of the *pericope de adultera*. John 7:53-8:11 is found (1) in many Greek uncials and minuscules mainly of the Majority or Byzantine text-type, (2) in the ancient versions or translations: Old Latin, Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic, and (3) in the writings of the Church Fathers: Didascalia, Ambrosiaster, Apostolic Constitutions, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine.

Jerome (AD 340-420), the translator of the Latin Bible called the Vulgate, said this about the *pericope de adultera*: ". . . in the Gospel according to John in many manuscripts, both Greek and Latin, is found the story of the adulterous woman who was accused before the Lord." Jerome considered the *pericope* genuine, and included it in his Vulgate.

Self-styled textual critics who arrogantly say: "This text has no place in Scripture; I will never preach from it!" should rather heed these wise words of Calvin: "it has always been received by the Latin Churches, and is found in many old Greek manuscripts, and contains nothing unworthy of an Apostolic Spirit, *there is no reason why we should refuse to apply it to our advantage.*"

It must be noted that if John 7:53-8:11 is removed from the Gospel, it leaves a vacuum between the words “out of Galilee ariseth no prophet (7:52), and “Then spake Jesus again unto them” (8:12). In 7:40-52, we find the private dialogue and debate among the Jewish populace, and between the temple servants and Pharisees over Jesus’ identity; whether He was the Moses-like Prophet (Deut 18:15) or not. Jesus was out of the picture at that time. It is thus quite awkward to introduce Jesus so abruptly in 8:12 where it is recorded that He spoke to them “again.” Jesus in verses 12-16 was teaching what is righteous judgment. The *pericope de adultera* provides the link between the two episodes. Jesus taught them “again” because He had already begun teaching the people before he was interrupted by the scribes and Pharisees (8:2-3). Jesus’ “light of the world” discourse clearly fits the context of the *pericope de adultera*. The Jewish religious leaders had failed to exercise righteous judgment because in condemning the adulteress, they failed to judge themselves for they were equally sinful (8:7-9). Jesus’ judicial and yet merciful treatment of the adulteress clearly demonstrates that He alone as the light of the world is the true and perfect Judge (8:12).

The divinely inspired account of the woman taken in adultery rightfully belongs to the Gospel of John. Let us not hesitate to use it for our encouragement and comfort.

Recommended reading: John William Burgon, “The Woman Taken in Adultery: A Defense of the Authenticity of St John 7:53-8:11,” in *Unholy Hands on the Bible*, ed Jay P Green (Lafayette: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1990), F1-16; and Edward F Hills, *The King James Version Defended* (Des Moines: The Christian Research Press, 1984), 150-9.

2c. The Last 12 Verses of Mark (Mark 16:9-20)

Are the Last Twelve Verses of Mark Really Mark’s? According to the NIV, “The most reliable early manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 16:9-20.” Its Study Bible goes on to say, “serious doubt exists as to whether these verses belong to the Gospel of Mark. They are absent from important early manuscripts and display certain peculiarities of vocabulary, style and theological content that are unlike the rest of Mark. His Gospel probably ended at 16:8, ...” Here is another NIV attempt at scission. Practically every modern English version would insert this doubt over the authenticity of Mark 16:9-20. It is only the KJV which accepts it without question.

We affirm the authenticity of the last 12 verses of Mark together with Dean J W Burgon who wrote a scholarly 350-page defence of those celebrated verses. Burgon argued that the codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus which are said by many to be “most reliable” are actually “most corrupt.” Burgon wrote, “Recent Editors of the New Testament insist that these ‘last Twelve Verses’ are not genuine. ... I am as convinced as I am of my life, that the reverse is the truth. ... I insist, on the contrary, that the Evidence relied on is untrustworthy,-- untrustworthy in every particular. ... I am able to prove that this portion of the Gospel has been declared to be spurious on wholly mistaken grounds.”

Furthermore, there is abundant manuscript evidence supporting the authenticity of Mark 16:9-20. E F Hills wrote, “They [Mark 16:9-20] are found in all the Greek manuscripts except *Aleph* [i.e. Sinaiticus], and *B* [i.e. Vaticanus], ... And more important, they were quoted as Scripture by early Church Fathers who lived one hundred and fifty years before *B* and *Aleph* were written, namely, Justin Martyr (c. 150), Tatian (c. 175), Irenaeus (c. 180), Hyppolytus (c. 200). Thus the earliest extant testimony is on the side of these last twelve verses.”

How about the allegation that the last twelve verses are non-Markan because of the difference in literary style? Metzger, for instance, argues against the last twelve verses because there are therein 17 words new to the Gospel of Mark. Such an argument is often fallacious because it wrongly assumes that an author has only one uniform style of writing. In any case, Burgon, after a careful comparison of Mark’s first twelve verses with his last twelve verses, concluded, “It has been proved . . . on the contrary, the style of S. Mark xvi. 9-20 is exceedingly like the style of S. Mark i. 9-20; and therefore, that *it is rendered probable by the Style* that the Author of the beginning of this Gospel was also the Author of the end of it. ... *these verses must needs be the work of S. Mark.*”

Recommended Reference: John William Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Oxford, London: James Parker, 1871, reprinted in 1983 by The Bible For Today); D A Waite, *Dean John William Burgon’s Vindication of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Collingswood, NJ: The Bible For Today, 1994); Edward F Hills, *The King James Version Defended* (Des Moines, IA: The Christian Research Press, 1984), 159-68; and “The Authenticity of the Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to Mark,” Article #106 (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, nd).

3b. The NIV Scissors Out God’s Word

There are 2,886 words missing in the NIV as compared to the KJV. The amount of words scissored out is equivalent to the entire book of 1 John! What are some of these words, verses and passages either omitted or questioned (based on UBSGNT cf NIV)?

1c. Entire Passages Questioned

1d. Mark 16:9-20

NIV: “[The *most reliable early* manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 16:9-20.]”

2d. John 7:53-8:11

NIV: “[The *earliest and most reliable* manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have John 7:53-8:11.]”

2c. Entire Verses Omitted

Matt 17:21, 18:11, 23:14; Mark 7:16, 9:44,46, 11:26; 15:28; Luke 17:36, 23:17; John 5:4; Acts 8:37, 15:34, 24:7, 28:29; Rom 16:24; 1 John 5:7-8.

3c. Portions of Verses Omitted or Modified

1d. In Matthew

“without a cause” (5:22), “to those of old” (5:27), “For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen” (6:13), “to repentance” (9:13), “among the people” (9:35), “Lebbaeus, whose surname was” (10:3), “raise the dead” (10:8), “of his heart” (12:35), “Jesus said to them” (13:51), “draw near to me with their mouth” (15:8), “at his feet” (18:29), “from my youth” (19:20), “and whatever is right you will receive” (20:7), “For many are called, but few chosen” (20:16), “and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with” (2x in 20:22,23), “take him away, and” (22:13), “to observe” (23:3), “in which the Son of Man is coming” (25:13), “false witnesses” (26:60b), “that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet: They divided my garments among them, and for my clothing they cast lots” (27:35).

2d. In Mark

“Isaiah the prophet” (1:2), “of the kingdom” (1:14), “to repentance” (2:17), “as whole as the other” (3:5), “to heal sicknesses and” (3:15), “of the air” (4:4), “Verily, I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment than for that city” (6:11), “bread, for they have nothing to it” (6:36), “they found fault” (7:2), “and fasting” (9:29), “into the fire that shall never be quenched” (9:45), “and every sacrifice will be seasoned with salt” (9:49), “for those who trust in riches” (10:24), “in the name of the Lord” (11:10), “and at him they threw stones” (12:4), “This is the first commandment” (12:30), “with all the soul” (12:33), “spoken of by Daniel the prophet” (13:14), “And another said, Is it I?” (14:19), “because of me this night” (14:27), “and thy speech agreeth thereto” (14:70).

3d. In Luke

“blessed art thou among women” (1:28), “when she saw him” (1:29), “hath visited” (1:78), “but by every word of God” (4:4), “Get thee behind me, Satan” (4:8), “to heal the brokenhearted” (4:18), “the Christ” (4:41), “and both are preserved” (5:38), “whole as the other” (6:10), “treasure of his heart” (6:45), “who had been sick” (7:10), “And the Lord said” (7:31), “and those with him” (8:45), “and you say, Who touched me?” (8:45), “and put them all out” (8:54), “even as Elias did” (9:54), “and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are

of” (9:55), “For the Son of man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them” (9:56). “when he departed” (10:35), “Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth” (11:2), “but deliver us from evil” (11:4), “bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask” (11:11), “the prophet” (11:29), “scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites” (11:44), “that they might accuse him” (11:54), “against you” (17:3), “him? I think not” (17:9), “and saw him” (19:5), “Why tempt ye me?” (20:23), “took her to wife, and he died childless” (20:30), “in my kingdom” (22:30), “And the Lord said” (22:31), “struck him on the face and” (22:64), “me, nor let me go” (22:68), “and of the chief priests” (23:23), written and in letters of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew” (23:38), “and certain others with them” (24:1), “and of an honeycomb” (24:42).

4d. In John

“which is in heaven” (3:13), “not perish, but” (3:15), “the Christ” (4:42), “waiting for the moving of the water” (5:3), “and sought to slay him” (5:16), “to the disciples, and the disciples” (6:11), “whereinto his disciples were entered” (6:22), “in me” (6:47), “being convicted by their own conscience” (8:9), “and saw none but the woman” (8:10), “through the midst of them, and so passed by” (8:59), “the pool of” (9:10), “as I said unto you” (10:26), “from the place where the dead was laid” (11:41), “which had been dead” (12:1), “in the world” (17:12), “and led him away” (19:16).

5d. In Acts

“ye have taken” (2:23), “of the Lord” (7:30), “him shall ye hear” (7:37), “it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks” (9:6), “he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do” (10:6), “which were sent unto him from Cornelius” (10:21), “who, when he cometh, shall speak unto thee” (10:32), “Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law” (15:24), “which believed not” (17:5), “I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem” (18:21), “that were of Paul’s company” (21:8), “that they observe no such thing, save only” (21:25), “and were afraid” (22:9), “unto his death” (22:20), “and would have judged according to our law” (24:6), “commanding his accusers to come unto thee” (24:8), “of the dead” (24:15), “that he might loose him” (24:26).

6d. In Romans

“of Christ” (1:16), “and upon all” (3:22), “who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit” (8:1), “for us” (8:26), “of righteousness” (9:31), “of the law” (9:32), “preach the gospel of peace” (10:15), “But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work” (11:6), “and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God

thanks” (14:6), “or is offended, or is made weak” (14:21), “I will come to you” (15:24), “of the gospel” (15:29).

7d. In 1 Corinthians

“for us” (5:7), “and in your spirit, which are God’s” (6:20), “of Christ” (9:18), “for me” (10:23), “for the earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof” (10:28), “Take, eat” (11:24), “unworthily” (11:29), “the Lord” (15:47).

8d. In 2 Corinthians

“that we would receive” (8:4), “in glorying” (12:11), “I write” (13:2).

9d. In Galatians

“that ye should not obey the truth” (3:1), “in Christ” (3:17), “through Christ” (4:7).

10d. In Ephesians

“through Jesus Christ” (3:9), “of our Lord Jesus Christ” (3:14), “rest of the” (4:17), “of his flesh, and of his bones” (5:30).

11d. In Philippians

“rule, let us mind the same things” (3:16).

12d. In Colossians

“and the Lord Jesus Christ” (1:2), “through his blood” (1:14), “and of the Father and” (2:2), “of the sins” (2:11).

13d. In 1 Thessalonians

“from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ” (1:1).

14d. In 2 Thessalonians

“as God” (2:4).

15d. In 1 Timothy

“in Christ” (2:7), “not greedy of filthy lucre” (3:3), “who” instead of “God” (3:16), “in spirit” (4:12), “good and” (5:4), “man or” (5:16), “from such withdraw thyself” (6:5), “and it is certain” (6:7).

16d. In 2 Timothy

“of the Gentiles” (1:11).

17d. In Hebrews

“by himself” (1:3), “and didst set him over the works of thy hands” (2:7), “firm unto the end” (3:6), “and their sins” (8:12), “O God” (10:9), “saith the Lord” (10:30), “was delivered of a child” (11:11), “were persuaded of them” (11:13), “or thrust through with a dart” (12:20).

18d. In James

“adulterers and” (4:4).

19d. In 1 Peter

“through the Spirit” (1:22), “for us” (4:1), “on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified” (4:14).

20d. In 1 John

“from the beginning” (2:7), “Christ is come in the flesh” (4:3), “in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one” (5:7), “and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God” (5:13).

21d. In Revelation

“the beginning and the ending” (1:8), “I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and” (1:11), “which are in Asia” (1:11), “him that liveth for ever and ever” (5:14), “and the angel stood” (11:1), “and art to come” (11:17), “here are they” (14:12), “over his mark” (15:2), “O Lord” (16:5), “another out of” (16:7), “of the earth and” (16:4), “the Lord” (19:1), “of them which are saved” (21:24).

1c. The Johannine Comma Removed (1 John 5:7-8)

Is There a Clear Biblical Proof Text for the Doctrine of the Trinity? 1 John 5:7-8 in the KJV reads, “For there are three that bear witness 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 words underlined constitute the Johannine Comma (Gk: *koptein*, “to cut off”). The Comma proves the doctrine of the Holy Trinity—that “There are three persons in the Godhead: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power, and glory” (WSC Q 6).

Why is this verse so seldom used to teach the doctrine of the Holy Trinity? The oft-quoted NT texts for the Trinity are Matt 3:16-17, 28:19, 2 Cor 13:14, and Rev 4:8, but why not 1 John 5:7f? One will reply, “How can I when my Bible does not have it?” Therein lies the problem; with 1 John 5:7f missing in so many of the modern Bible versions like the NIV, RSV, and NASB, it is no wonder that many Christians are ignorant of this verse. And even if they do know that this verse exists, they hesitate to use it because they have been deceived into thinking that it is not part of God’s Word. *The NIV Study Bible*, for instance, says that 1 John 5:7f “is not found in any Greek manuscript or NT translation prior to the 16th century.” On account of this they argue that 1 John 5:7f is spurious. It is unfortunate that even *The King James Study Bible* (Thomas Nelson Publishers) doubted the authenticity of this verse. Is there not a need for a 21st Century Reformation Study Bible?

It is not true that 1 John 5:7f is absent in all pre-16th century Greek manuscripts and NT translations. The text is found in 8 extant Greek manuscripts, and at least 5 of them are dated before the 16th century. Furthermore, there is abundant support for 1 John 5:7f from the Latin translations. There are at least 8,000 extant Latin manuscripts, and many of them contain 1 John 5:7f; the really important ones being the Old Latin which Church Fathers like Tertullian (AD 155-220), and Cyprian (AD 200-258) used. Now, out of the very few Old Latin manuscripts with the 5th chapter of 1 John, at least 4 of them contain the Comma. Since these Latin versions were derived from the Greek NT, there is reason to believe that 1 John 5:7f has very early Greek attestation, hitherto lost. There is also reason to believe that Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (AD 340-420), which has the Johannine Comma, was translated from an untampered Greek text he had in his possession, and that he regarded the Comma to be a genuine part of 1 John. Jerome in his *Prologue to the Canonical Epistles* wrote, “irresponsible translators left out this testimony [i.e., 1 John 5:7f] in the Greek codices.” Edward F Hills concluded, “. . . it was not trickery that was responsible for the inclusion of the Johannine Comma in the Textus Receptus, but the usage of the Latin speaking Church.”

This leads us to the so-called “promise” of Erasmus. Westcott and Hort advocate—Bruce Metzger—made this claim which became the popular argument against the Johannine Comma. He wrote, “Erasmus promised that he would insert *the Comma Johanneum*, as it is called, in future editions if a single Greek manuscript could be found that contained the passage. At length such a copy was found—or made to order.” This view against the authenticity of 1 John 5:7f is parroted by anti-KJVists Stewart Custer, D A Carson and James R White. Is this truly what happened? H J de Jonge of the faculty of theology, Leiden University, an authority on Erasmus, says that Metzger’s view on Erasmus’ promise “has no foundation in Erasmus’ work. Consequently it is highly improbable that he included the difficult passage because he considered himself bound by any such promise.” Yale professor—Roland Bainton—another Erasman expert agrees with de Jonge furnishing proof from Erasmus’ own writing that Erasmus’ inclusion of 1 John 5:7f was not due to a so-called “promise” but the fact that he believed “the verse was in

the Vulgate and must therefore have been in the Greek text used by Jerome.” The Erasmusian “promise” is thus a myth!

It has been suggested that the Johannine Comma did not come from the Apostle John himself but from an unknown person who invented and inserted it into 1 John 5 so that Christianity would have a clear Trinitarian proof text. Up till this point in time, no one is able to identify this mysterious person who tried to “help” the Church. He is probably a fictional character. In any case, it is highly unlikely that 1 John 5:7f is the work of a well-meaning interpolator. When we look at the text itself, the phrase, “the Father, *the Word*, and the Holy Spirit,” naturally reflects Johannine authorship (cf John 1:1,14). An interpolator would rather have used the more familiar and perhaps stronger Trinitarian formula—“the Father, *the Son*, and the Holy Spirit.” “The Word” or “The *Logos*” of 1 John 5:7f surely points to the Apostle John as its source for it is distinctively John who uses the term “the Word” to mean “Christ” in all his writings.

There is nothing in the Johannine Comma that goes against the fundamentals of the Christian faith. It is thoroughly biblical, and theologically accurate in its Trinitarian statement. There is really no good reason why we should not regard it as authentic, and employ it as the clearest proof-text in the Scripture for the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

Serious students will want to look up these two seminal monographs: (1) Edward F Hills, *The King James Version Defended* (Des Moines: The Christian Research Press, 1984), 209-13; and (2) Michael Maynard, *A History of the Debate Over 1 John 5:7-8* (Tempe: Comma Publications, 1995). The latter, by a librarian, in defence of the Johannine Comma is especially thorough and helpful. The onus is now on KJV detractors to address the documents, evidences, and arguments garnered by Maynard. This book is available at the FEBC Bookroom.

2c. Removal of Whole Verses

Eg: Matt 17:21; 18:11; 23:14; Mark 9:44, 46; 11:26; 15:28; Luke 17:36; 23:17; John 5:4; Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:7; 28:29; Rom 16:24. (See above for complete list of verses and words removed.) Do note that these verses are also missing in the UBSGNT and NA. Coincidence? One local NIV-champion in an attempt to refute me wrote, “I am amazed that Jeffrey Khoo is so ignorant as to say modern versions are based on the W-H Theory. He should know that most if not all versions after the RSV are based on an eclectic text, and not on the UBS or Nestle-Aland text.”

My reply: If the NIV is not based on the UBS or NA Greek text, then “I am amazed” over the striking similarities between those Greek texts and the NIV in omitting the exact same verses of NT Scripture! James R White himself, the most recent opponent of the KJV only position, would largely agree

with me, “There are two main modern texts, the United Bible Societies 4th Edition, and the Nestle-Aland 27th edition, both of which have the same text but differ in other matters such as punctuation, textual apparatus, etc. These texts are more ‘Alexandrian’ in character than the *Textus Receptus*, which was based upon Byzantine manuscripts, but *less* Alexandrian than the text produced by Westcott and Hort in 1881” (*The King James Only Controversy* [Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1995], 45). It must be said that although the modern critical Greek NTs are “less Alexandrian” they are still *very* Alexandrian by the amount of verses removed and passages questioned as we have discussed earlier and shall see later.

3b. The NIV Attacks Vital Doctrines of the Christian Faith

1c. Attack on the Eternal Generation of God the Son

The eternal generation of the second person of the Holy Trinity (i.e. Jesus is the eternally begotten Son of God) is an important doctrine of the Christian Faith. The 4th century Athanasian and Nicene Creeds state that Jesus is both Son and God “*only-begotten, ... of the Father before all the ages.*” The Westminster Confession of Faith (1648) likewise followed the ancient creeds in describing the relationship that exists within the Godhead: “In the unity of the Godhead, there be three persons, of one substance, power and eternity; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is *eternally begotten* of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son” (II.3). All 3 ancient creeds describe Christ as only begotten, or eternally begotten. Now you know that every doctrine must be based on the Bible. Where in the Bible do we find Jesus being described as only begotten Son of God? If you have the KJV you will find it in John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; and 1 John 4:9. But if you are using the NIV, you will have a hard time finding this doctrine in the Bible. The term “only begotten” with reference to Christ has been conveniently removed by the NIV. It mistranslates the Greek *monogenes* as “one and only.” Problem is *monogenes* does not just mean “one and only.” The Greek *monogenes* comes from 2 words: *monos* meaning “only” and *gennaō* meaning “to beget” or “to generate.” The KJV translates it literally and accurately as “only begotten.”

Do you now see why we as Bible-Presbyterians cannot use the NIV? The WCF teaches according to the Scriptures that Jesus “the Son is eternally begotten of the Father.” Now if I were to teach a class on the WCF, we come to this point on the eternal generation of the Son, and one of you were to ask me this very good question: “In which verse of the Bible is Jesus described as the only begotten Son of God?” If I have the NIV as my Bible, I will be dumbstruck. The NIV has removed this important doctrine on the person of Christ from the Scriptures. It has subtracted from God’s Word; a very dangerous thing to do (Rev 22:19). That is why we cannot trust the NIV. Why? Because instead of telling us what God says, it tells us what man thinks God is saying. The NIV is an interpretation, and not translation of the Bible.

2c. Attack on the Virgin Birth of Christ

In Luke 2:33 we read, “And *Joseph and his mother* marvelled at those things which were spoken of him” (KJV). In the NIV, it is like this, “*The child’s father and mother* marveled at what was said about him.” Do you see the problem here with the NIV? The NIV makes Joseph the father of Jesus! The NIV rendering of this verse is totally out of line for the following reasons: (1) the word “child” is not in the traditional Greek text, (2) the word “father” is not in the Greek, (2) the possessive pronoun “his” is connected to Mary alone (ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ), and does not include Joseph. Those who do not know better would probably come to the conclusion that Joseph was the direct, natural father of Jesus. The NIV has caused Luke to contradict the virgin birth. Jesus has only one Father, and that is the First Person of the Holy Trinity. Joseph was neither physically nor spiritually the father of Jesus.

However, NIV advocates will point out verse 41 which called Joseph and Mary “his parents” (so KJV as in NIV). The fact that Joseph and Mary were indeed parents of Jesus—Joseph being legally a “parent” and not naturally the “father” of Jesus—would prove the point that the biblical writers were careful not to attribute the title “father” to Joseph, for Jesus only has one Father, and that is His Father in Heaven—the First Person of the Holy Trinity. In verse 43, we again see the inspired writers carefully distinguishing Joseph’s actual relationship with Jesus by the words “Joseph and his mother,” again purposely avoiding calling Joseph Jesus’ “father.” Jesus Himself refused calling Joseph his “father,” and gently corrected his mother when she said, “thy father and I have sought thee” which drew this response from the Lord, “How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my *Father’s* business?” Why did not Jesus use “God,” or “the Lord,” but “Father” at this juncture? I believe it is to correct any misconception that Joseph was in any way His father. God alone was His Father.

3c. Attack on the Theanthropic Person of Christ

1 Tim 3:16 has to be one of the clearest texts of Scripture proving the full deity and full humanity of Christ, “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: *God was manifest in the flesh, ...*” But if you had the NIV, you would have a difficult time proving this. Instead of the reading, “God was manifest in the flesh,” you have “He appeared in a body.” The NIV obscures (1) the deity of Christ by removing “God” and replacing it with just “He,” and (2) the humanity of Christ by replacing “the flesh,” with “a body” (a body may not necessarily be of “flesh and blood”). The word in the original is σαρξ (*sarx*) meaning “flesh,” not σῶμα (*soma*) meaning “body.” It is also interesting and significant to note that the KJV translators never rendered *sarx* as body and *soma* as flesh (see Yeong Shoon Lau, *A Textus Receptus-King James Version Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, MDiv thesis, Far Eastern Bible College, 1997, 214, 228). The KJV recognised the proper distinctions between the two; something the NIV translators obviously failed to do in their dynamic-equivalence blindness.

Why does the NIV translate 1 Tim 3:16 as “He” and not “God?” It is simply because they chose to adopt a Westcott-Hort reading of the text.

According to Westcott and Hort, since the Sinai and Vatican codices read “he who,” instead of “God,” it must be the correct reading. And mind you, this is over against *the majority* of the Greek manuscripts including certain Alexandrian ones which read Θεὸς (*theos*) “God,” instead of ὅς (*hos*) “he who.” Many modern versions like the NIV happily follow Westcott and Hort in corrupting the Word of God. How can NIV defenders deny that the NIV is based on Westcott and Hort? How can NIV users who say they love God’s Word continue to use a version which supports the unbelieving views of those two enemies of Christ? For more discussion on this verse, see “God was Manifest in the Flesh (1 Tim 3:16),” Article #103 (London, Trinitarian Bible Society, nd).

4c. Attack on the Eternal Punishment of Sinners in Hell

The NIV has a habit of removing words that are not easily understood by the modern reader. In so doing, proof texts for certain important doctrines have also been removed. One example is the Hebrew word שְׁאוֹל (*Sheol*) where the KJV sometimes translates as “the grave,” and other times as “hell.” The NIV removes the concept of “hell” (ie a place of eternal punishment) when it refuses to translate *sheol* as hell. Thus, in Ps 9:17, “the wicked shall be turned into hell” is changed to “the wicked return to the grave.” Even Lucifer (ie Satan) will not be “brought down to hell,” but “brought down to the grave” (Isa 14:15). By never translating *sheol* as hell, the NIV has effectively made our Bible poorer on the teaching of eternal punishment. It is no surprise that today more and more Christians are rejecting the traditional doctrine that there is a place of eternal conscious torment called hell where all reprobates will finally be consigned. So-called evangelicals like Clark Pinnock, and John Stott are nowadays espousing the annihilation doctrine of the Jehovah’s Witnesses. Did they influence the NIV, or did the NIV influence them?

5c. Attack on Christ as the Judge who is God

In Rom 14:10,12 we are told, “we shall all stand before the judgment seat of *Christ*. ... So then every one of us shall give account of himself to *God*.” In the NIV, the deity of Christ is denied. It reads, “For we will all stand before *God’s* judgment seat . . . so then, each of us will give an account of himself to *God*.” In the KJV, all men are to stand before Christ, giving account to God. The equation is clear, Christ is God. But the NIV changes “Christ” in verse 10 to “God,” and by so doing, renders verse 12 a simple restatement of verse 10, without affirming the deity of Christ.

Anderson and Anderson correctly comment, “Here a wonderful verse which plainly declares our Saviour’s deity is done away with without the average Christian even knowing it. The deity of Christ is attested in this passage in some Alexandrian manuscripts, the majority of other manuscripts, many ancient versions, and at least ten church fathers. It is missing from only a handful of manuscripts (seven), which unfortunately for the church includes the two considered to the best by modern scholars: the Vatican manuscript and . . . the Sinai manuscript. The New International Version, by this omission, does more than delete a few words; it reflects the high handed approach to

textual criticism threatening the Church today” (*New International Version*, 18).

4b. The NIV Mistranslates God’s Word

1c. Mistranslation of Ps 12:7 on the Preservation of God’s Word

The NIV reads, “And the words of the LORD are flawless like silver refined in a furnace of clay, purified seven times. O LORD, you will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever” (Ps 12:6-7). Note the change from “keep them” to “keep us,” and “preserve them” to “protect us.” They changed the pronouns from third plural (ie “them”) to first plural (ie “us”). Is this a correct or accurate translation?

In the Hebrew, the first word is תשמרם (*tishmerem*). The *-em* suffix means “them” not “us.” He will keep “them” (so KJV) is correct. The second word is תצרנו (*titzrennu*). The *-ennu* suffix (with an energetic nun) is third singular (ie “him”), not first plural (ie “us”). The energetic nun is emphatic (ie “every one of them”). So it should be translated preserve “them” (ie “every single word of His words”) not “us” (ie “every single person of His people”). By incorrectly and inaccurately translating Ps 12:7, the NIV has effectively removed the doctrine of Bible preservation from this text.

For an excellent study of the doctrine of Bible preservation in the light of Ps 12, see Shin Yeong Gil, “God’s Promise to Preserve His Word: An Exegetical Study of Psalm 12:5-7,” ThM thesis, Far Eastern Bible College, 1999.

2c. Mistranslation of Isa 49:12 on God’s Promise to the Chinese

The following is taken from Timothy Tow, “NIV Turns ‘Land of Sinim’ into ‘Region of Aswan’ by a Twist of the Ball-Pen!” *The Burning Bush 2* (1996): 73-5.

“The translation of KJV of Isaiah 49:12, “Behold, these shall come from far: and, lo, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim” from the Hebrew text, הנה אלה מרחוק יבאו והנה אלה מצפלה מצפון ומים ואלה מארץ סינים: is correct. How does the NIV differ to translate מארץ סינים into “from the region of Aswan”?

“The word “Sinim” in Hebrew is סינים. And the word for “Aswan” according to the NIV in Ezekiel 29:10 and 30:6 is סונה. Now סינים is pronounced “Sinim” but סונה which is pronounced “Seveneh” is translated “Aswan.” But why is סינים at Isaiah 49:12 by a twist of the NIV’s ball-pen also become “Aswan?” Even the non-Hebrew reader can see that Sinim (סינים) and Aswan (סונה) are two different words. Perhaps the NIV translators think they can palm off their ware to the unwary non-Hebrew English reader.

“Another difference between the KJV and NIV translations is the NIV rendering of ארץ into “region” whereas ארץ has almost always been translated “land,” “earth,” or “ground.” Now if the NIV translates “the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali from the word ארץ (Isa 9:1) and Zebulon and

Naphtali are small tribes, why does not NIV use the word “region” here? The right word for “region” in Hebrew is חבל according to the Hebrew lexicon (BDB, 286). There is no valid reason to translate ארץ as “region” except for the sinister purpose of demoting the Land of Sinim into some Egyptian outback.

“The land of Sinim, according to Hastings’ *Dictionary of the Bible*, from the context, must have been the extreme south or east of the known world (*Dictionary of the Bible*, ed James Hastings, sv “Sinim”). The LXX favours the view that a country in the east is intended, and some modern commentators have identified Sinim with China, the land of the Sinae. The ancients’ view that Sinim refers to China is attested overwhelmingly by continuing modern Hebrew usage. My English-Hebrew, Hebrew-English lexicon by Prof M Segal and Prof M B Dagut, says China is סין (Sin) and Chinese is סיני (מלון אנטי-עברי) *English-Hebrew Dictionary*, sv “China,” “Chinese”). The root of “Sinim” is “Sin,” so “Sinim” points most assuredly to China and not to Aswan, which is translated from a different word סונה as stated above. Thus, one who is well-versed in Chinese is called a sinologue and sinology is the study of Chinese language, history, customs, etc; and the war between China and Japan was called the Sino-Japanese war.

“Let me quote from Dr Allan A MacRae my teacher on the above subject under discussion. In his *Studies in Isaiah*, Dr MacRae says as a matter of fact:

In verse 12 the remarkable extent of the work of the servant is clearly indicated with people coming to his light from the north and from the west and even from the land of Sinim (China). What a marvelous prediction of the extension of the gospel of deliverance from sin through the servant of the Lord to the very ends of the world! How wonderfully it has been fulfilled in these days when groups of believers have come to the Savior from so many sections of the earth, even including this very land of China, which must have seemed in the days of Isaiah to be the utmost fringe of civilization. Truly He has become “a light to the Gentiles. [Allan A MacRae, *Studies in Isaiah* (Hatfield PA: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1995), 237.

Edward J Young wrote likewise, “In any attempt to identify the land of Sinim we must look for a place far from Palestine. An ancient interpretation would identify it with China, ...” (*The Book of Isaiah*, NICOT [Grand Rapids: Wm B Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1972], 3:282, 294).]

“Furthermore, let us see how the translators of the Chinese Bible treat the Hebrew text. They translate the land of Sinim as the Kingdom or Country of Chin, and “Chin” is a root word for China, verily, as it was Chin Shih Hwang Ti the first Emperor who united the many ancient states into one China. This is a good translation in the tradition of the LXX, and in line with time-honoured Hebrew usage to this day.

“Speaking from my experience as a Certified Chinese Interpreter of the Supreme Court, Singapore in my young days, whenever there was any doubt in the translation of a Chinese document into English, the Judge would know exactly and objectively what the original says, and not some dynamic equivalent, the subjective NIV style. The KJV renders the Hebrew and Greek

of the Bible without subtraction or addition, least by juggling, when מֵאַרְרָן סִינַי can be twisted to read “from the region of Aswan.” Let us have an answer from the learned NIV translators.”

3c. Mistranslation of 2 Thess 3:6 on Secondary Separation

The following is taken from Charles Seet, “The Principle of Secondary Separation (2 Thess 3:6-15),” *The Burning Bush 2* (1996): 41-2.

“Paul wrote this passage because some in the church refused to work. But the scope of the sin is not limited to slothfulness. The loafers are referred to in 3:6 as πᾶς ἀδελφὸς ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος (“every brother walking disorderly.”) Why did the apostle choose to use this unspecific phrase rather than something more convenient, like πᾶς μὴ ἐργαζόμενος (“everyone who is not working”)? The word ἀτάκτως is a *hapax legomenon* (i.e. a word occurring only once in the scriptures) and is the adverbial form of the word a[takto], which itself occurs in 1 Thess 5:14, and is also a *hapax legomenon*. The verb form, ἀτακτέω, occurs significantly in the same context (in v.7) as the adverb, and it also is a *hapax legomenon*. It therefore becomes difficult to attach any meaning more specific than what is known from the common usage of this word (“not in proper order”, as found in 3 Macc 1:19; Philo, Josephus, Bel and the Dragon, etc.).

“Therefore the word “disorderly” used in 2 Thess 3:6 need not necessarily be referring only to people who are not working. Unfortunately, English translations like the NIV have paraphrased the Greek in rendering the passage: *We command you, brothers, to keep away from every brother who is idle...* This obscures the principle and limits the passage to only one *application* of the principle, namely -- the problem of loafers.

“After using this phrase, the apostle Paul goes on to use another equally non-specific phrase: μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβον παρ’ ἡμῶν (“not according to the tradition which they received from us”). The word at issue here is *tradition* (παράδοσις). This word is found only five times in Paul’s epistles (1 Cor 11:2, Gal 1:14, Col 2:8) and twice in 2 Thessalonians: here, and in 2:15. In none of these other occurrences, is the word ever employed in the sense of one particular teaching or commandment alone. It stands for all Christian teaching, oral or written.

“Since both of these non-specific phrases are found in the very first verse of the paragraph in which Paul proceeds to address the issue of errant non-working brethren, it would not be unreasonable to conclude that he deliberately chose to begin his instruction by stating a general principle, before dealing specifically with the problem itself. This pattern can be demonstrated in many other Pauline passages (Rom 13:1,6; 1 Cor 6:12,13-20; Gal 5:1ff). The whole of v.6, is therefore a *general principle*, that believers ought to separate themselves from every one in their midst who was deliberately disobeying any part of the whole body of inspired instruction. Thus, the main issue this paragraph addresses is *disobedience*.”

5b. The NIV Opposes a Strictly Messianic Fulfillment of Isa 7:14 in its Study Bible

I have argued strenuously that Jesus Christ is the only one who fulfilled the precious prophecy of Isa 7:14 which concerns His virgin birth (see “The Sign of the Virgin Birth: The Exegetical Validity of a Strictly Messianic Fulfillment of Isaiah 7:14,” Master of Divinity thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1991. An edited version may be found in the January 1995 issue of *The Burning Bush*. Both are available at the FEBC Library).

The RSV made a blatant attack against the virgin birth by rendering the Hebrew עלמה (*almah*) as “young woman” (Isa 7:14). The Virgin Birth of Christ was meant to be a miraculous sign to the house of David. If a young woman conceives, how then can it be a sign? It is God-given miracle only if a virgin conceives. It is something supernatural and unique. The angel Gabriel quoting Isa 7:14 said that the prophecy of the Virgin Birth is fulfilled in Jesus who came from the womb of Mary, a παρθένος (*parthenos*), “a virgin.” Was the angel wrong when he told us that this is the meaning of the word *almah* in Isa 7:14? No, these so-called scholars of the RSV were in error, not the angel. The angel surely knew Hebrew and Greek much better than they! Matt 1:18 and 25 tell us in no uncertain terms that Mary was a virgin from the time she conceived Jesus till the time she gave birth to Him. It is no wonder that Rabbi Israel Bettan criticised the RSV. He said of the RSV, “The Revised Standard Version is not a faithful translation, and in some places the revisers do violence to the original Hebrew. It is a good book on the Bible, but it is not the Bible. When asked to compare the King James Version with various other translations, the rabbi said that of the English versions mentioned the King James Version was, in his opinion, the most faithful to the original” (*The Brethren Missionary Herald* [Feb 1958]).

The same is said by Dr Robert Alter (BA, Columbia University, MA, PhD, Harvard University) who was professor of Hebrew at the University of California, Berkeley, “Modern English versions put readers at a grotesque distance from the Hebrew Bible. To this day, the *Authorized Version* of 1611 (the “King James Bible”) . . . for all its archaisms . . . remains *the closest* we have . . . of the original.”

The following critique of the NIV’s treatment of Isa 7:14 is taken from Radmacher and Hodges’ *The NIV Reconsidered*, 52-4.

The NIV translated העלמה (*ha’ almah*) in Isa 7:14 as “the virgin.” According to Radmacher and Hodges, “the use of the definite article ‘the’ with ‘virgin,’ the NIV has laid the groundwork for a quasi-liberal view of Isaiah 7:14.

“This becomes obvious when we read *The NIV Study Bible* note. The note states: ‘7:14 *sign*. A sign was normally fulfilled within a few years (see 20:3; 37:30; cf. 8:18).’ This statement leads to the legitimate inference that we should not look for a distant (that is, *Messianic*) fulfillment of 7:14 during the New Testament period! The flawed NIV view of Messianic prophecy is once again in evidence.

“The note continues: ‘*virgin*. May refer to a young woman betrothed to Isaiah (8:3), who was to become his second wife (his first wife presumably having died after Shear-jashub was born). In Gen. 24:43 the same Hebrew word (*almah*) refers to a woman about to be married (see also Pr. 30:19). Mt. 1:23 apparently understood the woman mentioned here to be a type (foreshadowing) of the Virgin Mary.’ So now the cat is out of the bag! In the NIV, ‘*the virgin*’ apparently is intended to refer to a specific individual who, though not previously named, is very much a part of the larger context of this announcement. To put it briefly, ‘*the virgin*’ refers to ‘*the*

woman' Isaiah is about to marry. Only if the prediction is viewed typologically, so we are told, can we find any validity to Matthew's use of this text in reference to the Virgin Mary.

"Despite the finely honed statements of the NIV study note, what the note really means is this: Isaiah 7:14 is not a direct prophecy about the virgin birth at all. Indeed, the woman to whom it *did* really apply gave birth in a perfectly normal way! But nobody could deduce such a conclusion from Matthew's use of the text.

Haven't we been through all this before? What about the long-running debate in the 19th and early 20th centuries, between liberals and conservatives, over whether Isaiah 7:14 truly predicts the virgin birth or not? Is not the Christian public ready for an evangelical translation that concedes the basic case to liberal theology and then clings to the slender reed of typology to preserve its weakened conservative credentials? We hope not.

"Let this be said clearly. The authors of this book hold firmly to the traditional evangelical view that Isaiah 7:14 directly predicts the virgin birth of our Lord. No other reading of this text comports with the inspired use of it made by Matthew."

6a. The Superiority of the King James or Authorised Version (KJV/AV)

1b. The KJV is Superior Because it is Based on the Preserved Text

All Christians should believe in the inspiration (2 Tim 3:16), and preservation of Scripture (Ps 12:6). Jesus used the OT Scripture during His earthly ministry, and considered every word of it to be inspired. In Matt 5:18, He said, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." This surely implies that the Hebrew Scriptures have been preserved through the centuries, to the extent that every bit of it has been left intact. If God has so providentially preserved the words of the OT Scriptures so that none of them is lost, will He not also preserve the NT Scriptures in the same way? Based on God's promises, we can say with good reason that we have the autograph of the NT in the wealth of extant manuscripts available today. Most of the extant NT manuscripts are of the Byzantine or Majority text-type which is well-represented by the Textus Receptus. The rest of the manuscripts belong to the Alexandrian or Minority text-type, and are reflected in the Critical Text of Westcott/Hort, UBSGNT, and NA. We believe the Majority Text is the Preserved Text, and the Minority Text, the Corrupt Text.

2b. The KJV is Superior Because of its Godly and Able Translators

The King James Version is an excellent translation of the Holy Scriptures. It is a good fruit. It is a good fruit because it comes from a good tree (Matt 7:15-20). *The KJV is a good translation because of good translators*; in terms of their intellect and learning, they were brilliant; and in their faith and devotion towards God, they were vibrant.

There are two main books that talk about the KJV translators: (1) Alexander McClure, *Translator's Revived* (1858), and (2) Gustavus Paine, *The Men Behind the KJV* (1959).

There were a total of 57 scholars of the highest rank who translated the KJV. All of them were not only men of great learning but also of great piety. They were

skilled in the biblical languages, and lived in a period when the English language was at its most glorious height. It was a most providentially opportune time to translate the Scriptures into the English tongue.

The translators were divided into 6 groups: 3 OT and 3 NT. An OT-NT pair worked on their assigned books at Cambridge, another pair at Westminster, and another at Oxford. They began their work in 1604 and completed it in 1611—a total of 7 years.

I do not think that today one can assemble such an august company of devout Bible scholars and theologians. I do believe that the translating of the KJV was a providential act of God just like the 16th century Reformation.

Why do we have such confidence in the KJV? We have such confidence in the KJV because of the intellectual and spiritual qualities of the men that produced it.

1c. The KJV Translators were Men of Great Piety

The KJV translators evinced an intense love for God's Word. It is disheartening to know that there are people today who translate the Bible because of the love of money. Bible-publishing is a money-spinning enterprise. Why do you think people spend time and energy to produce a new version once every few years? It can rake in millions of dollars.

The KJV translators are thankfully not driven by money. They were driven by this desire that people need to read the Bible in its purity and accuracy in their own language. In their original preface to the KJV—"The Translators to the Reader"—they wrote, "But now what piety without truth? What truth (what saving truth) without the Word of God? What Word of God (whereof we may be sure) without Scripture? The Scriptures we are commanded to search. (John 5:39; Isaiah 8:20). They are commended that searched and studied them. (Acts 17:11 and 8:28-29). They are reproved that were unskilful in them, or slow to believe them (Matthew 22:29, Luke 24:25). They can make us wise unto salvation (2 Timothy 3:15). If we be ignorant, they will instruct us; if out of the way, they will bring us home; if out of order, they will reform us; if in heaviness, comfort us; if dull, quicken us; if cold inflame us. ... Take up and read, take up and read the Scriptures . . ."

Dr John Reynolds who is called "the father of the KJV" because it was he who proposed this project was a Puritan. And there were many others in the committee who were puritans. Now the puritans were famed for their piety. With such a reverent attitude and devotion to the Scriptures we are confident that they did not take their work lightly. Indeed, they did not frivolously throw out verses and passages, unlike the NIV which has removed so many verses from the Bible. Eg: Matt 18:11, "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost." (In the NIV you have Matt 18:10, the next verse is not 11 but 12). Acts 8:37, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;" a total of 24 words missing! And such precious passages as John 7:58-8:11 on Jesus forgiving the woman taken in adultery and the last 12 verses of Mark are said to be not part of Scripture. What a lack of reverence for the Word of God by these NIV translators! We have scant confidence in these modern translators. There appears to be general lack of reverence for the Scriptures in these modern translators. We rather trust the KJV.

2c. The KJV Translators were Men of Great Learning

Opponents of the KJV say that the KJ translators are outdated in their theology and in their learning. “We have better, more up-to-date theology,” they say. What a deception and a false allegation! Spurgeon has well said, “There is nothing new in theology except that which is false.” That is a true statement. Jeremiah words continue to ring true: “Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls” (Jer 6:16).

If you will read the lives of the KJ translators you will be amazed by their intellectual and academic achievements. I dare say in terms of ability, they outstrip the modern translators any time. Let me just introduce you to a few of them:

Lancelot Andrews: Dr Andrews belonged to the Westminster team of translators, and was made chairman of the OT committee. Was Dr Andrews skilled in the OT languages? He was a graduate of Cambridge University where he devoted his time to the study of both modern and ancient languages, and to the study of theology. He was at home with 15 languages. (We are not talking about just a working knowledge of these languages. He was conversant with all 15). A very spiritual man, diligent in keeping his daily devotions (what we call QT). But do you know how he kept his QT. He would prayerfully read and meditate on the Scriptures, and then write his personal devotional thoughts in Greek. In other words, as he did his QT he wrote his RPG, not in English but in Greek. Nowadays, there are pastors who do not even keep their QT, much less write devotional manuals, and if they do, how many would write them in the Greek language? Who can match Dr Andrews’ spiritual sensitivity and linguistic superiority today?

William Bedwell: Dr Bedwell belonged to the Westminster team. He was an expert not only in Hebrew and Aramaic, but also in the cognate languages like Arabic, Persian, and other semitic languages. These extra-biblical languages are important in the translation of the OT because they are sister languages of Hebrew and Aramaic. Since they belong to the same family of semitic languages, knowing them will be helpful in identifying the meaning of certain rare words in the Bible. Dr Bedwell was so linguistically learned that he was able to produce an Arabic Lexicon or Dictionary (3 volumes), and a Persian Dictionary.

Henry Savile: Sir Henry Savile belonged to the Oxford team. He was involved in the translation of the NT. Savile became famous for his knowledge of the Greek language. He was Queen Elizabeth’s personal Greek tutor. He was also equally proficient in Latin. He translated the histories of Cornelius Tacitus who was a Latin historian. Savile translated his work from Latin to English. He not only did this, but also edited the complete work of Chrysostom the famous Greek Church Father. His edition of Chrysostom amounted to 8 immense folios. A folio is equivalent to the size of a volume of the Encyclopedia Britannica; he had 8 volumes of this size. A monumental work indeed. Do you find any of the modern translators producing such monumental works?

John Bois: Dr John Bois belonged to the Cambridge team. He was born into a very godly Christian family and was deeply influenced by his

father. At the age of 5 years he had read the Bible not in English but in Hebrew! By the age of 6 Bois could write in Hebrew! Not only had he such talent for the Hebrew language, he also was equally skilled in the Greek so much so that when he was a freshman in St John's College, he wrote his personal letters to his Cambridge professors not in English but in Greek! FEBC students here will tell you it is difficult enough to translate the Greek NT into English, but Bois could compose his own essays in Greek when he was a student at Cambridge. It is thus no surprise that he later became professor of Greek at Cambridge. Can any of the modern translators say this of themselves? To be honest, I have spent 8 years of my life in full-time theological studies and most of those years involved an intensive study of the biblical languages of Greek and Hebrew and I studied a little Aramaic, but am I at home with the biblical languages as the KJV translators were. I dare not say so. They were giants, I am but a dwarf. I would also venture to say that our modern translators are also pygmies compared to the KJV translators. Moreover, we are living in an age when Bible Colleges and Seminaries are giving up the study of the biblical languages. In FEBC we require our MDiv graduates to go through 3 years of Greek and 2 years of Hebrew, but there are seminaries in the States where you can get your MDiv without any of the languages, and no thesis to boot. (And mind you these are accredited seminaries). Even such reputable seminaries as Dallas and Grace Seminary have removed significant chunks of their traditionally strong language departments to make room for more practice-oriented courses. I wonder whether the Bible scholars of today really qualify to translate the Scriptures. How many of them if placed in 1600's would be selected to be part of the KJV translation committee?

Consider Alexander McClure's Evaluation of the KJ Translators and Translation. The KJV is a result of God's providence. McClure said, "As to the capability of those men, we may say again, that by the good Providence of God, their work was undertaken in a fortunate time. Not only had the English language, that singular compound, then ripened to its full perfection, but the study of Greek, and of the oriental tongues, ... had then be carried to a greater extent in England than ever before or since. ... it is confidently expected that the reader of these pages will yield to the conviction, that all the colleges of Great Britain and America, even in this proud day of boastings, could not bring together the same number of divines equally qualified by learning and piety for the great undertaking. Few indeed are the living names worthy to be enrolled with those mighty men. It would be impossible to convene out of any one Christian denomination, or out of all, a body of translators, on whom the whole Christian community would bestow such confidence as is reposed upon that illustrious company, or who would prove themselves as deserving of such confidence" (*Translators Revived*, 63-4).

How do new versions and their translators compare to the KJV and its translators? According to McClure, "As to the Bible in its English form, it is safe to assume the impossibility of gathering a more competent body of translators, than those who did the work so well under King James's commission. ... And what has not been done by the most able and best qualified divines, is not likely to be done by obscure pedagogues, broken-down parsons, and sectaries of a single idea, and that a wrong one,--who, from

different quarters, are talking big and loud of their ‘amended,’ ‘improved,’ and ‘only correct’ and reliable re-translations, and getting up ‘American and Foreign Bible Unions’ to print their sophomorical performances. How do such shallow adventurers appear along side of those venerable men . . . The newly-risen versionists, with all their ambitious and pretentious vaunts are not worthy to ‘carry satchels’ after those masters of learning. Imagine our greenish contemporaries shut up with an Andrews, a Reynolds, a Ward, and a Bois, comparing notes on the meaning of the original Scriptures! It would soon be found, that all the aid of our moderns could render would be in snuffing the candles, . . . Let tinkers stick to the baser metals; and heaven forefend that they should clout the vessels of the sanctuary with their clumsy patches” (*Translators Revived*, 233-4).

Consider Dean John William Burgon’s Confidence in the KJV. Dean Burgon, an Oxford scholar, was one of the greatest Bible defenders of the last century. In a time when Westcott and Hort sought to destroy the KJV by their corrupted Greek Text (today known as the eclectic text on which such versions as the RSV, NIV, and NASB are based). Dean Burgon was raised by the Lord to uphold and defend the KJV: “It may be confidently assumed that no ‘revision’ of our Authorized Version, however judiciously executed, will ever occupy the place in public esteem which is actually enjoyed by the work of the translators of 1611,--The noblest literary work in the Anglo-Saxon language” (*Revision Revised*, 113). He enjoined us “. . . to cling the closer to the priceless treasure which was bequeathed to them by the piety and wisdom of their fathers. . . . How very seldom our Authorised Version is materially wrong; how faithful and trustworthy, on the contrary, it is throughout” (*Revision Revised*, 232).

Consider also Burgon’s admiration of the KJ translators: “. . . the plain fact being that the men of 1611 produced a work of real genius: seizing with generous warmth the meaning and intention of the sacred Writers” (*Revision Revised*, 167). “Verily, those men understood their craft! ‘There were giants in those days.’ . . . the Spirit of their God was mightily upon them” (*Revision Revised*, 196).

I want to echo the words of Dean Burgon on attempts to produce a new translation: “As something intended to supersede our present English Bible, we are thoroughly convinced that the project of a rival translation is not to be entertained for a moment. For ourselves, we deprecate it entirely” (*Revision Revised*, 113-4).

I dare say that the Bible scholars, theologians, and linguists of today fail to come even close to the calibre of scholarship and spirituality that we find in the KJ translators. I sincerely doubt that the KJV will ever be surpassed by a superior translation. In any case, until the Lord providentially raises up equally faithful and competent servants to give us a new version which is equally accurate and reliable, let us stick to the good old version—the KJV.

3b. The KJV is Superior Because it is an Accurate Translation

The KJV uses a superior method of translation. The KJV employs the verbal/formal over against the dynamic equivalence method of translation. The verbal/formal equivalence method is the only acceptable method for the translation of

the Holy Scriptures. Why? Simply because the Bible is the verbally inspired Word of God. God gave a very serious warning in Rev 22:18, “For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: 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.” In any attempt to translate the Scriptures, it is paramount that there should be no addition to, subtraction from, and changing of God’s Word. It must be word-for-word, not thought-for-thought. The dynamic equivalence (a thought-for-thought) method may be well and good for other literature, but certainly not the Scriptures. The Bible’s divine origin and its verbal inerrancy forbid it. “Blood” must be translated “blood,” and not “death” (so TEV), and “Joseph” must be translated “Joseph,” and not “the child’s father” (so NIV).

4b. The KJV is Superior Because it is Faithful to Historic Protestant Theology

Those who say that all versions are good argue that there is no essential difference between the KJV and the modern versions in terms of theology. Although they admit that there are differences, they say that no vital doctrines are affected in all these new translations. I contend that this claim is false. We have already seen clear examples above of how these 20th century versions have unfaithfully manipulated the text affecting theology. We have discussed how certain doctrines have been affected. Let us recapitulate: (1) Inspiration of Scripture (2 Tim 3:16), (2) Preservation of Scripture (Ps 12:6), (3) Virgin Birth of Christ (Isa 7:14), (4) Eternal Generation of Christ (John 1:14,18, 3:16,18, 1 John 4:9), (5) the Holy Trinity (1 John 5:7-8), (6) the deity and humanity of Christ (1 Tim 3:16), and many others (see also D A Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, 131-183).

Some will argue that the absence of the Johannine Comma (1 John 5:7f) does not affect the doctrine of the Trinity because there are many other biblical passages that teach it. The doctrine is thus not lost. While the doctrine may not be lost, a very strong testimony for it has surely been. Which other scriptural passage is as crystal clear as 1 John 5:7 in expressing the unity of the three Persons of the Godhead? We lose a very valuable proof-text by such flippant statements against the traditional preserved text in favour for the critical cut-up text. This is not a small matter as some would like to think. Paul warned, “a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump” (Gal 5:9). The 7% (NIV’s Ken Barker says 2%) of missing words in the Scripture in the modern versions may be considered very little, but it is this little leaven is destructive to God’s Word, and to His Church.

7a. Some FAQ’s (Frequently Asked Questions) About the KJV-Only Issue

1b. Instead of using the KJV, can we use the New King James Version (NKJV) and the 21st Century King James Version (KJ21)?

The NKJV came into the scene in 1982. It claims to be an improvement of the old KJV. To its credit, the NKJV does not employ the dynamic but formal equivalence method of translation. It is thus a more reliable translation than the NIV. According to Arthur Farstad, the NKJV is more literal than the NIV, but more literary

than the NASB. Although better than the other modern versions available today, it is not superior to the old KJV for the following reasons:

Its failure to distinguish between the singular and plural of the 2d personal pronoun (ie “you”). For instance, “thou art” is “you (sg) are,” “ye are” is “you (pl) are,” “thee” is “you (sg),” and “you (KJV)” is “you (pl).” The Greek differentiates between the singular and plural “you,” and the old KJV renders them accordingly. “But the NKJV the singular “thee” to “you,” and in so doing gives us a less precise translation. Eg: in Luke 22:31-32, the NKJV reads, “Simon, Simon! Indeed, Satan has asked for **you** (sg or pl?), that he may sift *you* as wheat. But I have prayed for **you** (sg or pl?), ...” Cf KJV, “Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have **you** (pl), that he may sift *you* as wheat: But I have prayed for **thee** (sg), ...”

In Isa 7:14 on the virgin birth, the NKJV reads, “Therefore the Lord Himself will give *you* (sg or pl? just Ahaz or faithful believers?) a sign, ...” Since the NKJV does not distinguish between the singular and plural pronouns, it allows for a popular and very wrong interpretation of this verse which claims that the sign of the virgin birth was directly given to Ahaz the faithless king, and so must be fulfilled in his time. Walter Kaiser for example says that the virgin birth was fulfilled in Ahaz’s wife, and the child born was Hezekiah! With the old KJV, it is clear that *the plural* “you” shifts the focus from Ahaz to the house of David hinting to us that Ahaz is not the recipient of this sign.

So, the NKJV though superior to most modern versions is still inferior to the old KJV. There is therefore no good reason to replace the KJV with the NKJV. For more information, read G W and D E Anderson, *The New King James Version* (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1995).

How about the KJ21? The KJ21 unlike the NKJV is not a new translation but an update of the old KJV. As such (1) no textual changes were made, (2) the old and solemn pronouns (ie thee, thou, ye, etc) have been retained, (3) the important theological terms remain the same (eg judgment, doctrine, justification, sanctification, propitiation, atonement, etc). However, one drawback of the KJ21 is its costliness. Great Christian Books (a USA-based mail order bookseller) which sells books at significant discounts priced it at S\$50.40 (hardcover). As an update, it serves as a useful companion to, not replacement of the KJV.

2b. When you say the KJV is the only reliable and accurate Bible, are you saying that the Chinese, Tamil, Korean Bibles are not?

No, we are not saying that at all. We are also not saying that everyone in the whole wide world regardless of language must use only the English Bible. We are glad over the fact that the Bible is translated into so many languages. The Westminster Confession itself says that the Scriptures “are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation.” However, we must ensure that the translation used must be faithful, accurate, and reliable.

3b. Was King James a homosexual as alleged by anti-KJVists? If King James was such a man, does that not detract from the version that bears his name?

There are those who say that he was, and there are those who think otherwise. Before we pass judgment, we must hear from both sides viz, King James himself, and his accusers. We need concrete proof. Before we call someone a homosexual, we

must be very sure he is so beyond doubt. But for argument's sake, let's say King James was gay. Being homosexual he would surely alter scriptural texts which speak against the sin of homosexuality. We do not find such alterations in the KJV. On the contrary, we find intact such passages as Rom 1:26-27 speaking out against "*vile affections; for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which is meet.*" If King James was truly homosexual, why then did he leave this passage untampered?

In any case, even if King James was gay, he was not among the translators, and had no part in the translating work. Whether he was a homosexual or not is a non-issue.

Dr Samuel Gipp (*The Answer Book* [Tennessee: Bible & Literature Missionary Foundation, 1989], 9-10) said that King James had enemies. One such man was Anthony Weldon. Weldon, 25 years after King James had died, wrote a paper in 1650 calling him a homosexual. This allegation was largely ignored by the people at that time probably because it wasn't true. It may be regarded as one of these hate mails that we get now and then.

Update: Lately, a scholarly 392 page book providing evidence in support of the godly character of King James is offered by Stephen A Coston Sr, *King James the VI of Scotland and the I of England: Unjustly Accused?* (St Petersburg: KoenigsWort Incorporated, 1996). Available from the FEBC Bookroom.

4b. The many archaic words of the KJV make it difficult for me to understand the Scriptures. Is this not good reason for me to change to a modern version?

No, it is not a good reason. The claim that the KJV has "many" archaic words and therefore not understandable is overstated. Out of 800,000 words, there are only about 600 archaic words in the KJV. These out-dated words comprise only 0.1% of the KJV. The meaning of these words may be easily found in the "Bible Word List" published by the Trinitarian Bible Society. Dr Laurence Vance has recently produced a helpful volume not only to give but also to explain the meaning of the archaic words comparing them to the words found in modern versions. See his book *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version* (Pensacola: Vance Publications, 1996).

5b. The KJV is not as readable as the modern versions. Is this true?

After extensive research and study, D A Waite Jr says, "The entire KJV averages 1.31 syllables and 3,968 letters per word. This word length puts the KJV in the same readability category as the children's books . . ." It is not true that the KJV is unreadable. For the details, go to D A Waite Jr, *The Comparative Readability of the Authorized Version* (Collingswood: Bible For Today, 1996).

Those who want to improve their command of English would do well to use the KJV.

6b. There are so many revisions on the KJV. So which KJV is the correct one?

The KJV was first published in 1611. However, there were revisions that followed soon after; all of which were completed in 1629. The revisions that occurred

between 1611 and 1629 were due to printing errors. These errors were corrected by the KJV translators themselves, namely Samuel Ward and John Bois. In the course of typesetting, the printers have inadvertently left out words or phrases; all such manifest typographical errors were corrected. For example, Ps 16:17 of the 1611 edition read “good” instead of “God.” This was clearly a printer’s error, and was corrected in 1617.

Another revision of the KJV was done between 1762 and 1769. This revision had to do with spelling. For example, old forms which had an “e” after verbs, and “u” instead of “v,” and “f” for “s” were all standardised to conform to modern spelling. For example, “feare” is “fear,” “mooued” is “moved,” and “euill” is “evil,” and “alfo,” is “also.” (To see the old-style printing type-face and spelling, you can go to the 16-17th century facsimile editions of John Calvin’s *Sermons on the Epistles of Timothy and Titus* reprinted by Banner of Truth found in the FEBC library.) All these Gothic and German spelling peculiarities have been Romanised by 1769. It is important to note that the 1769 edition is essentially the same as the 1611. There are not two or more KJVs but only one, and the one which is used today is the 1769 edition. (See Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, 237-8.)

7b. Aren’t KJV-only or KJV-superiority advocates ignorant or unscholarly people?

The accusation of not being up-to-date or unscholarly is leveled against KJV advocates by neo-evangelicals especially. If you do not buy their brand of mixed-up modernistic cum evangelical scholarship, and disagree with their liberal presuppositions, you are labeled an “ignoramus.” Although there are KJV extremists who have a zeal but without knowledge, there are many who do their research, are proficient in the biblical languages, and are well-trained in theology. More importantly, all are ardent Christians who love the Lord, and His Word.

This stigma of being called an “ignoramus” if you support the KJV and oppose WH was faced by **Alfred Martin** (former Vice-President of Moody Bible Institute) when he was at Dallas Theological Seminary. So he decided to write his ThD dissertation to prove the WH textual critical theory wrong. The title of his dissertation written in 1951 was, “A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory.” This is what he said, “The present generation of Bible students, having been reared on Westcott and Hort, have for the most part accepted the theory without independent or critical examination. To the average student of the Greek New Testament today it is unthinkable to question the theory at least in its basic premises. Even to imply that one believes the Textus Receptus to be nearer the original text than the Westcott-Hort text is, lays one open to the suspicion of gross ignorance or unmitigated bigotry. ...

“At precisely the time when liberalism was carrying the field in the English churches the theory of Westcott and Hort received wide acclaim. These are not isolated facts. Recent contributions on the subject—that is, in the present century—following mainly the Westcott-Hort principles and method, have been made largely by men who deny the inspiration of the Bible. ...

“Textual criticism cannot be divorced entirely from theology. No matter how great a Greek scholar a man may be, or no matter how great an authority on the textual evidence, his conclusions must always be opened to suspicion if he does not accept the Bible as the very Word of God. ...

“The great difficulty in New Testament textual criticism today, which makes it impossible for Bible-believing Christians to be sanguine about the results of present research, is the almost universally held view among critics of the relative nature of truth. Textual criticism has become more and more subjective since Westcott and Hort opened the door of subjectivism wide” (David Cloud, *Myths About the King James Bible* [Oak Harbor: Way of Life, 1993], 18-9).

We thank the Lord that some anti-TR/KJV scholars later changed their position. They were honest about their initial blindness or ignorance, and spoke for the TR/KJV after knowing the truth. One such man is **William Bruner**, ThM, PhD. In a letter to D O Fuller he said, “. . . you wrote me a very kind letter and sent me some sample materials from your book *Which Bible?*. You might as well have been shooting a pop gun at a stone wall. My mind was so strongly fortified in the doctrine of Westcott and Hort that I could not for one moment consider the King James Bible. Had I not studied Textual Criticism under the great Dr. A.T. Robertson? I thought that you were just one of those die-hard Fundamentalists who were striving to keep the Christian world under the bondage of traditionalism. Such men are interested only in pleasing the people by catering to their ignorance, prejudice and sentimentality! But just a few weeks ago I happened to read your two books, *Which Bible?* and *True or False?*. For the first time a little new light shone in. I saw that there is another side of the argument. Dr Robertson had not given us all the facts” (Ibid, 4).

Apparently there has been a *conspiracy of silence*! This silence is promoted in most Bible colleges and seminaries when NT Introduction and NT Exegesis are taught. This is testified by **D A Waite**, ThD, PhD, who wrote, “For about twenty years I was in darkness about this issue. I knew nothing of it from roughly 1951 to 1971. . . I was at Dallas Theological Seminary from 1948-1952. That was my Master of Theology. Then I stayed an extra year, 1953. Throughout those years we were simply told to use the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament, which we did in the Greek classes. It was the actual text Westcott and Hort developed. It was not simply another text—the Nestles [sic] Text or the Souter Text—but it was Westcott and Hort. And *I didn't know there was any other Greek text. . .*

“I majored in classic [sic] Greek and Latin at the University of Michigan, 1945-48. Took three years to get my four years of work. I went summer and winter, so that I could marry my wife. Then I came to Dallas Seminary. I was learning New Testament Greek, and I didn't pay much heed to the text. I didn't care. I just wanted to learn the forms and get good grades, which I did. But I did not examine the textual base that we were using. *I just assumed that was the only one to use.*

“You ask the question, then, how I came to understand the Bible version issue. . . , my mother-in-law to be, Mrs. Gertrude Grey Sanborn, gave me the book *God Wrote Only One Bible*. I didn't say or think too much about it. I didn't study it at that time, but that was my first introduction. Then as I was teaching as professor of Greek at Shelton College in Cape Maine [sic], New Jersey, one of my pupils, Sandra Devos—Sandra Phillips, I think, was her name then—said that there was a book in our library at Shelton by Dean John William Burgon that defends not only the King James Bible, but also the Greek text, the Received Text, that underlies the Bible.

“‘Have you ever seen that book, Dr Waite?’ she asked me. I said, ‘Well, no, I haven't.’ I think I might have looked at it; I might have glanced at it. I thought to myself, ‘Here is an interesting thing. Here is the first book that I have seen that says there is a difference in the Greek text that the modern versions are using, and that the

King James Bible that underlies it, the Textus Receptus, is superior to the Westcott and Hort-type text, or to the critical text.’

“. . . Then about that time, I think it was about 1969 or 1970, along in there, Dr. Fuller came out with his book *Which Bible?*. I read that. Also I looked at at least one of the books by Dr. Edward F. Hills—*Believing Bible Study*. I don’t think I saw at the time his other book, *The Defense of the King James Bible* [sic].

“So in 1971, having read these various books, I was deeply convicted and convinced that the King James Bible and the Greek text that underlies it, as well as the Hebrew text—although I got into the Hebrew text a little bit later—but I was convinced that the Greek text that underlies the New Testament of the King James Bible was the accurate text to use. ...

“So can you say the first twenty years, from 1951-71, I was in somewhat of a daze, somewhat of a darkness, concerning the issues. Then from 1971-91, twenty more years, I have been writing, I have been studying, I have been preaching, I have been teaching, I have been debating, I have been arguing, I have been talking about, I have been preaching from, I have continued to memorize from and believe the King James Bible and the text that underlies that Bible. So for twenty years I’ve been a stalwart defender of that Book” (Ibid., 4-5; see also D A Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, 218-9).

Consider also the testimony of **Edward F Hills** (BD, Westminster, ThM, Columbia, ThD, Harvard). On how he became a KJV believer, Dr Hills wrote, “I have been interested in the problem of New Testament textual criticism since my high school days in the 1920's. At that time I began to read the commentaries of Charles Hodge, books that were a part of my Presbyterian heritage. I noticed that Hodge would sometimes mention variant readings, most however, just to show that he was knowledgeable, for he rarely departed from "the common text" (textus receptus) and "our English version" (King James). Even so my curiosity was roused, so that in 1931, when I was a sophomore at Yale University I took down C. R. Gregory's Canon and Text of the NT from a library shelf and began to read. I was dismayed at the large number of verses that, according to Gregory and his teachers Westcott and Hort, must be rejected from the Word of God. Nor was I much comforted by Gregory's assurance that the necessary damage had been done and the rest of the text had been placed on an unassailable basis. How could I be sure of this? It seemed to me that the only way to gain assurance on this point was to go to Westminster Seminary and study the question under the tutelage of Dr. Machen, who preached in New Haven rather frequently in those days, talking to Yale students at least twice.

“When I began to study New Testament textual criticism at Westminster (under Dr. Stonehouse) I found that the first day or so was mainly devoted to praising Dr. B. B. Warfield. He was lauded for being among the first to recognize the "epoch making" importance of the theory of Westcott and Hort and for establishing the Westcott and Hort tradition at Princeton Seminary, a tradition which was now being faithfully perpetuated at Westminster Seminary. To me, however, all this was very puzzling. Dr. Warfield was a renowned defender of the Reformed faith and of the Westminster Confession, yet in the department of New Testament textual criticism he agreed entirely with liberals such as Westcott, Hort and C. R. Gregory. He professed to agree with the statement of the Westminster Confession that the Scriptures by God's "singular care and providence" had been "kept pure in all ages", but it was obvious that this providential preservation of the Scripture was of no importance to Dr. Warfield when he actually began to deal with the problems of the New Testament.

When he engaged in New Testament textual criticism, Dr. Warfield ignored the providential preservation of the Scriptures and treated the text of the New Testament as he would the text of any book or writing. "It matters not whether the writing before us be a letter from a friend, or an inscription from Carchemish, or a copy of a morning newspaper, or Shakespeare, or Homer, or the Bible."

"I may be reading back into my student days some of my later thinking, but it seems to me that even at that time I could see that the logic of Warfield's naturalistic New Testament textual criticism led steadily downward toward modernism and unbelief. For if the providential preservation of the Scriptures was not important for the study of the New Testament text, then it could not have been important for the history of the New Testament text. And if it had not been important for the history of the New Testament, then it must have been non-existent. It could not have been a fact. And if the providential preservation of the Scriptures was not a fact, why should the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures be regarded as a fact? Why would God infallibly inspire a book and then decline to preserve it providentially? For example, why would God infallibly inspire the Gospel of Mark and then permit (as Warfield thought possible) the ending of it (describing the resurrection appearances of Christ) to be lost?

"Why was Dr. Warfield so inconsistent in the realm of New Testament textual criticism? Dr. Van Til's course in apologetics enabled me to supply the answer to this question. Dr. Warfield's inconsistency was part of his scholastic inheritance, an error which had been handed down to him from the middle-ages. Let me explain. During the middle-ages the school men tried to reconcile the philosophy of Aristotle with the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church by separating faith from reason and praying from thinking. While dealing with dogma, faith and prayer were appropriate, but the study of philosophy was reason's province. So the medieval school men contended, and soon this doctrine of the separation of faith from reason became generally accepted throughout the medieval Roman Catholic Church.

"The Protestant Reformers were fully occupied with other matters. Hence they spent but little time combating this medieval, Roman Catholic error of the separation of faith and reason. Hence this false scholastic doctrine survived the Reformation and soon became embedded in the thinking of conservative Protestants everywhere. In the 18th century Butler and Paley built their apologetic systems on this false principle of the separation of faith and reason, and in the 19th century, at Princeton and other conservative theological seminaries, this scholastic principle even governed the curriculum and the way in which the several subjects were taught. Systematic theology, practical theology and homiletics were placed in one box labeled FAITH. All the other subjects, including New Testament textual criticism, biblical introduction, apologetics and philosophy, were placed in another box labeled REASON.

"We see now why Dr. Warfield was so inconsistent. We see why he felt himself at liberty to adopt the naturalistic theories of Westcott and Hort and did not perceive that in so doing he was contradicting the Westminster Confession and even his own teaching in the realm of systematic theology. The reason was that Dr. Warfield kept these subjects in separate boxes. Like an authentic, medieval scholastic, he kept his systematic theology and the Westminster Confession in his FAITH box and his New Testament textual criticism in his REASON box. Since he never tried to mingle the contents of these two boxes, he was never fully aware of the discrepancies in his thinking.

“When I began to study New Testament textual criticism at Westminster in 1935, I noticed another thing. Almost as much time was spent in disparaging Dean Burgon as in praising Dr. Warfield. This again aroused my curiosity. Who was this Dean Burgon? Upon investigation, I found that he had been a British scholar that had not fitted into the usual scholastic mold. He had not kept his theology and his New Testament textual criticism in two separate boxes, but had actually dared to make his theology the guiding principle of his New Testament textual criticism. For this he was pronounced "unscholarly".

“Actually, however, he was merely following the logic of faith. He believed that the New Testament was the infallibly inspired Word of God. Hence it had been preserved down through the ages by God's special providence, not secretly in holes and caves and on forgotten library shelves but publicly in the usage of God's Church. Hence the text found in the vast majority of the New Testament manuscripts is the true text because this is the text that has been used by God's Church. As soon as I began to read Burgon's works, I was impressed by this logic of faith and also by the learned arguments by which Burgon refuted the contention of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott, Hort, etc. Finally, after some years of hesitation, I definitely committed myself to his view in 1952. ...

“Therefore, the true New Testament text is found today in the majority of the Greek New Testament manuscripts, in the Textus Receptus, and in the King James Version and other faithful translations of the Textus Receptus. And therefore also this same preserving providence operating today through the agency of all those true believers, however humble, who retain and defend the King James Version.”
(Copyright 1996 by Majorie J Hills).

Another such story is that of Dr **S Franklin Logsdon** (1907-87) who translated the NASB. Dr Logsdon in his testimony—“From NASV to KJV”—wrote, “Back in 1956-57 Mr. F. Dewey Lockman of the Lockman Foundation [contacted me. He was] one of the dearest friends we've ever had for 25 years, a big man, some 300 pounds, snow white hair, one of the most terrific businessmen I have ever met. I always said he was like Nehemiah; he was building a wall. You couldn't get in his way when he had his mind on something; he went right to it; he couldn't be daunted. I never saw anything like it; most unusual man. I spent weeks and weeks and weeks in their home, real close friends of the family.

“Well, he discovered that the copyright [on the American Standard Version of 1901] was just as loose as a fumbled ball on a football field. Nobody wanted it. The publishers didn't want it. It didn't get anywhere. Mr. Lockman got in touch with me and said, ‘Would you and Ann come out and spend some weeks with us, and we'll work on a feasibility report; I can pick up the copyright to the 1901 if it seems advisable.’

“Well, up to that time I thought the Westcott and Hort was the text. You were intelligent if you believed the Westcott and Hort. Some of the finest people in the world believe in that Greek text, the finest leaders that we have today. You'd be surprised; if I told you you wouldn't believe it. They haven't gone into it just as I hadn't gone into it; [they're] just taking it for granted.

“At any rate we went out and started on a feasibility report, and I encouraged him to go ahead with it. I'm afraid I'm in trouble with the Lord, because I encouraged him to go ahead with it. We laid the groundwork; I wrote the format; I helped to interview some of the translators; I sat with the translators; I wrote the preface. When you see the preface to the New American Standard, those are my words.

“I got one of the fifty deluxe copies which were printed; mine was number seven, with a light blue cover. But it was rather big and I couldn’t carry it with me, and I never really looked at it. I just took for granted that it was done as we started it, you know, until some of my friends across the country began to learn that I had some part in it and they started saying, ‘What about this; what about that?’

“Dr. David Otis Fuller in Grand Rapids [Michigan]. I’ve known him for 35 years, and he would say (he would call me Frank; I’d call him Duke), ‘Frank, what about this? You had a part in it; what about this; what about that?’ And at first I thought, Now, wait a minute; let’s don’t go overboard; let’s don’t be too critical. You know how you justify yourself the last minute.

“But I finally got to the place where I said, ‘Ann, I’m in trouble; I can’t refute these arguments; it’s wrong; it’s terribly wrong; it’s frightfully wrong; and what am I going to do about it?’ Well, I went through some real soul searching for about four months, and I sat down and wrote one of the most difficult letters of my life, I think.

“I wrote to my friend Dewey, and I said, ‘Dewey, I don’t want to add to your problems,’ (he had lost his wife some three years before; I was there for the funeral; also a doctor had made a mistake in operating on a cataract and he had lost the sight of one eye and had to have an operation on the other one; he had a slight heart attack; had sugar diabetes; a man seventy- four years of age) ‘but I can no longer ignore these criticisms I am hearing and I can’t refute them. The only thing I can do—and dear Brother, I haven’t a thing against you and I can witness at the judgment of Christ and before men wherever I go that you were 100% sincere,’ (he wasn’t schooled in language or anything; he was just a business man; he did it for money; he did it conscientiously; he wanted it absolutely right and he thought it was right; I guess nobody pointed out some of these things to him) ‘I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard.’”

For other scholars who hold to the KJV-only position, see *Myths About the King James Bible: Myth #5, True Scholars Reject the Received Text* by David Cloud.

8b. Who is Peter Ruckman? Do we agree with him in his defence of the KJV?

Peter Ruckman is a KJV-only defender, but extreme. Actually Ruckman has done more harm than good for the KJV cause. Anti- or Non-KJVists like D A Carson and J R White have attacked legitimate KJV defenders by wrongly and unfairly linking them to Ruckman. Actually I prefer to call myself a KJV-superiority rather than a KJV-only advocate. This is because the KJV-only label has often been misrepresented and caricatured, and many unfortunately connect the KJV-only position with Ruckmanism.

One of the heresies of Ruckman is that the KJV was “given by inspiration of God.” He also claims that the KJV is advanced revelation, and surpasses the inspiration of the original manuscripts. But 2 Tim 3:16 and 2 Pet 1:21 tell us that only the original writings or autographs can be considered “God-breathed.” The apographs (ie copies) are inspired if they are accurate copies. The translations are “inspired” in so far as they are accurate and faithful translations. In any case, the inspiration attached to translations is *derived* not direct. We believe in the preservation of the Scriptures, but it is *not miraculous* but *providential* preservation (so E F Hills).

Moreover, Ruckman takes pleasure in calling people who disagree with him names like “jackass,” “incredible idiot,” “depraved scoundrels,” “uneducated suckers,” etc. He is mean-spirited and rude. For example, he calls Robert Sumner

“Bobbie Scumner,” Bob Jones III “Bobby III,” and “Bobby Wobby,” and Robert Hymers “Hot Dog Hymers. Christian grace is clearly lacking in Ruckman’s speech.

David Cloud says he absolutely rejects Ruckman because of “his strange ideas, his multiple divorces, his angry spirit, his arrogance, his Alexandrian cult mentality, his extremism regarding the KJV being advanced revelation, ...” (*What About Ruckman?* [Oak Harbor: Way of Life Literature, 1995], 4).

9b. What do you think of Gail Riplinger, and her recent book—*New Age Bible Versions*?

Although Riplinger is to be commended for defending the KJV, her methodology is flawed. For this reason, I would suggest you take what she says with a grain of salt. The Trinitarian Bible Society, in a review of her book, wrote, “Mrs. Riplinger’s books contains no bibliography and many of the endnotes lack such necessary documentation as author and publisher. In addition, the book contains many factual errors, false innuendos, mistakes in logic, misquotations and instances of misleading research as well as general English language errors. ... This does not mean that there is no value to the verifiable, truthful or factual statements made in this book; however, many things in this book are without support and therefore untrustworthy.” (The full report can be obtained from the Trinitarian Bible Society, 1710 Richmond NW, Grand Rapids MI 49504, USA.)

This is what Dave Hunt—author of *The Seduction of Christianity*—wrote about Riplinger’s *New Age Bible Versions*, “Those who have a preference for the KJV, as we do, will find no encouragement in Riplinger’s endeavor. Her writing is driven by a misleading style and loaded with contrived ‘evidence.’ She starts off misrepresenting people and continues to do so throughout the entire book” (*Berean Call*, May ’94).

David W Cloud—editor of *O Timothy* magazine—also criticised Riplinger’s book, “For every person who turns from modern versions due to the influence of this book, I praise the Lord. Let me say very plainly at the outset . . . , I do not believe *New Age Bible Versions* is a dangerous book; I believe it is an undependable book” (*O Timothy* 11:8 [1994]).

Update: D A Waite is of a different opinion. He says, “Mrs Gail Riplinger has documented all 700 pages of her book, *New Age Bible Versions*. ... I believe there is tremendous value in her book. It is a book that has sold over 100,000 copies. It has been used to awaken many people as to the Bible version perversion” (*Foes of the King James Bible Refuted* [Collingswood: Bible For Today, 1997], 49).

10b. Which Colleges or Seminaries hold to the KJV-only position?

Besides *Far Eastern Bible College*, the following schools take a strong KJV stance (there may be others, but these are the ones I managed to locate).

1c. *Ambassador Baptist College*, P O Box 158, Stockton Street, Lattimore NC 28089, USA. Its NT Textual Criticism course description states, “An examination of the methods employed in textual criticism with special emphasis on the reliability of the Received Text” (1907-9 Catalog, 59).

2c. *Baptist Bible College and Graduate School of Theology*, 628 East Kearney, Springfield MO 65803, USA. In its 1995-9 catalog, under the section “Approved Bible Text for Baptist Bible College Curriculum” (26), the school states,

1d. We agree that the Bible in its original languages was inspired by God.

2d. By the 16th century, Wycliff and Tyndale had both translated the Bible into the English language. These were both considered acceptable translations.

3d. Through the efforts of the King of England, a new English translation was placed into the hands of the common man.

4d. In the process of time, the changes in word usage and punctuation necessitated several revisions.

5d. We believe that our students should be undergirded by an unshakable faith in the Word of God. We believe that the King James Version is God’s Word kept intact for the English-speaking people.

6d. This statement does not preclude the study of the individual Greek and Hebrew words in the original languages for clarity of meaning.

7d. The Textus Receptus is the approved Greek text of our curriculum.

8d. Update: The above position statement has recently been removed from their website. It appears that they no longer hold to the KJV/TR superiority position.

3c. *Baptist Bible College East*, 950 Metropolitan Avenue, Boston MA 02136, USA. Their doctrinal statement on the Bible is the same as that of #2c above).

4c. *Bethany Bible College and Theological Seminary*, 2311 Hodgesville Road, P O Box 1944, Dothan AL 36302, USA. The 1994 catalog states, “We accept the Scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments to be the verbally inspired Word of God, and that they are the Supreme and final authority for faith and practice. We further accept the 1611 King James Version of the Bible to be the preserved Word of God and use no other translation in our classroom.”

5c. *Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary*. 296 New Britain Avenue Newington, Connecticut 06111, USA. Their doctrinal statement reads, “We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are verbally inspired of God and inerrant in the original writings, and that they are the supreme and

final authority in faith and life. The Scriptures have been recorded and preserved by the Holy Spirit (II Timothy 3:16; II Peter 1:21; Psalm 12:6-7). We believe that the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts which underlie the *King James Version* (the Masoretic text of the Old Testament and the Textus Receptus of the New Testament) are the preserved words of God. Furthermore, we believe that the King James Version of the Bible is God's preserved word in English and therefore, it shall be the official and only translation of the Holy Scriptures used by this Church and all of its ministries (Psalm 119:89-90; Ecclesiastes 3:14; Matthew 5:17-18; John 10:35; I Peter 1:23-25)." Dr Michael Bates is the President, and Dr Thomas Strouse is the Dean.

6c. *Faithway Baptist College of Canada*, 1964 Salem Road, Ajax, Ontario L1S 4S7, Canada. They say, "We believe in the plenary, verbal inspiration of the sixty-six books of the Bible. The Old and New Testaments are inerrant in the original writings, and they are the supreme and final authority in all matters of faith and practice. We believe that the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament and the Textus Receptus of the New Testament are the preserved Word of God. It is our practice to use only the King James Version."

7c. *Florida Baptist College*, 506 South Oakwood Avenue, Brandon FL 33511, USA. Its General Catalog, Volume XVII contains a positional statement which reads "We believe that the Scriptures are verbally inspired; that it is incumbent upon every believer to 'study to shew himself approved unto God'. We recommend the use of the King James Version for public preaching and teaching."

8c. *Foundations Bible College*, Interstate 95, Dennings Road Exit #77, P O Box 1166, Dunn NC 28335, USA. Dr O Talmadge Spence, President of FBC, and Director of the Society for Fundamental Studies, believes that "The Authorized (King James) Version of the Scriptures is the only English Translation that will be read from the Congress Platform of Fundamentalists" (exact quotation from the "We Believe" resolutions of the World Congress of Fundamentalists, Edinburgh Scotland, 1976).

9c. *Great Plains Baptist College*, 412 South Hawthorne, Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57104, USA. The doctrinal information in 1995-7 catalog states, "We believe the Bible is verbally and plenary inspired, and that it is authoritative for all faith and practice; that the King James Version is the only true and accurate translation of God's Word in the English language."

10c. *Independent Baptist College*, 3940 Blue Ridge Blvd, Dallas TX 75233, USA. An abridged statement of faith on page 6 of its 1997-8 catalog says that they use the King James Version as their official classroom text.

11c. *Kentucky Bible College*, P O Box 156, Bowling Green KY 42102, USA. They say, "We believe in the verbal inspiration, inerrancy, and authority of the scriptures. We further believe that the Word of God has been preserved in the English language, in the King James Bible also known as the

‘Authorized Version’ or ‘1611’ Bible.” An additional note says, “We only use, and allow in study and writing requirements, the King James, 1611, A.V. Bible. No other English translations will be used.”

12c. *Landmark Baptist College*, 2222 East Hinson Avenue, Haines City FL 33844, USA. Its doctrinal statement says, “We believe in the original verbal inspiration and eternal preservation of the Scripture. We believe that the Bible is preserved for the English speaking world in the King James Bible.” Entering students must accept the fact that “The King James Bible will be the basis for all classroom teaching, chapel messages, and student assignments at LBC. Students who cannot accept this have no place at Landmark Baptist College.”

13c. *Landmark University*, P O Box 757, Bristol TN 37621, USA. Its statement of faith under “Bible Translations” states, “Landmark accepts only the KING JAMES 1611 as the word of God, holding all other English translations to be based on faulty and heretical manuscripts, and thus glutted with errors. Private ‘rendering of the original languages’ is unacceptable in all cases, since the King James rendering of the original languages will always be the superior, most finely expressive and accurate.” The position taken is extreme. The founder and president is Roy L Branson.

14c. *Pacific Coast Baptist Bible College*, 1100 S Valley Center Avenue, San Dimas CA 91773, USA. The following states its educational philosophy, “[It] is our philosophy that the training of students . . . should be undergirded by an unshakable faith in the divine inspiration and infallibility of the Word of God. We believe the King James Bible is God’s Word preserved for the English-speaking people” (1995-6 catalog, 9).

15c. *Pensacola Christian College and Theological Seminary*, 250 Brent Lane, Box 18000, Pensacola FL 32523, USA. “At Pensacola Christian College, we believe in the plenary, verbal inspiration of the Bible, and it is our practice to use only the King James Version in the pulpit and in classroom instruction. We believe the Textus Receptus is a superior text, and we use it for Greek instruction.” Update: PCC/PTS has come up very strongly against fundamental colleges and seminaries that either merely pay lip service to the KJV, or undermine it altogether by rejecting the traditional text in favour of the modern but corrupt eclectic text. Get a hold of these three excellent video lectures on the KJV issue by Dr Dell Johnson, Dr Theodore Letis, and Dr Michael Bates: (1) “The Leaven in Fundamentalism,” (2) “The Bible ... The Text is the Issue,” (3) “The Bible Preserved ... from Satan’s Attacks.” A weak *argumentum ad hominem* rejoinder is offered by Drs David Doran and William Combs (Detroit Baptist Seminary), Dr Kevin Bauder (Central Baptist Seminary), Dr Robert Delnay (Clearwater Christian College), Drs Thurman Wisdom and Randy Jaeggli (Bob Jones University), Rev Larry Oats (Maranatha Baptist Bible College), Dr Sam Horn (Northland Baptist Bible College), and Dr David Burggraff (Calvary Baptist Seminary) in “Fundamentalism and the Word of God.” Video tape is available from Detroit Baptist Seminary, 4801 Allen Road, Allen Park, MI 48101, USA.

16c. *Protestant Reformed Seminary*. 4949 Ivancrest SW, Grandville Michigan 49418, USA. Excellent articles in defence of the Textus Receptus and the KJV are found at <http://www.prca.org/Seminary/seminary.html>.

17c. *Trinity Baptist College*, 426 South McDuff Avenue, Jacksonville FL 32254, USA. Its doctrinal statement on the Scriptures states, “. . . We also believe that the King James version of the Bible is the divinely preserved Word of God for the English-speaking people (Psalm 12:6-7) and that it has enjoyed a miraculous manifestation of God’s approval all during its history and use” (1993-4 catalog, 10). Dr Bob Gray is the Chancellor.

11b. What do you think of James R White’s *The King James Only Controversy*?

Like many anti-KJV advocates, White presents half-truths. David Cloud has an excellent critique of White’s book. See his article “Examining ‘The King James Only Controversy,’” in *O Timothy* 15 (1998): 1-56. Order from Way of Life Literature, 1701 Harns Road, Oak Harbor, WA 98277, USA.

12b. “Should Creationists Abandon the King James Version?”

The above question is the title of an essay written by Dr Henry Morris, founder and president emeritus of the Institute for Creation Research, P O Box 2667, El Cajon CA 92021, USA. It is an excellent summary of the KJV-superiority position; an appropriate conclusion to our study of the KJV-NIV Debate. Dr Morris wrote:

Should Creationists Abandon the King James Version?

In this day when many Christians have started using one of the modern English translations of the Bible, abandoning the King James Version, it may be well to review a few of the reasons why many creationists still prefer the latter.

The King James Translators

One reason is that all the fifty or more translators who developed the King James Bible were godly men who believed implicitly in the inerrancy and full authority of Scripture and in the literal historicity of Genesis, with its record of six-day Creation and the worldwide Flood. This has not been true of many who have worked on the modern versions.

Furthermore, the King James translators (54 men altogether) were great scholars, as proficient in the Biblical languages as any who have come after them. They were familiar with the great body of manuscript evidence, as well as all the previous translations. They worked diligently on the project (assigned to them by King James) for over seven years (completed in 1611), with the result that the “Authorized” version eventually displaced all those that had gone before and has withstood the test of wide usage in all English-speaking countries ever since.

Which New Translation?

This is not a new question. There have been over 120 English translations of the complete bible published since the King James, as well as over 200 New Testaments. Even if one really feels that he ought to switch to a modern translation, how can he decide which, if

any, is really the inspired word of God? I personally have perused in some depth at least 20 of them.

Is God the Author of Confusion?

For a long time, the “official” version used in each Bible-believing church was the King James, with the others used occasionally for reference study by teachers and pastors. Now, however, confusion reigns. Congregational reading is no longer possible, and Scripture memorization, which has been an incalculable blessing in my own Christian life, is almost a lost art these days.

And what about our belief in verbal inspiration? If it’s only the “thought” that counts, then the words are flexible, and we can adjust them to make them convey any thought we prefer. Exact thoughts require precise words.

Which Version Best Renders The Original Manuscripts?

Even many King James Bibles have footnotes referring to what are said to be “better manuscripts” which indicate that certain changes should be made in the King James text. But what are these manuscripts, and are they really better? It is significant that almost all the new versions of the New Testament are based on what is known as the Westcott-Hort Greek text, whereas the King James is based largely on what is known as the Textus Receptus. As far as the Hebrew text is concerned, the King James is based on the Masoretic text, while the modern versions rely heavily on the Kittel’s revised Masoretic text.

The Masoretic text was compiled from the ancient manuscripts of the Old Testament by the Masoretes, Hebrew scholars dedicated to guarding and standardizing the traditional Hebrew text as “handed down” (the basic meaning of Masoretic) from the earlier Hebrew scribes, who had in turn meticulously copied the ancient Hebrew manuscripts, scrupulously guarding against error. As far as the Hebrew text developed by Rudolf Kittel is concerned, it is worth noting that Kittel was a German rationalistic higher critic, rejecting Biblical inerrancy and firmly devoted to evolutionism.

The men most responsible for alterations in the New Testament text were B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, whose Greek New Testament was largely updated by Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland. All of these men were evolutionists. Furthermore, Westcott and Hort both denied Biblical inerrancy and promoted spiritism and racism. Nestle and Aland, like Kittel, were German theological skeptics.

Westcott and Hort were also the most influential members of the English revision committee which produced the English Revised Version of the Bible. The corresponding American revision committee which developed the American Standard Version of 1901 was headed by another liberal evolutionist, Philip Schaff. Most new versions since that time have adopted the same presuppositions as those of the 19th century revisers.

Furthermore, the Westcott-Hort text was mainly based on two early Greek manuscripts, the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus texts, which were rediscovered and rescued from long (and well-deserved) obscurity in the 19th century. Since these are both said to be older than the 5000 manuscripts that support the Textus Receptus, they were called “better.” This was in spite of the fact that they frequently disagreed with each other as well as with the Textus Receptus and also contained many obvious and flagrant mistakes.

The fact that these two manuscripts may have been older does not prove they are better. More likely it indicates that they were set aside because of their numerous errors. Thus they would naturally last longer than the good manuscripts which were being used regularly.

So one of the serious problems with most modern English translations is that they rely heavily on Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Bible developed by liberals, rationalists, and evolutionists, none of whom believed in the verbal inspiration of the Bible. Is this how God would preserve His word? Would He not more likely have used devout scholars who believed in the absolute inerrancy and authority of the Bible?

How About The Archaic Language In The King James?

The beautiful prose of the King James is a treasure which should not be lost. It has been acclaimed widely as the greatest example of English literature ever written. Apart from a few archaic words which can be easily clarified in footnotes, it is as easy to understand today as it was four hundred years ago. This is why the common people today still use and love it. It is the “intelligentsia” who tend to favor the modern versions. The King James uses mostly one and two-syllable words, and formal studies have always shown its readability index to be 10th grade (in Singapore terms, this is equivalent to Secondary 4) or lower.

It is noteworthy that the King James was produced during the period when the English language and literature had reached their zenith of power and expressiveness. This was the age of Shakespeare, for example. Modern English is merely a decadent remnant of its former beauty and clarity. It is no wonder that a Bible translation produced at that special time in history has endured for almost 400 years, meeting the needs and guiding the culture of over ten generations of English speaking peoples.

We have abandoned today many fine points of grammar commonly used in 1600. For example, we forget that “thee,” “thou,” and “thine” were used to express the second person singular, with “you,” “ye,” and “yours” reserved for second person plural. Today we use “you” indiscriminately for both singular and plural, thereby missing the precise meaning of many texts of Scripture.

Furthermore, the translators were not only Biblical scholars but accomplished writers, and one of their goals had been to produce a Bible that would “sing” with beauty and power, as well as retaining literal faithfulness to the original texts, which had themselves been written with majestic musical beauty.

With all these factors in mind, do we not most honor the Lord and His revealed word by having it read and used in that form of our language which was in use when the English language was at its best, instead of in our modern jargon? All modern versions are inferior to the King James in this important regard.

Conclusion

I believe, therefore, after studying, teaching, and loving the Bible for over 55 years, that Christians—especially creationists!—need to hang on to their old King James Bibles as long as they live. God has uniquely blessed its use in the great revivals, in the worldwide missionary movement, and in the personal lives of believers, more so than He has with all the rest of the versions put together, and “by their fruits ye shall know them” (Matthew 7:20).

It is the most beautiful, the most powerful and (I strongly believe) the most reliable of any that we have or ever will have, until Christ returns.

8a. Recommended Literature for Further Study and Reference

1b. Timothy Tow and Jeffrey Khoo, *A Theology for Every Christian: Knowing God and His Word* (FEBC Press, 1998), co-authored with Rev Dr Timothy Tow.

2b. Timothy Tow, “Holy Hatred,” *The Burning Bush* 4 (1998): 106-113.

3b. Jeffrey Khoo, *Kept Pure in All Ages: Recapturing the Authorised Version and the Doctrine of Providential Preservation* (FEBC Press, 2001).

4b. Timothy Tow, “Death in the Pot!,” *The Burning Bush* 7 (2001): 35-37.

5b. Jeffrey Khoo, “Bob Jones University and the KJV: A Critique of *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*,” *The Burning Bush* 7 (2001): 1-24. Republished together with another review by Thomas Strouse, in “Reviews of the Book *From the*

Mind of God to the Mind of Man” by Pensacola Theological Seminary for distribution in USA.

6b. Prabhudas Koshy, “Why We Should Regard the Bible as Authoritative,” *Bible Witness*, July-September 2001, 8-10.

7b. Timothy Tow, God’s Special Providential Care of the Text of Scripture,” *Bible Witness*, October-December 2002, 3-4.

8b. Jeffrey Khoo, “A Perfect Bible Today!,” *Bible Witness*, October-December 2002, 5-6.

9b. Prabhudas Koshy, “Jesus’ View of the Holy Scripture: An Exposition of Matthew 5:17-19,” *Bible Witness*, October-December 2002, 12-15.

10b. Prabhudas Koshy, “If We Reject the Doctrine of the Perfect Preservation of the Bible,” *Bible Witness*, October-December 2002, 16-17.

11b. Prabhudas Koshy, “Faith Guides, Intellectualism Beguiles,” *Bible Witness*, October-December 2002, 18-20.

12b. Jeffrey Khoo, “A Plea for a Perfect Bible,” *The Burning Bush* 9 (2003): 1-15.

13b. Jeffrey Khoo, *KJV Questions and Answers* (Bible Witness Literature Ministry, 2003).

14b. Jeffrey Khoo, “The Emergence of Neo-Fundamentalism: *One Bible Only?* or “Yea Hath God Said?,” *The Burning Bush* 10 (2004): 2-47.

15b. Quek Suan Yew, “Judges 18:30: Moses or Manasseh?,” *The Burning Bush* 10 (2004): 48-53.

16b. Jeffrey Khoo, “John Owen on the Perfect Bible,” *The Burning Bush* 10 (2004): 74-85.

17b. Prabhudas Koshy, “Did Jesus and the Apostles Rely on the Corrupt Septuagint,” *The Burning Bush* 10 (2004): 93-95.

18b. Quek Suan Yew, “Did God Promise to Preserve His Words?: Interpreting Psalm 12:6-7,” *The Burning Bush* 10 (2004): 96-98.

19b. Jeffrey Khoo, “*Sola Autographa* or *Sola Apographa?*: A Case for the Present Perfection and Authority of the Holy Scriptures,” *The Burning Bush* 11 (2005): 3-19.

20b. Quek Suan Yew, “Jesus on Perfect Preservation of the Bible,” *Bible Witness*, March-April 2005, 3-6.

21b. Jeffrey Khoo, “The Canonisation and Preservation of Scripture,” *Bible Witness*, March-April 2005, 7-8.

22b. Timothy Tow, "My Glory Will I Not Give to Another" (Isaiah 42:8), *The Burning Bush* 11 (2005): 67-68.

23b. Carol Lee, "A Child of God Looks at the Doctrine of Verbal Plenary Preservation," *The Burning Bush* 11 (2005): 69-81.

24b. Jeffrey Khoo, "Bob Jones University, Neo-Fundamentalism, and Biblical Preservation," *The Burning Bush* 11 (2005): 82-97.

25b. George Skariah, "The Biblical Doctrine of the Perfect Preservation of the Holy Scriptures," unpublished ThD dissertation, Far Eastern Bible College, Singapore, 2005.