

THE KING JAMES BIBLE IS GOD'S WORDS KEPT INTACT IN ENGLISH BECAUSE OF ITS SUPERIOR ORIGINAL LANGUAGE TEXTS

By Pastor D. A. Waite, Th.D., Ph.D.

Bible For Today Baptist Church

900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, New Jersey 08108

BFT@BibleForToday.org

Phone: 856-854-4747

The first of the four reasons why God's Words are kept intact best in the KING JAMES BIBLE is because of the **SUPERIOR TEXTS** on which it was built. The **TEXTUAL FOUNDATIONS** of the KING JAMES BIBLE are the best **FOUNDATIONS** of any English Bible that exists today.

I. THE KING JAMES BIBLE IS GOD'S WORDS KEPT INTACT IN ENGLISH BECAUSE OF ITS SUPERIOR OLD TESTAMENT HEBREW TEXT.

The KING JAMES BIBLE is translated from a **superior** Old Testament text. It is translated from what we call the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament text. These other versions that are translated today, such as the **NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION** of 1960, the **NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION** of 1969, or even the **NEW KING JAMES VERSION** of 1979, have big question marks as far as the foundation of their Old Testament text. There are many things that are changed when compared to the text of the KING JAMES translators, who used the Old Testament Masoretic Hebrew text. The word, "Masoretic," comes from *masor*, a Hebrew word meaning "traditional." The Masoretes handed down this text from generation to generation, guarded it and kept it well, as we will see.

A. The Inferior Old Testament Texts of the New Versions.

1. The **NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION** Old Testament Text. Take a look, for instance, at the **NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION**. They admit, in their Preface (p. viii), the following:

"Hebrew Text: In the present translation the latest edition of [1] Rudolph Kittel's BIBLIA HEBRAICA has been employed together with the most recent [2] light from lexicography, [3] cognate languages, and [4] the Dead Sea Scrolls."

You can see from this that the NASV does not use only the Masoretic Hebrew Text (the right one), but makes use of other sources as well. The Hebrew text they use is Kittel's *BIBLIA HEBRAICA*. That would be the 1937 edition, the same one we used when I studied Hebrew under Dr. Merrill F. Unger at Dallas Theological Seminary (1948-53). This edition has about fifteen to twenty suggested changes in the Hebrew text placed in the footnotes on each page. If you multiply this by the 1424 pages in this Kittel Bible, it comes out to between 20,000 and 30,000 changes in the Old Testament. They could be major changes, or they could be minor changes. Does that sound like a "preserved" Bible to you? Does that sound like the fulfillment of not *"one jot nor one tittle?"* I don't like the way these men dealt with the Old Testament text. My Savior said that every word, every letter, and every part of every letter has been preserved by the power of God (Matthew 5:18). Evangelicals and even Fundamentalists are using and recommending the **NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION**, the **NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION**, and even the **NEW KING JAMES VERSION**, all of which use inferior Old Testament texts.

2. The **NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION'S** Old Testament Text. The **NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION** has the same thing to say as to the Old Testament foundation they are using for their translation. On pages viii-ix of the **NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION** of 1978, the editors wrote:

(p. viii) "For the Old Testament, the standard Hebrew text, the Masoretic text, as published in the latest editions of [1] BIBLIA HEBRAICA [which is the same Kittel Bible I mentioned before] was used throughout. The [2] DEAD SEA SCROLLS contain material bearing on an earlier stage of the Hebrew text. [So they're going to use the Dead Sea Scrolls. They're going to change it when the Dead Sea Scrolls say change it in various places]. They were consulted as were the [3] SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH [that is another text that is different from the Hebrew] and the [4] ANCIENT SCRIBAL TRADITIONS relating to [p. ix] textual changes [that is a tradition, maybe, in some places, and they're going to use that perhaps over the Masoretic Hebrew text for textual changes]. Sometimes a [5] VARIANT HEBREW READING IN THE MARGIN of the Masoretic text was followed instead of the text itself. . . . [Now they're going to use marginal readings instead of the actual text]. In rare cases, [6] WORDS IN THE CONSONANTAL TEXTS WERE DIVIDED DIFFERENTLY from the way they appear in the Masoretic Text. . . . The translators also consulted the more important [7] EARLY VERSIONS--[that is] the [8] SEPTUAGINT; [so here's the Old Testament

translated into Greek and they're going to use that as their basis and foundation] **[9] SYMMACHUS** and **[10] THEODOTION** [they had a translation from the Old Testament Hebrew into Greek]; *the* **[11] VULGATE** [there's your Latin translation]; *the* **[12] SYRIAC PESHITTA**; *the* **[13] TARGUMS** and for the Psalms, *the* **[14] JUXTA HEBRAICA** of Jerome. Readings from these versions were occasionally followed. . . . Some words were read with a **[15] DIFFERENT SET OF VOWELS**. These instances are usually **NOT** indicated by footnotes." [My words are in brackets]. [NIV, Preface, pp. viii-ix].

The NIV editors have very honestly and very boldly altered the foundations of our Old Testament text in the above fifteen DIFFERENT WAYS, whenever it suited their fancy! You don't know at what point they've used one document to contradict the Masoretic Hebrew text, and at what point they used another document. It is like not being sure whether they've used cement or sand for a foundation. They may have used a little cement, but all of a sudden there is much sand. You don't know whether it will hold up as a building or whether it will fall flat. The foundation is different. It has been altered.

3. The NEW KING JAMES VERSION Old Testament Text. But you might say, "The NEW KING JAMES VERSION translators, are more fundamental people. They wouldn't dare change the Old Testament text, would they?" Let us take a look and see what they say about their Old Testament text. The Preface of the NEW KING JAMES VERSION on Page vi says,

". . . the text used was the **[1] 1967/77 STUTTGART EDITION of BIBLIA HEBRAICA**."

This is not Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* but a new edition. I have that Hebrew text also. It is called "*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*" (which is from Stuttgart, Germany). This is similar to Kittel's edition. The date, however, is not 1937, but 1967/77. That is the Hebrew text they are using in all the schools now, I am told. It is the one now available on computer. In fact, THE BIBLE FOR TODAY carries it from the LOGOS Bible Study Software for Microsoft Windows. The *Biblia Hebraica* from Rudolf Kittel is abbreviated **BHK** (*Biblia Hebraica Kittel*). The one used by the NKJV is abbreviated **BHS** (*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*). The **BHS** has a similar arrangement as Kittel's. The Hebrew text (though not the same Hebrew text as that which underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE) is printed at the top of each page. The same things hold true for this Hebrew text as for Kittel's, that is, there are still about fifteen to twenty suggested changes in the Hebrew text placed in the footnotes on each page. This amounts also to about 20,000 to 30,000 suggested changes throughout the Old Testament. In addition to this woefully and tragically **inadequate** Hebrew text, the NEW KING JAMES BIBLE preface says (p. vi):

". . . with frequent **[2] comparisons being made with the BOMBERG EDITION of 1525** [which was the basis of the KING JAMES, by the way] *the* **[3] SEPTUAGINT version of the Old Testament and the** **[4] LATIN VULGATE**, in addition referring to a variety of **[5] ANCIENT VERSIONS of the Hebrew Scripture and manuscripts from the** **[6] Dead Sea Scrolls**." [My words in brackets].

Here are at least six admitted foundations consulted and possibly used for the NKJV as a Hebrew text foundation.

So you have, in all three of these Bibles that fundamental Christians are using today, a Hebrew text and Old Testament foundation that is **different** from that of the KING JAMES BIBLE. So, if you have a **different** foundation, how can the building, the Words, be the same? They can't be the same. They are not the same. They are **different**.

B. The Old Testament Hebrew Text Was Accumulated by the Jews.

Let us take a look at the Old Testament of the KING JAMES BIBLE and why it has a superior text. First, it was **accumulated** by the Jews, and secondly, it was **authorized** by Jesus.

1. Romans 3:1-2--The Jews Were Named by God to Be the Guardians of the Old Testament. A Scripture text we ought to use to prove that the Jews were the **God-appointed custodians** of the Old Testament is Romans 3:1-2. No Gentile was to put his unclean hands upon God's Old Testament. Even the New Testament (with the possible exception of one book) was written by Jews, God's ancient earthly people Israel, who one day will be restored to faith when they see their Messiah and they will look upon Him "Whom they have pierced." (Zechariah 12:10).

Rom. 3:1-2: "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? (2) Much every way: chiefly, because that **UNTO THEM WERE COMMITTED THE ORACLES OF GOD**."

Strong gives this information about the word, "oracles":

"3051. *logion* {log'-ee-on}; neuter of 3052; an utterance (of God): -oracle.

The "*oracles of God*" are the very "utterances" or Words of God. Unto them (the Jews) "were committed the oracles of God." This is why we place so much confidence in the traditional Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament text that those Jews guarded and kept for us. That is why the KING JAMES translators used this text as the basis for their Bible rather than the Latin Vulgate (which was not Hebrew at all) or the Septuagint Greek (which is not Hebrew), or Symmachus, or Theodotion (all these are Greek), or an ancient tribal tradition, or any other source which is not the Masoretic Hebrew text. None of these other things should ever have a say in how the text should read, nor should any of them be used to contradict the traditional Masoretic Hebrew text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE.

2. The Methods of the Old Testament Guardians. Let us take a look at how the Jews fulfilled this Biblical promise by their strict rules in copying the Hebrew Old Testament. This is from *General Biblical Introduction* by H. S. Miller written in 1960, pages 184-185. He lists eight rules the Jews used in the copying of the Synagogue Rolls of the Old Testament Scriptures. These rules are mentioned in the Talmud:

"1. The parchment must be made from the skin of clean animals; must be prepared by a Jew only, and the skins must be fastened together by strings taken from clean animals.

2. Each column must have no less than 48 nor more than 60 lines. The entire copy must be first lined.

3. The ink must be of no other color than black, and it must be prepared according to a special recipe.
4. No word nor letter could be written from memory; the scribe must have an authentic copy before him, and he must read and pronounce aloud each word before writing it. [For instance "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" You would have to pronounce the word "in the beginning" in Hebrew, (*b'reshith*); "God," (*Elohim*); "created," (*bara*); "the heavens" (*eth hashamayim*); "and the earth" (*wa eth ha arets*). He had to pronounce every word before he wrote it down, with an authentic copy before him. He had to pronounce it aloud, not just see it in his mind. This was to avoid any errors, duplications, omissions, etc.].
5. *He must reverently wipe his pen each time before writing the word for "God" [which is Elohim] and he must wash his whole body before writing the name "Jehovah" [which is translated "LORD" in our KING JAMES BIBLE] lest the Holy Name be contaminated.*
6. *Strict rules were given concerning forms of the letters, spaces between letters, words, and sections, the use of the pen, the color of the parchment, etc.*
7. *The revision of a roll must be made within 30 days after the work was finished; otherwise it was worthless. One mistake on a sheet condemned the sheet; if three mistakes were found on any page, the entire manuscript was condemned.* [What if the man got from Genesis all the way through to Malachi and found three mistakes? He would have to start from Genesis and go all the way to Malachi again. You see the meticulousness with which the Jews were ordered to guard the Words of God? Those men believed that the Words they were copying were God's holy Words. Because of this, they guarded them, unlike men today who add, subtract, and change at will such as has been done in the NKJV, NASV, NIV, and in other new versions. To that extent, they are perversions of truth and Scriptures.]
8. *Every word and every letter was counted,* [Notice that. The words and letters were counted. Think of counting all the letters on every page of the Hebrew Old Testament. Talk about exactness. Yet that was the method God used to preserve the Old Testament.] *and if a letter were omitted, an extra letter inserted, or if one letter touched another, the manuscript was condemned and destroyed at once.* [Miller, op. cit., pp. 184-185] [My comments in brackets.]

These are historic rules the Jews used. Miller also added these words which we should bear in mind:

*"Some of these rules may appear extreme and absurd, yet they show how sacred the Holy Word of the Old Testament was to its custodians, the Jews (Rom. 3:2), and they 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.**" [Miller, op. cit., p. 185]*

3. A Brief History of the Traditional Hebrew Masoretic Old Testament Text.

Let us take a brief look at the history of the Hebrew Old Testament text. The word, "*Masoretic*," is from the Hebrew *masar* ("to hand down"). It means to hand down from person to person. The Masoretes were "traditionalists" who guarded the Old Testament Hebrew text. There were families of Hebrew scholars in Babylon, in Palestine, and in Tiberius. According to most students of these matters, these Masoretes safeguarded the consonantal text. According to some fundamentalist writers, the vowels were present in the Hebrew language right from the start. All the Masoretes had to do was to guard both consonants and vowels. They may very well be correct in this. I agree with this position. Dr. Thomas Strouse has written extensively proving that the vowels were a part of original Hebrew Old Testament.

For instance, in our English language, if we use the word "*WATER*" the vowels are "*a*" and "*e*." By analogy, if it were a Hebrew word, all they would have had would have been "*WTR*." They knew what the word meant. We would have recognized it, but with other vowels, it might have been "*WAITER*." So, to safeguard the words, to be certain what the Word of God was saying and teaching, God put in the vowel markings underneath the consonants. For example, you might find a small "*r*" which is the sound "*ah*"; you might find three dots which is the sound "*eh*"; or you might find two dots which is the sound "*ay*"; one dot is "*ee*." These are called *matres lectiones*, ("mothers of reading") which enabled Gentiles (and other Jews who were not as familiar with the text) to read those Hebrew words with the vowels in there and know exactly what word it would be. So it would be, for instance "*WATER*" instead of "*WAITER*." These Masoretes guarded the consonantal text and also all of the vowels. They wanted to make sure we knew what those words were, especially for the benefit of those of us who are not Jews, and who would not understand the history of it. The Masoretes flourished from about 500 to 1000 A.D. They were supposed to have standardized the Hebrew Old Testament in about 600-700 A.D. by carefully guarding the vowel pointings which were in the originals. These vowels aid in the pronunciation of the consonantal text. Their text is called the Masoretic Text or "M.T." if you want to abbreviate it. Some people spell the word "Massoretic," some "Masoretic." I prefer "Masoretic" with only one "s."

4. The Hebrew Text Used by the KING JAMES BIBLE. What about the Hebrew text used by the KING JAMES BIBLE translators? Here's some background on it. The **Daniel Bomberg edition**, 1516-1517, was called the *First Rabbinic Bible*. Then in 1524-25, Bomberg published a second edition edited by Jacob Ben Chayyim (or Ben Hayyim) iben Adonijah. This is called the **Ben Chayyim edition** of the Hebrew text. Daniel Bomberg's edition, on which the KING JAMES BIBLE is based was the **Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text**. This was called the *Second Great Rabbinic Bible*. This became the standard Masoretic text for the next 400 years. This is the text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. For four hundred years, that was the Old Testament Hebrew text. Nobody translated the Old Testament except by using this text. [This is from *Biblical Criticism Historical, Literal, Textual* by Harrison, Walkie and Guthrie, 1978, pages 47-82.]

The **Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text** was used even in the first two editions of *Biblia Hebraica* by Rudolf Kittel. The dates on those first two editions were 1906 and 1912. He used the same Hebrew text as the KING JAMES BIBLE translators.

The edition we used when I was a student of Dr. Merrill F. Unger at Dallas Theological Seminary (1948-53), was the 1937 edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* by Kittel. All of a sudden in 1937, Kittel changed his Hebrew edition and followed what they called the **Ben Asher Masoretic Text** instead of the **Ben Chayyim**. They followed, in that text, the **Leningrad Manuscript**, (B19a or "L.") The date on it was 1008 A.D. This was not the traditional Masoretic Text that was used for 400 years and was the basis of the KING JAMES BIBLE. They changed it and used this Leningrad Manuscript. **So even the main text used by the NKJV, NASV, and NIV in the Hebrew is different from that used for the KING JAMES BIBLE.** In addition to the various changes in the Hebrew text at the top of the page, the footnotes in Kittel's *BIBLIA HEBRAICA* suggest from 20,000 to 30,000 changes throughout the whole Old Testament.

The reason that most of the Hebrew departments (in colleges, universities, and seminaries who teach Hebrew) use the **Ben Asher Hebrew Text** instead of the **Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text** is the same reason these same people use the critical Greek text in the New Testament. They believe the "oldest" texts, either in Hebrew or in Greek, must always be the best. Not necessarily. These so-called "old" texts of the New Testament, such as "B" (Vatican) and "Aleph" (Sinai) and their some forty-three allies, were corrupted, I believe, by heretics within the first 100 years after the original New Testament books were written. Therefore, even though these might be the oldest, they were doctored by heretics and therefore are not the "best." Other texts, even though they might be later, if they follow the words of the original must therefore be the ones to use. Those texts which agree with the original documents are those which the KING JAMES BIBLE has followed.

Then there was a revision of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*. It was called the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, the Stuttgart edition of 1967/77, based also on the same **Ben Asher** text. That is based on the **Leningrad Codex** which is the same one the revised Kittel Bible of 1937 used.

5. Nineteen Erroneous Documents Used to "Correct" the Masoretic Hebrew Text. Not only are the texts that the new versions are taken from based on the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* or the *Biblia Hebraica Kittel* (which is the wrong Hebrew base, with a lot of erroneous footnotes) but the NIV and other modern versions also make corrections based upon nineteen other spurious criteria.

I will be quoting in part from *ASV, NASV, and NIV Departures from the Traditional Hebrew and Greek Text*, which I wrote some time ago. [B.F.T. #986] In this study, we have listed a total of 103 examples of changes from the Hebrew text and twenty-three Greek examples. We print the Masoretic Hebrew text with the Bomberg Edition as the basis of the KING JAMES BIBLE; then we print what the AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION of 1901 has, the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION of 1960 has, and what the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION of 1969 has. We also show what the KING JAMES BIBLE has. The Masoretic text and the KING JAMES BIBLE agree with each other but these other versions depart from the Masoretic text in these examples. We could have picked from hundreds of other examples. In this study, we list on page A-9, at the bottom, some of the other ways of departing from the Hebrew text, including the following eleven together with eight more sources listed in the NIV's Preface, pages viii-ix: (Cf. section 1-b above).

(1) The Septuagint, LXX, the Greek Old Testament. The AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION, NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION, and the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION departed in the Old Testament seventy-three times (35% of the 103 departures we have listed in here) preferring the Septuagint over the Hebrew. Now that Greek Old Testament is a very deficient translation from the Hebrew into the Greek. In many books and places, it is just like the LIVING VERSION. It is a paraphrase, a **perversion**. In fact, in the beginning of this document [B.F.T. #986] we have an analysis of the Septuagint, showing how bad it is as a translation. There are quotations from the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* and comments as to why the Masoretic text should be followed instead of the Septuagint.

(2) Conjecture, No Reason Given. In sixty-seven examples out of the 103 (32% of the time) the Masoretic Hebrew text is scuttled merely because of **conjecture**. In other words, these editors don't even have a Hebrew text, Greek text, or Latin text. They don't have any sources at all. They just say, "Well, we want it to read this way." When I was studying Hebrew at Dallas Theological Seminary, (1948-53), as I mentioned before, our teacher was Dr. Merrill F. Unger (who wrote *Unger's Bible Dictionary*, etc). We were reading in the book of Isaiah, using the Kittel Bible (*Biblia Hebraica* by Rudolf Kittel) and of course it has all these footnotes. Dr. Unger read the word in a way different from the Masoretic text. He used one of the footnotes as a basis for the change. I raised my hand and said, "Dr. Unger, why did you change this text?" He replied, "It just reads better that way." That is because down in the footnotes, every time they want to change it, with no evidence whatever, the footnotes read "L" which stands for the Latin word *legendum*. It means "which read." When they are following the Septuagint, or some other version, or the Latin Vulgate, the footnote reads, "with the Latin Vulgate," etc. But sometimes they just have an "L." In fact, in Genesis 1:9, there's an "L." After the "L," it says "probably this." In other words, there's no evidence, no document. It is just conjecture and guesswork. How Bible-believing Christians can allow guesswork and conjecture to determine their Bible is beyond me, but they do.

(3) The Syriac Version. In twenty examples out of the 103 (10% of the time), they used the Syriac instead of the Masoretic Hebrew text.

(4) A Few Hebrew Manuscripts. Sometimes, just a "few" Hebrew manuscripts, not the Masoretic text, but a few manuscripts were used to correct the Masoretic text.

(5) The Latin Vulgate. Sometimes the Latin Vulgate (the Latin translation of the Bible), was used to correct the Masoretic text.

(6) The Dead Sea Scrolls. In eight examples out of the 103 (4% of the time) the Dead Sea Scrolls were used instead of the Masoretic text. When Mrs. Waite and I visited Israel in 1982, we went into the Qumran caves where they found the so-called Dead Sea Scrolls. They were preserved by the Essenes. Among other things, they have the Book of Isaiah. There is very little difference

from the Scripture. These Essenes fled from Jerusalem to this place and took some of the Hebrew Bible scrolls they had. But, why would we use the Dead Sea Scrolls instead of the Masoretic Text which the Hebrews in Jerusalem had so carefully guarded? These Essenes left the Hebrew synagogue in Jerusalem. They left the Jewish beliefs their fathers had. They were an offshoot and a false, heretical cult. There are two reasons for questioning these Dead Sea Scrolls where they might differ with the Masoretic Hebrew text: (1) They might have had corrupt Hebrew texts that they began with, at least in some places; (2) They might have been careless in the transmission of these texts. These are both unknown, hence, they should never be used to replace the Masoretic Hebrew text. They could have changed the text in a hundred different ways. I don't know why any version should take a Dead Sea Scroll reading over the Masoretic traditional text, the historical text which had been guarded so meticulously. Yet in some instances this is done.

(7) Aquila. Sometimes Aquila, a Greek Old Testament translation, was used to correct the Masoretic text.

(8) The Samaritan Pentateuch. Sometimes the Samaritan Pentateuch was used to correct the Masoretic text. This contains the first five books of Moses which the Samaritans used. The Samaritans were a mixed people who had a different translation of the Old Testament.

(9) Quotations from Jerome. Sometimes quotations from Jerome, who translated the Latin Vulgate, were used to correct the Masoretic text.

(10) Josephus. Sometimes Josephus, a Jewish historian, and not even a saved man, was used to correct the Masoretic text.

(11) An Ancient Hebrew Scribal Tradition. Sometimes an ancient Hebrew scribal tradition was used to correct the Masoretic text.

(12) The BIBLIA HEBRAICA of Kittel or Stuttgartensia. These are false Hebrew texts which are improper bases for the Hebrew Old Testament.

(13) A Variant Hebrew Reading in the Margin. This is also an unreliable source to challenge the Masoretic Hebrew text.

(14) Words in the Consonantal Text Divided Differently. There is nothing wrong with the way the Hebrew consonants are presently divided. They need not be divided differently.

(15) Symmachus. This Greek translation of the Old Testament should not be permitted to set aside the Masoretic Hebrew text.

(16) Theodotion. This Greek translation of the Old Testament should not be allowed to contradict and bypass the Masoretic Hebrew text.

(17) The Targums. These documents, once again, should never be taken as authoritative Old Testament Scripture. They were never meant to supplant the Masoretic Hebrew text.

(18) The Juxta Hebraica of Jerome for the Psalms. Again, this is not the Scripture of the Old Testament, no matter how it may be regarded as information about the Psalms.

(19) A Different Set Of Hebrew Vowels. Just as we do not need any different consonants in the Masoretic Hebrew text, so we do not need any different sets of vowels for that text. Just leave it alone, and let it be! God has preserved it just as it is.

6. My Conclusion on the Hebrew Masoretic Text. My conclusion on the Masoretic Hebrew text is this: There may be some places in the text of the Daniel Bomberg Hebrew edition of the Masoretic text where there are seeming contradictions. For instance, the king may be eighteen years old or eight years old. Even if there are seeming contradictions, I feel it is imperative to go by what the Traditional Masoretic text has as its reading and let the Lord figure out what may seem contradictions to us. **Keep what God has given and preserved through the ages and let the Lord figure out why.** It could be both eight and eighteen and have a harmonization we don't know anything about. The editors of these new versions, have footnotes that depart from the Masoretic text. They often decide the issue on the basis of **pure guesswork!** But how do you know their decision is the correct one? Just leave the Hebrew text as it is. **The KING JAMES translators came along and saw what the Hebrew Masoretic text said and simply translated it right over into the English. They didn't quibble with it; they didn't try to harmonize it.** For instance, you'll find in Isaiah 9:3 that there is a "not" [LO] which has been completely eliminated by the new versions. The Scripture says, "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy. . ." and these new versions have just taken it out because they think it makes more sense. But the Hebrew says "not" and the KING JAMES translators simply wrote it down, faithfully as they ought to have done.

Never be ashamed of the traditional Masoretic Hebrew text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE!! It was accumulated by the Jews in fulfillment of Romans 3:1-2. We agree with Dean John William Burgon who wrote of "the **INCREDIBLE FOLLY OF TINKERING THE HEBREW TEXT.**" [from a letter April 8, 1885, appearing in the *Guardian* as quoted in *JOHN WILLIAM BURGON, LATE DEAN OF CHICHESTER--A BIOGRAPHY*, 1892, by Edward Mayrick Goulburn, Vol. II, p. 241. **[B.F.T. #1619]** It truly is an "INCREDIBLE FOLLY" for anyone who is "guilty" of "TINKERING THE HEBREW TEXT." We should LEAVE IT ALONE just as it is!

C. The Old Testament Hebrew Text Was Authorized by Jesus. Not only was the Scripture **accumulated** by Jews, but it was **authorized** by Jesus. Jesus Christ authorized the traditional Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament text. Though we have looked at some of these verses under the subject of **Bible preservation**, we will look at them once more

from a slightly different aspect.

1. Verses Teaching This Position.

(1) Matthew 4:4. Jesus was speaking to the devil and refuting him with Scripture:

*"But He answered and said, **IT IS WRITTEN**, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by **EVERY WORD** that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."*

As we said before, "*it is written*" is in the perfect tense, meaning it has been written in the past and stands written now, preserved until the present time. **So the Lord Jesus Christ AUTHORIZED the Old Testament He had in His hand.** The first books of the Old Testament were originally written by Moses around 1500 B.C. The Old Testament Hebrew Words were preserved for 1,500 years and the Lord Jesus said, "*it is written.*" This means that the **WORDS OF GOD** have been written down in the past and these very **WORDS** have been preserved down to the present time, and they stand written NOW as they were at the first. This is the very essence of BIBLE PRESERVATION!

(2) Matthew 5:17-18. Jesus speaks about the "*law or the prophets.*" This is a technical term referring to the traditional Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament text. There are three divisions in the Old Testament: the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. Sometimes the expression, "law and prophets," refers to all three divisions. The Law (the *torah*) refers to the first five books; the Prophets (the *naviim*) refers to both the former and the latter Prophets; and the Writings (the *kethuvim*) refers to the Psalms and the rest of the books. Here in verses 17 and 18 Jesus said,

*"(17) Think not that I am come to destroy the **LAW**, or the **PROPHETS**: . . . (18) For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one **jot** or one **tittle** shall in no wise pass from the Law, till **all** be fulfilled."*

Jesus said of the words, letters, and even parts of the letters found in the Hebrew Bible in His day, that no jot or **tittle** would be eliminated, effaced, or changed in the slightest manner until all was fulfilled. So He put His AUTHORIZATION on the traditional Masoretic Hebrew text He had in His day.

(3) Luke 24:27. When the Lord Jesus Christ talked to the disciples on the road to Emmaus, He taught them:

*"And beginning at **Moses and all the prophets**, He expounded unto them the things concerning Himself."*

Here is the phrase "*Moses and all the prophets.*" It leaves off the "writings," but again, this was referring to the threefold division of the Hebrew Bible: Law, Prophets and Writings. That is AUTHORIZATION by the Lord Jesus of the traditional Masoretic Old Testament Hebrew text that was present in His day.

(4) Luke 24:44.

*"And He said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were **written** in **THE LAW** of Moses, and in **THE PROPHETS**, and in **THE PSALMS**, concerning Me."*

The Greek word "*written*" is *gegrammena*, the perfect participle: that which was written in the beginning and is continuously being preserved and stands written today. The phrase "*in the Psalms*" makes it the complete threefold division of the Hebrew canon: the law of Moses (Torah); the prophets (Naviim); and the Psalms or Writings (Kethuvim). It is called the "*TANACH*" today by the Jews, taking the "*TA*" for "*TORAH*," the "*NA*" from "*NAVIIM*," and the "*CH*" for "*KETHUVIM*." This is the one abbreviation for the entire Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament. **He put His hand on the entire Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament text that existed then and AUTHORIZED it.** Many people may ask, "Didn't the Lord Jesus Christ use the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament? Wasn't He referring to that?" No, he was not. He referred to the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms. The Septuagint did not have that division at all. In fact, aside from the Apocrypha contained in the Septuagint, the order is LAW, PSALMS, and PROPHETS instead of, as the Hebrew, LAW, PROPHETS & PSALMS. As you can see, the Septuagint has the order of books much as we have in our Bibles today. The Hebrew does not have the same order; it ends with the book of 2 Chronicles.

2. Quotations Explaining This Position. Christ appealed unreservedly to the traditional Hebrew text.

(1) A Quotation from Dr. Edward Hills. Here is a quotation from Dr. Edward Hills, who has written extensively on the subject of the Bible.

*"During His earthly life, the Lord Jesus appealed unreservedly to the very words of the Old Testament text (Matthew 22:42, John 10:34-36), thus indicating His confidence that this text had been accurately transmitted. Not only so, but He also expressed this conviction in the strongest possible manner, ' . . . till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled,' (Matthew 5:18.) . . . Here our Lord Jesus assures us that the Old Testament in common use among the Jews during His earthly ministry was an **ABSOLUTELY TRUSTWORTHY REPRODUCTION OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT WRITTEN BY MOSES AND OTHER . . . WRITERS.**" [BELIEVING BIBLE STUDY, by Dr. Edward Hills, pp. 5-6].*

The Lord Jesus Christ never refuted any text, any word, or any letter in the Hebrew Old Testament. He didn't say, "Now Moses was misquoted here, it should have been this." He offered no textual criticism whatever. Had there been any changes, I'm sure He would have corrected it, but He didn't. It stands written! His stamp of approval is on the Masoretic Hebrew text. It is AUTHORIZED by Jesus. He did not authorize the Septuagint, the Latin Vulgate, some scribal tradition, Josephus, Jerome, the Syriac version, or any other document!

(2) A Quotation from Dr. Robert Dick Wilson. Here is a quotation from Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, a Presbyterian, and a teacher there at Princeton Seminary before the flood of Modernism came in. Henry Corey reflected on the life of

Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, a man who had mastered some forty-five languages and dialects and who was a staunch defender of the doctrine of verbal inspiration of Scripture. Corey affirmed that Wilson accepted as **accurate** the Masoretic Hebrew text. Corey, quoting Wilson, wrote:

"The results of those 30 years' study [that is what Wilson wrote of his own study of Scripture in the Hebrew] 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 edition, by Dr. David Otis Fuller, pp. 80-81].

Here is a man who studied, and studied, and found the Masoretic Hebrew text to be accurate and solid. So I see no reason why we should have any other foundation for the Old Testament than the Masoretic Hebrew text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE, the **Daniel Bomberg edition**, edited by **Ben Chayyim**—the **2nd Rabbinic Bible of 1524-25**.

3. **Alternative to Believing This Position?** You might say, what is the alternative? What if you do not accept the **Daniel Bomberg edition** of the **Masoretic Hebrew** text on which the KING JAMES BIBLE is based as the **authoritative** Hebrew text from which to translate? The alternative, quite logically, would be to accept some other basis. What other basis are you going to use? Are you going to use the Kittel *Biblia Hebraica* (**BHK**) which was based upon the same text as the KING JAMES BIBLE in 1906 and 1912, and then was revised and scrapped for another Hebrew text in 1937? Or are you going to use the 1967/77 *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (**BHS**) which is a revised Kittel? If you're not going to use the base that is printed in the **defective** Hebrew text at the top of the page in either **BHK** or **BHS**, are you going to use some of these changes in the footnotes--20,000 to 30,000 of them? If so, which ones are you going to use? Are you going to use only the ones they used in the NEW KING JAMES VERSION? Only the ones they used in the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION? Only the ones they used in the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION? Are you going to use 25% of them? 50% of them? Or are you going to use all of them? Or are you going to become a doubter, thinking that we don't really know what the Old Testament is? Are you going to take the position that "We can't be certain of the Hebrew Old Testament, so we must doubt all of it"? **Satan is the master of deceitful doubting and he is the author of all this confusion.** Once you forsake a standard, you're adrift in a sea of doubts. There's nothing to take its place. Young Christians and people in the pews that have not been saved too many years might say, "If there's all this bickering and fighting among the theologians and pastors as to the right Hebrew Old Testament text to use, I give up and throw up my hands." The devil wins if he can plant the seeds of confusion and doubts into the hearts of men and women as well as boys and girls.

After much study, thinking, and praying about this subject, I have personally arrived at a **strong conviction** that I will not budge from the traditional Masoretic Hebrew text on which our KING JAMES BIBLE is based. That is it. I'm not going to move. I don't want to change anything. We're going to stand right there. Somebody's got to stand. **Martin Luther said, "Here I stand; I can do no other."** He wasn't going to move from salvation by faith (*sola fide*), salvation by grace (*sola gratia*) and salvation only by the Scripture (*sola scriptura*). He wasn't going to follow the Pope. He wasn't going to follow the decrees of the Church Councils. He was standing on the Words of God alone! Though we might not be Lutherans like Martin Luther, we must not budge either. If we do, we are like a wave of the sea, driven by the wind and tossed.

4. **Illustration of Rejecting This Position.** Let me point out an illustration about the Old Testament text. *The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament* (1979) has four volumes. It is edited by John R. Kohlenberger, III, and published by Zondervan. Zondervan is supposed to be a Bible-believing, evangelical publishing house. I want to show you what they have done to the Old Testament text. Rudolf Kittel, who wrote this *Biblia Hebraica*, the two editions earlier and then the edition of 1937, was an apostate German rationalist. He was a believer in the Graf-Welhausen documentary hypothesis of the Pentateuch. It is called the JEDP theory. He did not believe in the inerrancy of Scripture. He was all he shouldn't be. This man, although we don't believe in the Hebrew text he used (he used the **Ben Asher** instead of the **Ben Chayyim** text), at least he put the Hebrew text on the top of the page. He kept the changes separate and distinct by putting them in the footnotes, so you could read his Masoretic text as it was. The same method was followed later in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.

What did the NIV and Zondervan do, though? Any time they wanted to change the Masoretic Hebrew text, **they put it right up in the text**, instead of in the footnotes. Let me illustrate: Genesis 4:9 says in the KING JAMES BIBLE, and in the Hebrew Masoretic Text:

"And Cain talked with Abel his brother: and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him."

In the NIV it says,

"Cain said to Abel, his brother, '**Let us go out to the field. . .**'"

There's nothing in the Hebrew text to justify this. All the other Hebrew versions leave it out, but Kohlenberger puts it right into the text. He has a footnote on it in very small type which says,

*"This Hebrew reading and translation is **conjectured** on the basis of the early versions listed above in Note 1."*

So they conjecture it and put the Hebrew into the text, if there's anything they want to add to it. A devout Jew would NEVER do such a thing! All these unbelievers, like Kittel and the German Stuttgart editors, at least put any suggested changes from the Hebrew text into the footnotes. But Kohlenberger and Zondervan, **who are supposed to be believers in Christ**, put the **conjecture** right into the Hebrew text. It is a sad day when a supposedly Bible-believing evangelical will emend the traditional Masoretic Hebrew

text itself.

As we've pointed out before, the Old Testament basis of our KING JAMES BIBLE is the traditional Masoretic Hebrew text, the **2nd Rabbinic Bible, Daniel Bomberg Edition, edited by Ben Chayyim** in 1524-25. The date of the 1st Bomberg Edition was 1516-1517. It was called the First Rabbinic Bible. During this time they came up with a standard Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament text and it lasted 400 years. That standard was used even in Kittel's first two editions, 1906 and 1912. Let us stick to it firmly!

II. THE KING JAMES BIBLE IS GOD'S WORDS KEPT INTACT IN ENGLISH BECAUSE OF ITS SUPERIOR NEW TESTAMENT GREEK TEXT.

We believe the KING JAMES BIBLE is based on a **superior** New Testament text. We believe this for two reasons: (1) The first is that the *Textus Receptus* that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE was **accepted by the churches**. (2) Secondly, the *Textus Receptus* that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE is **attested by the evidence**. Before taking up these two main divisions, let us look at a little background information.

A. The Chief Opponent of the *Textus Receptus* Today. The text which is used today in most colleges, universities, and seminaries (even conservative and/or fundamental ones) is the *Nestle/Aland Greek New Testament, 26th edition*. It has gone through twenty-six editions thus far. Nestle began his critical Greek edition in 1898, following the basic text of Westcott and Hort and three other editions of his day. The Greek-English edition I have is dated 1981. I believe the 26th Greek edition came out in 1979. From 1898 to 1979, is about eighty-one years. If you divide eighty-one by twenty-six, you can see that they have come out, on the average, with one new, updated, changed, **different edition of the Greek New Testament every 3.1 years!** What does that tell you as to the certainty these editors have in **God's preservation** of His New Testament Words? It tells you that these men really don't know what the Greek New Testament is. This is basically the same as the Westcott and Hort text, 1881 edition, with changes here and there. The history of this text is an interesting history. The edition of *Nestle/Aland Greek New Testament 26th Edition* that I have has with it, in parallel columns, the English of the REVISED STANDARD VERSION, which is copyrighted by the NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, the apostate-led Council.

B. The Editors of the *Nestle/Aland* Greek Text. This *Nestle/Aland* Greek text was named for Eberhard Nestle, a German, and Kurt Aland, also a German. It was made up by a committee consisting of Kurt Aland (who is an unbeliever), Matthew Black (an unbeliever), Carlo M. Martini (a Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church), Bruce Metzger (who is from Princeton, a man who demonstrated his apostasy as editor of the *Reader's Digest Bible*), and Alan Wigren (from Chicago, an apostate also). All these were editors of the 26th edition of the *Nestle/Aland* Greek New Testament Text.

C. This Text Underlies the Modern English Versions. This Greek New Testament text, or one like it, is the basic text that underlies the modern versions: the ENGLISH REVISED VERSION (ERV) of 1881, the AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION (ASV) of 1901, the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION (NASV) of 1960, the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION (NIV) of 1969, the NEW ENGLISH VERSION (NEB) of 1961, and most of those listed in APPENDIX B. This Greek text is what the so-called scholarly world as well as New Evangelicals and many Fundamentalists (sad to say) use. The fact that there have been **TWENTY-SIX EDITIONS IN EIGHTY-ONE YEARS (a new edition every 3.1 years)** would give you the DISTINCT impression that these men, and their followers, who put confidence in their editions, have **NO ASSURANCE WHATSOEVER** of what **ARE** and what **ARE NOT** the very and the exact **GREEK WORDS OF GOD** in the New Testament! I certainly wouldn't want to be in their shoes! I have CONFIDENCE in the *Received Text* that underlies our KING JAMES BIBLE, and I have CONFIDENCE in our KING JAMES BIBLE as the most **accurate** English translation of that text. For this reason, I believe the KING JAMES BIBLE is the **WORDS OF GOD IN ENGLISH!**

D. The Greek Text That Underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. The KING JAMES BIBLE used a text (which the Trinitarian Bible Society has reprinted) called *HE KainE DiathEke* (The New Covenant or Testament). This was copied from the Greek text produced by Dr. Frederick H. A. Scrivener and published by the Cambridge University Press in 1894, originally. This *Textus Receptus* that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE New Testament, was basically **Beza's 5th edition of 1598**. Dr. Frederick H. A. Scrivener, in his *NEW TESTAMENT IN GREEK ACCORDING TO THE TEXT FOLLOWED IN THE AUTHORISED VERSION TOGETHER WITH THE VARIATIONS ADOPTED IN THE REVISED VERSION* of 1881, lists about 190 places where the KJB editors departed from Beza's 5th edition in favor of eight other sources (Cf. pp. 648-656). **[B.F.T. #1670]** This Greek text is the exact text which underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. **It is a text that hasn't changed. It hasn't had a revision in the last 381 years.** I don't believe it needs any revising. It is called the Traditional *Received Text*, or the Byzantine Text, or the Syrian text, or the *Textus Receptus*. It is the best, and the only foundation as far as I can see, to use to translate the New Testament from the Greek language into English or any other language. This is the text I want to talk about, the

Received Text which has been handed down from generation to generation by the church.

E. *The Textus Receptus Has Been Accepted by the Churches.* As mentioned before, there are two reasons why we believe the *Received Text* is **superior**: (1) First, it has been **accepted by the churches. It is traditional.** It has been handed down by the people who knew what they were talking about. (2) Second, it has been **attested by the evidence.** There is evidence that this is a superior text. We don't have to take it only by faith. There is strong **evidence** to indicate that this is the text that should be used, and that it is **historic.**

I will be giving a total of thirty-seven links in the historical chain of evidence. I will show how, through the history of the Christian church, various churches, groups, organizations, and documents have accepted this text, the *Textus Receptus*, as the true Greek text which we should accept as our New Testament and from which we should translate. The translation of the New Testament should be based upon the *Greek Received Text.* These Greek words, we believe, go all the way back to the original manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. They have been accepted ever since they were written down.

F. *Westcott and Hort Refused to Accept the Textus Receptus Greek.* Though there was some scattered opposition to the *Received Text* in years before, the **concerted** effort against the *Received Text* came in 1881, and after. In 1881, two theological heretics (**posing as conservatives**) from the Anglican Church (Church of England), Westcott and Hort, published their Greek text that rejected the *Textus Receptus* in 5,604 places by my actual count. 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 of 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.

Westcott was a bishop of the Anglican Church; Hort was a teacher at Cambridge University. I've written a little booklet entitled, *The Theological Heresies Of Westcott And Hort* [B.F.T. #595] In this study, I quote from their writings extensively and show from five of their books that they are **apostates, liberals, and unbelievers.** And yet, they are the ones that altered this text. Hort was worse than Westcott. He wrote an *INTRODUCTION* to this revolutionary text. **If we don't understand the part of Westcott and Hort in this, we won't understand why there was the change from the Textus Receptus to the new Westcott-and-Hort-type text.** Why was it? Because Hort, writing the *INTRODUCTION* in 1882, propounded a totally erroneous theory (530 pages). We've reprinted it so that people who are interested in it can see what Hort wrote, his contradictions, and that which was false. [B.F.T. #1303] Hort swayed the whole scholarly world on his side of the Atlantic Ocean including England, Scotland, and Germany, as well as on this side of the Atlantic. B. B. Warfield and his Presbyterians followed him. Baptist institutions, such as A. T. Robertson's Southern Baptist Seminary at Louisville, followed him. They just threw out the New Testament that had been in our hands for hundreds of years. **Westcott and Hort concocted a new Greek text and changed the Received Text that had been used in the Church from the beginning of the writing of the New Testament.**

G. *The Westcott and Hort Text Changes the Textus Receptus in Over 5,600 Places.* Do you know how many changes they made? My own **personal count**, as of August 2, 1984, using Scrivener's *GREEK NEW TESTAMENT* referred to above, was **5,604** changes that Westcott and Hort made to the *Textus Receptus* in their own Greek New Testament text. Of these 5,604 alterations, I found **1,952** to be OMISSIONS (35%), **467** to be ADDITIONS (8%), and **3,185** to be CHANGES (57%). In these **5,604** places that were involved in these alterations, there were **4,366** more words included, making a total of **9,970** Greek words that were involved. This means that in a Greek Text of 647 pages (such as Scrivener's text), this would average **15.4 words per page** that were CHANGED from the *RECEIVED TEXT.* Pastor Jack Moorman counted 140,521 words in the *Textus Receptus.* These changes would amount to 7% of the words; and 45.9 pages of the Greek New Testament if placed together in one place. Here's what it would be like in a table format. I entitle it "**THE BATTLEGROUND**" between the two different kinds of Greek New Testament: "*T.R.*" stands for the *Textus Receptus.* "*W/H*" stands for Westcott and Hort's Greek Text of 1881.

THE N.T. GREEK TEXTUAL BATTLEGROUND

TEXTUS RECEPTUS

Has 140,521 Greek words.
Has 647 pp. in Greek Text
Has 217 Greek words. per page
Has 100% of the Greek words.
Has all 647 pp. unchanged

W/H CHANGES IN T.R.

Changes 5,604 places in the N.T.
Changes include 9,970 Greek words.
Changes 15.4 Greek words. per page
Changes 7% of the Greek words.
Changes total 45.9 pp. in Greek text

Dr. Jack A. Moorman, in December, 1988, wrote a book entitled: *MISSING IN MODERN BIBLES--IS THE FULL STORY BEING TOLD?* It was published by THE BIBLE FOR TODAY in April, 1989. Rev. Moorman counted every word of the *Received Greek Text* and also every word of the *Nestle/Aland Greek Text* and, on a chapter by chapter count, came up with the *Nestle/Aland* text being **SHORTER** than the *Received Text* by **2,886** words. This is 934 words more than were omitted from the Westcott and Hort text. (1,952 vs. 2,886). The omitting of 2,886 Greek words is the equivalent, in number of English words

involved, of **DROPPING OUT THE ENTIRE BOOKS OF 1 PETER AND 2 PETER!** Pastor Moorman's book is eighty large pages. [B.F.T. #1726]

People say, "Well, they don't make any difference. There isn't any doctrine in the changes." But there are doctrines that are changed. We will see this in CHAPTER V of this book. Do you see that if you were taking an English Bible based on the foundation of the *Nestle/Aland* 26th edition instead of the *Received Text*, you could not possibly make them equal? There's a theorem in geometry and mathematics, that states: "Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other." These things cannot be equal. No matter how you try to translate--the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION, let us say, or the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION, since they're based in the New Testament on the *Nestle/Aland text* that differs from the *Received Text* in over 5,600 places, involving almost 10,000 Greek words--there's no way in the world you could make them equal to the KING JAMES BIBLE which is based on the *Received Text*. The NIV and NASV are perversions of the Words of God because they are based upon a Greek text that is false to the truth and improper in every way. The FOUNDATION is faulty.

H. The Two Greek Texts Have Irreconcilable Differences. **The foundational New Testament and Old Testament texts in question are fundamentally and irreconcilably different.** It is impossible that they can come up with anything but **confusion**. Talk about doctrinal changes! In our booklet [B.F.T. #83] *THE CASE FOR THE RECEIVED TEXT OF HEBREW AND GREEK UNDERLYING THE KING JAMES VERSION-- A Summary Of the Evidence & Argument*, [Available from the Bible For Today] I analyzed three books that summed up the argument and put it as clearly as I could in 1971. In the back of this B.F.T. #83, "THE CASE FOR THE KING JAMES VERSION OF THE BIBLE, page thirty-nine, we have listed some very important verses, Greek texts, and English translations that eliminate parts of them, using forty-four different versions of the New Testament. There are 162 key verses to compare in these Greek texts. In each of these translations you have a number of verses or parts of them that are omitted. For instance, the Revised Standard Version omits some or all of 158 of the 162 test verses, or 97%; Nestle's Greek text omits some or all of 155 of the 162 test verses, or 96%.

I. Many Doctrinal Differences in the Two Greek Texts. Though CHAPTER V will take up the doctrinal errors in the versions more in detail, in B.F.T. #83, I took these key verses, listed them and then classified them as to doctrines that are omitted. For instance, the deity of Christ: I give three verses on that. Now, that is a doctrinal difference. There are a total of sixteen verses on this. The second is the omission of Christ's full title, the Lord Jesus Christ. In addition, there are changes regarding the matters of Christ's Virgin Birth as well as the omission of "begotten" which alters His eternal Sonship and His relationship with the Father. These are doctrines. There are omissions of "Alpha and Omega" involving His eternal generation and eternal future, omission of Christ's omnipresence, His eternal future state, His part in creation, the fact that salvation is only through Jesus Christ and faith in Him, weakening of the fact of Christ's bodily resurrection, His bodily ascension, His bodily return, and His great commission. There are omissions. Here is what the argument is. People usually say: "The Westcott and Hort text has a few omissions but no major doctrines are involved." Well, **major doctrines are** involved. Secondly they say: "If they take a doctrine out here, it is found somewhere else in the New Testament." Well, I don't care if they leave it in 100 other places; if they take it out any place it is a defective, deficient Greek version and a defective, deficient English version based upon it.

J. The Early Heretics Polluted the Westcott-and-Hort-type Text. You know why the heretics took out some things but not all of them? They wanted the Bible to agree with them. The heretics who flourished in the first hundred years after the Bible was written did not have every New Testament book in their possession, so they couldn't rip out, change, recopy, or forge various verses throughout the New Testament. They could only do such things with the books they had in their hands. So some books escaped the heretics' knife. **But, if you take out anything, it is defective.** How many words of God have to be left out of your Bible before it is no longer 100% God's Words? Just one? That would be enough for me. But when you have over 5,600 changes involving almost 10,000 words, you have serious trouble.

K. Why the NIV & NASV and Others Are NOT the Words of God. Can I hold up the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION and say it is the Words of God in English? No, I can't because there are almost 10,000 reasons why it isn't the Words of God in English. Can I hold up the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION and say it is the Words of God in English? No, I can't. Can I even hold up the NEW KING JAMES BIBLE and say it is the Words of God in English? No, I can't. **Can I hold up the KING JAMES VERSION and say it is the Words of God in English? Yes. All the words are there, accurately translated by master translators.**

L. This Writer Was Trained in the Westcott and Hort Camp. *The Case for the King James Version* [B.F.T. #83] was the first paper I wrote on the subject of the superiority of the KING JAMES BIBLE. It was written in 1971. I was trained to prefer the Westcott and Hort Greek text (now called the *Nestle/Aland text*) at Dallas Theological Seminary. The *Received Text* had been, almost without question, the text in use up until 1881, when this change took place. For almost 1,800 years the church accepted the *Received Text*. Suddenly many people threw it out. Something that had lasted for 1,800 years is now, all of a sudden, no good. These days, you are looked down on and almost thought of as an ignoramus if you stand for the *Textus Receptus* for which Christian churches down through the centuries have stood. If you don't use the *Nestle/Aland text*, many think something must be wrong with you. This is a serious situation. That is why the DEAN BURGON SOCIETY (of which I am now president) was raised up in 1978. And this is why THE BIBLE FOR TODAY has been emphasizing this issue ever since 1971. These organizations and others have been seeking to put the truth of this issue before the people and

to defend the *Received Greek text* and the *Masoretic Hebrew text* that underlie our KING JAMES BIBLE.

M. The Thirty-Seven Historical Evidences Supporting the *Textus Receptus*. Here are the thirty-seven links in the chain of historical evidence to support the *Received Text*.

1. Historical Evidences for the *Received Text* During the Apostolic Age (33--100 A.D.)

- (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.*

2. Historical Evidences for the *Received Text* During the Early Church Period (100--312 A.D.). Dr. Scrivener and Dean Burgon both agree that, during the first 100 years after the New Testament was written, the greatest corruptions took place to the *Received Text* used by the early church. The B (Vatican) and Aleph (Sinai) manuscripts and the approximately forty-three allies which underlie the Westcott-and-Hort-type text were, I believe, the result of such corruptions. Some of the heretics which operated in this period were Marcion, (160 A. D.); Valentinus, (about 160 A. D.); Cyrinthus, (50-100 A. D.); Sabellius, (about 260 A. D.); and others.

- (4) *The Peshitta Syriac Version, (150 A. D., the second century.) This was based on the Received Text.*
- (5) *Papyrus #66 used the Received Text.*
- (6) *The Italic Church in Northern Italy (157 A. D.) used the Received Text.*
- (7) *The Gallic Church of Southern France (177 A. D.) used the Received Text.*
- (8) *The Celtic Church in Great Britain used the Received Text.*

Why did all these have their Bibles based on the *Received Text*?--the churches in Italy, France, and Great Britain--why? Because those were the true Words of God, **and they knew it**. That was the *Received Text*. They lived in 150 A. D. The Bible was completed in 90-100 A. D. They had the originals right there in their hands and they based it on that which was pure, accurate, and preserved by God and by the Lord Jesus Christ Who preserves everything. These churches used this text and not any other. The heretics made most of the changes in the *Received Text* during this time; the greatest proportion of which, according to both Dr. Scrivener and Dean Burgon, were made during the first 100 years after they were originally written.

- (9) *Church of Scotland and Ireland used the Received Text.*
- (10) *The Pre-Waldensian churches used the Received Text.*
- (11) *The Waldensians (120 A. D. and onward) used the Received Text.*

3. Historical Evidences for the *Received Text* During the Byzantine Period (312--1453 A.D.)

- (12) *The Gothic Version of the 4th century used the Received Text.*
- (13) *Codex W of Matthew in the 4th or 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 MSS.

(16) *The Greek Orthodox Church used the Received Text.* We don't agree with many of their doctrines or practices, but that entire church for over 1,000 years has used the *Received Text*. Why? **They know the Greek language. They're Greeks.** Even though they are **modern** Greeks, they use the New Testament that is based upon the *Received Text* because it is the Words of God, and they know it.

(17) *The present Greek Church still uses the Received Text.* When Mrs. Waite and I were in Israel, we visited the church which is supposed to be on the place where Jesus was born, the Church of the Nativity. They have a big Church built on the site. It doesn't look anything like the original place, I am certain. I don't even think it is on the proper place. They have commercialized it. In Jerusalem, they have Christ born in various places, crucified in various places, and buried in several places. In the Church of the Nativity, Christ's supposed birth place, we met a Greek Orthodox priest. I said to him, "You're a member of the Greek Orthodox clergy, is that right?" He said, "Yes," and then told us his name. I said, "You have a New Testament you use, don't you?" "Oh, yes," he said. I asked, "Which text do you use? Are you familiar with the so-called Westcott-and-Hort-type-text?" "Oh, yes," he said,

"We use the Received Text; we have no confidence at all in the Westcott and Hort text."

That was interesting. **The Greek Orthodox Church still goes back to this text that underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE.**

4. Historical Evidences for the *Received Text* During the Early Modern Period (1453--1831 A.D.)

(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.* A Roman Catholic Cardinal named Ximenes, edited it, yet it was based, **not** on the texts which most Roman Catholic Bibles used, the Westcott and Hort text, but on the *Received Text*.

(21) *Martin Luther's German Bible (1522) used the Received Text.*

(22) *William Tyndale's Bible, (1525), used the Received Text.* Tyndale was a great Bible translator who was martyred because of his Bible translation.

(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.* **That is the Greek text that the KING JAMES BIBLE was based on, using the 1598, 5th edition of Beza.**

(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 Elzevir Brothers' Greek New Testament (1624) used the Received Text.*

(37) *The Received Text in the New Testament is the Received 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!*

In fact, **it is my own personal conviction and belief, after studying this subject since 1971, that the WORDS of the Received Greek and Masoretic Hebrew texts that underlie the KING JAMES BIBLE are the very WORDS which God has PRESERVED down through the centuries, being the exact WORDS of the ORIGINALS themselves.** As such, I believe they are **INSPIRED WORDS**. I believe they are **PRESERVED WORDS**. I believe they are **INERRANT WORDS**. I believe they are **INFALLIBLE WORDS**. This is why I believe so strongly that any valid translation **MUST** be based upon these original language texts, and these alone!

N. The Radical Text of Westcott and Hort. The *Received Text* was "received by all" until German Rationalism began to doubt it late in the 1700's and early in the 1800's. In 1881, Westcott and Hort came along with a new Greek text for the English Revised Version (ERV) of 1881. The *Received Text* was certainly accepted by the churches down through the corridor of history. But all at once, these two men had a powerful influence by means of Hort's *INTRODUCTION* to the Greek New Testament. This book, though based on pure untested hypothesis, swayed most people of the so-called scholarly world. Everything had to change. **The Received Greek Text was under fire.** At first, all the preachers **studied out of this false Greek text**, the Westcott-and-Hort-type text, or *Nestle/Aland* text but **preached out of the KING JAMES BIBLE** which was based on a different Greek text. This was a little **hypocritical**, but it didn't seem to bother those who practiced it. They'll do anything to keep the money and support of the fundamentalists who favor the KING JAMES BIBLE, perhaps.

But after a while the publishers began to get itchy palms. They wanted to make a little money, so they had to change that KING JAMES BIBLE. Also, some of the ones who were professors, teachers, preachers, and theologians said, in effect,

"Isn't it a little inconsistent to use this Westcott and Hort Greek text and still cling to the KING JAMES BIBLE which is not based on the same Greek text?"

For many years I was told by various teachers at the Dallas Theological Seminary where I attended from 1948-53, to use the AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION of 1901 (not the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION of 1960, but the AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION of 1901). They pushed it and said it was the best version to use. I never got it through my head why it was better. They said, "Oh, it is better, for the KING JAMES is not as good, not as accurate." The reason they told me to use the AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION of 1901, was because it was based on the Westcott and Hort text. They were beginning to throw out the *Received Text*, and the KING JAMES. The AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION of 1901, never really got off the ground. People never really bought it. It was almost a dead issue from the start.

First, there was the ENGLISH REVISED VERSION of 1881 in England. Then there was the AMERICAN REVISED VERSION of 1898 (see APPENDIX B). After that, as an outgrowth of the ENGLISH REVISED VERSION OF 1881, this same Committee arranged for the AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION of 1901, in this country. It followed the Westcott and Hort text. But after a while other versions came out. The one that really began to shock and shake the world of the Evangelical Bible believers and fundamentalists was the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION of 1960. That is when everybody got into the act and said, in effect:

"Well, I guess the time has come to be logical and reasonable, to put the Greek text into the English and let us have the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION."

But the way they sold it was **not** to admit they were changing the Greek in over 5,600 places, involving almost 10,000 words in the *Received Greek text* of the New Testament, **nor** to admit they were changing the *Masoretic Traditional Hebrew Text* and using something else. They didn't sell it on that basis. They sold it on the basis that you couldn't understand the KING JAMES BIBLE.

As far as READABILITY INDEX is concerned, here are some levels for the KING JAMES BIBLE based on the computer English program "RIGHT WRITER."

For Genesis 1	Readability = 8.13	8th Grade
For Exodus 1	Readability = 7.94	8th Grade
For Romans 1	Readability = 9.74	10th Grade
For Romans 3:1-23	Readability = 5.63	6th Grade
For Romans 8	Readability = 7.72	8th Grade
For Jude 1	Readability = 10.11	10th Grade

This certainly puts the lie to the charge that the KING JAMES BIBLE is too difficult to understand. This "RIGHT WRITER" readability index can be found out for any chapter or verse in the KJB.

The man who led me to the Lord Jesus Christ was a custodian in my High School, Uncle Charles Allen, who never went through the fifth grade. He understood the KING JAMES BIBLE and led me to Christ by using it when I was a High School senior. I know hundreds of people whose intelligence and educational levels have not reached as high as some of these high and mighty people who say they can't understand this KING JAMES BIBLE, yet these people **do** understand it. How do you figure that out? They say you can't understand it, that it is outmoded. Can't you understand John 3:16? Listen to it:

"For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

What is difficult about that? I observed last Christmas-time that the retarded children from the SHEPHERD'S HOME, during their presentation of "*CHRISTMAS IS*," memorized **all** of their Bible verses from the KING JAMES BIBLE. Why can't the rest of us understand it who go to grade school, elementary school, high school, college, graduate school, and/or seminary? But that was the way it was sold. Publishers said that the new translation makes the Bible so much easier to understand. Remember 1 Corinthians 2:14 which states:

"But the NATURAL MAN receiveth NOT the things of the Spirit of God: for they are FOOLISHNESS unto him: neither can he know them, because they are SPIRITUALLY DISCERNED."

This verse is still true, regardless of which TRANSLATION is used!

Our son, D. A. Waite, Jr., has written excellent book entitled *THE COMPARATIVE READABILITY OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION (BFT #2671 @ \$6.00 + \$2.00 S&H)*. He compared, using the computer print-outs, six modern versions with current readability standards. The six versions compared to the King James Bible were the ASV, RSV, NASV, NIV, NKJV, and NRSV. In almost every comparison, the King James Bible was slightly more readable than the other versions. I recommend that you get a copy of this book for yourself.

O. How I Got the Thirty-seven Links of the *Textus Receptus* Together. There is an interesting background story of how I got together the thirty-seven historical links for the *Textus Receptus*. One of the deacons from a church in Michigan asked me to find this out for him. The pastor wanted to have a man who could represent the Received Text and the KING JAMES BIBLE, because his church was in the midst of a controversy over what Bible they should use. Some of the intelligentsia there wanted to introduce the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION into the church. The pastor had been there about twenty-three years and always preached from the KING JAMES BIBLE. He didn't want to change. These NIV people, who were teachers in the Christian school, began to foment trouble. So the Pastor said to the deacons, in effect:

"I don't often do this as pastor, but in this one instance I will do this: You can bring a man, whomever you want from Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary [which is a GARBC-approved school] or wherever you want. He can talk to you deacons about the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION. Then I'll bring a man to talk about the Textus Receptus which underlies the Greek New Testament of the KING JAMES BIBLE. You deacons can listen to these men and then make up your minds and decide what this church is going to do."

They agreed to that. Whatever the deacons would decide, that would be the way the church would go. There would be unity. So the pastor asked me to speak. I said I would be very glad to speak. There were about eight to ten deacons in the meeting. I talked to them for a while, and then opened up the meeting for questions and answers. They had some tough questions, but I gave them the answers as well as I could. First, they were going to get a man to precede me so I could be the last word (which I would rather have had). Do you know, with one excuse after another, the men from Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary refused to appear. They found out I was going to be the other side of the coin and some refused to speak. Finally, I spoke first. When their side was to show up, not one seminary man arrived, but two men. It took **two** of them to defend the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION and the Westcott and Hort Greek text. When I asked them for a tape so we could see what they said, what their reasons were, they wouldn't give me a tape. These two men from GRAND RAPIDS BAPTIST COLLEGE AND SEMINARY didn't want me to have a tape of anything they said. Do you suppose I could have answered all their arguments? I would hope so! When all was said and done, the deacons recommended that the church use only the KING JAMES BIBLE in all of its meetings, including the Sunday School classes. Praise the Lord! The truth (and that is what I believe we gave them) won out, at least for a while.

We're going to have battles like this all over the country. Some churches have been splitting over what Bible to use. There are many preachers who don't know what to do. They are in a quandary. They are divided between one version or another. Their church can't read a Scripture verse in unison. They have to go to the hymnbook to get something they can read together, because one will read one version and another read a different one. A lot of pastors are sweeping it under the rug, hoping it will go away. It won't go away. The issue is before us. **The KING JAMES BIBLE is the Words of God in English and the other versions are not. That is the simple truth.**

P. The *Textus Receptus* Is Attested by the Evidence. Let us see how the *Textus Receptus* is attested by the evidence. We've said that it was accepted by the churches, but what about the evidence? What evidence do we have that we can trust that this is the preserved Greek New Testament text from which we should translate our New Testament Bibles? The evidence is divided into three groups: (1) Manuscripts, (2) Ancient Versions, and (3) Church Fathers' writings.

1. The Evidence of the MANUSCRIPTS. As of 1967, the Greek manuscripts which have survived numbered 5,255. Kurt Aland, who is an apostate German, working in Munster, Germany, doesn't believe in the *Received Text*. His name is on the *Nestle/Aland text*. He was the chairman of the editors. He has copies of many manuscripts, most of them in microfilm, (about 90% of the total available, according to one source). But every time Aland comes to a manuscript that goes along with the *Received Text*, he disregards and says it is just a copy of some other text and is not to be counted as a separate witness or as valuable. That is how Aland and his followers deal with evidence. They don't take things at face value. When they find a

manuscript that agrees with the *Received Text*, they say it has been doctored, "mimeographed," or duplicated. Therefore, the number of texts that agree with this are not 500, 1,000, or over 5,000, but just **one** witness.

Aland and his followers accept the false explanation of Hort and Westcott to the effect that there was a meeting in the early church (250-350 A.D.) of all the church leaders then living. They believe, though there is not one shred of historical evidence to support this hypothesis, that these church leaders made up a revision or recension of the Greek text in which, allegedly but falsely, all the Greek manuscripts that went along with the Westcott-and-Hort-type text were thrown out and all that went along with the *Textus Receptus* were kept. They say that everything from then on was a repetition, just like a mimeographed copy. With the result that the *Received Text* manuscripts that have survived are thought to be, NOT independent witnesses (which, in fact, they are), but only carbon copies of but ONE witness. This theory has one problem, that is, it is just a THEORY. There is **no proof** that such a meeting or recension ever took place. Something that stupendous, where they would have called all the bishops and church fathers from all areas of the then-known world to a meeting in 250 A.D. or 350 A.D., should have left a record.

But that is the concoction Hort dreamed up. He had to account for the fact that in upwards of 99% or more of the 5,255 manuscripts that we have in our hand, the evidence points to the *Received Text*, not to either the Westcott-and-Hort-type of text or the *Nestle/Aland 26th-Edition-type Greek Text*. Hort would have to say to himself in effect:

"How are we going to counter that? How are we going to account for the fact that just a mere 45 documents out of 5,255, or less than 1% of the evidence now in our possession conforms with our text, while all the other evidence agrees with the Received Text? Let us concoct a theory with no proof necessary. Let's say the church leaders got together and made up a recension, a text that is made to our specifications. After making it, let us say these church leaders threw out all the others and just kept their own, thus making but one recension or revision of the Greek New Testament."

That is the gist of what Hort wrote in his *INTRODUCTION*. It is just as false as the day is long, but people bought it. In the back of this *Nestle/Aland text* there is a list of manuscripts and documents that are cited in my copy of their 26th edition, on page 711. There are about 562 manuscripts on this page. A footnote at the bottom of the page says, in Latin, "**and many others.**" All of them, since they go along with this *Received Text*, are counted by Westcott and Hort and Aland as only one witness since they believe there was this special recension and all the manuscripts that agree closely are merely carbon copies of that one recension. Again, there is NO evidence whatsoever in the history of the church that this ever took place! It must be considered false, therefore. It is a mere theory and hypothesis.

What about the manuscripts? What kinds are there? There are four kinds of Greek manuscripts that we have in our possession today: (1) papyri, (2) uncials, (3) cursives, and (4) lectionaries.

(1) Papyrus Fragment Manuscripts. The first kind of manuscript is the papyrus fragment. These are small pieces of papyrus. Papyrus is a kind of paper made out of the papyrus plant which grows plentifully in Egypt. It is brittle. Most papyri don't have many verses on them. There were eighty-one of them as of 1967. Now they have eighty-eight. Of the eighty-eight, according to an estimate by Pastor Jack Moorman in his book, *Forever Settled*, only about thirteen (15%) go along with "B" and Aleph, the Westcott and Hort text; about seventy-five (85%) of the eighty-eight go along with the *Received Text*. [B.F.T. #1428]

(2) Uncial Manuscripts. Uncials are Greek manuscripts written in capital letters which run together. There are no punctuation marks and no spaces between the letters. There are some old uncials and there are some more recent ones. They are also called majuscules. Uncials means "large or inch-long letters." There are 267 uncials. Only nine of these 267 go along with the Westcott and Hort text (only 3%). But 258 of the 267 (97%) go along with the *Received Text*. By the way, when Westcott and Hort saw that only nine of the 267 uncials lined up with their text, they decided to use only the old uncials, A, B, Aleph, C and D. These are called old uncials, from the 4th century up to the 6th century. What about the others? They left them out completely because they didn't prove their point or support their Greek text.

(3) Cursive Manuscripts. Cursives (or minuscules) are Greek manuscripts written in longhand, or cursive. Their letters flow together as our own "cursive" writing does today. There are 2,764 of them preserved for us today. Only twenty-three of those go along with the Westcott and Hort text (1%). 2,741 (99%) go along with the *Received Text* that underlies our KING JAMES BIBLE. That is a huge number of documents favoring the *Received Text*. That is why Hort had to make up his "recension" theory, which was a tissue of lies that has no historical support behind it. He had to account for this discrepancy, even if it meant resorting to colossal deception and falsehood!

(4) Lectionary Manuscripts. There are 2,143 lectionaries. "Lection" comes from a Latin root meaning "to read." Lectionaries were portions of Scripture in the Greek and Latin Bibles, that were read in the churches on certain days. All (100%) of them go along with the *Received Text* which underlies the KING JAMES BIBLE. There are none that support the Westcott-and-Hort-type text. In the Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Orthodox Church they do the same today. They read a certain portion from the Gospels, and a certain portion from the Epistles on specific days. In those days, they took the Bibles they had, and marked them up to make the lections, the exact portion which should be read for that day. Those lectionaries are good evidence to show what manuscripts they had at that time. They either put together a lectionary themselves or they had a whole Greek New Testament and marked off these special portions to show which should be read on what day. So the 2,143 lectionaries are powerful evidence for the *Received Text*.

THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF MARK, is the title of a book by Dean John William Burgon, written in 1871. It contains over 350 pages, and has been reprinted by the BIBLE FOR TODAY. [B.F.T. #1139] We have reprinted almost 3,000

pages of books by or about Dean Burgon. He was a scholar who defended the Traditional Text which underlies our KING JAMES BIBLE. This book contains overwhelming evidence, from manuscripts, lectionaries, ancient versions, and the church fathers, proving that the last twelve verses of Mark (Mark 16:9-20) are genuine. These verses have been taken out of the Westcott and Hort text. That is one of the 5,604 places (involving almost 10,000 words) that are changed. A black line is put between this section and the foregoing verses in the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION with a note reading:

"[The two most reliable early manuscripts do not have Mark 16:9-20.]"

They also put in a footnote in the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION which questions the authenticity of these verses. But these twelve verses are a lection, one of the Scripture portions that was read by the "Melchite Syrian Christians as well as by the Greeks" on the 2nd Sunday after Easter. Burgon goes into that and proves beyond any question that this was the reason a few manuscripts dropped this section out. He also shows that the portion before Mark 16:9-20 (verses 1-8) was also a lection or a reading. At the beginning of verse 9 there is the word, *telos*, meaning "end." Some people took this to mean that was the end of Mark's Gospel. It doesn't mean that at all. It meant that was the end of the lection portion. In this case, it was the reading from Mark 15:43 through 16:1-8. This lection was read on the second Sunday after Easter [cf. Burgon, *THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF MARK*, pp. 226, 238. [See page 238 for the other times these verses were read as a lection]. So lectionaries bear strong testimony in favor of the *Received Text*. In chart form, here is the manuscript evidence for the *Received Text* (TR) and for that of Westcott and Hort's or the *Nestle/Aland's* text (WH):

	<u>TOTALS</u>	# of MSS	% of MSS
			<u>WH/TR</u>
Papyrus Fragments	81(88)	13/75	15%/85%
Uncials	267	9/258	3%/97%
Cursives	2764	23/2741	1%/99%
Lectionaries	2143	0/2143	0%/100%
<u>TOTALS:</u>	5,255	45/5210	1%/99%

2. The Evidence of the Ancient Versions. The ancient versions are translations of the Greek Bible from the early days. For instance, the Peshitta Syriac, second century, about 150 A.D., is mostly based on the *Received Text*. The Curetonian Syriac, third century, is basically the *Received Text*. The Old Latin, or *Vetus Itala*, second century A. D. is from the *Received Text*. In the other versions we have, some take the *Received Text*, some do not. **But these are evidences.**

3. The Evidence of the Church Fathers. The Church Fathers were old church writers such as bishops and pastors who wrote letters to the churches in the early days of the church. In the course of their writings, they often alluded to verses of Scripture that were found in their Greek or Latin New Testament. They either quoted the verses verbatim, or made reference in some way to the verses. From some of those allusions, you can tell what kind of Bible text they had in their hand. Was it the Westcott and Hort reading, or was it the *Received Text*?

Dean John William Burgon, is the author of these five books which we have reprinted: (1) *REVISION REVISED* [B.F.T. #611], (2) *THE LAST 12 VERSES OF MARK* [B.F.T. #1139], (3) *THE TRADITIONAL TEXT OF THE HOLY GOSPELS* [B.F.T. #1159], (4) *CAUSES OF CORRUPTION OF THE HOLY GOSPELS* [B.F.T. #1160], and (5) *INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION* [B.F.T. #1220].

In these books, Burgon goes into great detail on the matter of the Church Fathers. Before he died in 1888, Dean Burgon and his staff amassed more than 86,000 quotations or allusions to Scripture by the Church Fathers. This documentation still exists today in the British Museum Library. The research is contained in sixteen large folio volumes. One of the members of our Dean Burgon Society Executive Committee, Dr. Jack Moorman, a missionary in England, gave me a report on these volumes in his letter of January 10, 1992. He wrote that each of the sixteen volumes was about ten inches by twelve and one half inches in size. They are five inches to seven inches thick. You can well imagine the hundreds of hours that went into that research on the part of Burgon and his staff to produce sixteen volumes of that size. It is unfortunate that these were not published in a more permanent manner. They are in handwritten form only. Dr. Moorman wrote:

"They are . . . an index to quotations in other works, mainly that of J. P. Migne. The volumes are all references: there are no quotations from the Fathers. . . . The references are handwritten on small slips and pasted on the pages in Biblical order under a given Father. Each slip contains the chapter and verse of the Scripture, followed by the volume and page in a patristic edition where that text is quoted. I assume that there are some 86,000 slips in the sixteen volumes. . . ."

This letter was a valuable report on the present status of this research on the Church Fathers and their allusions to the New Testament Scriptures.

The quotations showed what kind of Greek text the Church Fathers were using. There were many allusions made to the *Received* or *Traditional Text*. From 100-300 A. D. there were approximately 100 Church Fathers who wrote extensively and referred in some way to the New Testament verses. From 300-600 A. D. there were approximately 200 Fathers who wrote extensively. So there are 300 Church Fathers who wrote from 100 A.D. to 600 A.D. You can quite often look at the writings and see which text they had in their hands, whether the *Received Text* or the so-called Neologian text of B and Aleph favored by

Westcott and Hort.

Edward Miller edited Burgon's work, because Burgon died before he could complete his massive study on the New Testament text. In 1896, Miller published two of Burgon's books, one of which was *THE TRADITIONAL TEXT OF THE HOLY GOSPELS*. In it is a list of Church Fathers who quoted different portions of the *Received Text* and a list of those who quoted from the Westcott-and-Hort-type text. This list (pages 99-100) is of seventy-six writers who died before 400 A. D. and shows the impressive number of quotations from the Traditional Text. Miller found that not only (1) there **WERE** quotations from the Traditional Text (*Received Text*) from Church Fathers who died in 400 A.D. or before; but also (2) the Traditional Text quotations were **IN THE MAJORITY** over those favoring the "neologian" (Westcott-Hort-type) text; and also (3) the Traditional Text quotations were in the **RATIO OF 3 TO 2** in their favor! Of a total of 4,383 quotations from the seventy-six Church Fathers who died before 400 A.D., there were 2,630 (60%) of the quotations from the Traditional or *Received Text* and only 1,753 (40%) of the quotations from the neologian or Westcott-Hort-type of text. This is a ratio of 3 to 2 or 1.5 to 1 in favor of the Traditional or *Received Text*. Today, writers of the Westcott and Hort school frequently make the false statement that there are NO references to the Traditional or *Received Text* before the fourth century. These figures certainly prove them in error.

Dr. Moorman's sixth book on the subject of the New Testament text was entitled *Early Church Fathers And The Authorized Version--A Demonstration--Companion Volume To Early Manuscripts And The Authorized Version*. [B.F.T. #2136] This is an excellent book that our readers will want to acquire. He used a more recent reference source for both the Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers. He examined eighty-six different works from Church Fathers who died from 110 to 397 A.D. (before 400 A.D.). He compared 401 Scripture quotations cited in the Digest source. He found 279 to refer to the *Textus Receptus* and only 114 or 122 to refer to the B and Aleph (or Westcott/Hort or *Nestle/Aland*) type of text. This is a ratio of 2.3 to 1 as over against 1.5 to 1 found by Burgon and Miller--a much higher ratio! We appreciate Pastor Moorman's excellent scholarship in New Testament textual matters.

Q. An Evaluation of Manuscripts "B" and "Aleph." The big two manuscripts that the Westcott and Hort people rely upon are *B* and *Aleph*. *B* is the Vatican manuscript; *Aleph* is the Sinai manuscript. These are presumably fourth century uncials which had very little, if any, use by their owners. I believe this was true because the owners recognized them to be perverted texts, having been defaced and polluted by heretics and others. Westcott & Hort and their followers say B and Aleph are superior merely because they are the oldest and therefore purest. Well, they are neither the best nor the purest. They were corrupted by the heretics. One reason they were preserved is they were in Egypt where the climate was conducive to their survival. The second reason they were preserved is that they were not used by the church because they realized they were full of heretical changes. These copies happened to escape the burnings and persecutions in the early church, perhaps, by being hidden away through disuse and not out in the open. **If they had been used, they would have been worn out like my Bible, which is just about in tatters.** My wife gave it to me in 1947, the year before we were married. I'm using it, and have had it rebound several times. When you use a book constantly, it tatters and tears.

The Vatican manuscript (B) was stored in the Vatican library. The Sinai manuscript (Aleph) was found in the wastepaper basket at St. Catherine's Monastery. They were getting ready to burn it to keep warm for the winter. There was a very comical expression that my fellow debater used when we were debating Dr. Stuart Custer of Bob Jones University on the Greek manuscripts. Dr. James Quorllo had a very interesting way of putting it. Tischendorf was the one who bought this manuscript from St. Catherine's Monastery. He was a German apostate scholar who was working on the New Testament. He bought it for hundreds and hundreds of dollars from the monks who were getting ready to burn it. Dr. Quorllo said,

"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!"

He had to pay for the trash. It really was that, because of all the heretics' changes. After he found this Sinai or Aleph manuscript in the wastebasket, Tischendorf went back and altered his old editions of the Greek New Testament in hundreds of places, completely revolutionizing it after he had completed it. Burgon's *Revision Revised* has an excellent analysis of the defects both of B (Vatican) and Aleph (Sinai). Another excellent analysis of the defects of B and Aleph can be found in a book by Cecil J. Carter entitled *The Oldest And Best Manuscripts--How Good Are They?* [B.F.T. #1733] He cites Tischendorf as reporting that Aleph contained "**15,000 changes made by contemporary or later hands**" (p. 10). Consider the defects that must have abounded in Aleph to need 15,000 changes by various correctors!

Hort, in his *INTRODUCTION* to their new Greek text of 1881, said that the readings of B and Aleph, where they agreed, were the true readings of the New Testament. If they did not agree, then any binary (or combination of two) readings of B with one other manuscript would be the true reading. If they could not find any other manuscript to agree with B (Vatican), then B alone would be sufficient to establish the true reading. It is quite evident that they had a strong prejudice in favor of B. H. C. Hoskier's two volume book on *CODEX B AND ITS ALLIES* has been reprinted by the BIBLE FOR TODAY. [B.F.T. #1643] Hoskier's very technical comparison of B with Aleph showed these two corrupt manuscripts to be in contradiction one with the other in **over 3,000 places in the Gospels alone!** In other words, if B is right, Aleph is wrong. If Aleph is right, B is wrong. It is quite possible, in these instances, that NEITHER B nor Aleph is correct.

It is mainly the Vatican manuscript (B) which Westcott and Hort relied upon. It was supposedly written in 350 to 375 A. D. They just about worshiped that manuscript. Burgon and Miller came along, with over 86,000 quotations from the Church

Fathers, many of which ante-dated either B or Aleph. Dr. Moorman did further research along the same lines, as mentioned above. If indeed the "oldest is the best," Westcott and Hort are beaten at their own game. The Church Fathers thereby demolish the arguments of B and Aleph of the 4th century because the Fathers go back before even the 4th century and bear witness to a much earlier text than either B or Aleph. As mentioned above, Burgon and Miller cited seventy-six Church Fathers who wrote and who died before 400 A.D. Irenaeus, for example, lived around 150 A. D. Pastor Moorman cited eighty-six Church Fathers who wrote and died before 400 A.D. Ignatius, for example, died in 110 A.D. All three of his quotations were from the Traditional or *Textus Receptus* type of text. The Westcott and Hort people say a manuscript is bad because it is not old enough. They also erroneously boast that there are no *Textus Receptus* readings before 400 A.D. Yet the above evidence proves this to be in error. Not only were readings found from the Traditional Text, but they were found to be in the MAJORITY of cases. In other words, more than half were from the *Received Text* rather than the Westcott-and-Hort-type text. Not only did they find the Traditional Text readings to be in the MAJORITY, but to be in a PREPONDERANCE of cases, either 1.5 to 1 (Burgon & Miller) or 2.3 to 1 (Moorman) in favor of the Traditional Text rather than just a simple majority! So this is a powerful argument.

Of course Hort had an argument explaining **why** the Church Fathers quoted the *Received Text* more than their preferred text of B and Aleph. He claimed falsely that the editions of the Church Fathers were altered also, just like he claims the Greek manuscripts were altered in the years of about 250 to 350 A. D. As in the case of the false recension of the Greek New Testament, so in the case of the Church Fathers' recension, there is not a particle of evidence to prove that this ever took place! It is pure hypothesis and speculation on his part. Hort had an answer for everything, however spurious, erroneous, and bereft of a single shred of evidence or proof. The leaders of the Baptists, Presbyterians, Southern Baptists in Louisville, and many others, fell hook, line, and sinker for Hort's specious arguments. They were thoroughly deceived by a master deceiver and apostate. They apparently did not know enough to check out the evidence for themselves. They just accepted what Westcott and Hort dogmatically asserted with no proof whatever. They accepted this fanciful theory uncritically, and the entire church has been suffering for it ever since.

Basically, I would like to say that the New Testament foundation or basis for our Greek New Testament which underlies our KING JAMES BIBLE was definitely authorized and accepted by the churches down through the centuries, attested by the evidence, and therefore absolutely worthy of being trusted and believed by us today or in any future age!