

# Not One Jot or Tittle

How God Preserved His Word for all Nations

Dr. Peter James Putney

Copyright © 2021 Peter James Putney

All rights reserved.

All Bible verses are from the King James  
Version unless otherwise indicated.

Cover Photo License: USTAX-  
0FA4BD36C-1

ISBN: 9798772078822

## DEDICATION

This book is dedicated to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ who loved us and gave us His perfect Word to guide our lives.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prologue.....	i
Introduction.....	1
ONE - The Promise of Preservation.....	7
TWO - The Preservation of the Old Testament.....	13
THREE - The Preservation of the New Testament.....	33
FOUR - The Alexandrian Manuscripts.....	43
FIVE - The Critical Text.....	53
SIX - Doctrinal Corruption in the Critical Text.....	71
SEVEN - Logical Fallacies in Textual Criticism.....	81
EIGHT - The Critical Text in Other Languages.....	89
NINE - The Call to Textual Purity.....	105
Bibliography.....	115



## PROLOGUE

**T**he purpose of this book is to strengthen the reader's faith in the Word of God. There is no other topic that deserves to be addressed and defended more than the purity of the Bible. When someone cannot trust in the reliability of the Bible, their entire faith is in jeopardy because the Bible is the foundation of all that a Christian does and believes.

This book is written for the person who wishes to examine the manuscript evidence of the Bible with an open heart and a willingness to accept the evidence without prejudice. My desire is to present the evidence and historical facts in a way that the reader can determine for himself what is true and what is not.

Many say that the issue of the textual purity of the Bible is not important and should not be focused on. For me, there is nothing more important than standing for the purity of God's Word. If the Bible is not worth defending, then nothing is worth defending. I hope that this book can be a blessing and resource to all those who love and desire the purity of the Word of God.

Dr. Peter James Putney, D.Min.

*Thy word is very pure: Therefore thy servant loveth it.*

*-Psalm 119:140*



# INTRODUCTION

About six thousand years ago a woman named Eve encountered a serpent in the garden of Eden. This serpent was the devil, and his desire was to convince the woman to disobey God and eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

The problem for Satan was that this woman did not possess a sin nature as the human race does today. He would need an extremely effective tactic in order to deceive her. The devil, knowing this was the case, used his most popular and most effective tactic of all, he questioned God's Word. "*Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?*" (Genesis 3:1b). When the woman responded with what God had said,

the devil quickly countered by implying that God's words were not reliable. "*Ye shall not surely die.*" was his subtle reply (Genesis 3:4b). This simple method of casting doubt on God's words helped convince the woman to eat of the forbidden tree.

If the method of questioning God's words was so effective in the garden of Eden when applied to a sinless human, is it not correct to assume that it is still effective today when applied to fallen ones? The answer is most definitely yes. In fact, it is so effective that the devil still continues to use it constantly and consistently in his efforts to deceive mankind.

The devil knows that the most effective way of deceiving a Christian is by destroying his foundational faith in God's Word. Psalm 119:3 warns, "*If the foundations be destroyed, What can the righteous do?*" I have personally seen the rapid descent toward apostasy that is possible when a Christian begins to view the Bible, not as God's perfect Word, but as a book written by men. Once this view is adopted, there are no limits to the heresies, false beliefs, and sinful practices that a Christian can fall into.

A simple example of the devil's deceit is when a Christian attempts to show a Jehovah's Witness that the Trinity is a biblical doctrine. He will most likely turn in his Bible to 1 John 5:7 to show the existence of the Trinity. Assuredly, the

Jehovah's Witness will respond that 1 John 5:7 is not in the original manuscripts and is not a legitimate verse in the Bible. Most Christians will not know how to respond to this attack. They do not know that 1 John 5:7 is indeed found in many ancient Greek manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> In addition to the Greek manuscripts, there are many other ancient Bibles in other languages that contain this verse.<sup>2</sup> 1 John 5:7 is also quoted by many ancient Christians in their writings such as Tertullian (died 220 AD), Cyprian of Carthage (died 258 AD), and Priscillian (died 385 AD). Many other ancient books and documents cite the verse proving that it indeed existed and was known in ancient times.<sup>3</sup> Most Christians do not know that if verse 7 were removed from the text, the grammatical structure of the Greek in verses 6 and 8 would not make sense.<sup>4</sup> The uninformed Christian will most likely simply stay silent or possibly even begin to doubt the reliability of the Bible.

The strategy of the devil is to tell Christians that they really cannot know for sure what the Bible says. It is to convince them that the Bible contains errors and has not been

---

<sup>1</sup> Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, 1993), (1 John 5:7) 623 (manuscripts 61, 88, 221, 429, 629, 636, 918, and 2318).

<sup>2</sup> J.A. Moorman, *When the KJV departs from the Majority Text*, (Cleveland, GA: The Old Paths Publications, Inc. 2010), 146.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 147-148

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 142-143. (The Greek genders used in verses 6 & 8 depend on verse 7.)

perfectly preserved. He wants them to believe that their Bible is not pure, and not completely reliable.

Such was the strategy of the Catholic church during the dark ages. They burned Bibles and prohibited the Scriptures from being translated into the common languages of that day. So effective was this tactic, that they were capable of preaching heresies such as the purchase of indulgences for salvation.

Today, the Bible is available to most people around the world in all major languages. The devil, not to be disheartened with his attacks against the Scriptures, has simply changed his tactics to attacking men's confidence in the Bible. His greatest and most effective attack has been convincing Christians that the Bible has not been preserved since the time of its original writing. Today, the popular view is that the original words of the Bible have been lost over thousands of years due to scribal errors or intentional corruptions.

This method of questioning the preservation and accuracy of God's Word has unfortunately been a very effective tactic. Many Christians and churches no longer believe that every word of the Bible has been preserved and can be known. Many modern preachers unashamedly proclaim from their pulpits that the Bible contains errors and contradictions. Others tell their congregations that it is only a

book written by men. As a result, the devil has succeeded in making the Bible a subjective truth. When someone is not in agreement with a doctrine or teaching of the Bible, they often simply reply, "this might be an error" or "the originals probably didn't say that."

The age-old attack of "*hath God said?*" is alive and well today. The devil does not care if people have the Bible as long as they do not have confidence in it. Today, many people do not believe that the words of the Bible are pure and trustworthy. They no longer have faith in the Bible, and therefore, no longer trust it as a guiding light for their lives.

In the following pages, we will examine how God has preserved His Word throughout the ages. Most Christians unfortunately do not know much about manuscript evidence, but this can easily be changed. This book will attempt to confirm the believer's faith in preservation by showing the evidence for it. Those who do not believe in the preservation of the Scriptures will be challenged to examine if their beliefs are really correct.

The study of manuscript evidence is particularly needed in the context of the Bible versions in other languages. I currently minister in South America and see the need for textual purity in the Spanish Bible versions. This book will

attempt to bring to light timeless truths that, once understood, will give the reader a firm conviction regarding the importance of the purity of the Bible in English, Spanish, or any other language.

The Lord has promised to preserve His Word. The Bible tells us in Matthew 5:18, "*For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*" Let us now examine how the Lord has kept this promise.

ONE

# THE PROMISE OF PRESERVATION

**T**he doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures is of supreme importance in the fight against apostasy. Even in today's age of prevailing liberalism, many Christians still vigorously defend the doctrine of Inspiration. They resist the attacks of liberal theologians who claim that the Bible was not verbally and plenary inspired, even in the original autographs.<sup>5</sup>

The doctrine of Inspiration is clearly taught in the Bible. *Easton's Bible dictionary* defines inspiration as "that extraordinary or supernatural divine influence vouchsafed to

---

<sup>5</sup> A biblical autograph is the original manuscript written by the biblical author.

those who wrote the Holy Scriptures, rendering their writings infallible."<sup>6</sup> The Bible clearly teaches this doctrine in 2 Timothy 3:16. It states, "*All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.*" The apostle Peter wrote regarding the doctrine of Inspiration in 2 Peter 1:21, "*For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*" Inspiration means that the men who wrote the Bible were so influenced by the Holy Spirit, that we can say that they were simply the pens that God used to write His Word.

While the doctrine of Inspiration is widely accepted in the modern Christian world, the doctrine of the Preservation of the Scriptures is not. Most modern theologians believe that the exact wording of the Bible has been lost. Therefore, the ideas of God are what have been preserved, and not the words. Norman Geisler, one of the most famous modern theologians, represents this view in his statement:

Even when the accuracy of a reading in the original text cannot be known with 100 percent accuracy, it is possible to be 100 percent certain of the truth preserved in the texts that survive.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> M. G. Easton, *Easton's Bible dictionary*, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1893).

<sup>7</sup> Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, Rev. and expanded. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 44.



Is it true that God only preserved His ideas and not His words? If this is indeed the case, what exactly was the purpose of the infallible inspiration given to the original autographs? What benefit do the inspired autographs give us today if we don't know exactly what they said? Does the Bible have anything to say about this issue?

One does not have to look far in the Scriptures to find the answer. Psalm 12:6 tells us that, "*The **words** of the Lord are **pure words**:" God did not say that just the ideas of the Lord are pure, but rather that His words are pure. Jesus said in Matthew 4:4, "*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.*" Jesus noted an importance in the words of the Scriptures, not just the ideas. God did not just promise to preserve the ideas or the truths of the Bible, He promised to preserve the words. The Lord placed an importance on each individual word of God and not just the ideas contained in those words.*

The preservation of the Bible has been a special miracle of God here on the earth. Psalm 119:89 says, "*For ever, O LORD, Thy word is settled in heaven.*" If the Word of God is settled in heaven, why would God not preserve it on earth for us as well? Logic dictates that God would have preserved the words that He inspired. Proverbs 30:5 also confirms the promise of preservation, "***Every word** of God is pure: He is a shield unto them*

*that put their trust in him."*

The Bible promises harsh judgment on those who alter the words of God. In Revelation 22:18 it states, "*For I testify unto every man that beareth **the words** of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book.*" It is clear that the focus of the doctrine of the Preservation of the Scriptures is regarding the words of God, and not just the ideas.

God has promised to preserve His words perfectly for every generation. Jesus said in Matthew 24:35, "*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but **my words** shall not pass away.*" This point could not be clearer than what He said in Matthew 5:18, "*For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*" Rolland McCune comments regarding this verse:

Here the references to the 'smallest letter' (kjv: 'jot') and 'stroke' (kjv: 'tittle') are hyperbolic, indicating the inalterability and thus the continuing authority of God's entire written revelation.<sup>8</sup>

The Bible is clear that the individual words of God have not passed away from the time they were written until now.

The promises of preservation are clearly stated and presented throughout the Bible. Despite this, many modern

---

<sup>8</sup> Rolland McCune, *A Systematic Theology of Biblical Christianity: Prolegomena and the Doctrines of Scripture, God, and Angels*, vol. 1, (Allen Park, MI: Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009), 51.

theologians try to explain away these promises by performing hermeneutical gymnastics in order to claim that these passages do not really teach the doctrine of the Preservation of the Scriptures. Again, to those teachers and preachers who believe and proclaim that the words of the Bible are not preserved, one must ask, what was God's purpose then of inspiring the original autographs? If only the original autographs contained the words of God, and the Bible we have today is corrupted, what good does inspiration do us today? If the exact words are indeed lost, then very few human beings have ever actually had access to the pure Word of God.

The greatest problem presented in denying the doctrine of the Preservation of the Scriptures is that the Bible clearly teaches and promises it. If these promises are lies, then what of the other promises? Titus 1:2 specifically states that God cannot lie. If what Jesus said about not one jot or tittle being lost is a lie, then all the promises of God are immediately now in question, including that of salvation. This is the ultimate goal of Satan. He continues to present the same argument to Christians today as he did in the garden of Eden. His subtle lie was then as it is today, "yea hath God said?"

The good news is that the promises regarding the preservation of the Bible are true. God's exact words have been preserved for us today, and we can trust that the Bible, and its teachings, are 100 percent true. We can know for sure

what the exact words of God are, because they have not been lost.

God has placed a tremendous and undeniable importance on the Bible. Every word in the Bible is important. Jesus said that man must live by "*every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God*" (Matthew 4:4). How could we live by "every word" if those words have been lost?

The importance of the Scriptures can also be seen in Psalm 138:2. There it states, "*I will worship toward thy holy temple, And praise thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: For thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name.*" If God has magnified His Word above His very name, you can be certain that He took the effort to not only inspire, but also to preserve it. God is certainly capable of preserving His Word throughout history.

In the following chapters, we will examine how God accomplished the task of perfectly preserving the Scriptures from the time they were written, until today. We will also learn about the evidence that reveals textual corruptions in many modern Bible versions and how to identify them. Let us begin by examining the preservation of the Old Testament text.

## TWO

# THE PRESERVATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

**T**he study of how God has preserved the Scriptures begins with examining the preservation of the Old Testament. As we have already seen, the Lord Jesus Christ taught the doctrine of preservation during His earthly ministry. Jesus said in Matthew 5:18, "*For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*" Even though heaven and earth might pass away, the Scriptures would never pass away. Jesus taught that the Old Testament had been preserved from the time of its writing to the present, and that it would never be lost.

Those who believe this promise, almost unanimously,

agree that the Hebrew Masoretic text is the preserved ancient text of the Old Testament Scriptures. This text was also used as the textual basis for the translation of the Old Testament of the King James Version, as well as many other translations in many languages throughout church history. Let us examine the history of the Hebrew Masoretic text and how it was preserved from the time of its writing until today.

The task of preserving the Scriptures was given in the Old Testament to the priests. Deuteronomy 17:18 states, "*And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites:*" The book of Romans also makes clear that the Jews were entrusted with the care of the Old Testament Scriptures. Romans 3:2 states, "*Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.*" As we will see, history bears witness how the Jewish priests went to great efforts to care for and make faithful copies of the Scriptures.

During the time of the Babylonian captivity, the pure Hebrew text of Scripture was preserved and available to Ezra the priest. Ezra 7:10 reads, "*For Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments.*" From the time of Ezra until the time of Christ, the Scriptures continued to be propagated and preserved by the Jews.

After the time of Christ, various groups of scribes

continued to faithfully copy the Scriptures. The earliest of these scribes were called Tannaim (teachers) and were known for their tremendously accurate copies. The Tannaim were followed later by another group, known as the Amoraim (Expositors) who also aided in the copying of the Old Testament.<sup>9</sup>

## The Hebrew Masoretic Text

As we have already mentioned, the preserved text of the Hebrew Old Testament is called the Hebrew Masoretic Text. This text received its name from the Masoretic scribes. The Masorites were Jewish scholars who were concerned with the precise transmission of the Scriptures. They were active from 600–950 AD and followed strict and elaborate scribal traditions in order to guarantee the precise copying of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament.<sup>10</sup>

The Masorites followed the traditions of ancient Jewish scribes that included many complicated systems and methods in order to ensure the precise and accurate copying of the Scriptures. For example, the number of words and even the middle letter of a book, were counted and recorded in each copy to help verify that no errors had been made. The scribes

---

<sup>9</sup> Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, (Collingswood, N.J.: The Dean Burgon Society Press, 1999). 9.

<sup>10</sup> Drew Longacre, «Masoretas», ed. John D. Barry y Lazarus Wentz, *Diccionario Bíblico Lexham*, (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014).

would even note and compare how many times a word or phrase appeared in a book.<sup>11</sup> God used these scribes to help fulfill His promise of preserving His Word in the Old Testament through their faithful transmission of the Hebrew text.

Rabbi Akiba (died around 135 AD) shows the attitude of the Jewish scribes when he said, "the accurate transmission is a fence for the Torah."<sup>12</sup> The historical evidence supports the belief that the Old Testament text has indeed been preserved. The number of Hebrew Old Testament manuscripts is around 2,000, although some are only portions of the Old Testament.<sup>13</sup>

The accuracy in which the scribes preserved the text of the Old Testament is seen in a discovery made by Dr. Yigael Yadin in Israel. Portions of the Old Testament texts were discovered that could not be older than 73 AD. The discovery included chapters eight to twelve of the book of Leviticus. What is so incredible, is that the text was absolutely identical with the Hebrew Masoretic text. Dr. Yadin also discovered other ancient manuscripts of other parts of the Old Testament that were in agreement with the traditional Hebrew Masoretic

---

<sup>11</sup> Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, 9.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* 10.



text.<sup>14</sup>

The Hebrew Masoretic text has historically been considered God's preserved Word. The complete Old Testament text was printed for the first time in 1488, after the invention of the printing press. Many famous translators such as Martin Luther, and the AV1611 translation committee, used this text in their Bible translations.<sup>15</sup>

Although the Hebrew Masoretic text has been the trusted text of the Old Testament for many centuries, modern textual criticism has recently doubted it. In many cases, they have rejected the Hebrew Masoretic text as being supposedly inferior to translations of the Old Testament. Most of the modern Bible translations no longer faithfully follow the Hebrew Masoretic, but rather a Greek translation of the Old Testament Hebrew called the Septuagint.

## The Greek Septuagint or LXX

The Septuagint is a corrupt translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek. Its exact origins are unknown. There is a strange, and obviously mythical, legend about its origins that comes from the Letter of Aristeas. The legend says that a group of 72 scribes assembled in 285-247 BC

---

<sup>14</sup> David Otis Fuller, *Which Bible*, quoting Yigael Yadin, *MASADA: Herod's Fortress and the Zealot's Last Stand*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1995), 10.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.* 9.

to translate the Pentateuch into Greek. The name LXX (Roman numerals for 70) refers to these 72 scribes.<sup>16</sup> According to the legend, these scribes supposedly made the translation in 72 days and each individual scribe translated the Hebrew into Greek in exactly the same way. The myth states that the translation was inspired in the same manner as the original Hebrew autographs. Quoting *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, "Philo indicates that the translators miraculously produced exactly the same result."<sup>17</sup>

The details of this legend are obviously exaggerated and untrue. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* notes the legend's discrepancies:

Internal evidence indicates that the LXX was really the work of a number of translators (in some cases more than one scholar sharing the responsibility for a single Book), that not all of it was translated at Alexandria, and that the work of translation extended over a considerable period.<sup>18</sup>

Many modern textual critics often prefer the Septuagint's reading to that of the Hebrew Masoretic, but is this Greek translation really superior to the Hebrew? When we examine the evidence, we will quickly see that the LXX

---

<sup>16</sup> J. William Johnston, "Septuagint," ed. John D. Barry et al., *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> F. L. Cross and Elizabeth A. Livingstone, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1493.

(Septuagint) has many problems and is not as reliable as is claimed.

The quality of the LXX as a translation is very problematic. Dr. Moorman comments on this fact:

At its most idiomatic, it abounds with Hebraisms; at its worst it is little more than Hebrew in disguise. But with these reservations the Pentateuch can be classified as fairly idiomatic and consistent, though there are traces of its being the work of more than one translator. Outside the Pentateuch, some books, it seems, were divided between two translators working simultaneously, while others were translated piecemeal at different times by different men using widely different methods and vocabulary. Consequently, the style varies from fairly good Koine Greek, as in part of Joshua, to indifferent Greek, as in Chronicles, Psalms, the Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and parts of Kings, to lateral and sometimes unintelligible translation as in Judges, Ruth, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, and other parts of Kings ... Comparatively few books attain to the standard of the Pentateuch; most are of medium quality, some are very poor. Isaiah as a translation is bad; Esther, Job, Proverbs are free paraphrases ... Proverbs contains things not in the Hebrew text at all, and Hebrew sentiments are freely altered to suit the Greek

outlook.<sup>19</sup>

It should also be noted that the LXX version of Job is 17 percent shorter than that of the Hebrew, and Jeremiah is 12 percent shorter.<sup>20</sup>

The LXX is not only a problematic translation of the Hebrew, it also has obvious errors in it. For example, Genesis 5:26 in the Hebrew Masoretic states that Methuselah lived 782 years, but the LXX says that he lived 802 years.<sup>21</sup> The LXX has Methuselah living 20 years longer than the Hebrew Masoretic. This is a problem, especially because according to the Hebrew, Methuselah died the same year as the flood. If the LXX is correct, then Methuselah survived the flood by 14 years which contradicts the Biblical narrative that only 8 survived the flood (1 Peter 3:20). The Hebrew is obviously correct and the Greek LXX is in error.

There are many other examples of errors in the LXX. Genesis 2:15 has "garden of Delight" instead of "garden of Eden." Genesis 3:8 says "afternoon" instead of "cool of the day." Genesis 5:3 says Adam was 230 years old when Seth was born instead of 130 years as in the Hebrew. Genesis 5:6 has

---

<sup>19</sup> Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, 14.

<sup>20</sup> Tim McLay, «Septuagint», ed. David Noel Freedman, Allen C. Myers, y Astrid B. Beck, *Eerdmans dictionary of the Bible*, (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000), 1185.

<sup>21</sup> Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton, *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: English Translation* (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1870), Ge 5:26.

205 years when it should read 105 years. Genesis 5:7 says 707 years instead of the Hebrew 807 years. Genesis 5:9 says 190 years instead of 90 years in the Hebrew. Many other examples of errors in lifespans are found in Genesis chapters 5 and 11 of the LXX. Genesis 6:14-15 in the LXX has the ark being built out of square wood instead of gopher wood. Genesis 10:2 adds a son named Elisa to the list of Japheth's children (there are also many other examples of names added). Genesis 10:10 calls Babel "Babylon." Genesis 20:14 adds a thousand pieces of silver. The list of differences and contradictions between the Hebrew Masoretic and the LXX is long and extensive.

The LXX not only changes many of the Hebrew readings, it also deletes entire portions of Scripture. Exodus 36:10-33 is completely missing in the LXX. Other passages that have been entirely removed include Jeremiah 52:28-30, 1 Samuel 18:1-3, Exodus 28:23-28, Proverbs 22:6, Isaiah 2:22, and others.

The LXX is also tremendously different from the traditional Hebrew Bible because it contains the apocryphal books mixed within the normal canon. This is strange as the Apocrypha has historically been rejected by the Jews.<sup>22</sup> The traditional divisions of the Law, Prophets and Writings are also abandoned in the LXX.

---

<sup>22</sup> Douglas Estes, «Apócrifos», ed. John D. Barry y Lazarus Wentz, *Diccionario Bíblico Lexham*, (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014).

The apocryphal books were rejected by the Jews, in part, because they contain heretical doctrines that contradict the rest of the Bible. For example, Tobit 6:5–9 contains obvious occult practices, it reads:

<sup>5</sup>Then the angel said to him, “Cut open the fish and take out its gall, heart, and liver. Keep them with you, but throw away the intestines. For its gall, heart, and liver are useful as medicine.” <sup>6</sup>So after cutting open the fish the young man gathered together the gall, heart, and liver; then he roasted and ate some of the fish, and kept some to be salted. The two continued on their way together until they were near Media. <sup>7</sup>Then the young man questioned the angel and said to him, “Brother Azariah, what medicinal value is there in the fish’s heart and liver, and in the gall?” <sup>8</sup>He replied, “As for the fish’s heart and liver, you must burn them to make a smoke in the presence of a man or woman afflicted by a demon or evil spirit, and every affliction will flee away and never remain with that person any longer. <sup>9</sup> And as for the gall, anoint a person’s eyes where white films have appeared on them; blow upon them, upon the white films, and the eyes will be healed.” <sup>23</sup>

This narrative directly contradicts the prohibition of witchcraft found in Deuteronomy 18:10–12. There are other examples of contradictions with the Scriptures such as

---

<sup>23</sup> *New Revised Standard Version* (Tobit 6:5-9)

salvation by giving alms (Tobit 12:9) and offering sacrifices for the salvation of the dead (2 Maccabees 12:43-45).

The LXX's inclusion of the Apocryphal books could in part explain why modern textual critics prefer the LXX over the Hebrew. This is foolish when we consider that Jesus himself rejected these books as canon when He classified the Old Testament in Matthew 23:35. It states, "*...from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.*" 2 Chronicles was the last book in the Hebrew Bible. The LXX ends with Daniel and then Bel and the Dragon. This statement clearly shows that Jesus rejected the continued stories of the Apocrypha as canon.

Modern textual critics often elevate the LXX over the original Hebrew manuscripts by claiming that it was the Bible of Jesus and the Apostles. However, this is very unlikely. Jesus spoke of the Old Testament Scriptures as written in Hebrew. He specifically noted the Hebrew Bible divisions, for example, Luke 24:44 states, "*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 probability that Jesus preferred a Greek translation to the Hebrew text is very low. Hebrew was the language of the synagogue during the time of Christ, as it is today. The

scrolls that Jesus read from were almost certainly in Hebrew.<sup>24</sup>

Despite popular claims, there is little evidence that the modern Septuagint existed during the time of Christ. It is a possibility, but it is by no means certain. The Letter of Aristeas is obviously legendary and does not present firm proof that what we call the Septuagint (LXX) today existed at the time of Christ. Manuscript evidence of the Septuagint has not produced a copy dating prior to 200 AD (some say 300 AD).<sup>25</sup> Many believe that the modern Septuagint was assembled by Origen in Alexandria, Egypt.

The claim that Jesus and the apostles quoted from the Septuagint is also suspect. Quoting Dr. Moorman:

There are about 263 direct quotations from the Old Testament in the New, and of these only 88 correspond closely to the Septuagint. A further 64 are used with some variations, 37 have the same meaning expressed in different words, 16 agree more closely with the Hebrew, and 20 differ both from the Hebrew and the Septuagint.<sup>26</sup>

The fact that the LXX sometimes corresponds with the New Testament quotes is not firm evidence that Jesus and the apostles were quoting from the LXX. It could very easily have been the other way around. A likely possibility is that the 88

---

<sup>24</sup> Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, 22.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid*, 18.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid*, 21.



quotations that correspond closely with the Septuagint do so because it was produced after the time of the apostles, and quotes the New Testament. It also should be noted that when Jesus and the apostles referred to the Old Testament Scriptures, it was often in reference to a fulfilled prophecy and not a direct quote.

The LXX varies from the Hebrew Masoretic text in many ways. Additions, omissions, and changes were expressly prohibited in the Old Testament Law. Deuteronomy 4:2 states, *"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you."* Proverbs 30:6 confirms this, *"Add thou not unto his words, Lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."*

The person who honestly examines the evidence should conclude that the LXX is not where God has preserved the text of the Old Testament. Those that prefer to use the LXX in modern Bible versions do not believe it is perfect either. The reality is that most modern Bible translators do not believe that any text is perfect. They make God into a liar by saying that He has not perfectly preserved His Word. The truth is that God did perfectly preserve His Word and He used the Hebrew Masoretic text to help do so.

## The Septuagint (LXX) in modern translations

If someone wants a Bible in any language that is

faithful to what God originally wrote, they need a translation that follows the Hebrew Masoretic text and not the LXX. Unfortunately, this is not true of most modern translations in most languages. Almost all modern translations follow, at least in part, the LXX. The result is that these translations contain erroneous readings, omissions, additions, and changes to the Word of God.

It should be noted that the translations that use the LXX do not follow it faithfully. These translations normally mix the LXX and the Hebrew Masoretic. The reason for this is that if they followed the LXX faithfully, they would have obvious errors and large portions of missing verses such as Exodus 36:10-33, Jeremiah 52:28-30, 1 Samuel 18:1-3, and Proverbs 22:6. It is very likely that they would sell far fewer Bibles if they were consistently faithful to the LXX.

Instead of faithfully following either text, many modern translations mix multiple texts according to how the translators see fit. The result is a Bible that is really a hybrid of multiple texts, a hybrid that has not previously existed prior to the translators creating it. These new hybrid Bibles are nothing more than creations based on the preferences of modern "scholars."

Almost all modern translations are different in regards to which texts are used and when. Some use the LXX in one verse and a different version uses it in another. Who decides

when to use what text? The reality is that it is completely up to the preferences of the translation committees. It is for this reason that modern Bible translations can be so different from one another.

In the following examples, we will examine a few popular Spanish and English Bible translations and how they have, or have not, inserted the LXX into their Old Testament text. We will use three English and three Spanish Bibles for our comparisons, the *King James Version* (KJV), the *Brenton LXX* (an English translation of the LXX), The *New International Version* (NIV), the *Reina-Valera Gomez* (RVG), the *Reina-Valera 1909* (RV1909), and the *Reina-Valera 1960* (RV1960). English explanations will be added to help the reader with the Spanish versions.

## Who wept, Hagar or the child? - Genesis 21:16b

(KJV) ... *And she sat over against him, and lift up **her voice**, and wept.* (Hagar wept)

(Brenton LXX) ... *and she sat opposite him, and the **child cried** aloud and wept.* (The child wept)

(NIV) ... *And as she sat there, **she began to sob.*** (Hagar wept)

(RVG) ... *y se sentó enfrente, **y alzó su voz y lloró.***

(Hagar wept)

(RV1909) ... *y sentóse enfrente, **y alzó su voz y lloró.***

(Hagar wept)

(RV1960) ... *cuando ella se sentó enfrente, **el muchacho alzó su voz y lloró.*** (the child wept)

In this example the LXX adds "the child" to the verse and changes who it was that wept. The KJV, RVG, RV1909, and the NIV follow the Hebrew. The RV1960 follows the Septuagint (Brenton LXX). Both readings cannot be correct. One is right and one wrong. Since we know that the LXX contains errors, the Hebrew should be considered correct.

### Did or did not increase the joy? - Isaiah 9:3a

(KJV) *Thou hast multiplied the nation, and **not** increased the joy:*  
(Hebrew)

(Brenton LXX) *The multitude of the people which thou hast brought down in thy joy,* (LXX)

(NIV) *You have enlarged the nation and increased their joy;* (LXX)

(RVG) *Aumentando la gente, **no** aumentaste la alegría.* (Hebrew)

(RV1909) *Aumentando la gente, **no** aumentaste la alegría.*  
(Hebrew)

(RV1960) *Multiplicaste la gente, y aumentaste la alegría.* (LXX)

In Isaiah 9:3 we see another big difference between the Hebrew Masoretic and the LXX. The Hebrew says that God did not increase the joy and the LXX says that He did. The Bible translations shown here are not just making translation preferences, they are following two different texts. What is being said is two different things that are opposite from one

another. If we follow the Hebrew, we know that God did not increase the joy. If we follow the LXX, which has demonstratable errors, we will think that He did. The KJV, RVG, and RV1909 correctly follow the Hebrew and the RV1960 and NIV follow the LXX.

### Added phrase in the LXX - Genesis 4:8a

(KJV) *And Cain talked with Abel his brother: ...* (Hebrew)

(Brenton LXX) *And Cain said to Abel his brother, **Let us go out into the plain:**...* (LXX)

(NIV) *Now Cain said to his brother Abel, "**Let's go out to the field.**"...* (LXX)

(RVG) *Y habló Caín con su hermano Abel. ...* (Hebrew)

(RV1909) *Y habló Caín a su hermano Abel: ...* (Hebrew)

(RV1960) *Y dijo Caín a su hermano Abel: **Salgamos al campo.***  
(LXX)

In Genesis 4:8 we have an example of an addition made in the LXX that is not in the original Hebrew. The phrase "Let us go into the plain" is only found in the corrupt Septuagint. The NIV and RV1960 once again follow the LXX and the KJV, RVG, and RV1909 do not.

### *I know him* removed - Genesis 18:19a

(KJV) For **I know him**, that he will command his children and his household after him, (Hebrew)

(Brenton LXX) *For I know that he will order his sons, and his house after him, (LXX)*

(NIV) *For I have chosen him, so that he will direct his children and his household after him (LXX)*

(RVG) *Porque **yo lo conozco**, sé que mandará a sus hijos y a su casa después de sí, (Hebrew)*

(RV1909) *Porque **yo lo he conocido**, sé que mandará a sus hijos y a su casa después de sí, (Hebrew)*

(RV1960) *Porque yo sé que mandará a sus hijos y a su casa después de sí, (LXX)*

In Genesis 18:19 we have an example of an omission made in the Septuagint and the translations that follow it. God said regarding Abraham, "*I know him.*" This phrase is removed in the Septuagint. The KJV, RVG, and RV1909 follow the Hebrew and the RV1960 and NIV follow the Septuagint in removing the phrase.

## Other examples

In my comparisons of different Bible versions, I have found that the RV1960 Spanish Bible shows a particular affinity for the Septuagint. It is interesting that it will often follow the LXX even when the NIV does not. In Genesis 24:39 the KJV and Hebrew read, "*And I said unto my master, Peradventure the woman will not follow me.*" The RV1960 omits the phrase "unto my master" and the NIV includes it. This phrase

is included in the Hebrew Masoretic but excluded in the LXX.

Genesis 21:9 shows another significant departure from the Hebrew in the RV1960. The KJV and Hebrew read, "*And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking.*" The LXX and RV1960 add the phrase "with Isaac her son." The NIV follows the Hebrew.

The LXX also adds the phrase "*why have ye stolen my silver cup?*" to Genesis 44:4-5. This phrase is not in the Hebrew. The RV1960 includes this phrase from the LXX and the NIV does not.

In Esther 8:10 it reads, "*And he wrote in the king Abasuerus' name, and sealed it with the king's ring, and sent letters by posts on horseback, and riders on mules, camels, and young dromedaries.*" The LXX does not mention the animals, it reads: "*And they were written by order of the king, and sealed with his ring, and they sent the letters by the posts.*" The RV1960 and NIV both only mention the horses, therefore following a mixture of the two readings.

Job 13:13 omits the phrase "let me alone" in the LXX. The RV1960 and the NIV follow its example and read the same.

In Song of Solomon 2:10 the KJV and Hebrew read, "*My beloved spake, and said unto me, Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away.*" The LXX changes "my love" to "my companion." The RV1960 follows this corrupt reading and says "amiga" (friend) and the NIV follows closer to the Hebrew with

"darling."

There are many other examples, but these should be sufficient to show that many popular translations in English, Spanish, and other languages often leave the Hebrew reading to follow the corrupt LXX. These versions pick and choose what text to follow depending on the preferences of the translators. Their translation committees were not loyal to any text, but rather to what was right in their own eyes. The KJV in English and RVG in Spanish are faithful to the Hebrew Masoretic Text, and do not follow the corrupt LXX.



### THREE

# THE PRESERVATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

**I**n studying manuscript evidence, the reader will quickly realize that there are really only two types of Bibles available today. Those that have come from the Received Text family of manuscripts, and those that have come from the Critical Text (Alexandrian) family. The Received Text has historically been used by churches dating back to the time of the apostles. The Critical Text Bibles have only dominated new translations for the last 150 years.

Those who support the Critical Text Bibles rarely claim that the Critical Text is where the promise of preservation has been fulfilled. They do not usually believe in the doctrine of

the Preservation of the Scriptures. They almost always believe that the Greek text of the New Testament has been lost and must be reconstructed by means of textual criticism.

## The method of preservation

As we learned in the previous chapters, God has promised to preserve His Word. The good news is that He has kept that promise. The promise made by Jesus Christ, that not one jot or tittle would be lost from the Scriptures, has been kept in the New Testament through the textual lineage of the Received Text manuscripts. The question is, how did God providentially work in order to preserve His Word? He did not just leave the preservation of the Scriptures to chance. God providentially worked throughout the human process of copying and protecting faithful copies of the Bible.

Dr. Moorman notes three specific steps in this process:

First, many trustworthy copies of the original New Testament manuscripts were produced by faithful scribes. Second, these trustworthy copies were read and recopied by true believers down through the centuries. Third, untrustworthy copies were not so generally read or so frequently recopied...Thus as a result of this special providential guidance the true text won out in the end, and today we may be sure that the text found in the vast majority of the Greek New Testament manuscripts is a trustworthy

reproduction of the divinely inspired original text.<sup>27</sup>

The vast majority of the over 5,000 Greek New Testament manuscripts that exist today are indeed in agreement. At least 85 percent of the New Testament Greek manuscripts in existence today are part of the Received Text family.<sup>28</sup> Textual expert John Burgon estimated that 995 of every 1000 manuscripts he examined supported the Received Text.<sup>29</sup>

The Received text has historically been the Bible that the common people used. In fact, it is was the common Christians and churches who were the most faithful in protecting their copies of the Scriptures. These Christians were very unlikely to damage their precious Bibles by writing on them. The manuscripts today that were owned by the common people are the most clean and free from alterations.<sup>30</sup>

Evidence abounds that the traditional Received Text was present in the earliest days of the church. Many church fathers quoted and recognized the distinct Received Text readings in their Scripture citations. The following notable ancient Christians have cited the traditional Bible in their writings:

---

<sup>27</sup> Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, 60.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid*, 71.

<sup>29</sup> Burgon, John William. *The Revision Revised*. Kindle Edition. 134.

<sup>30</sup> Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, 69.

(100 - 150 AD) The Didache, Diognetus, Justin Martyr;  
(150 - 200 AD) Gospel of Peter, Athenagorus, Hegesippus,  
Irenaeus;  
(200 - 250 AD) Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian,  
Clementines, Hippolytus, Origen;  
(200 - 300 AD) Gregory of Thaumaturgus, Novatian,  
Cyprian, Dionysius of Alexandria, Archelaus;  
(300 - 400 AD) Eusebius, Athanasius, Macarius Magnus,  
Hilary, Didymus, Basil, Titus of Bostra, Cyril of Jerusalem,  
Gregory of Nyssa, Apostolic Canons, Epiphanius, and  
Ambrose.<sup>31</sup>

The fact that these ancient men cited the distinct readings of the traditional Bible is unquestionable evidence that the traditional text existed during the earliest days of the church. The traditional Bible of today is the same Bible that was used by the earliest Christians, it has not been lost. Those that claim that the words of Scripture have been lost and must be reconstructed are simply wrong.

There are many ancient Bibles in other languages that were translated from the traditional text. Their existence is strong evidence that the Received Text manuscripts represent the original biblical text that was used by the early churches. Let us examine some of these ancient Bibles that support the belief that the traditional text is the preserved Word of God.

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, 95.

## The Itala Version

An Old Latin Version of the Bible, called the Itala Version, was produced by the Italic Church by 157 AD.<sup>32</sup> This Latin translation is based on the Received Text. Quoting Dr. Jeffrey Young:

The old Latin translation that was in use when Jerome prepared the Vulgate was translated much earlier than 300 AD because 50 copies are still extant dated between 300 and 400 AD. This translation is also a witness, prior to the fourth century, that testifies to the authenticity of the traditional text.<sup>33</sup>

Frederick Nolan confirms the existence of the Itala Version in 157 AD, which is less than one hundred years after most of the books of the New Testament were written.<sup>34</sup> This is very powerful evidence that the traditional text is the text used by the first Christians. The Itala Version was known to be used by the common people, to be a quite literal translation of the Greek, and to have been copied until the 9th century.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, (Duluth, MN, NorthStar Baptist Ministries), 78. Quoting Frederick Henry Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 2d ed (Cambridge, Deighton, Bell, & CO., 1874), 2:43

<sup>33</sup> Will Kinney, "The Old Latin Versions and the KJB," [http://textus-receptus.com/wiki/Article:\\_The\\_Old\\_Latin\\_versions\\_and\\_the\\_KJB\\_by\\_Will\\_Kinney](http://textus-receptus.com/wiki/Article:_The_Old_Latin_versions_and_the_KJB_by_Will_Kinney) (accessed 3-29-21).

<sup>34</sup> David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, 78. Quoting Frederick Nolan, *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate: or, Received Text of the New Testament* (London: F. C. & J. Rivington, 1815), xvii, xviii.

<sup>35</sup> Carroll D. Osburn, "Itala," ed. David Noel Freedman, Allen C. Myers, and Astrid B. Beck, *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, 659.

## The Peshitta Version

The Syrian Peshitta Version is another powerful ancient witness to the integrity of the traditional text. According to *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, the Old Testament of the Peshitta is translated from a Hebrew text almost identical to that of the Hebrew Masoretic.<sup>36</sup> The New Testament of the Peshitta is based on the traditional Received Text.

The Peshitta was used by the common Christians in Syria during a time shortly removed from the apostles. The *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* also gives the origin of the name:

The word *peshitta* ... functions as an adjective meaning "simple." The translation was apparently the "simple" or "common version." (Most believe the designation was to distinguish this standard Syriac version from the more sophisticated, annotated Syro-Hexapla.)<sup>37</sup>

The translation could have been made as early as the first century.<sup>38</sup>

The fact that the Peshitta is based on the traditional text is strong evidence that the Received Text is the true text of the Bible. The Peshitta was later revised several times and unfortunately, corruptions made their way into these later

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. "Peshitta,"

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

revisions. The Peshitta originally omitted the Apocrypha, but these books were later added from the Septuagint.<sup>39</sup>

Textual expert John Burgon noted the antiquity and receptivity of the Peshitta:

The churches of the region of Syria have always used the Peshitta. There has never been a time when these churches did not use the Received Text based Peshitta.<sup>40</sup>

Today, the Peshitta is a powerful witness to the validity of the traditional texts and hence to the preservation of the Scriptures.

## The Gothic Version

The Gothic Version is a Received Text based Bible that was originally translated into the Gothic language around 350 AD by a missionary to the Goths by the name of Ulphilas.<sup>41</sup> The book of Second Corinthians and considerable portions of the four Gospels, as well as some of the other Pauline Epistles, survive today. The Gothic Version is a very literal translation of the Greek.<sup>42</sup>

To quote Norman Geisler, who is no friend to the

---

<sup>39</sup> Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, 36.

<sup>40</sup> David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, p. 81; quoted in John Burgon and Edward Miller, *The causes of the Corruption*, 128.

<sup>41</sup> Carroll D. Osburn, "Gothic Version," ed. David Noel Freedman, Allen C. Myers, and Astrid B. Beck, *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, 524.

<sup>42</sup> F. L. Cross and Elizabeth A. Livingstone, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 698.

doctrine of the Preservation of the Scriptures, "This translation adheres closely, almost literally, to the Greek text of the Byzantine type (Received Text)."<sup>43</sup> The *Eerdmans Bible dictionary* also confirms that it is based on the traditional text.<sup>44</sup> Those who say that there is no evidence that the traditional text existed prior to the fifth century are silenced by the existence of the Gothic Version.

The traditional text was common and accepted in its day if it was used to translate into other languages. The Gothic Version is a great witness that the traditional text is the preserved Word of God.

## Other Translations

Dr. Waite gives an extensive list of the Received Text being used in European translations:

These include the Gallic Church of Southern France, (177 AD); the Celtic Church of Great Britain; the Church of Scotland and Ireland; Codex *W* of Matthew in the fourth or fifth century; Codex *A* in the Gospels in the fifth century; the vast majority of extant New Testament manuscripts; the early Greek church (312-1453 AD); all the churches of the Reformation; Erasmus's Greek New Testament of 1516 as

---

<sup>43</sup> Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, Rev. and expanded, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 519.

<sup>44</sup> Carroll D. Osburn, "Gothic Version," ed. David Noel Freedman, Allen C. Myers, and Astrid B. Beck, *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, 524.



well as his later editions, The Complutensian Polyglot of 1522; Luther's German Bible; the French Version of Olivetan of 1537; the Taverner's Bible of 1539; Stephanus' Greek New Testament (1546-51); the Geneva Bible of 1557-60; the Bishops' Bible of 1568; ... Beza's Greek New Testament of 1598 as well as his other editions; the King James Bible of 1611; and the Elzivers' Greek New Testament of 1624.<sup>45</sup>

Many other examples could be given of translations of the traditional Bible. The evidence is abundant that the Received Text has been used by the churches since the earliest days of church history. This is because it is the true Bible. God providentially preserved His Word over the centuries and fulfilled His promises. Psalms 119:89 states, "*For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.*"

While the vast majority of all existing manuscripts support the Received Text, opponents of the doctrine of the Preservation of the Scriptures will point out that there are occasionally slight discrepancies amongst individual manuscripts. Although these differences are small and few (such as the spelling of a word), the Bible tells us that not one jot or tittle will pass away and therefore we should resolve these differences, however small they may be. The good news is that

---

<sup>45</sup> D.A. Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, (Collingswood, N.J.: Bible for Today, 1992), 45-48.

these discrepancies are easily resolved through a process of comparison with all the available manuscripts within its family.

To help the reader understand this process, imagine a table with 1,000 manuscripts of the gospel of John. Suppose that 990 contain a word in a verse and 10 of the manuscripts omit the word. The conclusion can be safely made that the word is indeed part of Scripture and that the 10 manuscripts that omit it contain a scribal error. This process of comparison is what is used to allow us to resolve any discrepancies within a manuscript family, however small they may be.

It is the personal conviction of many (including this author), that the King James Bible Translation Committee was providentially used by God to produce a standardized, collated Received Text that eliminated all scribal errors. Many modern textual experts agree, that this collation of the Received Text family of manuscripts done by the AV1611 scholars, even today, cannot be improved upon. In this standardized text (the KJV and its textual base), the promise of every jot and tittle being preserved has been fulfilled. Many great books exist explaining the background and methods used by the over fifty King James Translators to produce a faithful and preserved Bible. If someone wants to see a perfect copy of God's Word today, they can find it in the King James Bible and its base text.

## FOUR

# THE ALEXANDRIAN MANUSCRIPTS

**M**any Christians believe that any version of the Bible is acceptable as long as it is a "good translation." Unfortunately, most do not have any idea which manuscripts are behind their Bible version. Modern Bibles are sold under the premise of being translated from the "oldest and best manuscripts." These general statements tell the reader nothing of which manuscripts were used or how reliable they were.

The reader should remember that there are really only two distinct types of Bibles in the world today. Those that are translated from the majority text manuscripts or the "Received

Text", and those translated from the "Critical Text." Now that we have examined the reliability of the Received Text, we will begin our study of the Critical Text or Alexandrian manuscript family.

## Early Textual Corruptions

Since the earliest days of the church there have existed people who have intentionally altered scribal copies of the Biblical texts. The apostle Paul spoke of such men who were altering the Bible even in his day. He said, "*For we are not as many which corrupt the word of God:*" (2 Corinthians 2:17a). This intentional corruption of God's Word was happening in Paul's day and continued to happen throughout the early days of church history. Textual expert John Burgon comments:

As soon as inaccuracy had done its baleful work, a spirit of infidelity and of hostility either to the essentials or the details of the new religion must have impelled such as were either imperfect Christians, or no Christians at all, to corrupt the sacred stories. Thus, it appears that errors crept in at the very first commencement of the life of the Church.<sup>46</sup>

Textual corruptions at times were a result of scribal error, but often it was intentional. Burgon quotes the ancient church father Caius, who spoke of the textual corruptions

---

<sup>46</sup> John Burgon and Edward Miller, *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, (London: MacMillan CO., 1897), 4.

taking place during his time (around 175 AD). Caius is quoted in the following statement:

The Divine Scriptures, these heretics have audaciously corrupted...laying violent hands upon them under pretense of correcting them. That I bring no false accusation, anyone who is disposed may easily convince himself. He has but to collect the copies belonging to these people severally; then, to compare one with another; and he will discover that their discrepancy is extraordinary.

Caius goes on to name the men who were guilty of producing and propagating false copies of Scripture as Theodotus, Asclepiades, Hermophilus, and Apollonides.<sup>47</sup>

It is beyond doubt that textual corruptions occurred very early in church history. Today there are over 8,000 differences between the Received Text and the Critical Text. Over 2,800 words have been removed by the Critical Text.<sup>48</sup> That is more than the number of words found in the entire book of 1 John. Obviously, corruption has occurred in some biblical manuscripts. The important question therefore is "which manuscripts are corrupted?"

Evidence suggests that many of the manuscripts that were produced in Alexandria, Egypt suffered the most

---

<sup>47</sup> John Burgon, *The Revision revised*, 323.

<sup>48</sup> David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, 100-101; quoting David Cloud, *Myths about the Modern Bible Versions* (Oak Harbor, Wash: Way of Life Literature 1999), 35.

corruption. These manuscripts today are known as the Alexandrian family of manuscripts, and they are the textual basis of the modern Critical Text Bibles. These manuscripts use the form of text that originated in Alexandria, Egypt and was used by Origen. The Alexandrian family includes manuscripts like Papyri 46, 47, 66, 75, B, Aleph and around 25 other Greek New Testament manuscripts.

Many of these manuscripts are not in agreement with one another as we shall later see. The two most famous (and most used) Alexandrian family manuscripts are Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus. These manuscripts will be studied in depth later in the book.

## The Catechetical School of Alexandria

To understand the origins of these corrupt manuscripts, one must begin by understanding the corrupt influences in the city in which many of them were produced. The Catechetical School of Alexandria was established in the second century and was concerned with advanced teaching in theology. Some of its most famous heads and teachers were Pantaenus (190 AD), Clement (190–202 AD), and Origen (202–231 AD).<sup>49</sup>

The school was known for using arguments of the

---

<sup>49</sup> F. L. Cross and Elizabeth A. Livingstone, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 301.

prevailing philosophies of that time and for using the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture.<sup>50</sup> While many liberal theologians will attempt to paint the school as a good influence on the ancient Christian world, even they will admit it was influenced by Gnosticism and heresy. For example, as Schaff defends the school he writes:

In its efforts to reconcile revelation and philosophy it took up, like Philo, many foreign elements, especially of the Platonic stamp, and wandered into speculative views which a later and more orthodox, but more narrow-minded and less productive age condemned as heresies.<sup>51</sup>

The reader should note that even the school's defenders admit that they taught heresy.

Schaff also admits that at least one of the heads of the school, Clement, was indeed a gnostic.<sup>52</sup> Gnosticism is defined in the *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* as "a heretical movement of the 2nd-century Christian Church, teaching that esoteric knowledge (gnosis) of the supreme divine being enabled the redemption of the human spirit."<sup>53</sup> The basic teaching of Gnosticism is that salvation is through knowledge. Many believe the apostle Paul was confronting Gnosticism in

---

<sup>50</sup> Michael J. Anthony et al., *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, (Baker Reference Library, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001), 111.

<sup>51</sup> Philip Schaff and David Schley Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 2, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), 780-781.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.* 783.

<sup>53</sup> Catherine Soanes and Angus Stevenson, eds., *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*.

Colossians 2:8 when he said, "*Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.*"

The school at Alexandria was responsible not only for influencing Christianity with heretical teachings, but also for corrupting the Scriptures. The Alexandrian Christians seemed to have a reputation for rejecting New Testament readings which did not make sense to them. John Burgon presents evidence of this from Origen's own Commentary on Matthew:

In this Commentary, Origen, the leading Christian critic of antiquity, gives us an insight into the arbitrary and highly subjective manner in which New Testament textual criticism was carried on at Alexandria about 230 AD. In his comment on Matthew 19:17-21 (Jesus' reply to the rich young man) Origen reasons that Jesus could not have concluded his list of God's commandments with the comprehensive requirement, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." For the reply of the young man was, "All these things have I kept from my youth up," and Jesus evidently accepted this statement as true. But if the young man had loved his neighbor as himself, he would have been perfect, for Paul says that the whole law is summed up in this saying, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." But Jesus answered If thou wilt be perfect etc., implying, that the young man was not yet perfect. Therefore, Origen argued, the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," could not have been spoken by Jesus on this occasion and was not part



of the original text of Matthew. The clause had been added, Origen concluded, by some tasteless scribe.<sup>54</sup>

Origen must have considered himself very important if he felt he could determine that something did not belong in Scripture because it didn't make sense to him. In speaking of the causes of early textual corruption Burgon notes:

Above all, it is to be inferred that licentious and rash editors of Scripture - among whom Origen may certainly be regarded as a prime offender - must have deliberately introduced into their recessions (translations) many an unauthorized and uninspired gloss, and so have given it an extended circulation.<sup>55</sup>

Although Origen is often lifted up as a great church father by many modern theologians, the truth is that he had a more corrupting influence on the church than probably anyone ever has. Origen was in truth, a heretic and is known for teaching many heretical doctrines. For example, Origen said in regards to the false doctrine of infant baptism, "In the Church, baptism is given for the remission of sins, and, according to the usage of the Church, baptism is given even to infants."<sup>56</sup> Origen also believed that baptism was the method by which our

---

<sup>54</sup> Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, 71.

<sup>55</sup> Dean John W. Burgon, *The causes of corruption of the New Testament*, (Collingswood, New Jersey, The Dean Burgon Society Press). 48.

<sup>56</sup> Origen of Alexandria, *Homilies on Leviticus*, 8:3.

sins were redeemed.<sup>57</sup> He did not believe in the bodily resurrection and he believed in universal salvation (the teaching that all, including demons, will be saved).<sup>58</sup> The list of Origen's heretical teachings is long and extensive.

In the famous dispute that arose in Alexandria between Arius and Athanasius (4th century) over the deity of Christ, Origen was called the father of Arianism.<sup>59</sup> Arianism is defined as "A movement in the early church that distinguished the divinity of God the Father from the divinity of Christ by arguing that Jesus was a created being."<sup>60</sup> A modern day equivalent would be the Jehovah's Witness religion. The city of Alexandria is in fact, the cradle of this heretical doctrine.

Origen is also the father of many Catholic doctrines, including purgatory.<sup>61</sup> He also is most likely the reason that the Catholic church uses the Apocrypha. Dr. Moorman comments that, "the inclusion of the Apocrypha in the Catholic Bible may be traced back to Origen's inclusion of these books in his own doctored Greek manuscripts."<sup>62</sup>

One thing is certain: Origen is guilty of changing the

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid, homily 2, 47.

<sup>58</sup> David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, 98.

<sup>59</sup> Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, 91.

<sup>60</sup> John D. Barry et al., eds., "Arianism," *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*.

<sup>61</sup> Origen of Alexandria, *On First Principles*, Book 2, Chapter 11, Sections 6-7 (2.11.6-7).

<sup>62</sup> Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible*, 92.

Scriptures to suite his own doctrinal positions and opinions. His assertion that "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" should be removed, based on his opinion, is clear evidence of this. Origen also reportedly had a team of scribes whose purpose it was to "correct" the biblical manuscripts.<sup>63</sup>

Brooke Westcott, one of the creators of the modern Critical Text, referred to Origen's alteration of Mark 6:3.<sup>64</sup> There is evidence that Origen altered Luke 2:14 as well in order to rectify what he considered an inconsistency in the Bible.<sup>65</sup>

It cannot be denied that Origen exhibited a corrupting influence on the Scriptures. The Alexandrian family of manuscripts, which were produced under the supervision of Origen or his followers, are not reliable copies of the Word of God. As we shall see in the next chapter, these manuscripts even contradict each other, and are considered unreliable by many textual scholars. Even so, they are the basis of the modern Critical Text. As a result, many Bible translations contain these erroneous readings that attack fundamental Christian doctrine.

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Origen of Alexandria, *Homilies on Luke*.



## FIVE

# THE CRITICAL TEXT

**T**he Critical Text is the modern Greek text that is used as the base of almost all of the modern Bible translations. It comes from the Alexandrian manuscripts and not the traditional text. The result of this is that most modern Bible translations, in many cases, are very different from the Bibles that Christians have been using throughout the history of the church. In this Chapter, we will examine the modern history of the Critical Text and whether it is reliable or not.

Although there are over 5,000 manuscripts in existence today, the Critical Text is mostly constructed by just two of these manuscripts. These two manuscripts are called Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus and they are the pillars of the

Critical Text. Let us now examine these two manuscripts and their reliability.

## Codex Sinaiticus

Codex Sinaiticus is a mid-fourth century biblical manuscript. It was discovered at the Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai. The name means "the Sinai book." The manuscript was produced on animal skins and it is estimated that the skins of more than 350 animals were used to produce its approximately 750 original leaves. About 400 of these leaves survive today. Due to the cost of producing a book made of such materials, it is believed that the Bible was not the property of an average person. Codex Sinaiticus contains the Septuagint with the Apocrypha and the entire New Testament. Much of the beginning of the Old Testament has been lost. The manuscript also includes the *Epistles of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas* after the Book of Revelation.<sup>66</sup> Digital images of each page of the codex can be viewed today at [codexsinaiticus.org](http://codexsinaiticus.org).

Codex Sinaiticus was discovered by Friedrich Constantine Von Tischendorf. Tischendorf was a German textual critic that lived in the middle of the nineteenth century and who traveled around the world in search of biblical

---

<sup>66</sup> Jeffrey E. Miller, "Codex Sinaiticus," ed. John D. Barry et al., *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*.

manuscripts of the New Testament.

In 1844, Tischendorf visited the Monastery of Saint Catherine and discovered the manuscript. Pages of Sinaiticus were actually found in the garbage. The monks were intending to use them as kindling for the fire.<sup>67</sup> Tischendorf heavily overestimated the manuscript's value and assigned it the first Hebrew letter Aleph, even though all the letters of the Greek alphabet had not yet been assigned to this category of manuscripts. As other textual experts began to examine Sinaiticus, it was clear that it was not as valuable or as reliable as was previously thought.

F.H.A. Scrivener in his examination and publication of the manuscript found that it contained many scribal errors. He writes:

Letters and words, even whole sentences, are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately cancelled...whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament.<sup>68</sup>

His examination of the manuscript indicated that it was the work of at least four different original scribes, and that at least

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> Frederick Hendry Ambrose Scrivener, *A full collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text of the New Testament*, (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. London: Bell and Daldy, 1864), xxv.

ten others had made corrections at unknown later dates. Scrivener in referring to these later revisers, states:

It is covered with such alterations, brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of them systematically spread over every page, others occasional or limited to separate portions of the manuscript, many of them being contemporaneous with the first writer, the greater part belonging to the sixth or seventh century, a few being as recent as the twelfth.<sup>69</sup>

These "alterations" were done as a kind of "revision" according to Scrivener. He goes on:

When the manuscript was completely written, it seems to have been subjected to several kinds of revision...chiefly to amend gross and obvious mistakes or to supply words and clauses omitted...occasionally his changes are made over the original text itself.<sup>70</sup>

Scrivener expressed much frustration with Sinaiticus:

It will readily be imagined how vastly the labour and anxiety of a critical editor must be enhanced by so extensive a mass of alterations, many of them being corrections of corrections, in such different hands and spread over the course of many centuries.<sup>71</sup>

The manuscript that Scrivener described is far from

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid, xix.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid, xxx-xxxi.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid, xxxv.



reliable. Textual expert John Burgon also said in regards to Sinaiticus:

The most untrustworthy codex is Ⲙ (Sinaiticus), which bears on its front a memorable note of the evil repute under which it has always labored: it is found that at least ten revisers between the IVth and the XIIth centuries busied themselves with the task of correcting its many and extraordinary perversions of the truth of Scripture.<sup>72</sup>

Many other textual experts have echoed the same opinion in regards to Sinaiticus' unreliability. Even so, this corrupt manuscript was destined to become a pillar of the modern Critical Text and its textual errors would eventually find their way into most modern Bible translations.

## Codex Vaticanus

Codex Vaticanus, also known as codex B, is believed to be the oldest extant vellum manuscript. It contains 759 leaves, 142 of which are New Testament texts. It was likely written in the fourth century.<sup>73</sup>

This manuscript is believed by many to be one of the 50 Bibles that Eusebius produced for the Roman Emperor Constantine. It is called Vaticanus because it was discovered

---

<sup>72</sup> Burgon, John William. *The Revision Revised*. 13.

<sup>73</sup> Jeffrey E. Miller, "Codex Vaticanus," ed. John D. Barry et al., *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*.

by Tischendorf in the Vatican library. It had been there since at least 1475 AD. In 1534 AD, Sepulveda and Erasmus discussed the manuscript briefly in their correspondence.<sup>74</sup> These two textual experts rejected Vaticanus due to its obvious corruptions.

Codex Vaticanus is generally regarded as the most valuable Greek manuscript by most modern textual critics due to its completeness and antiquity. Its origins can be traced to Alexandria, Egypt. *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* notes that the scribe of Vaticanus preferred "shorter readings."<sup>75</sup> This is a modern scientific way of saying that the manuscript has deleted much of the Bible.

The "shorter readings" of Vaticanus are abundant. This is clearly seen in the fact that it is missing the following verses: Matthew 12:47; 16:2b–3; 17:21; 18:11; 23:14; Mark 7:16; 9:44, 46; 11:26; 15:28; 16:9–20; Luke 9:55a–56b; 17:36; 22:43–44; 23:17, 34; John 5:4; 7:53–8:11; Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:7; 28:29; Romans 16:24; 1 Peter 5:3; 1 John 5:7–8.<sup>76</sup> There are numerous other words and phrases omitted from many other verses as well.

Apparently, ancient readers were very annoyed with the deletions of the Biblical text. In the margin beside Hebrews

---

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.

1, a frustrated reader wrote: "Fool and knave, can't you leave the old reading alone and not alter it."<sup>77</sup>

Markers known as "distigmai" accompany 778 lines in the New Testament of Vaticanus. These indicate textual variants known to exist when it was copied.<sup>78</sup> This means that the text of Vaticanus is not older than the many variant readings, such as those found in the traditional Bible. We have already examined solid evidence that the traditional text existed very early. Vaticanus simply deleted and changed the text. It is very obvious that this was not a faithful copy of the original text used by the ancient church.

Textual expert John Burgon was also not impressed with the quality and reliability of Vaticanus:

We venture to assure him, without a particle of hesitation, that  $\aleph$  (Sinaiticus) *b* (Vaticanus), and *d* are three of the most scandalously corrupt copies extant: exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anywhere to be met with...have become, by whatever process (for their history is wholly unknown), the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and intentional perversions of Truth, which are discoverable in any known copies of the Word of God.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Burgon, John William, *The Revision Revised*, 16.

## Contradictions between Sinaiticus and Vaticanus

The textual differences of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus with the traditional Bible (Received Text) are significant. Burgon notes:

*b* (Vaticanus) is found to omit at least 2877 words: to add, 536: to substitute, 935: to transpose, 2098: to modify, 1132 (in all 7578) ... the corresponding figures for *Ⲙ* (Sinaiticus) being severally 3455, 839, 1114, 2299, 1265 (in all 8972).<sup>80</sup>

What is most interesting is that the changes are by no means the same in both manuscripts. Burgon noted that it is in fact easier to find two consecutive verses in which these two manuscripts differ the one from the other, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree.<sup>81</sup> The two manuscripts are far from being in agreement with each other.

It is incredible that these corrupt manuscripts are considered some of the most valuable in existence today and that they are used to "reconstruct" the original text of the New Testament. Well over 99 percent of the modern Critical Text is composed of a mixture of the readings of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Vaticanus composes the majority of that 99 percent.<sup>82</sup> The Nestle-Aland edition of the Critical Greek New Testament only departs from these two manuscripts 214 times

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid. 13.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid.

<sup>82</sup> David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, 25.

in the entire New Testament.<sup>83</sup> When the modern Christian reads a translation based on the Critical Text, he is most certainly reading a textual corruption that came directly from Codex Vaticanus or Codex Sinaiticus. With these two manuscripts set up as its pillars, the modern Critical Text was about to be born.

## Westcott and Hort

In 1881, two British textual critics named Brooke Westcott and Anthony Hort published their Critical Greek New Testament. It was a unification of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus into one Critical Greek text.<sup>84</sup> This new Greek text was a complete departure from the Received Text Bibles that had been used since the early days of the church. The text that was published in 1881 was a new combination of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus that no one had ever used before. It was this Greek text that would replace the Received Text as the textual basis for almost all Bible translations published thereafter.

The men who published this new Greek Critical text literally changed the Bible that the majority of Christians used. For centuries, Christians used Bibles that were based in the

---

<sup>83</sup> Moorman, *8,000 differences*, (Collingswood, New Jersey, The Dean Burgon Society, 2006). ix.

<sup>84</sup> David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, 105.

traditional text, the Received Text. With the publication of the Critical Text, all this was about to change. From 1881 on, most new translations would follow this brand-new text that had never before existed, this new hybrid of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

Was it wise for modern Christianity to trust these two men to change the traditional Bible? The answer is a definitive no. This becomes even more clear when we study just who these men were. Today, we have many books and letters that were written by Westcott and Hort. These documents give us a very good idea as to the beliefs and character of these men.

Westcott and Hort were men who did not believe in many orthodox doctrines, especially in regards to the authority and preservation of the Scriptures. Hort said in a letter:

The positive doctrines even of the Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue. There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible;<sup>85</sup>

Hort differed greatly with orthodox Christianity in regards to the authority of the Bible in the life of the Christian.

Westcott and Hort not only did not believe in orthodox views in regards to the authority of the Bible, they

---

<sup>85</sup> Arthur Fenton Hort y Fenton John Anthony Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, vol. 1, (London; New York: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.; Macmillan & Co., 1896), 400.

also despised the traditional Bible that had been used since the early days of the church. Hort said regarding the traditional Bible (Received Text):

I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of texts, having read so little Greek Testament, and dragged on with the villainous *Textus Receptus*.<sup>86</sup>

The villainous *textus Receptus*? This is the person whom modern Christians trust to have reconstructed the Greek text of their Bibles? Hort continued:

Think of that vile *Textus Receptus* leaning entirely on late manuscripts.; it is a blessing there are such early ones.<sup>87</sup>

Calling the traditional and historic Bibles "vile" shows the low view these two men had for Scripture.

In addition to the authority of the Scriptures, Westcott and Hort denied many other orthodox Christian doctrines. In regards to the literal creation, Westcott wrote:

No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history -- I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did.<sup>88</sup>

Westcott and Hort were evolutionists who denied the Genesis

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid, 211.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> D. A. Waite, *The Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort*, (Collingswood, NJ, The Bible for Today, Inc., 1979), 4.

account of creation.

Hort was not someone who believed in the biblical doctrines of salvation. He even called the substitutionary atonement of Christ "immoral." Hort writes:

I entirely agree...with what you there say on the atonement, having for many years believed that 'the absolute union of the Christian (or rather, of man) with Christ Himself' is the spiritual truth of which the popular doctrine of substitution is an immoral and material counterfeit.<sup>89</sup>

Westcott also did not believe in biblical salvation, but he did teach the false doctrine of universal salvation. He wrote in his commentary of Hebrews 2:8-9, "The fruit of His work is universal."<sup>90</sup> Is it true that all people will be saved? No, only those that trust in Christ will be saved. Westcott also taught other heretical views regarding salvation. He wrote in his commentary of John 15:8, "a Christian never 'is' but always 'is becoming' a Christian."<sup>91</sup> The teaching that a Christian can never be sure of his salvation is heresy and false doctrine (1 John 5:12-13).

Westcott denied the reality of Heaven. He wrote in his commentary of John 1:18, "The 'bosom of the Father' (like heaven) is a state and not a place."<sup>92</sup> The Bible teaches that

---

<sup>89</sup> Ibid, 5.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid, 22.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid, 23.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid, 19.



heaven is most definitely a place. Jesus said that He would prepare a "place" for us, not a "state" (John 14:2). Westcott's view of the doctrine of heaven was very heretical.

Many other examples could be given regarding the many heresies of Westcott and Hort. Entire books have been written that analyze their writings which clearly reveal their heretical views. The examples given here should be sufficient to show that Christians are foolish to trust these men (or anyone for that matter) to change the Bible that most Christians had used since the early days of the church.

## The Occult Activities of Westcott and Hort

In addition to their many doctrinal heresies, strong evidence exists from the writings of both Westcott and Hort that they were involved in occult activities during the time they prepared their Greek New Testament. These serious accusations are made with very strong evidence from the letters of both men. The evidence that is about to be presented shows the satanic influence on the two men that changed the text of almost all modern translations.

Hort wrote in a letter:

Westcott...and I have started a society for the investigation of ghosts and all supernatural appearances and effects, being all disposed to believe that such things really exist...Westcott is drawing up a schedule of questions...our own temporary

name is the Ghostly Guild.<sup>93</sup>

Dr. Sorenson notes that this occult activity club was organized by Westcott and Hort at Cambridge University the same year in which they began their work on their Greek text. They continued to participate in this club for a period of ten years.<sup>94</sup>

Today the "Ghostly Guild" is listed in *The Encyclopedia of Occultism and Parapsychology* as an occult organization in which its members related personal experiences with ghosts.<sup>95</sup> The club investigated supernatural activities centered around "beings of the unseen world" manifesting themselves in "extraordinary ways." The "Ghostly Circular" drawn up by Mr. Westcott himself says the following:

The interest and importance of a serious and earnest inquiry into the nature of the phenomena which are vaguely called 'supernatural' will scarcely be questioned. Many persons believe that all such apparently mysterious occurrences are due either to purely natural causes, or to delusions of the mind or senses, or to willful deception. But there are many others who believe it possible that the beings of the unseen world may manifest themselves to us in extraordinary ways.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> Arthur Fenton Hort y Fenton John Anthony Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, vol. 1, 211.

<sup>94</sup> David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, 172.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.* 177.

<sup>96</sup> Arthur Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, (London: MacMillan & Co., 1903), vol. 1, 117-118.

The reference to these "beings of the unseen world" that "manifest themselves to us in extraordinary ways" are possibly a reference to seances. Westcott then goes on to request that anyone having testimony of supernatural occurrences submit a written form to the guild for further investigation.

Westcott's son also wrote of his father's devotion to these occult activities:

He (Westcott) devoted himself with ardor during his last year at Cambridge, to two new societies. One of these was the "Ghostly Guild," which numbered amongst its members A. Barry, E. W. Benson, H. Bradshaw, the Hon. A. Gordon, F.J. A. Hort, H. Laurd, and C.B. Scott, was established for the investigation of all supernatural appearances and effects. Westcott took a leading part in their proceedings, and their inquiry circular was originally drawn up by him.<sup>97</sup>

His son later quotes his father as having "faith in Spiritualism."<sup>98</sup>

Hort, who was also involved in this occultic club, wrote of the alarm that would be raised by Christians who would later buy their Greek text if they found out about their occult activities. Hort wrote:

Also—but this may be cowardice—I have a sort of craving

---

<sup>97</sup> Ibid. 117.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid. 119.

that our text should be cast upon the world before we deal with matters likely to brand us with suspicion. I mean, a text, issued by men already known for what will undoubtedly be treated as dangerous heresy, will have great difficulties in finding its way to regions which it might otherwise hope to reach, and whence it would not be easily banished by subsequent alarms.<sup>99</sup>

Yes Mr. Hort, your occult activities that took place at the same time you worked on your Greek text do indeed raise alarms.

In Westcott's *Life and letters*, another occult club is mentioned that was organized by Westcott called "Hermes." This club met weekly.<sup>100</sup> Dr. Sorenson quotes a secular book tracing occult societies. The book (*The Founders of Psychical Research*, pages 90-91) cites a letter between members of Westcott's club and refers to a homosexual relationship between members. The source quotes a letter from a club member as saying that homosexuality was not rare among the men in the club. While there is no evidence that Westcott and Hort themselves participated in homosexual activities, they were members and founders of a club in which it frequently did.<sup>101</sup> One thing seems to be clear, while these two men were preparing their Greek text, they were being influenced by

---

<sup>99</sup> Arthur Fenton Hort y Fenton John Anthony Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, vol. 1, 445.

<sup>100</sup> Arthur Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, 147.

<sup>101</sup> David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, 175.

demonic spirits by means of their occult activities.

Today, supporters of the Critical Text position lift up Westcott and Hort as fine Christian gentlemen who gave the world a better Bible. The truth is that these men were heretics who dabbled in occult activities. They despised the traditional and historical Bible, rejected many orthodox Christian doctrines, and produced a corrupt Greek text that the devil has used to deceive billions. The Bible warns of these deceptions in 1 Timothy 4:1, "*Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;*"

I conclude this chapter with this bold, but yet very true statement, the modern Critical Text Bibles are full of corruptions that came from the influence of the devil himself. The battle for the integrity and purity of the Word of God is most assuredly a spiritual battle.



SIX

## DOCTRINAL CORRUPTION IN THE CRITICAL TEXT

**W**hile an understanding of the history of the Critical Text is useful, it is not necessary to understand that the text is corrupt. A simple comparison of the Received Text and Critical Text is sufficient evidence to prove that there are doctrinal corruptions. The corruptions of the Critical Text are obviously intentional and try to weaken important Christian doctrines such as the virgin birth and the deity of Christ. Like the Septuagint (LXX), the Critical Text creates contradictions and errors in the Bible.

While a list of all the more than 8,000-word changes would be too extensive for this study, some of the greatest

errors will be discussed here. One of the most popular Critical Text Bible versions is the *New International Version* (NIV). This version will be compared with the *King James Version* (KJV) which follows the traditional text. Both Bibles follow opposite texts and opposite philosophies in regards to the preservation and purity of the Word of God.

### **Firstborn removed – Matthew 1:25**

(KJV) *And knew her not till she had brought forth her **firstborn** son: and he called his name JESUS.*

(NIV) *But he did not consummate their marriage until she gave birth to a son. And he gave him the name Jesus.*

The first example of corruption is in Matthew 1:25. The word "firstborn" (πρωτότοκος) is present in the traditional Bible but is missing in the NIV and the Critical Text. The word implies that Jesus was not the only child of Mary. The Bible teaches that Mary and Joseph had children after Jesus was born (Mark 6:3). It seems that this change could have been made to support the catholic doctrine of Mary's perpetual virginity.

### **The Virgin Birth – Luke 2:33**

(KJV) *And **Joseph** and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.*

(NIV) *The child's **father** and mother marveled at what was said about him.*



An obvious attack on the virgin birth of Christ in the Critical Text is found in Luke 2:33. In the traditional Bible, the name of Joseph (Ἰωσήφ) is used because Joseph was not the father of Jesus. In the Critical Text, this is changed to πατήρ (father). To call Joseph the father of Jesus is an obvious contradiction with the verses that teach that Christ was without an earthly Father such as in Isaiah 7:14, Luke 1:34, etc. God intended to say "Joseph" not "father" to emphasize the fact that Joseph was not the father of Jesus. This is a devilish change and it shows the intentional corruption of the Critical Text.

### The Model Prayer – Matthew 6:13

(KJV) *And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: **For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.***

(NVI) *And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.*

Another obvious error in the Critical Text is seen in the exclusion of the last phrase of the model prayer in Matthew 6:13. The removal of this last portion of the model prayer that is in the Received Text shows a clear error and the textual corruption of the Critical Text.

## The Doctrine of Fasting - Matt 17:21 & 1 Cor 7:5

**Matthew 17:21** (KJV) *Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and **fasting**.*

**Matthew 17:21** (NIV)(omitted)

**1 Corinthians 7:5a** (KJV) *Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to **fasting** and prayer;*

**1 Corinthians 7:5a** (NIV) *Do not deprive each other except perhaps by mutual consent and for a time, so that you may devote yourselves to prayer.*

The doctrine and practice of fasting is commonly attacked in the Critical Text. In Matthew 17:21 the KJV and traditional text mention the need for prayer and fasting. The NIV and Critical Text delete the entire verse. In 1 Corinthians 7:5 the Received Text says that sexual relations in a marriage can be halted voluntarily for times of prayer and fasting. The word fasting is removed in the Critical Text and the NIV.

## Entire Verses Omitted

The Critical Text omits many verses from the traditional Bible. Translations that follow the Critical Text often vary in how many they choose to omit. The following examples show some of the verses omitted in the NIV as a result of following the Critical Text.

**Matthew 17:21** (KJV) *Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.*

**Matthew 17:21** (NIV)(omitted)

**Matthew 18:11** (KJV) *For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.*

**Matthew 18:11** (NIV)(omitted)

**Matthew 23:14** (KJV) *Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.*

**Matthew 23:14** (NIV)(omitted)

**Mark 7:16** (KJV) *If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.*

**Mark 7:16** (NIV)(omitted)

**Mark 9:44** (KJV) *Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*

**Mark 9:44** (NIV)(omitted)

**Mark 9:46** (KJV) *Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*

**Mark 9:46** (NIV)(omitted)

**Mark 11:26** (KJV) *But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.*

**Mark 11:26** (NIV)(omitted)

**Mark 15:28** (KJV) *And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.*

**Mark 15:28** (NIV)(omitted)

**Luke 17:36** (KJV) *Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken,*

*and the other left.*

**Luke 17:36** (NIV)(omitted)

**John 5:4** (KJV) *For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.*

**John 5:4** (NIV)(omitted)

**Acts 8:37** (KJV) *And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*

**Acts 8:37** (NIV)(omitted)

**Acts 15:34** (KJV) *Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still.*

**Acts 15:34** (NIV)(omitted)

**Acts 24:7** (KJV) *But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands,*

**Acts 24:7** (NIV)(omitted)

**Acts 28:29** (KJV) *And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.*

**Acts 28:29** (NIV)(omitted)

**Romans 16:24** (KJV) *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.*

**Romans 16:24** (NIV)(omitted)

## The Doctrine of the Trinity – 1 John 5:7

(KJV) *For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.*

(NIV) *For there are three that testify:*

Many other verses are only partially removed, but damaged sufficiently to hide important doctrines. A great example of this is the doctrine of the Trinity in 1 John 5:7.

## The Doctrine of Hell – Mark 9:45

(KJV) *And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched:*

(NIV) *And if your foot causes you to stumble, cut it off. It is better for you to enter life crippled than to have two feet and be thrown into hell.*

The doctrine of hell is heavily attacked in the Critical Text. There are several examples of this in the book of Mark. The Critical Text removes the last phrase of Mark 9:45 and therefore, the eternal nature of hell. The same attack is seen in Mark 9:44 and Mark 9:46. Both verses are entirely removed, thereby weakening the doctrine of hell.

## The Blood Atonement – Colossians 1:14

The importance and necessity of the blood of Christ is also diminished in the Critical Text. An example of this can be seen in Colossians 1:14.

(KJV) *In whom we have redemption **through his blood**, even the forgiveness of sins:*

(NIV) *in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.*

In the Critical Text "through his blood" is removed. This phrase does appear in the traditional Bible. The blood atonement is a doctrine that the devil hates. Its omission in the Critical Text is a strong example of this doctrine being attacked.

### The Doctrine of the Deity of Christ – Rev 1:11

(KJV) *Saying, **I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last:** and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches...*

(NIV) *which said: Write on a scroll what you see and send it to the seven churches:*

The doctrine of the deity of Jesus Christ is heavily attacked throughout the Critical Text. This doctrine has been attacked by cults throughout all of church history. In Revelation 1:11 the phrase "*I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last*" is removed in the Critical Text. We will see many examples of this attack when we examine the Critical Text in popular Spanish Bibles. There are many examples of the name of Christ being deleted all throughout the New Testament in the Critical Text. The deity of Christ is the doctrine most attacked in the Critical Text.

## Conclusion

Many other examples could be given of corruption in the Critical Text, but these should be sufficient to show that key doctrines of the Bible are attacked. The Critical Text creates doctrinal contradictions and inconsistencies in the Bible. Therefore, the Christian who cares about the purity and preservation of the Word of God should stay as far away from this corrupt text as possible. He should desire a Bible that does not include any of the corrupt Critical Text, and is faithful to the preserved texts that God has given us.





## SEVEN

# LOGICAL FALLACIES IN TEXTUAL CRITICISM

**T**he Critical Text is composed mainly of two manuscripts (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) and is supported by a very small percentage of the existing manuscripts. The Alexandrian manuscripts that support the Critical Text often do not agree with one another and contain obvious errors. On the other hand, the Received Text is supported by around 5,000 manuscripts that are mostly in agreement. With these things being the case, why then do modern Bible translations use the Critical Text and not the Received Text?

The answer lies in several logical fallacies used by supporters of the Critical Text to discredit the Received Text

manuscripts. As we will soon see, the logic used by many modern "scholars" is incorrect. Some of these fallacies will be explored here.

The reader must understand that the supporters of the Critical Text do not believe that the Bible is preserved at all. The Bible-believing Christian is looking at the manuscripts from the point of view that God has providentially preserved His Word. The Critical Text supporters are not. They almost unanimously agree that the Bible has not been preserved and that no line of manuscripts contains the preserved Words of God.

The Bible issue is in reality a doctrinal issue. If God did not preserve His words, then His promises to do so are clearly lies. If these promises are lies, then the Bible contains lies and cannot be trusted to guide our faith. The textual issue is indeed a doctrinal issue. If the preservation position is correct, the Bible is preserved and can be trusted. If the Critical Text position is correct, then the Bible has been lost and the promises of preservation (and who knows what else) in the Bible are lies. It really is as simple as that. We will now examine some of the beliefs of modern textual critics and why they are incorrect.

**Logical fallacy #1:** *The great number of manuscripts that support the Received Text are evidence of just one textual witness.*

Modern textual critics look at the thousands of Received Text manuscripts that are in agreement with one another essentially as only one textual witness. They claim that these manuscripts must be copies of an official and unknown "ecclesiastical text." Because these manuscripts are so similar, modern critics consider them to be secondary copies of one master copy, much like a translation of the Bible. For this reason, they ignore these thousands of manuscripts and consider them negligible in modern textual "science."<sup>102</sup>

The truth is just the opposite. The unity of the thousands of Received Text manuscripts proves that God has preserved His Word. That "ecclesiastical text" is the true Word of God that has been providentially preserved throughout history. Dr. Van Bruggen states:

This striking number...cannot be put aside as meaningless, as though it is to be traced back to one archetype in the fourth century. On the contrary, the large number deserves attention, since, in the midst of all sorts of variations, it confronts us with a growing uniformity. This can hardly be described as spontaneous converging deviation. It rather points in the direction of a simultaneous turning-back in various centuries to the same central point of the original

---

<sup>102</sup>David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, 130.

text.<sup>103</sup>

The reality is that the great number of Received Text manuscripts prove that God has preserved His Word.

**Logical Fallacy #2** *The Critical Text is the text that is most used by modern textual critics and therefore is trustworthy.*

A simple way to put this is that there is a prejudice when it comes to logically weighing the manuscript evidence and determining which texts are more reliable. The modern scientific community has jointly decided that the Alexandrian manuscripts are superior and that the thousands of Received Text manuscripts should be ignored.

It should be remembered that Hort despised the Received Text and called it "vile" and "villainous." Most modern textual critics approach the textual issue not only with subjectivity, but a distinct bias and foregone conclusions against the Received Text.

Supporters of the Received Text are seen as men who are stuck in the past. The most famous evangelical preachers with the largest congregations all use Bibles based on the Critical Text. They have abandoned the doctrine of the Preservation of the Scriptures for the modern view that only the ideas of the Bible are preserved. This being the case, it is

---

<sup>103</sup> David H. Sorenson, *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, 134; quoted in Van Bruggen, *The Ancient Text*, 21.

not surprising that modern textual critics just "go with the flow" of the liberal scientific community in giving preference to the corrupt Critical Text.

It should be noted that the modern scientific community is also in agreement that men came from monkeys and the Big Bang is responsible for creation. The Bible-believing Christian should never believe what the majority teaches, just because the majority teaches it. He should believe what is true based upon the Scriptures and actual evidence.

**Logical Fallacy #3** *The older manuscripts are always more trustworthy.*

Supporters of the Critical Text give preference to Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus because they are very old. They ignore the fact that these two manuscripts contradict one another almost more than they are in agreement. They are obviously not reliable, and yet they are given preferential treatment due to their age. This is a logical fallacy for several reasons.

First, the oldest manuscripts often survived because they were not used. The copies of Scripture that were accepted and used by Christians and churches were worn out due to use. A simple experiment and observation of one's bookshelf at home can prove this point. I have many books on my bookshelves, and many of them look practically brand new even though they are decades old. This is because I have either

never read them or read them only once. They are not worth reading a second time, or even all the way through, in some cases. However, there are some that I have read through many times (for example my Bible). These books are worn and falling apart. The most used and valuable books are worn out.

The same is true with biblical manuscripts. Those manuscripts that have survived for 1500 years probably were not used very often, if at all. They certainly were not used by common Christians. It will be remembered that Codex Sinaiticus required approximately 350 animals to make its pages. This was not a Bible the average church or Christian was using, but rather was probably funded by the corrupt Roman Empire.

Second, Bibles that were used and worn out were not allowed the indignity of just deteriorating, but were often burned or destroyed out of respect after the new copies were made.<sup>104</sup> This was customary in ancient times, and can actually be evidence that the Received Text manuscripts were the ones the common people and churches were using consistently. The fact that the Critical Text manuscripts survived for so long is really evidence that they were not used by churches. Otherwise, they would have been burned as they wore out and new copies were made.

---

<sup>104</sup> David Fuller, *Which Bible*, (Grand Rapids, MI, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975), 6.

Third, many ancient Bibles that are translations from the Received Text, such as the Italic version or the Peshitta, are often ignored and not considered witnesses of the Received Text even though they are very old. It should be obvious that if a translation of an ancient text existed very early, then the text it was translated from also existed very early. How could a translation be made of a text that did not exist? Citations of the traditional Bible made by ancient Christians are also often ignored. Why would an ancient Christian cite a Scripture from the traditional text if that text did not exist? There appears to be much hypocrisy in modern textual criticism because many "scholars" only seem to want to see evidence that supports the Critical Text.

The reality is that the vast and overwhelming majority of the existing manuscripts in the world support the Received Text. Much of this evidence is ignored because of a prejudice toward the Critical Text. Despite this, we can know for certain the promise of Preservation has been fulfilled. The evidence does indeed support the doctrine of Preservation.

Once again, it must be recognized that there is a spiritual aspect to this battle for the correct biblical text. The ancient attack of the devil has been to cast doubt on the trustworthiness of the Bible. The reason that many modern textual critics support the Critical Text and view the Received Text as "vile" is because the devil is actively working against

our confidence in the Bible. Remember, the supporters of the Critical Text do not believe that the Bible is perfect or that it has been preserved. They often view the Bible textual issue from a secular and faithless point of view.

It is very common today for those who would dare to defend the purity of God's Word to be mocked by modern "scholars." Those who believe in the preservation of the Word of God should be prepared for these Satanic attacks. As we have seen, the Bible issue is indeed a spiritual battle.



## EIGHT

# THE CRITICAL TEXT IN OTHER LANGUAGES

**T**he issue of textual purity is important in all languages, not just in English. Now that we have an understanding of the textual issue and its importance, it is time to apply it to the world of Bible translations in other languages, and in particular, to the Spanish language. As in most languages, there are many Critical Text Bible translations in Spanish. The popular *New International Version* (NIV) has a Spanish counterpart, *La Nueva Versión Internacional* (NVI). This version and others that are very committed to the Critical Text are popular and heavily used in Spanish churches.

A popular family of Bible translations in the Spanish

world are the Reina-Valera Bible translations. The original translation was translated in 1569 by Casiodoro de Reina, and its first revision was done in 1602 by Cipriano de Valera. The Reina-Valera translation has undergone various revisions since that time. The most popular of these revisions have been the *Reina-Valera 1909* and the *Reina-Valera 1960*.

The original translation was partly based on the traditional text, however, as new revisions of the Bible were released, they were contaminated more and more with the Critical Text and the Septuagint. We have already seen examples of the Septuagint in the Old Testament of Spanish Bibles, now we will focus on the influence of the Critical Text on the New Testament of several popular versions.

In our examples, we will use the KJV and the NIV in English. The Spanish versions that we will use are the *Reina-Valera 1909* (RV1909), the *Reina-Valera 1960* (RV1960), and the *Reina-Valera Gomez* (RVG). As we will see, the RV1909 and RV1960 often depart from the traditional text and the RVG is a revision that was made to faithfully follow the Received Text.

### ***By Jesus Christ* omitted – Ephesians 3:9b**

(KJV) ...*which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things **by Jesus Christ:***

(NIV) ...*which for ages past was kept hidden in God, who created all things. (omitted)*

(RVG) *...desde el principio del mundo en Dios, que creó todas las cosas **por Jesucristo**;*

(RV1909) *...escondido desde los siglos en Dios, que crió todas las cosas.* (omitted)

(RV1960) *...escondido desde los siglos en Dios, que creó todas las cosas;* (omitted)

The reader will notice that the words "by Jesus Christ" (δὲα ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ) have been removed in the Critical Text Bibles. This is an attack on the deity of Christ, an attack which is very common in the Critical Text. The KJV and RVG faithfully follow the Received Text but the NIV, RV1909, and RV1960 omit the words because they prefer the Critical Text.

### **Lord omitted – Luke 23:42**

(KJV) *And he said unto Jesus, **Lord**, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.*

(NIV) *Then he said, "Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom."* (omitted)

(RVG) *Y dijo a Jesús: **Señor**, acuérdate de mí cuando vengas en tu reino.*

(RV1909) *Y dijo a Jesús: Acuérdate de mí cuando vinieras a tu reino.* (omitted)

(RV1960) *Y dijo a Jesús: Acuérdate de mí cuando vengas en tu reino.* (omitted)

In this verse, the thief on the cross is speaking to Jesus

and calls him Lord (κυριε) in the traditional Bible. The Critical Text omits this word, which hides an important truth that the thief believed that Christ was the Lord. The NIV, RV1909, and RV1960 follow the Critical Text and remove the word, while the KJV and RVG follow the Received Text and include it. It should be noted that this is not a small change, but rather the omission of a key word that affects the entire point of the verse.

### **Of Christ omitted – Romans 1:16a**

(KJV) *For I am not ashamed of the gospel **of Christ**: for it is the power of God unto salvation...*

(NIV) *For I am not ashamed of the gospel, because it is the power of God that brings salvation...(omitted)*

(RVG) *Porque no me avergüenzo del evangelio **de Cristo**: porque es el poder de Dios para salvación...*

(RV1909) *Porque no me avergüenzo del evangelio: porque es potencia de Dios para salud...(omitted)*

(RV1960) *Porque no me avergüenzo del evangelio, porque es poder de Dios para salvación...(omitted)*

The next example comes from Romans 1:16. In the Critical Text, the phrase "of Christ" (του χριστου) is missing in reference to the gospel. The KJV and RVG include the phrase as they follow the Received Text, but the NIV, RV1909, and RV1960 omit it. The omission of the name of Christ is a very

common occurrence in the Critical Text. This should not be surprising considering that the Critical Text came from Alexandria, Egypt which was the cradle of Arianism.

### **Christ omitted – Luke 4:41a**

(KJV) *And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art **Christ** the Son of God...*

(NIV) *Moreover, demons came out of many people, shouting, "You are the Son of God!"... (omitted)*

(RVG) *Y también salían demonios de muchos, dando voces y diciendo: Tú eres **Cristo**, el Hijo de Dios...*

(RV1909) *Y salían también demonios de muchos, dando voces, y diciendo: Tú eres el Hijo de Dios... (omitted)*

(RV1960) *También salían demonios de muchos, dando voces y diciendo: Tú eres el Hijo de Dios... (omitted)*

Luke 4:41 is another example of the name of Christ being removed. In this verse a demon confesses that Jesus is the Christ. In the Critical Text, the word "Christ" (Χριστός) is omitted. The NIV, RV1909, and RV1960 follow the Critical text reading and omit the word "Christ" as well.

### **Cometh in the name of the Lord – Mark 11:10**

(KJV) *Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, **that cometh in the name of the Lord**: Hosanna in the highest.*

(NIV) *"Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David!"*

“*Hosanna in the highest heaven!*” (omitted)

(RVG) *¡Bendito el reino de nuestro padre David, **que viene en el nombre del Señor!** ¡Hosanna en las alturas!*

(RV1909) *Bendito el reino de nuestro padre David que viene: ¡Hosanna en las alturas!* (omitted)

(RV1960) *¡Bendito el reino de nuestro padre David que viene! ¡Hosanna en las alturas!* (omitted)

In this example, the phrase *that cometh in the name of the Lord* is omitted ... The omission of "Christ," "Lord," or "Jesus" is common in Bibles that follow the Critical Text. For example, in the RV1960, these omissions are found in Matthew 24:2, Mark 9:24, Mark 11:10, Luke 4:41, Luke 9:43, Luke 23:42, Acts 3:26, Acts 7:30, Acts 9:5, Acts 15:11, Acts 15:17, Romans 1:16, 1 Corinthians 9:1, 2 Corinthians 4:10, 2 Corinthians 5:18, and Ephesians 3:9.

## Belief changed to obedience – John 12:47a

(KJV) *And if any man hear my words, and **believe** not,*

(NIV) *If anyone hears my words but does not **keep** them,*

(RVG) *Y si alguno oye mis palabras, y no **cree**, yo no le juzgo; (believe)*

(RV1909) *Y el que oyere mis palabras, y no las **creyere**, (believe)*

(RV1960) *Al que oye mis palabras, y no las **guarda**, (keep or obey)*

In this example, the word πιστεύω (believe) is used in the Received Text. The Critical Text changes this to φυλάσσομαι (obey). There are multiple examples of this nature in the Critical Text. The KJV, RVG, and RV1909 follow the Received Text and the NIV and RV1960 follow the Critical Text.

### ***To repentance omitted – Mark 2:17b***

(KJV) ...*I came not to call the righteous, but sinners **to repentance.***

(NIV) ...*I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners."*

(omitted)

(RVG) ...*No he venido a llamar a justos, sino a pecadores **al arrepentimiento.***

(RV1909) ...*No he venido a llamar a los justos, sino a los pecadores.*

(omitted)

(RV1960) ...*No he venido a llamar a justos, sino a pecadores.*

(omitted)

Mark 2:17 is an example of doctrinal corruption in the Critical Text. The traditional Bible says that Jesus came to call sinners "to repentance" (εις μετανοιαν). The Critical Text omits the phrase, thereby changing the whole sentiment of the verse and attacking the doctrine of repentance. The NIV, RV1909, and RV1960 follow the Critical Text and omit the phrase.

### ***In your salvation added – 1 Peter 2:2***

(KJV) *As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby:*

(NIV) *Like newborn babies, crave pure spiritual milk, so that by it you may grow up **in your salvation**.* (phrase added)

(RVG) *desead, como niños recién nacidos, la leche no adulterada de la palabra, para que por ella crezcáis;*

(RV1909) *Desead, como niños recién nacidos, la leche espiritual, sin engaño, para que por ella crezcáis **en salud**.* (phrase added)

(RV1960) *desead, como niños recién nacidos, la leche espiritual no adulterada, para que por ella crezcáis **para salvación**,* (phrase added)

1 Peter 2:2 is an example of an addition found in the Critical Text. The Critical Text adds the phrase "*in your salvation*" (εἰς σωτηρίαν) or in the RV1960 "*for salvation (para salvación)*." These words are not found in the traditional Bible. Every Christian should grow spiritually, but this addition implies that this growth is for salvation which is not what the Bible teaches. The Bible clearly prohibits adding to the Word of God (Proverbs 30:6, Revelation 22:18). The NIV, RV1909, and RV1960 follow the Critical Text reading and add the phrase. The KJV and RVG follow the Received Text.

### ***Without a cause omitted – Matthew 5:22a***

(KJV) *But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother **without a cause** shall be in danger of the judgment:*



(NIV) *But I tell you that anyone who is angry with a brother or sister will be subject to judgment.* (omitted)

(RVG) *Mas yo os digo que cualquiera que sin razón se enojare contra su hermano, estará en peligro del juicio;*

(RV1909) *Mas yo os digo, que cualquiera que se enojare locamente con su hermano, será culpado del juicio;*

(RV1960) *Pero yo os digo que cualquiera que se enoje contra su hermano, será culpable de juicio* (omitted)

In this example, the word "ειρη" (without a cause) is omitted in the Critical Text. This word is important, because it clarifies that anger is not in and of itself a sin (Eph 4:26). Jesus himself got angry at times (Mark 3:5). When this word is omitted, a contradiction with the rest of the Bible is created, and Christ is guilty of sin. The KJV, RVG, and RV1909 follow the Received Text; the NIV and RV1960 follow the corrupt Critical Text.

### ***Publicans changed to gentiles – Matthew 5:47***

(KJV) *And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?*

(NIV) *And if you greet only your own people, what are you doing more than others? Do not even pagans do that?*

(RVG) *Y si saludáis solamente a vuestros hermanos, ¿qué hacéis de más? ¿No hacen también así los publicanos? (publicans)*

(RV1909) *Y si abrazareis a vuestros hermanos solamente, ¿qué*

*hacéis de más? ¿no hacen también así los **Gentiles**? (Gentiles)  
(RV1960) Y si saludáis a vuestros hermanos solamente, ¿qué hacéis  
de más? ¿No hacen también así los **gentiles**? (Gentiles)*

In this example, we see a word change in the Critical Text. The traditional Bible uses the word "τελωναι" (publican) and the Critical Text uses the word ἔθνηκοι (gentile). The NIV, RV1909, and RV1960 follow the Critical Text; the KJV and RVG the Received Text.

### **Alms changed to righteousness – Matthew 6:1a**

*(KJV) Take heed that ye do not your **alms** before men, to be seen of them:*

*(NIV) Be careful not to practice your **righteousness** in front of others to be seen by them.*

*(RVG) Mirad que no hagáis vuestras **limosnas** delante de los hombres, para ser vistos de ellos; (alms)*

*(RV1909) MIRAD que no hagáis vuestra **justicia** delante de los hombres, para ser vistos de ellos: (righteousness)*

*(RV1960) Guardaos de hacer vuestra **justicia** delante de los hombres, para ser vistos de ellos; (righteousness)*

In Matthew 6:1, the Received Text uses the word "ελεημοσυνην" (alms) and the Critical Text uses "δικαιοσύνη" (righteousness). The verse makes sense if it tells us to do our alms in secret, but how can we do our righteousness in secret? This is an obvious error and corruption in the Critical Text.

The KJV and RVG follow the traditional reading and the NIV, RV1909, and RV1960 follow the Critical Text.

### Phrase omitted – Matthew 15:8

(KJV) *This people **draweth nigh unto me with their mouth,** and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me.*

(NIV) *These people honor me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me. (omitted)*

(RVG) *Este pueblo **se acerca a mí con su boca,** y de labios me honra, pero su corazón lejos está de mí.*

(RV1909) *Este pueblo de labios me honra; Mas su corazón lejos está de mí. (omitted)*

(RV1960) *Este pueblo de labios me honra; Mas su corazón está lejos de mí. (omitted)*

In Matthew 15:8, the Critical Text omits the entire phrase of "*draweth nigh unto me with their mouth.*" The RVG and KJV follow the Received Text, while the NIV, RV1909, and RV1960 follow the Critical Text.

### Hundreds of differences with the Received Text

Dr. Rex Cobb did a full comparison of several popular Spanish Bibles with the Received Text. He found that the RV1909 departs from the Received Text 122 times and that the RV1960 departs from the Received Text 191 times. This does not include the times they follow the Septuagint in the

Old Testament. The RVG was faithful to the traditional text, departing 0 times.<sup>105</sup> A full list of all these changes can be found in pdf format at [rvgbiblia.com](http://rvgbiblia.com).

## What the translators said

In order to understand why many popular Spanish Bibles follow the Critical Text, we need only to look at what their revision committees said about their translations practices. The famous Eugene Nida was the organizer and overseer of the Reina-Valera 1960 revision committee. Like most modern textual critics, he was a huge supporter of the Critical Text. In his book *Bible Translating*, he encourages Bible translators to use the Critical Text when translating the Bible to any other language.<sup>106</sup>

Nida admits to intentional departures from the Received Text in the RV1960. In his book *The Bible Translator* he wrote:

Nevertheless, in some instances where a Critical Text is so much preferred over the traditional Textus Receptus the committee did make some slight changes, particularly if such changes were not in well-known verses where an alteration would be unduly upsetting to the constituency.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> Rex L. Cobb, "Spanish Bible Comparisons", Baptist Bible Translators Institute, Bowie, TX.

<sup>106</sup> Eugene Nida, *Bible Translating*, (American Bible Society), 1947, 50.

<sup>107</sup> Eugene Nida, *The Bible Translator*, Vol 12, 1961, 113.

The men behind the Reina-Valera 1960 said themselves that they used the Critical Text. They specifically stated that they tried to insert the Critical Text into the RV1960 in such a way that would not be "upsetting" to those who would buy the Bible.

Jose Flores, who was the President of the Spanish Bible Society and a consultant to the RV1960 revision committee, speaks to the incorporation of the Critical Text in the RV1960 Spanish Bible. He said:

One principle added to the first list of the RV 1960 revision committee was that wherever the RV1909 Version has departed from the Textus Receptus to follow a better text, we did not return to the Receptus. Point 12 of the working principles states: in cases where there is a doubt over the correct translation of the original, we consulted preferentially The *English Revised Version* of 1885, The *American Standard Version* of 1901, The *Revised Standard Version* of 1946, and the *International Critical Commentary*.<sup>108</sup>

Flores clarifies that the RV1960 not only used the Greek Critical Text, but also followed English Critical Text translations.

The fact that the RV1960 consulted the ASV is especially obvious when one reads the two Bibles. One

---

<sup>108</sup> José Flores, *El Texto Del Nuevo Testamento*, CLIE 1977, 323.

example of such similarities is seen in the decision of when and where to translate the word hell. In the KJV, the word hell is translated 54 times. The same is true for the RVG. In the ASV, however, the word hell is only translated 13 times. The same is true for the RV1960. In fact, the word hell is translated in the exact same places in the two Bibles. The verses are, Matthew 5:22; 5:29; 5:30; 10:28; 18:9; 23:15; 23:33, Mark 9:43; 9:45; 9:47, Luke 12:5, James 3:6, and 2 Peter 2:4.

Another example of the RV1960 following the ASV can be found in the translation of the word unicorn. The word unicorn appears six times in the Bible in Numbers 23:22, 24:8, Deuteronomy 33:17, Job 39:9, 10, and Psalm 92:10. The word refers to a one-horned animal, not a mythical creature. It is possible that it refers to a rhino, or even an extinct animal. The ASV translates the word "wild ox," which is clearly an erroneous translation. The RV1960 follows the ASV's example and translates the word "buffalo."

A defender of the RV1960, Calvin George, also recognizes that the RV1960 contains the Critical Text. He states that he does not believe it is incorrect to consult the Westcott and Hort texts in Bible translation but does not believe it should form the basis for a translation.<sup>109</sup>

The men behind the RV1960 did not hold to the view

---

<sup>109</sup> Calvin George, *The Battle for the Spanish Bible*, (Kearney, NE: Morris Publishing, 2001), 115.

that the Word of God is preserved and therefore must be translated as literally as possible. Eugene Nida is known as the father of Dynamic Equivalency. Robert Thomas notes that:

According to Nida, a translation should stimulate in a reader (in his native language) the same mood, impression, or reaction to itself that the original writing sought to stimulate in its first readers. This is an unattainable goal and one that can be only approximately achieved.<sup>110</sup>

Dynamic Equivalency focuses on translating the idea of a passage rather than the words of a passage. The reader will recall that God did not promise to preserve His ideas, He promised to preserve His words. Matthew 4:4 states, "*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.*"

Nida not only organized and oversaw the RV 1960 translation, he also is credited with the initiating, organizing, and making of the first edition of the United Bible Societies Critical Greek New Testament published in 1966. It was the second edition of Nida's Greek Text that was used as the base Greek text of the *New International Version* (NIV).

The reader should now see clearly that most popular Spanish Bible versions contain the corrupt Critical Text. Some versions such as the RV1909 and the RV1960 do not remove

---

<sup>110</sup> Robert L. Thomas, "Bible Translations and Expository Preaching," in *Rediscovering Expository Preaching*, (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1992), 308.

entire verses, but they do contain large amounts of Critical Text readings. Many Christians have been deceived to think that these versions are honestly and faithfully following the Hebrew Masoretic and Received Text, but the reality is, they are not. The comparisons we have shown also reveal that the Reina-Valera Gomez (RVG) Spanish Bible is the most faithful to the Hebrew Masoretic and the Received Text. This is the Bible that I personally use and recommend in Spanish, just as the King James Version should be used in English.



## NINE

# THE CALL TO TEXTUAL PURITY

**T**his book was written for the purpose of showing the historical evidence that God has indeed preserved His Word. As we arrive at the last chapter, I hope I have succeeded in showing the reader that God's Word is indeed perfect and available to us today. The preserved original language text of the Bible, and its faithful translations (such as the KJV, RVG, and others in other languages), should be defended from the attacks of modern textual criticism. Those that claim that God's Word is not preserved should be refuted and rebuked. The devil must not be allowed to win the battle for the integrity of God's Word.

As this book closes, I would like to make a plea to all those that believe in the promise of preservation. We need to take a stand for what is right in regards to textual purity in all languages. In my experience, many Christians who believe the truth of preservation are willing to compromise and use (or even defend) Bible versions that are not true to the true original texts. In this closing chapter, we will examine why corrupt Bible translations in any language, are so often defended when they should not be.

## Pragmatism

*The Concise Oxford English Dictionary* defines pragmatism as a philosophy that "evaluates theories or beliefs in terms of the success of their practical application."<sup>111</sup> The basic question of this theory is "does it work?" not "is it true?" Pragmatism is responsible for many worldly practices in churches today. For example, many churches are beginning to unashamedly accept homosexuality, and many even have homosexual pastors. If one were to question their morality, they would quickly point to their full congregation as evidence that their conduct is not sinful.

1 Timothy 6:5 sums up pragmatism when it describes men who "supposing that gain is godliness." This is

---

<sup>111</sup> Catherine Soanes and Angus Stevenson, eds., *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*.

pragmatism, the belief that if something has worked for me in the past, it must be right. This is a humanistic philosophy and it has been used to justify many ungodly practices in the church.

Unfortunately, this same philosophy can be seen in many Christians who continue to use corrupt Bible versions despite their Critical Text errors. Often, they will make excuses such as "I was saved from this Bible" or "many great churches have been planted with this Bible." Many ask, "If God has blessed churches that use this Critical Text Bible, how could it be corrupt?"

The fact is: A Bible translation is corrupt because it uses the Critical Text. It was corrupt when it was first printed, and it is still corrupt today. The fact that many have been saved from hearing it preached, and many good churches use it, does not change the fact that it is corrupt. We cannot fall into the trap of pragmatism.

I praise the Lord for souls saved in ministries that use Critical Text translations. This does not change the fact that these Bibles are contaminated with the Critical Text and that there are better options available that should be used. Pragmatic excuses should not hinder us from separating from Critical Text Bibles.

## Ignorance

A common reason that the Critical Text translations continue to be popular is that the information about its history is simply not widely known. Most Christians simply do not know the differences between Bible versions and why those differences are there.

In the context of missions, new missionaries who arrive on the field are often given a corrupt translation by a veteran missionary. When someone questions if the Bible has corrupt readings in it, the older missionaries play down the Critical Text readings as "not a big deal."

Pastors who only speak English trust their missionaries to make the right decisions about the Bible translation issue. They are not directly affected by other language translations because they only speak English. They are often assured by others that the corrupt translation is a "good version" or "based on the Received Text." Because of their inability to read these Bibles, there is often little motivation to verify these claims. Ignorance has been a very powerful tool for those that seek to propagate the use of the Critical Text Bibles on the mission field.

## Fear

Another reason that Critical Text translations continue to be popular is fear. John 12:42-43 says, "*Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they*

*did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God."* There are many missionaries, pastors, and Christians who know that the translation they are using is corrupt but continue to use it anyway. For many of them, the main reason is fear of being "put out of the synagogue" for using a less popular Bible version.

As a foreign missionary, I have lost financial support and friends, because of my stand on the textual issue. There is a cost to not using the popular Critical Text Bibles in your ministry, and an even greater cost if you dare to speak up about the issue. Because of this cost, those that choose to stand for what is right must not love the praise of men more than the praise of God. It takes courage to stand up for what is right, because one will certainly be attacked for it. This is nothing new in Christianity. 2 Timothy 3:12 says "*Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.*"

## Compromise

Another reason the Critical Text Bibles continue to be popular is compromise. Many missionaries and pastors say that they use a Critical Text translation (possibly for the reasons already mentioned), but they simply tell their people where the errors are when they preach from the Bible. This is a dangerous compromise. If the men who claim this are honest, they must

admit that they do not have every Critical Text error marked in their Critical Text Bibles, and then point it out every time they preach. Even if they did, they have crossed the dangerous line of telling their people that their Bible is full of errors, and only they have the knowledge of what is truth and what isn't.

2 Peter 1:20 teaches, "*Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.*" The Bible is not the property of one person. The layman needs to know he has the Word of God and can trust in it just as much as the preacher.

This compromise is completely unnecessary today since 100 percent Hebrew Masoretic and Received Text Bibles exist in many languages. Pastors do not have to tell their people that their Bible is full of errors. They can simply give them one that isn't. Knowing that you can trust in your Bible is very important for spiritual growth.

Once a believer believes that his Bible is full of errors it is a small step to then confessing it is just a book written by men. I have seen this progression first hand on the mission field amongst Christians who use the Critical Text translations.

## **Pride**

The final reason that will be given, as to why the Critical Text translations continue to be popular despite their corruptions, is simply pride. Many preachers simply do not want to admit that they have used a corrupt Bible for so many

years. They view any information (such as this book) against their Critical Text translation as a personal attack. Rather than examining the evidence and making a wise decision, they are offended and do not even consider if the arguments made are valid.

This proudful spirit is condemned in Scripture. Proverbs 9:8 says, "*Reprove not a scorner, lest he hate thee: Rebuke a wise man, and he will love thee.*" There have been some people who have attacked me personally for teaching the things that are documented in this book, but many others have been very grateful to learn them. In my personal experience, many Christians who are taught these truths, and then given a pure translation of the Scriptures, have been beyond thankful. Pride should not be the reason that a Christian continues to use a corrupt Bible translation.

Whether it be due to pragmatism, ignorance, fear, compromise, pride, or other reasons, the Critical Text translations continue to be popular in churches all around the world in many languages. It is my prayer that as the truth continues to be taught, more and more Christians would have the courage to separate from the unclean and corrupt Critical Text. 2 Corinthians 6:17 commands, "*Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you.*" These Bibles contains the unclean and corrupt Critical Text, and this contamination should cause

the Christian to separate from them and use the translations that are faithful to the preserved text of the Bible.

1 Corinthians 5:6 states, "*Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?*" The leaven of the Critical Text must be rejected by God's people. When we stand before Christ at the judgment seat, will He accept that we allowed the corrupt Critical Text into our churches for any of the reasons given above?

The deception of Satan in the garden of Eden against sinless man was based primarily in questioning God's Word. Satan has not changed his tactics. It is my personal belief, that one of the greatest influences toward apostasy in churches today is the loss of confidence in the purity of God's Word. This does not have to continue.

Christians who do not believe in the Preservation of the Scriptures are encouraged to examine the evidence presented in this book, as well as in others. Through searching, they can understand that God has indeed preserved His Word. Every jot and every tittle has been preserved for us today and we can know for certain what God has said in the Bible.

God places a supreme importance and value upon the truth. He tells us in Proverbs 23:23, "*Buy the truth, and sell it not; Also wisdom, and instruction, and understanding.*" What is important in the Bible textual issue is not popularity, not personal disputes, and not personal opinions. The only thing that



matters in the Bible textual issue is the truth.

There is nothing worth defending more than the purity of the Word of God. May God's people go forward, standing for the truth, in this important matter.

*Thy word is very pure: Therefore thy servant loveth it.*

*-Psalm 119:140*



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anthony, Michael J., *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education*, Baker Reference Library, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.

Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee, *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: English Translation*, London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1870.

Burgon, John William. *The Revision Revised*. Kindle Edition.

Burgon, John and Miller, Edward, *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, London: MacMillan CO., 1897.

Cobb, Rex L., "Spanish Bible Comparisons", Baptist Bible Translators Institute, Bowie, TX.

Corley, Bruce, Lemke, Steve, Lovejoy, Grant, *Biblical hermeneutics: a comprehensive introduction to interpreting Scripture*, 2nd ed. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2002.

Cross, F. L. and Livingstone, Elizabeth A., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Easton, M. G., *Easton's Bible dictionary*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1893.

Flores, José, *El Texto Del Nuevo Testamento*, CLIE 1977.

Fuller, David Otis, *Which Bible*, Grand Rapids; Michigan: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975.

Geisler, Norman L. and Nix, William E., *A General*

Introduction to the Bible, Rev. and expanded. Chicago: Moody Press, 1986.

George, Calvin, The Battle for the Spanish Bible, Kearney, NE: Morris Publishing, 2001.

Hort, Arthur Fenton and Hort, Fenton John Anthony, Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, vol. 1, London; New York: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.; Macmillan & Co., 1896.

Johnston, J. William, The Lexham Bible Dictionary, Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.

Kinney, Will, "The Old Latin Versions and the KJB", [http://textus-receptus.com/wiki/Article:\\_The\\_Old\\_Latin\\_versions\\_and\\_the\\_KJB\\_by\\_Will\\_Kinney](http://textus-receptus.com/wiki/Article:_The_Old_Latin_versions_and_the_KJB_by_Will_Kinney) (accessed 3-29-21)

Longacre, Drew, Diccionario Bíblico Lexham, Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014.

McCune, Rolland, A Systematic Theology of Biblical Christianity: Prolegomena and the Doctrines of Scripture, God, and Angels, vol. 1, Allen Park, MI: Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009.

Moorman, Jack, Forever Settled: A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible, Collingswood, N.J.: The Dean Burgon Society Press, 1999.

Moorman, Jack, When the KJV departs from the Majority Text, Cleveland, GA: The Old Paths Publications, Inc. 2010.

Moorman, Jack, 8,000 differences, Collingswood, New Jersey, The Dean Burgon Society, 2006.

Mynatt, Daniel S., Eerdmans dictionary of the Bible,

Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000.

Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, 1993.

Nida, Eugene, *The Bible Translator*, Vol 12, 1961.

Nida, Eugene, *Bible Translating*, American Bible Society, 1947.

Origen of Alexandria, *Homilies on Luke*

Origin of Alexandria, *Homilies on Leviticus*

Origin of Alexandria, *On First Principles*

Schaff, Philip and Schaff, David Schley, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 2, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

Scrivener, Frederick Hendry Ambrose, *A full collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text of the New Testament*, Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. London: Bell and Daldy, 1864.

Soans, Catherine and Stevenson, Angus, eds., *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Sorenson, David H., *Touch not the Unclean Thing*, Duluth, MN, NorthStar Baptist Ministries, 2001.

Thomas, Robert L., *Rediscovering Expository Preaching*, Dallas: Word Publishing, 1992.

Tongue, D. H., *New Bible Dictionary*, Leicester, England, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996.

Waite, D.A., *Defending the King James Bible*, Collingswood, N.J.: Bible for Today, 1992.

Waite, D. A., *The Theological Heresies of Westcott and Hort*, Collingswood, NJ, The Bible for Today, Inc., 1979.

Westcott, Arthur, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, London: MacMillan & Co., 1903.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Peter Putney has been a foreign missionary since 2011. He is currently working as a church planter in Colombia, South America. He pastors Iglesia Bautista Victoria (Victory Baptist Church) in Rionegro, Antioquia, and is the director of Seminario Bautista Victoria (Victory Baptist Seminary). Dr. Putney has his Bachelor of Divinity from Treasure Valley Baptist Bible Institute, his Master of Religious Education from West Coast Baptist College, and his Doctorate in Pastoral Administration from Bethany Divinity College and Seminary. He enjoys serving on the mission field with his wife Elisabeth and four children.