

An ATTEMPT at

LOOKING TO THE WORD OF GOD

For Light on Practical Questions

GOD'S WORD - in ENGLISH

(The Living Word of the Living God in English Translations)

The KING JAMES Version

(God-Given, Blessed, Used - But is it totally inerrant, inspired, above change/ correction?)

& OTHER Versions

(Are they all false, Satanic - or in varying degrees God-Given, blessed, and used today?)

IF (like me) you're in the habit of opening your Bible and reading it in the happy confidence that it is God's Word, and expecting that He will speak to you from it, AND you are happy for other Believers to open their Bibles and do the same, even though they use a different translation/ version, PLEASE JUST KEEP ON DOING THAT, GIVING THANKS TO GOD, AND IN FELLOWSHIP WITH HIM PUT INTO PRACTICE WHAT HE SAYS TO YOU, TO HIS HONOUR AND GLORY. And don't waste your time reading this.

Only the hope of helping some of those distressed by controversy on the subject moved me to overcome my reluctance to deal with it, and sustained me in the needful wading through and evaluating of the half-truths, spoken in bitterness that are inevitable when would-be "holier than thou" people fight.

E Read

"Just as God gave GREEK words, one by one, to Matthew the Tax-gatherer, Peter the fisherman, Luke the Doctor, and Paul the Theologian, etc, even so He has given ENGLISH words to those chosen vessels who were used to produce the perfect word of God in ENGLISH." SPSB Aug 83 P 6. This belief has been named "King James Onlyism" by Dr P Ruckman, who wrote a book KING JAMES ONLYISM vs SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM. He, and others, insist that even its differences from all Greek Texts are inspired "advanced revelation," and that any attempt to correct it, or use alternative versions, is a Satanic attack on God's Holy Word.

God commands us to PROVE all things, and HOLD FAST TO what is good, 1 Th 5:21. To enable us to do this He has given us guide-lines. What God says through His servants is the TRUTH, it's spoken in LOVE, and its fruit is the UPBUILDING AND UNITING of the Body of Christ. Eph 4 What Satan speaks through his servants is marked by LIES, spoken in bitterness, and its fruit is the breaking down and division of the body of Christ, Rom 16:17; 2 Cor 11:1-15. Each of us is directly answerable to the Lord, Rom 14:4-5. What I have assembled in this booklet is intended to be of help in this, and most of the source books drawn on were written BEFORE "KJV Only" ideas had been propagated. They are listed below with the Code Name I will use for them: (Unfortunately I've not been able to re-check all refs, as some books were borrowed.)

THE TEXT OF THE NT, K & B Aland. W B Eerdmans 1987 K&B A.
 TRANSLATING FOR KING JAMES, Notes from Translator John Bois. JonB.
 A HISTORY OF THE BIBLE, F G Bratton, Robert Hale Ltd 1961 FGBr.
 THE ENGLISH BIBLE, F F Bruce. Lutterworth Press 1961 FF B1.
 THE BOOKS & PARCHMENTS, F F Bruce. Pickering & Inglis 1963 Ed. FF B2.
 FROM ANCIENT TABLETS TO MODERN TRANSLATIONS, D Ewert. DavE.
 THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF THE BIBLE Western Europe... Reformation. Edit S L Greenslade. SLGr. INTERLINEAR HOLY BIBLE, Jay Green 1981 JayG.
 OUR ENGLISH BIBLE, Hoare. Hoa.
 The Holy Scriptures according to Masoretic Text, Jewish Pub Soc 1917. JAV.
 OUR BIBLE & THE ANCIENT MSS, F Kenyon (Revised) Ey & Spot 1958 Keny1.
 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF GREEK BIBLE. Kenyon, O.U.P. 1932 Keny2. TEXT OF GREEK BIBLE Kenyon, G Duckworth 1950 Keny3.
 THE ENGLISH BIBLE, KJV TO NIV, J P Lewis, Baker Bible House. JPLe.
 ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE J I Mombert, Bagster 1906 JMom.
 THE LEARNED MEN, G S Paine. T V Crowell 1959 GSPa.
 CODEX SINAITICUS C. Tischendorf, 8th Ed. 1934 Tis.
 6000 YEARS OF BIBLE G S Wegener Eng. (Eng. Trans) Hodder & S 1963 GSW.
 THE BIBLE ALMANAC Packer, Tenney, etc, TEXTS & TRANSLATIONS tBA.
 KJV TRANSLATORS Notes To the READER Ex The Readers Bible, Ox & Camb University Press, 1951 NTR. GOOD NEWS FOR EVERYONE, E A Nida. EAN.
 THE K J ONLY CONTROVERSY, J R White. Bethany Hs Publishers, 1995 JRWhi. (A well-researched, well-reasoned, and charitable book.) I've read, and have on file The Scripture Preservation Society's Bulletins SPSB.198285 and The Bible Translators Magazine BTM 1978-93 I have/use Translator's Handbooks for 12 Bible books. So, am aware of the concerns and attitudes of modern translators. Sources listed at a paragraph end may be responsible for PART ONLY of the information, but nothing is included in the paragraph that contradicts the sources.

OT & NT- Old and New Testaments. LXX - Septuagint Greek OT. KJV- King James Version; NKJV- New KJV, RV- Revised version, NIV- New International Version, NASB New American Standard Bible, GN/TEV - Good News Bible. [RT] Received Text (Textus Receptus.) [MT] Majority Text. [Nes] Nestle-Aland Text. W&H Westcott& Hort. Mss- Manuscripts.

OUTLINE - INDEX.

Introduction - The Bible is GOD'S WORD.....	3
MANUSCRIPTS AND THE FORMATION OF TEXTS.....	15
MANUSCRIPTS, READINGS, TEXTS & TEXTUAL CRITICISM.....	23
King JAMES and the TRANSLATORS (& the Translator's Task)	36
REVISION of the King James Version.....	43
OMISSIONS in MODERN VERSIONS - and WHY	48
Is the KJV INERRANT - God's Only and Final WORD in English?.....	54
APPENDIX I The Scripture Preservation Society.....	62
Appendix II Foolish and Hurtful Statements.....	64

GOD'S WORD IS INTENDED TO BE UNDERSTOOD

That Scripture should be available in easily understood language is dear, as the NT was written in the common-language form of Greek. It was Tyndale's ambition to "make the boy that drives the plough in England know Scripture." FFB2 P 223 He said "Because I had perceived by experience that it was impossible to establish the lay people in any truth, except the Scripture were plainly laid before their eyes in their mother tongue, that they might see the process, order, and meaning of the text." As a result the whole moral tone of the nation was changed. JayG Pref. Contrast this with a modern view. **1

To point out the limitations of a translation may be helpful, but no-one should be criticised because of the Bible Translation they use. Some foolishly chase novelty, some foolishly refuse to change when change is needed. JRWhi P 9. Using the best version will work no life-changing miracles. God alone works them - and Godly dependence on Him, and patient love towards our Brethren who differ from us, are part of His requirements. Attacking a version, new or old, distresses those who have come to know the Lord through it.

Footnote **1 "God's book has never been written in the language of the day so that any blasphemer, jester, and scoffing intellectual can pick it up and get God's 'secret things' and tread them under foot." SPSB Aug/Sept 1985P 3.

NEW TRANSLATIONS ARE RESENTED

The KJV Translators expected opposition to their translation as it was the normal response to "any thing that savoured of newness or renewing." NTR P XI. The Lord was sympathetic to those who instinctively disliked His Gospel because to them the "old Wine," of the Law tasted better, Lk 5:9. That people are upset to find changes in what they've known and loved as the word of God is natural.

AD 405 Augustine wrote to Jerome objecting to the public reading of the Vulgate OT as it differed at times from the LXX. JRWhi P 11. Jerome complained "If I correct errors I am denounced as a falsifier. If I do not correct them I am pilloried as a disseminator of error." He said that people refused his pure water preferring to drink from the old muddy streams, of the Western Text. DavE P 178

AD 1412 Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury writing to Pope John XVIII cursed Wycliffe for turning the sacred books of the church into the mother tongue, calling him "that miserable, pestilential John Wycliffe of damnable memory, son of the old serpent, forerunner and disciple of Antichrist." Similarly Knighton accused Wycliffe of scattering evangelical pearls before swine by allowing the eternal word to become a jest and plaything of the people." GSW P 224

Sir Thomas More "To study to find errors in Tyndale's book were like studying to find water in the Sea." FFB2 P 223 The Great Bible was said to have "resulted in its words being disputed, rimed, sung and jangled in every ale-house." Hoa 204

1612 The KJV translation "Is so poorly done it will grieve me all my life - They put the errors in the text, and the correct readings in the margin" Dr Hugh Broughton, Hebrew scholar and Godly Puritan in his book A CENSURE OF THE LATE TRANSLATION FOR OUR CHURCHES. JPLe P 29-30 He and others accused the translators of blasphemy, being damnable corrupters, unfaithful to the original, denying the Deity of Christ etc. DavE P 203 He also said "he thought it done so ill that he would rather be rent in pieces with Wild Horses, than any such translation by my consent should be urged upon poor churches." FFB2 P 229

1881 On the Revised Version Dean Burgon (An Anglo-Catholic, objecting to changes out of deference to "The voice of Catholic antiquity.") wrote "The systematic depravation of the underlying Greek.. is nothing else but a poisoning of the River of Life at its sacred source. Our revisers (with the best and purest of intentions no doubt) stand convicted of having deliberately rejected the words of inspiration on every page." FFB1 151.

In 1970 because he had distributed copies of Good News NT, J C Bloom, a blind man of Gulfport Mississippi was attacked at home, feet tied to hands, and his Scriptures torn up. EAN P 11.

Controversy arising from this attitude towards NEW Translations creates uncertainty, as it concentrates attention on the 1% of God's Word that is uncertain enough to argue about. This lessens the assurance that the Bible is comprehensible and reliable. Concentrating on disputables, and looking for possible faults, makes it easy to ignore the requirements of 1 Cor 13:1-7.

It divides God's Bible-loving people, concentrating their attention on the things they differ about so they have less time to use the Bible in Evangelising, helpful teaching, and practical living. And quarrelling about versions and words makes them, God, and the Gospel look ridiculous to the world at large.

To say "God's honour is at stake, I'll not give an inch," may sound noble. We SHOULD take God's Word, and God's honour seriously. But Satan as "Angel of Light" 2 Cor 11:13-15 easily twists this into our taking ourselves and our own ideas too seriously as if we must use our skills to keep "God's Ark" safe, and so dishonouring God as Uzzah did, 2 Sam 6:6. Dogmatic assertions "proving" other people are ignorant and deceived, have a strong appeal to the Flesh. They recruit sincere, Godly people with "WEAK" consciences to JUDGE and campaign against those with "STRONG" consciences - and the Latter to DESPISE the former. And, the message of Romans 14 is ignored by those too eager to defend their translation of it. Whenever we see an issue creating bitter speaking and division in God's household we know Satan is at work. **2.

To concentrate on a FORM of words, and fight for the use of that form of words, discourages serious study of the will of God revealed in the Bible and its application to Godly living. Recklessly blackening Modern versions generates equally reckless blackening of KJV. To scan any translation with a view to finding as much as possible to condemn is a waste of our limited time that serves only to feed self-righteous pride, and foster division. The efforts of early Brethren to return to a more NT "Church Order" would have been still-born if they had not thrown off the tyranny of such expressions as "The Office of a Bishop."

The "KJV ONLY" issue is a MODERN problem

All my life I've constantly used the KJV and thanked and praised the Lord for the blessings that resulted. And used other versions to correct and widen my understanding of the saving truth of God. In my youth I was advised to use RV for study as it was the most accurate/consistent in translating Greek words into English. Some "Brethren" used J N Darby's translation.

Until 40 years ago those expounding God's Word read from KJV and clarified its truths by using modern words, Eg A MEAT offering is made of four, Lev 14:20 etc. PREVENT means to go before, 1 Th 4:15. Cp Ps 59:10, etc. CONVERSATION means way of life, Eph 4:22, Phil 3:20 Paul was daiming a

clear conscience, not ignorance, in saying "I KNOW NOTHING BY MYSELF," 1 Cor 4:4. LET in 2 Th 2:7 means to hinder. PECULIAR people, Ex 19:5; 1 Pet 2:9, etc = People to be His special possession. KJV "purchased possession" in Eph 1:14) **3.

Footnote **2 Some ask "Doesn't the fact that God has greatly used the KJV PROVE that we should continue using it? But God also greatly used the LXX for many years in the early church - and then greatly used the Vulgate down to the time of Luther and Zwingli.

Footnote **3 Gail Riplinger in NEW AGE VERSIONS P 170-171 insists Peculiar meant ODD "When Paul & Peter wrote it, & when Moses wrote it 4000 years earlier." JRWhi P 148

They quoted from the RV, or the margin notes of Newberry or Scofield to correct false impressions, Eg It was DEMONS (Daimonios) not DEVILS (Diabolos) that were cast out in Mt 9:34. etc. There is only ONE Devil. The HELL where our Lord wasn't left, Acts 2:27, was Hades (OT Sheol) the place of the dead, not the fiery HELL of torment, (Gehenna) as in Mt 5:22, etc. (At the Judgment Hades will be emptied, and the Godless dead pass into HELL/Gehenna, Rev 20:13-14.) In 2 Th 2:2 it's day of LORD, not day of CHRIST.

In Acts 19:2 Have ye received the Holy Ghost SINCE ye believed- a poor translation that suggested the Holy Spirit was given at some time AFTER people believed and were saved, was corrected to DID you receive.. WHEN.. as Paul was testing these Disciples of John as to whether what THEY called BELIEVING was the Biblical Believing in/Receiving Christ, and being born of the Spirit. They'd not even heard of Pentecost, and the fact that they hadn't RECEIVED showed their believing in Christ to be at the shallow stage of the crowds in Jn 2:23 **4.

W E Vine in his Bible Dictionary is an example of a Godly Scholarly man taking up the alternative Readings in Texts, and translations, weighing them up/ testing them by God's word as a whole, just as Scripture commands us. In this he follows the example of (as far as I know) ALL the Early Brethren teachers and writers who welcomed the rediscovery of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus Mss. To my knowledge none of the great men of God of the Church at large, in the past, has taught that the [RT] or KJV were uniquely inspired. They praised the KJV as God's gift, but didn't hesitate to correct it, or suggest improvements.

THE BIBLE IS GOD'S WORD

Unless we accept that the Bible is what it says it is, we have no foundation on which to build our ATTITUDE towards the versions of the Bible available, or their USEFULNESS for the purpose for which it was written. Initially the Church depended on the DIRECT MINISTRY of the Apostles and Prophets, whose teaching and preaching, under God, provided the foundation of the Church, Eph 2:20 The Apostles were chosen, equipped and empowered to witness to what the Lord Jesus had said and done, Acts 10:39. The Prophets made direct revelations of the will of God, the Apostle Paul being THE prophet through

whom the nature and function of the church was revealed, Gal 1:12; Eph 3:2-13, etc.

Footnote **4 On this Dr Ruckman comments in his BIBLE BELIEVERS COMMENTARY P 549550 "The AV (1611) text is infallible absolute truth as it stands, and no "God-breathed originals" would shed any more light on it than the light it already has in the God-honoured Reformation text of 1611. P 550551 "therefore the alteration of "since" (Acts 19:2) to "when" means absolutely NOTHING at all since the scriptural dumbbells who made this alteration could not expound the passage after they corrected it without referring to Cornelius Stam or C I Scofield if their lives depended on it. And on P 652 "If you can't handle verse 6 as it is written, what is the point in changing verse 2, unless you are trying to play "god" for a bunch of idol-worshipping suckers ("Christians") who are too stupid to check their speedometers?" He ignores the fact that WHEN is the natural way of translating the Greek participle. JRWhi P 240 Page 240.

Within a generation, the Written Word of God became the sole guide for Church, and Believer. As one after another of the Epistles were written, and the Gospels were put in writing, it became important that the exact NATURE and PURPOSE of Scripture be set out. This was done in two of the last Epistles to be written. Tim 3:15-17; 2 Pet 1:19-21, assure us that all Scripture is God breathed, written from God by men who were moved to do so by God the Holy Spirit, as to the WORDS THEY SPOKE (Laleo, not merely lego - the logos/ message they conveyed,) so that the whole is a UNITY. The PURPOSE of Scripture is that the Godly should be perfectly equipped for doing the whole will of God.

For this to be effective it's essential that the meaning of any individual verse etc be understood in relation to the message of the Word of God as a whole. It's essential that the reader refrain from individualistic, independent thinking and speaking. In all expounding, interpreting, and applying the Word of God, we must seek submissive dependence on the Spirit of God, that we may be bond slaves of the Word, and of God Himself and so, speaking as His Oracles, 1 Pet 4:11. Neither adding to nor taking away from it, Rev 22:18-19. **5.

That we're far removed in time, distance, cultural setting, and personal experience from the original hearers and readers need be no barrier between us and the Author. God the Holy Spirit, if ungrieved by our attitude and actions, can make it come alive to us, as we seek to hear the voice of God, and pass it on to others. And, God in His Wisdom has set N THE SCRIPTURES THEMSELVES the pattern we should follow in handling them.

God chose to reveal Himself in WORDS, and can be expected to have used those words deliberately and wisely to reveal Himself, and to convey His meaning. They are never adequate in themselves, but the Holy Spirit illumines them. It's helpful to check ALL times a word is used in Scripture to get the range of possible meanings, and overall sense. Specialist books are useful also.

We should put into the hand of the young Believer ONE generally reliable version of the Scripture, and encourage him to concentrate on that. It needs to be simple enough for the MECHANICS of reading it to be effortless, so that his mind is free to concentrate on the TRUTHS he meets, and his heart is free to respond to them in loving appreciation. (If he needs an oversimplified version, he needs to realise that many truths will be inadequately/ inaccurately expressed.) He should use it to make God's Word his own by marking and memorising verses that God makes meaningful and dear to him.

Footnote **5 This applies directly to "The scroll of his prophecy," but like all Scripture reveals a principle of general application. In the early church the attempt to improve Scripture by adding a clearer definition of the Person of Christ led only to division and confusion. Can we ADD TO the Bible's definition of itself such words as "inerrant" or to limit it to a particular version, and expect God to bless that action?

When a Believer knows one translation well enough to feel at home in it, he may benefit from reading in different translations. Hopefully he will then find verses that surprise or even shock him, and make him realise that there is a depth in God's Word beyond the understanding he has reached. Eg I could read KJV Col 3:19 smugly aware that I was never BITTER against my wife. But it was a shock to read in some modern translation "Don't be IRRITABLE with." Surely even good husbands find good wives IRRITATING at times! The Greek is Pikraino, from Pik= to cut or prick. Being uncomfortably PRICKLY to live with IS natural to me. But it needed to be rebuked.

All Scripture is God-breathed, but is all of equal value? All God's children are equally indwelt by the Spirit, Rom 8:9, have His teaching unction, 1 Jn 2:20 - But are all of EQUAL value as mouthpieces for God? In God's providence blunt, unspiritual men like Jephtha, Judg 11:24, Joab, 2 Sam 19:1-7, and Festus, Acts 26:24, contributed to His Word. So did defiant sinners such as Pharaoh, and Pilate - and pious frauds like Balaam, and Job's Comforters - and agnostic hypocrites like Caiaphas, Jn 11:50 It contains the words of Demons, Mt 8:29-31, and Satan Himself with his murderous lies, Job 1:9-11; 2:4. Proverbs contains a mixture of spiritual wisdom and courtly cunning, (Arum/ Prudence, Prov 22:3 is what the Serpent had in Gen 3:1!) Would a pioneer missionary choose Esther as the first book to translate?

I understand that when the Metric system was established a Metre bar in Paris was set up to be preserved as the permanent standard of length. God has not done that with His Word. He chose to allow copies of the NT to be widely scattered, and left to His servants the responsibility to determine which of the various readings were original. We're totally dependent on God's Word, and God promised to PRESERVE HIS WORDS, Mt 4:4. Every detail of His revealed will is valid, and His commandments have permanent value, Mt 5:17-19, but our Sacrifice, Priest, and Altar aren't the Jewish ones, or the Christian imitations. All

the prophetic promises will be fulfilled, Mt 24:34-36 The Gospel that brings us to spiritual birth is the same as brought life to the Apostle Peter, 1 Pet 1:23 2 Pet 1:1-4. The Scriptures were given to give us security of belief, witness, worship, and lifestyle, Rom 15:4, as well as warning examples to us who've been given God's full and final word, 1 Cor 10:11. We're to receive it as such, 1 Th 2:13. But that doesn't mean always using the SAME FORM of words. Even in that most solemn quote of Ps 22:1 the Gospel writers expressed the Hebrew in two different ways, ELI, ELI, Mt 27:46 and ELOI ELOI, Mk 15:34. **6.

Footnote **6 Ps 12:5-7 Says nothing about the inerrancy of the KJV, but that God will keep His promise and preserve the afflicted one JRWhi 243 White explains in a note on his debate with Dr Holland. July 1997, that the Hebrew text used by KJV (1525 edition of Bomberg) says "will keep THEM, preserve HIM," as in NASB. A few Heb Mss and LXX say "Keep US.. preserve US," as in NIV. God's Pure and Valuable promises/WORDS in 126 is feminine plural. PRESE RVE /protect in 127 is masculine singular, so refer not to God's WORDS being preserved, but to the afflicted one being preserved as God promised. Newberry Bible margin says the second THEM should be IT, or HIM, adding hopefully it may mean each word of God's Word, but that's not logical. A Jewish version (with no axe to grind) JAV gives 12:7, as "Thou wilt keep them O Lord; Thou wilt preserve us from this generation forever."

God's Word is setted forever in Heaven, Ps 119:89. This pure and unchanging word/ expression of His Will is intended for everyone, so is expressed in human words that change as human language changes, Neh 8:8. His written Word is preserved by Him in the varying readings of the men He used to copy and pass it on. There's no evidence in history of ANY SINGLE Mss containing an unchanging Word. But the Lord's Words have been a constant reality to me since He put into my heart a love for them in January 1943 At first it was the KJV that blessed my heart and mind with ever wider/ deeper views of the treasures of His Word. Then when its words and rhythms became too familiar to startle me easily, His word continued to be fresh and fruitful to me through my reading and using those attempts of modern men, who, like the KJV Translators, attempted in their fallible, human frailty to translate freshly the LIVING ETERNAL WORD OF GOD into the living, ever-changing language of men.

THE BIBLE & THE REFORMATION

Sola Scripturum - the Bible alone, was the motto of the Reformers. "The Bible, and the Bible only is the religion of the Protestants," Chillingworth, 1638 SLGr P 175. That "The Reformers dethroned the Pope and enthroned the Bible," meant it was important to have the most accurate possible Text and clearest Translation. The Bible Wycliffe translated into English was the Latin Vulgate. It was also the Bible for Huss, and for Luther and Zwingli at first, but when the Greek Text became available they took it up eagerly as it allowed them to reach back beyond the Latin to the Greek Mss. Although these varied among themselves, and from the Latin in some degree, it allowed them to gain absolute assurance of the Truth of God except in unimportant matters. Based on that assured text they reached out to others by translating it into the

common languages of their countries. (Against this, R.C.'s insisted that Bible and Church "Services" must be in LATIN, and in a single authorised form, to preserve the dignity, and sacred associations of Scripture.) **7.

Realising that God speaks from Scripture transformed preaching. The Holy Spirit was expected to work in preacher and hearer alike to interpret God's Word and give the spiritual sense. But also the hearer was encouraged to read God's Word for himself, and see that what the preacher taught was what the words said. And beyond that they looked to Christ. Puritan sermons were backed by learning, but proclaimed in simple clear language. The text was expounded, the doctrines exemplified and confirmed by reference to other parts of Scripture, and finally applied to the lives of the hearers. SLGrP 184185

Footnote **7 At a Disputation at Zurich 1523 The Bishop of Constance's delegates argued that only a general council of the whole of Catholic Europe could legislate for the Church. But Zwingli opposing this said that it was possible to decide issues locally because an infallible Judge lay on the table, written in Hebrew, Greek and Latin. And there were Christian hearts present who through the Spirit of God could tell which side rightly interpreted the Scriptures. The Church didn't give us the Scriptures, the preaching of the Gospel gave us the church. The church didn't decide which Scriptures were canonical - they ruled out some books as they did not proclaim the Gospel. (Luther also appealed to the Holy Spirit to validate/interpret the Scripture. Calvin added that we should also use common sense.) SLGrP 4-5.

Luther was vividly conscious that the Bible was the life-giving Word of God which deserved and demanded the reader's total obedience, but that didn't cover every word in the Text. In fact, having placed Christ at the heart of the Scriptures Luther felt free to be critical of parts of the Bible in a manner which would scandalise later Lutherans. Eg James- "A good book but not Scripture." "Revelation is neither Apostolic nor Prophetic, and resembles the dreams of Abbot Joachim." "It does no harm to say the Pentateuch was not written by Moses." SLGrP 86

Calvin also declared that "Scripture is self-authenticated, carrying its own evidence along with it, and ought not to submit to proofs and arguments, but obtains the conviction which it merits with us, by the testimony of the Spirit." SLGrP 179. But again that didn't tie him to a specific Text or Translation. Calvin agreed with Erasmus that 3 nonRT readings were correct eg Jn 8:59 that the phrase "going through the midst of them, and so passed by" had been borrowed from Lk 4:30 - Just as modern Texts and translations do. He also listed 18 other non [RT] readings that he accepted, rejecting the [RT] ones. KJV DEFENDED, E F HILLS, P 204 Calvin also conjectured Jas 4:2 should be ENVY, not Kill. JRWhi P70

The INRUSH OF MODERN VERSIONS HAS CREATED UNCERTAINTY

In the last 40 years a confusing array of modern translations and paraphrases have appeared, often more daring than durable, more enterprising than reliable. Conflicting interpretive translations rob us of simple security in saying "God's Word says." Controversy IS inevitable, as it was between the supporters of the rival versions when the KJV was issued. Tyndales, Coverdales, the Bishops, and the Great Bible (Apart from the Anglican Prayer-book,) promptly faded out. but the Puritans clung to the Geneva Bible.

The Lord Jesus spoke in a way that made the Common People hear Him gladly, Mk 12:37, and the NT was written in vivid, sometimes shocking, language, Eg Jn 6:54, "Unless you EAT my flesh," uses an unusual, crude Greek word Trogo- "To Gnaw, to Chew." The need for a translation that can speak to the average citizen is still as important as it was then. But a readable translation that weakens truths that are now unpopular, takes away more than it gives.

The RC church fought against Scripture being in any language other than the Latin they had used for a thousand years. Without agreeing with them, many Godly people prefer the dignity and reverence of a translation using familiar "church" words rather than the language of the street. The majority of the KJV translators wished to maintain continuity with the traditional religious words - Calvary, Charity, Easter, Bishop..

Older people miss the security of familiar words that have been blessing them through a long life, and today are naturally upset when attending "Church" is no escape from a chaotically changing world. So some Protestants insist on the use of KJV. Some Catholics insist on the Latin Mass.

"Protestants study the Bible, Catholics don't" is no longer true, as they are now encouraged to read the Bible, instead of being forbidden to. Hallelujah!. But it puts Bible Societies under pressure to weaken "Protestant" elements in a translation, and add the Apocrypha to make it acceptable to Roman Catholics. (KJV had the Apocrypha, in 1611 Rom 8 in the RC NEW AMERICAN BIBLE is good and clear, apart from having JUSTICE instead of RIGHTEOUSNESS in 8:10.)

Bibles are no longer expensive black leather-covered, or cheap small-print, hard-covered give-aways, all with the same words. Commercially produced and competitively marketed Bibles aim at catching the eye of all sorts of people of all ages. This is bewildering but may be necessary now that Sunday School and Bible Class attendance is rare.

Bible memorisation supported by the constant hearing of one version being read has been lost. Thinking about the meaning of Bible verses and their application to life has been encouraged, as we pray and struggle to see which translation best conveys the truth of God as it was originally written.

Some prefer the security of dogmatic statements, and slogans to shout at anyone who disagrees with them, rather than face the many hours of hard work

needed to gain an understanding of the truths of the Bible, and the humbling realisation that none of us really can know everything it's saying. Godly Believers are rightly distressed by the confusion caused by modern translations, and by the increasing godlessness of the world, and the worldliness of the church. This makes them vulnerable to the "wishful thinking" illusion that if only we used the old version and the old form of witness, old-time revival would return. Or attracted to the dogmatic divisive leader who seeks to enrol some Christians on his side by slandering those who disagree, and putting all the blame of our failures on those he criticises. Some of God's children spend money and time pointing out real or imaginary faults in versions old and new. There is a need to point out inadequacies in any version as part of our "Speaking the Truth in Love. But ALL versions are vulnerable to criticism if read critically, and to gain benefit from any we should read any translation as a listener to God, not as a critic.)

It's easy to live by FEAR, and ignorance and bitterness go hand in hand with fear. It's disturbing to find a new translation shakes us out of the comfortable security of familiar words. But far more damage is done by violently attacking the translators without checking whether they have translated honestly what was before them. This can stir up believers into hating all who differ. And, make them feel virtuous in refusing to read any modern version, even though they're better at defending the KJV than understanding it.

Only the security of confident Faith in, and Knowledge of, the God of Grace Rom 5:1-5, enables us to "speak the truth in love," Eph 4:15, in the spirit of 2 Tim 2:23-26 I'm trying to learn to do so, and so cease to be a DIVISIVE, or slanderous person. I find honestly admitting the uncertainties, as well as the far greater certainties, enables us to live by FAITH, not fear, confidently and securely.

Besides, each year sees more individuals/congregations, making more use of modern versions/language, and more of those faithful to the old version/language/ways are called home. Elements of bad and good exist in this pattern of change. We can maximise the GOOD, or the EVIL of it, but CHANGE is inevitable. We can rush changes through, and, alienating the Godly older folk, wreck our fellowships. We can resist changes stubbornly as absolutely evil, and rigidly control what is done in our assembly buildings until they are empty. Even if we could make time stand still within the local church it would still be useless, for the world around us, among whom we are called to witness, is changing more rapidly than is the professing church.

The world of SCHOOL, and of ENTERTAINMENT, increasingly sidelines the knowledge of God, and the Bible, as being old-fashioned, and irrelevant. Having the Gospel presented in KJV language confirms in young people the impression that God has nothing to say to them that could be useful or important. The Laws of the land, and public expectations, have abandoned the Bible, and education, long secular in NZ is now secular without the implicit support of Godliness and Goodness it used to feature. On the other hand the claim by Liberals that the OT isn't ancient has been rebuffed by the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls, just

as 100 years ago the finding of early NT Mss defended the ancientness of the NT text. And the scientific world is less confident that a Godless Universe makes sense, or that a Society that throws off Biblical/ Religious restraints becomes a Paradise.

A spirit of fault-finding is the most obvious reason for other objections. "Jesus isn't allowed to be emphatic in NIV, as it records Him as saying "I tell you the truth" etc instead of "Verily verily," carries little weight now that "Verily" is used facetiously, if at all.

Being in my Seventies, Lk 5:39, makes sense to me, as I long for the security of earlier, simpler days and ways. I could cry wistfully "O Sun stand thou still on Gibeon.." or in panic "It's going too fast/changing too fast- LET ME OFF!" But as long as the Lord spares us we're called to serve our generation in the will of God, Acts 13:36 not to withdraw into any past, real or imagined. And we're to teach a new generation the acts and ways of the Lord, Ps 78:1-6. This may involve our sharing with them versions of Scripture and ways of doing things in which we can never FEEL at home, even when we admit that the old familiar ones no longer open the Gospel door to sinners in a way that most can respond to.

WHY HAS GOD LEFT US WITH UNCERTAINTIES AS WELL AS CERTAINTIES?

Our human hearts crave the security of ONE TEXT of Scripture which reflects accurately the Hebrew & Greek originals. ONE TRANSLATION INTO ENGLISH, which perfectly conveys that text to us. So, the claim that the [RT] and the KJV ARE that TEXT and TRANSLATION is welcomed by many of God's people, clung to and defended tenaciously.

This is put into perspective when we remember that our human hearts also crave the security of ONE GOSPEL ACCOUNT of the human life and atoning death of our Lord, but God in His wise love gave us FOUR. We long for ONE AUTHORISED ACCOUNT OF THE PROCESS OF CONVERSION, and that same wise love describes it in terms of Receiving Christ, Jn 1:12, Believing in Him, Jn 3:16, Coming to Him, Jn 6:35 Following Him, Believing in our heart/ confessing with our mouth, Rom 10:9-10, etc.

We'd like ONE description of our STATUS but are called Disciples, Followers of the Way, Believers, Saints, Christians. And ONE description of the PROCESS of living as a Christian. ONE description of the relationships within the Godhead, ONE statement of correct DOCTRINE, ONE statement of the nature and correct practice of the local Church, ONE statement of the events and sequence of events that bring this world scene to a close, etc. ONE statement as to the nature of God's INSPIRATION of Scripture, and ONE correct system of INTERPRETING it. (Some Believers transfer their Faith to human creeds, or to human Leaders who claim to be the one and only interpreter of everything as "God's Prophet for this Age, etc.)

We must allow God's Word to determine our doctrines, not choose improbable texts and translations because they make some doctrine clearer. Scribes were tempted to make the doctrines of God's word clearer by small additions, and translators face the same temptation. To do so invites God's rebuke, Prov 30:5-6. God has chosen not to tell us His reasons for the bewildering variety of Scripture that we find confusing when we try to reduce His truth to dogmatic statements. It seems to me that it has these advantages:

1. It makes us realise that God in His Person and Purpose is GRAND and GLORIOUS beyond any human understanding or description- See Ex 33:18-23; Rom 11:33-36; 2 Cor 12:4; Eph 3:18-19; 1 Tim 6:16; Rev 4:2-3, etc. The PERSONAL Living Word is more than any correct credal statements. The WRITTEN Living Word is more than any correct form of words.

2. It makes us realise that only God Himself, by His Spirit, can enlighten our minds and enlarge our human understanding to enable us to BEGIN to grasp what He wants us to know and be, 1 Cor 2:7-16. The fact that the God of Glory is ever seeking our fellowship calls us to be thankful, and seek His fellowship, wisdom, and guidance. And not to demand something in our hand that we can learn and act on without His aid.

The Bible is written in a form that is intended to develop SONSHIP fellowship with our Heavenly Father, not slavish, robotic obedience to a detailed code of belief and behaviour. So, although as fallen creatures we're unable to instinctively know and do the will of God, or even to automatically desire to do so, day by day we face a series of choices. And God wills it to be so, as it fees us to choose to develop heart loyalty to our Lord, Jn 21:22; Acts 15:37-40; Rom 14:3-10; 1 Cor 11:19.

3. It gives us a constant challenge to LOVE our brothers/ sisters in Christ, who are, by God's ordaining, all different from us in their natures and gifts, and so have different understandings of Scripture. (Often because their FAVOURITE VERSES around which they build their understanding of God's Word as a whole, are different from those which are central to us/ our understanding and experience.) This means that we cannot simply please ourselves in belief and practice, but must learn to be like Christ who pleased not Himself, Rom 15:1-7; Phil 2:1-16 so that we remain in fellowship with each other, and combine our different understandings to glorify God with one mind and mouth. All this demands more of us than even the Godliest find easy. We are constantly humbled, which gives God the chance to lift us up, 1 Pet 5:5-8. Constantly need to repent and seek forgiveness/ cleansing, and so are constantly brought face to face with the Grace of God that provides this for us, 2 Cor 5:21; 8:9; 1 Jn 1:5-9.

Our need for SECURITY in all this is provided in our SHEPHERD, Jn 10:27-29. His Word is FOREVER SETTLED IN HEAVEN, Ps 119:89, not on EARTH, in any ONE translation. He keeps all His promises to His people/

keeps all His people and completes His work in them, 1 Th 5:23-24; Jude 24. I don't need to KNOW everything. He knows it, and is ever eager to give me the wisdom I need. He gives me the assurance of Isa 30:20-21; 35:8; 43:1-2; Jn 7:17, etc as we walk together in the Light, Jn 8:12; 1 Jn 1:4-9.

Being human, like Naaman, we can't help wishing/ demanding that God's provision for us should meet our expectations. But He has chosen not to, and we must go DOWN from our high view of what we would expect God to provide in the way of Texts, Translations, instructions for Doctrine and Daily Living. And if we want our leprosy to be headed we need to constantly DIP/ IMMERSIVE ourselves in God's Word in the form/ forms His Grace, through the labours of His servants, has provided for us.

After 55 years of doing so, the joy of it/of fellowship with Him in it, is greater than ever. True I've often to struggle wearily with alternative texts and translations but by His Grace that struggle leads to a richer, safer understanding of His Word, as His truths are so wonderful that no ONE way of expressing them can convey ALL the riches and sanity that He has provided for us in His Holy Word, Rom 8:13-17. And He gives us a sound mind to search them out, 2 Tim 1:7; 3:15-17; 2 Pet 1:19-20

TO PROMISE MORE THAN GOD DOES is tragic folly that sets one up for disillusionment, or abdication of rationality and truth. Ex 15:26 proclaims that a right response to His commandments will mean that He will not inflict on Israel the plagues He inflicted on Egypt. Yet some take it to mean that God will heal all His trusting, obedient children today. When God doesn't heal they may fall into despair convinced that they can't really be His children at all as they're not healed. Or escape into the make-believe world of saying "Yes he (the person prayed for) DID die, but God wonderfully healed him just before death, just as He promised."

Others twist Prov 22:6 to give a false assurance that wise child-rearing ensures a child's Salvation. Others pin false hopes on Christening. Ps 12:7 states that God will keep His promises and preserve His people, and yet some read it as meaning that every word of the KJV is inerrant and directly inspired of God, even though if this were so, to deny there were Cockatrice, etc would be to call God a liar. While it might well suit us to believe all the above claims, none of them are of more value than the comforting words of Hananiah, Jer 28

We will see later that many years of Labour has produced absolute certainty for perhaps 90% of the Hebrew OT Text. The original Greek NT may have reached absolute certainty for 99.5% of the Text. The KJV Translators made no claim for 100% inerrancy in the [RT] Greek Text, or for their Translation. They made the certainties certain by honestly acknowledging uncertainties - by printing alternatives in the margin. **8. We may never be 100% sure whether Jude wrote in vs 1 that we are "Sanctified," or "Loved," but we can live with

THAT uncertainty, as it is abundantly clear from other Scriptures that we are both!

It may seem forthright, and loyal, to demand to be shown one Bible that is THE WORD OF GOD, and insist that any which differ are false. It may help if we remember the old story of the enthusiast for forthrightness, who claimed that any answer beyond a simple "YES" or "NO" was evasive and showed shifty dishonesty. UNTIL he was asked "Have you stopped beating your wife yet?" The Translators of KJV expressed the truth well in saying that even the meanest current English Translation "IS THE WORD OF GOD." NTR XXIII.

It would be convenient if God had provided us with the miraculously preserved ORIGINALS of the Scripture, or better still His AUTHORISED TRANSLATIONS of them into every possible language, just as it would be convenient if He had provided that angelic beings did all the preaching and teaching of the Word of God, faultlessly. But God did neither. He committed both the task of copying and translating Scripture, and the task of Preaching it, to us.

These tasks have been done well in the measure that God the Holy Spirit has been relied on, and so left free to direct us. Individual weakness, prejudice, etc is guarded against when a number of people share the task. (One man translations are marked by freedom and liveliness of expression, but are less accurate. No ONE version has taken the place of the KJV as there's no human head of the church now to do what King James did. And the two centres of English Bible use are going in different directions- RSV and GN/TEV may dominate in England. In USA, KJV, NIV, NKJV are all strongly supported.

Footnote **8 Dr Scrivener, the great defender of the [RT] and KJV on the Committee which produced the 1881RV, recorded in his book THE AUTHORISED EDITION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE, Cambridge Press, 1884P 41, that the 1611KJV had, in the Old Testament, 4,111 marginal notes giving more literal renderings, and 2156 with alternative (Hebrew Text) readings "which in the opinion of the translators are not very less probable than the text." On P 56 he gives NT as - 767 marginal notes, 37 relate to variant (Greek Text) readings, 582 to alternative translations. BTM (Tech) Jan 1988P 102 JRWhi P 77. The KJV before me still carries such a note on Lk 10:22

TEXTS & MANUSCRIPTS - HEBREW

Until the first Bible was printed in 1456 the Scriptures were Manuscripts (Mss) = hand-written copies. Hebrew Mss were written on "parchment" 2 Tim 4:13. The skins of lambs killed as sacrifices in the Temple were used (according to one tradition.) Enough skins to make a roll such as Isaiah, Lk 4:17, were sewn together. There are few Ancient HEBREW Mss, as worn ones were put in the Synagogue Genizah = Store room, until given decent burial. A Cairo Synagogue failed to bury the contents of its Genizah, so ancient Mss were found there.

The oldest Mss were written in CAPITALS, consonants only, with no breaks between the letters, or punctuation. JayG Pref. We'd find THLRDSMSHPRD easy

to read because Ps 231 is familiar. TRLGDSGDTSRL, Ps 73:1 is harder. Modern Hebrew Newspapers omit most vowels, and people constantly using the language read them easily. But, after the Exile, Hebrew was increasingly replaced by Aramaic in Israel, Syria, Babylon, Neh 8:7-8. And in Egypt, Asia Minor, Greece, by Greek. FFB2 P 41. In NT times Greek was used as often as Hebrew in Jewish funeral inscriptions, and in preserved letters. Found at Masada a letter from Ben Yair Bar Kochba's Deputy (patriotic Jew though he was) is written in Greek, as it says it takes him too long to write in Hebrew.

As in Hebrew the letters of the alphabet were used as numbers - A=1, B=2, etc - scribes could check that they had copied a page correctly by adding it up and seeing it came to the same number as the page they copied from. The claim that they ALWAYS did this and destroyed the page if incorrect is a pious fable - few Mss pages are free of mistakes and corrections. They were most careful in copying the "Five Books of Moses," (Pentateuch) and least careful of its last book, Chronicles, so what it says sometimes fits poorly with Kings. In Hebrew, letters such as R and D are alike except for a small tail (tittle, KJV) so 2 Sam 8:13 David smote Syrians (RM= Aram) 1 Chr 18:12 & the title of Ps 60 Edom (DM= Edom). FFB2 P 41. This suggests that Mt 5:18 refers to the fulfilment of every detail dealt with in God's Word, rather than to the correct form of words in any Text or Translation.

Sadducees and Samaritans accepted only the Pentateuch as God's Word. The Samaritan Pentateuch differs from the Masoretic in 6000 places. In 2000 of them it agrees with the LXX. They built their temple on Gerizim, and it substitutes Gerizim for Ebal in Deu 27:4. FGBr P 181, FFB2 P 129. Among the Hebrew "Dead Sea Scrolls," the Isaiah scrolls, and others, are very close to what became the Masoretic text, (it uses more common words instead of obscure ones). But some agree with the LXX, and some with the Samaritan Pentateuch. This shows that at the time of Christ a wide variety of OT texts were in use. FFB2 P 122-123

With the destruction of the Temple the Sadducees faded from the scene but the Pharisees clung to the OT Law and Traditions/ Masorah. Their Scribes/ Masoretes slowly collected all the Mss they could, and worked at establishing the original text. The result is what we call the Masoretic Text. (This process of collecting Mss and by comparing them trying to work out the original and correct form of the text is called "Textual Criticism." It isn't criticising God's Word.)

They made it easier to read accurately by dividing the letters into words, and putting vowel points in etc. But the meanings of some words had been lost, so they guessed from context. In some places the Hebrew made no obvious sense, Eg 1 Sam 27:10 where the KJV departs from Masoretic text, as it does in Ex 14:20 Keny1 P 148 The years of Saul's reign are missing in 1 Sam 13:1 as is part of Deu 32:43 quoted in Heb 1:6.

The Masoretic Text reached final form in 9th-10th Century AD, FGBr P 175. Minor differences in Mss remain, especially involving WRITTEN/ Kethib, and

TO BE READ/Qere. EAN P 95 While the Scribes wrote the Name of JEHOVAH/YAWEH thousands of times in the OT, it was marked to be read aloud as Adonai. The Qere was written small above the line Eg in Judges 18:30 the letters MS= Moses, has a small "suspended" N between the M and S, reminding the reader to read Manasseh as the idolatrous priest's grandfather, to avoid publicly shaming the memory of Moses, and to show that the character of that priest was like that of the later wicked king Manasseh. FFB2 P 118-119. JAV notes this.

Claims that a correct copy of the OT was preserved by God and became the Masoretic Text have no foundation. All the evidence shows that God entrusted His Word to human stewards, and over-ruled to preserve it largely in the Hebrew Texts, and used centuries of work by the Masoretic "Textual Critics," to establish it from the many imperfect Mss they had access to. Where they failed, God supplemented their work by the Greek LXX, etc, and more recently the Dead Sea Scrolls. Eg Masoretic Isa 21:8 "a LION" (Aryeh) is "He who SAW" (Haro'eh) in the Dead Sea scroll copy, and NIV follows this. FFB2 P 122 NASB follows the Dead Sea Isaiah Text in 13 readings. JPLe P 168

There's more support for the Messiahship of Jesus in the LXX than in the Masoretic Text eg "They pierced my hands and my feet," Ps 22:16, is in only a few Hebrew Mss. Most have "Like a Lion they are at my feet" and some modern translations follow the Masoretic Text in this. Keny1 P 153 Christians, and Jews, accept the form of the Masoretic Text established by the Ben Asher family about AD 900 FFB2 P 121. In 1525 a Tunisian Refugee Jacob Chaiyim co-operated with Christian Printer Bomberg to set type and print a standard form of the Masoretic Text giving correct Qere/Kethib readings. SLGr P 52-53

TEXTS & MANUSCRIPTS - GREEK

(The Making of the RECEIVED TEXT 1516-1624)

Bible comes from the Greek Biblos /Biblion, a rolled up scroll. From the 2nd Century on they were folded into a Codex= book form. Keny3 P 18. The oldest NT Mss are written on Papyrus. Better-lasting calfskin Vellum was used from the 4th century. Keny2 P 2, Keny3 P 14. Paper was used from about the 12th Century onward. Keny3 P 21, GSW P 190 Early Mss were UNCIALS- written in capital letters, words not separated, and with little punctuation. Keny3 P 17, JayG. The change to MINUSCULE/Cursive writing came about the 9th Century. JRWhi P 35

Most of the Greek Mss we have today were kept and copied by the Greek Orthodox church (as Greek continued to be their common language.) As the Roman Catholic church used Latin, their scholars kept and copied only a few Greek Mss, sometimes along with the Latin Vulgate. They regarded Greek Mss with suspicion as the Greek church was considered heretical for teaching that the Holy Spirit was sent by the Father only. Hebrew was despised as the language of Christ-rejecting Jews.

Western Europe was cut off from reading the Scriptures in Greek until the Turks captured Constantinople in 1453 and Greek scholars fled to the West taking Mss with them. So, 1458 Greek Teaching began at Paris University. 1476 Earliest Greek Grammar. 1480 Greek Lexicon. 1493 Greek Teaching began at Oxford. 1516 Greek NT printed. HoA P 118.

The R.C. Church had argued that people should simply listen to what the Priests said, and the Priests should use only the Vulgate. But the moral scandals and monetary greed of the R.C. church discredited it, and men like Luther and Zwingli used the Vulgate Bible to show how far the church had departed from Bible truth. Once the NT was available in Greek they, and some R.C. scholars, welcomed the chance to study it.

Pope Leo X, a scholar and Mss collector, suggested that a scholarly version of the Bible be produced by Cardinal Ximenes. This was the Complutensian Polyglot= many languages. In the OT prologue it said they had placed the Latin version of the blessed Jerome between the Synagogue (Hebrew) and Eastern Churches (Greek), like Christ crucified between the thieves! It was printed 1517, but the Pope didn't allow it to be released until 1522 About 600 copies were sold. It was used by KJV Translators, BA P 75 As with the Masoretic Text, preparing a GOOD Text required the obtaining of as many Mss as possible, and by comparing them = Textual Criticism, trying to establish the form of the original text. Cardinal Ximenes was said to have spent 4000 Ducats on purchasing 7 Hebrew Mss, and borrowed others from Venice and the Vatican. SLGr P 50-51, 61.

Froben, a printer, urged Erasmus to complete and publish a Greek Text, as being first to publish would have great financial and reputational gains. Erasmus rushed it through in 1516 The 1519 edition was much better. 3,300 copies of these editions were sold. SLGr P 59-61.

Erasmus was in such a hurry that he used few Mss. Minuscule 2, Copied 15th Century, was used as his text of the Gospels. He used Min 1 for proof-reading. It agrees closely with Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, but puts Jn 7:53-8-11 at end of John's Gospel. Erasmus was suspicious of it as it was a minority in his Mss. DavE P 150 Keny2 P 24-25 Keny3 P 105 For his 1516 First Edition his only Mss of Revelation had the last six verses missing so he translated these from the Vulgate. Keny3 P 156 As a result he put "The BOOK of life," Rev 22:19, where ALL Greek Mss have "the TREE of life." JPLe P 43 JRWhi 64-68 (Yet Ruckman and others claim that [RT] is the only Text not "Corrupted by Romanism!")

The notes Erasmus made alongside his Greek Text shows he wrestled with the same problems faced by Textual Critics today. He wrote "You must distinguish between Scripture, the translation of Scripture, and the transmission of both - otherwise what will you do with the errors of the copyists?" JRWhi P 16. "Granted that the Greek books are just as corrupt as the Latin, but by

collating Mss that are equally corrupt one can often discover the true reading." Mss aren't all corrupt/faulty in the same way.

In Rom 10:17 he chose against the Vulgate "Word of CHRIST," as he said "word of GOD lends more dignity to the words of the Apostle and has a wider application." In Rom 12:11 he chose serving the LORD Kurios against serving the TIME Kairos, noting that Kurios and Kairos are easily confused. KJV translators opted for Kurios, although Stephanas' Texts have Kairos. JRWhi 58-59.

Erasmus said the Vulgate and the parallel passage in Acts 26 moved him to put "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks" in Acts 9:5 as against the vast majority of the Greek Mss. In Acts 9:6 the Vulgate is the source of "And he trembling and astonished said, Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" The [RT] stands alone in reading Eph 1:18 as "the eyes of your understanding" and 39 "the fellowship of his mystery," against all Greek Mss which read "the eyes of your heart," and "the administration of his mystery." Hills, P 208 says of these "Because the TR/([RT]) was God-guided as a whole, it was probable that they were guided in these few passages also." JRWhi P 67, 88

Erasmus died 1536 Robert Estiennes/Stephanas/Stephens, Paris, who had collected Mss of the Vulgate, and edited it, SLGr P 65-66 continued to print and improve Erasmus Greek Text Keny1 P 161. His 3rd edition, 1550 for which he had 15 Mss, used both Erasmus and Complutensian Texts. It has variants in margin from a number of sources, including Codex Bezae. It was very popular in England and was for most the "Received Text" of that day. FFB2 P 225 Estienne's 1551 Edition was printed at Geneva. SLGr P 61-63

Theodore Beza (Calvin's successor at Geneva) continued to refine Estienne's Greek Text, producing 9 Editions 1565-1604 He made little use of Codex Bezae. K&BA P 5-6. He added more variant readings from his Mss. He kept in Lk 2:14 "Goodwill towards men," but noted below "Towards men of goodwill" as alternative. Beza made some conjectural emendations such as Rev 16:5. "which art, and wast, and shall be" - the Greek says "who art and wast O Holy One." - replacing Hosios- Holy One, with Esomenos, without any Mss to support the change. JRWhi P 62-63

Erasmus, Estiennes, and Beza all worked at refining the Greek Text. but the Received Text got its name from "The text received by all/Textus Receptus," title in the 1633 edition published commercially by Elzevir Bros, a Dutch publishing house. They made only minor alterations to Beza's 1565 edition. K&BA P 5-6. (Stephanus 1550 edition continued to be the [RT] in England.) Keny2 P 3. Elzevir's 1624 edition was the [RT] on the Continent. From then onwards Elzevirs continued printing cheap editions of the text, as the Erasmus/Estiennes/Beza text was generally accepted by that date. SLGr P 63-64 Keny1 P 161.

Tyndale and Coverdale used Erasmus Text. Stephanas 1550 Text was available for the Geneva Bible 1557 & 1560 & KJV 1611. Keny3 P 157. John Bois

refers to 4 possible translations from 2 conflicting Mss of 2 Pet 2:11, (a) Auton-Them. (b) E auton- Themselves. JonB P 95

The making of the WESTCOTT & HORT TEXT

The Reformation focussed the eyes of the Godly on the need to go back to the NT word of God, and the [RT] was the result of earnestly collecting and comparing Greek Mss to gain the best possible Greek text. The Council of Trent 1546 anchored the RC church to the Vulgate. The [RT] was a satisfactory base for Protestant Translations. So, although Scholars continued to collect, examine, and compare Mss, work done on the Greek Text was leisurely.

The eager Bible searching and Bible preaching of the Reformation faded and the rise of Agnostic/Atheistic theology had a deadening influence on the study and preaching of God's word. Then the fact that the [RT] was based on Mss written out/copied more than 1000 years after Christ suddenly became important when Renan wrote a rationalistic LIFE OF JESUS in which he claimed we could know nothing certain about Him as the Gospels hadn't been written until about 500 years after His death - according to him. Suddenly the finding of ancient NT Mss was a matter of great concern. If we think of monasteries as places where Bibles were treasured, and that studying and copying them was the main concern, what Tischendorf found would shock us. At one Monastery the key of the library where Bibles were kept had been missing for 10 years. Libraries could be so neglected that they were dust-covered untidy heaps of crumbling books and pages. Few people were interested in reading Greek Mss - The Patriarch of the Coptic church knew only MODERN Greek! GSW P 280282 From the early days Monks were told to use for their devotions "Sayings of the Fathers," which contained Scriptures that neatly fitted asceticism, and little else. **9.

This explains why when Tischendorf visited the Monastery at Mt Sinai in 1844 he saw a large basket full of mouldering Mss used for fire lighting. He was allowed to help himself, to 43 leaves of the LXX OT. His keenness meant the monks realised that Old Mss were valuable, so would sell no more. Tis P 23

Fourteen years later Tischendorf obtained the Authorisation of the Tsar of Russia (as head of the "orthodox" churches) to search for and copy old Mss. In 1859 during his third visit to Sinai he was invited to the cell of the Steward of the monastery. After mentioning that he had been reading the LXX, the steward took a carefully wrapped codex = book, of the Bible off the shelf, and showed it to him. The NT he had not seen before. But the pages of the LXX matched those he had already obtained, and completed the copy of the LXX OT.

Footnote **9 The founder of the great Nitria monastery said it was dangerous to quote the Bible. A HISTORY OF THE EARLY CHURCH, H Lietzman Vol 1V, P 153-154 So it's not surprising that the sayings of St Ephraem were written over a scrubbed out NT Mss - the Ephraem Palimpsest.

They refused to consider selling this "Sinaitic Ms." He got the Superior in Cairo to borrow it, and was allowed to have one page at a time for copying. He suggested the Mss be presented to the Tsar of Russia, as it was later. Finally the Communists sold it to the British Museum for £100000. Keny3 P 76-77, Tis P 26-29, GSW P 289291.

The foreword of Tischendorf's book says "The discovery of the Sinaitic Codex was a rebuff to the Atheists, Agnostics and rationalizing Christian Professors." "The.. discovery .. will neutralize to every unprejudiced mind all the doubts which criticism has been able to raise against the genuineness of St John's Gospel. The testimony from the Convent at Mt Sinai is confirming us still more fully in the certainty of the things in which we've been instructed," Lk 1:4. Tis P 10-13. Godbey a USA Translator claimed God in His mercy had hidden the Sinaiticus Ms away to "preserve the bright light of the Apostolic Age before it suffered the sad eclipse of apostasy." BTM(Tech) Jan 1988 P 105 **10.

At the Conference of the Evangelical Church of Germany 1864 Tischendorf was asked to comment on the Rationalist Renan's LIFE OF JESUS. His lecture was appreciated as showing Renan's distortion of the realities of early church history, and showed the credibility of the Gospels and their witness. The Religious Tract Society, Zwickau asked him to publish the result of his Textual study of NT including the Sinaitic Codex. Tis P 15-16. **11.

As more Greek Mss became available it was obvious the [RT] text wasn't the best possible. 1734 Bengel published an edition of [RT] using Codex A. He divided Mss into African (Alexandrian) & Asiatic (Byzantine.) regarding the later of less value, though more numerous. K&BA P 8, Keny3 P 160 Wesley and Zinzendorf "The father of modern missions," used Bengel's text in their translations.

Footnote **10 This Sinaitic Mss was written by at least three different scribes. It wasn't carefully written, and has a large number of corrections by different hands. (indicating it was well used?) It was corrected in the 7th century to make it closer to the Byzantine Text. Keny2 P 10-11, Keny3 P 79, 195 JRWhi P 33 The Vatican Text was copied by 2 Scribes for OT - a different one for NT. It's generally carefully written, but has some obvious slips. It was corrected by a 4th Scribe soon after it was written, and later by another. The letters are Coptic style so likely to be Egyptian. It has lost the Pastoral Ep, Philemon & Revelation. FGBr P 171. It was used in Pope Sixtus V's authorised LXX 1587. First Protestant access, Tischendorf, 1866 allowed 42 hours to check against other Mss. He published his attempt at reproducing it in 1867. An RC authorised publication was made in 1899. Keny3 P 85-87.

Footnote **11 That the NT was written early is demonstrated by the fact that Clement AD 95 in his Epistle quotes from Romans, 1 Corinthians and Hebrews. FFB2 P 181. The Ryland Papyrus Ms of Jn 1831-33 37-38 is dated about AD 125-140 within 50 years of the traditional date AD 90 for John's original writing. All four Gospels were well enough known for Tatian to make a harmony of them in AD 170-180. Keny3 P 113. Part of his was found in the ruins of Dura Europas destroyed in 250AD. Keny 3 P 115, DaveE P 121, 143

1831 Lachman produced a "Critical" text based on his theory that the OLDEST Mss were automatically the best. Tischendorf collected Mss and issued texts. Quite independently Tregelles tried to develop an Improved Greek text, based on the age of various READINGS rather than age of the Ms. He relied "On the authority of the ancient copies without allowing [RT] any prescriptive rights." Published parts of his 1857-1872 tBA P 75-76, K&BA P 10-11, Keny3 P 162-164

While variations between Mss written within 300 years of Christ's death embarrassed Christians, it proved (against the claims of Agnostics and Bible critics) that the Originals must have been written a long time earlier to allow for the changes to creep in during the process of copying. The finds stimulated interest in studying the NT by Liberal and Conservative scholars alike. As they were eager to restore church life to that of the NT, among the latter were the "Early Brethren" S P Tregelles, J N Darby, who used the new-found Mss in his translation, T Newberry, in his ENGLISHMAN'S BIBLE - KJV set out with aids to give the sense of the original Hebrew & Greek, and C E Stuart author of TEXTUAL CRITICISMFOR ENGLISH STUDENTS. (Bagster) Newberry Large Type Bible P XXII.

Others argued that the oldest Mss were inferior texts, too corrupt to be usable, so survived because not worn out by use. And, as the [RT] was based on the greatest number of Greek Mss it should remain the standard, but be adjusted to new material. In 1884 Dr Scrivener published an [RT] with more than 250 changes from the Stephanas 1550 [RT] available for the KJV. JayG NT Pref.

Dean Burgon argued that the Byzantine Text on which the [RT] was based must be correct as it reflected "the deliberate judgment of the Church." He said that only in a few places it needed revising. Eg Raising the Dead wasn't part of the Lord's commission in Mt 10:8. He complained that the RV retained it because it was found in the "corrupt Early Mss." THE REVISION REVISED J W Burgon 1883 P 107-108 JRWhi P 91, FFB2 P 187, Keny2 P 7-8. **12.

Westcott & Hort classed the Early Mss, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, as NEUTRAL= original, unmodified text, because of their brevity, and simplicity; having been copied fewer times; and all Translations and quotations before 350 AD came from such texts. They published the final form of their NT Greek Text in 1881 Keny2 P 6-7. tBA P 76 They took a lead in the NT Committee producing the RV, and although the [RT] was considered at each point, and defended by another learned textual critic, Dr Scrivener, Hort usually won the vote of the 2/3rds of the Committee needed to change the text. FFB1 P 138-139, Keny1 P 312 Hort wasn't followed in 200 cases. Where Tregelles differed from Hort each was followed half the time. BTM (Tech) Jan 1988 P 105 Hort was confident that the discovery of further Mss would prove W&H Text right. Burgon that they would prove [RT] right. But almost no finds have supported Hort's Neutral Text, or the claim that the Byzantine/ [RT] text is ancient. Keny2 P 67, FFB2 P 233

Footnote **12 Criticisms of RV, and W&H are generally quotes from Burgon. The persistent slaughter of Bible-Believers down through the centuries makes his view that "The

voice of Catholic antiquity," required us to use the [RT] so as to stay in step with the historic pre-reformation church, unconvincing.

MANUSCRIPTS, READINGS, TEXTS, & TEXTUAL CRITICISM

MANUSCRIPTS, being hand-written, are never identical. READINGS are the different ways in which verses read in different Mss. Eg In many Mss Jn 1:18 reads "The only begotten SON," The Sinaitic, Vatican and some other Mss read "The only begotten GOD," TEXTUAL CRITICISM is the process of comparing different readings like these and trying to determine which is the original TEXT, or closest to it. Textual criticism is needed whenever more than 1 Ms of Scripture is available. When you have ONE clock you can be sure of the time. When you have more than one you lose that sureness, and gain a different, more solid sureness, as no clock is a perfect timekeeper. The same is true of Bible Mss. (and Bible Versions.) (Before radio was invented Ships carried 3 Chronometers= accurate clocks. As soon as one clock was out of step, they adjusted it to the other two. By doing that they could be sure of the correct time and so could calculate their position accurately.)

The [RT] was the result of 100 years of TEXTUAL CRITICISM using perhaps as many as 30 Mss. This left most of the NT TEXT certain, although KJV translators put 37 alternative Greek readings in the margin. (See Footnote **8)

Today there are so many Mss that while disputed passages have been checked in them all, it has not yet been possible to give due weight to the testimony of all, over the whole NT. K&BA P 35 Of the oldest, the Papyrus Mss, only 1 was available for the W&H Text - there are now 93 They had 64 Uncials - there are now 257. We have now 2795 Minuscules, most of which weren't available to W&H. With so many "clocks" most of the text is so much more certain, but some uncertainties remain. K&Ba P 13, DavE P 2425

It seems impossible for copying to be 100% accurate, although some scribes worked very carefully, so each Ms is at least slightly different. And the next scribe would copy that mistake. Eg The scribe employed by Erasmus to copy the Greek Ms of his friend Reuchlin in Rev 17:4, mis-spelled Akatharta as Akathartetos - a word which doesn't exist in Greek, but is still in the modern [RT]. JRWhi P 64-66

The Lord could have provided ONE perfect Preacher for each generation, but He has chosen to use the imperfect witness of ALL His children. He is interested in developing Christ-likeness and sonship service. He could have preserved ONE perfect TEXT of Scripture, but He chose to leave the stewardship of Holy Scripture to many imperfect scribes, textual critics, and translators.

To MAKE SENSE of what's written, is I believe the FIRST RULE for a Copier OR Teacher, but anything not plain in the TEXT should be presented as tentative. The Scribes who copied Bible Mss were, like its preachers, individuals, each with God-given skills, and human imperfections and

viewpoints. They could never be quite sure that any problem in the Ms they were copying from wasn't a mistake which they should correct. That it was the WORD OF GOD made them careful, but didn't solve the problem. One solution, was to leave a blank to be filled in later if they became convinced that the doubtful piece WAS Scripture.

Another was to write it in the text marked off with asterisks etc, or put it in the margin. Later scribes might copy them into the main text. K&Ba P 275 DavE P 161. **13.

When copying from dictation, words that sounded alike were a problem. Copying from Mss, words that looked alike were a problem, particularly if written untidily or faded. So some Mss of Rev 1:5 read Lousanti= washed us. Others Lusanti= Freed us. Both are equally true statements. The [RT] has Spilos-Defiling Spots in 2 Pet 2:13, Spilas- a rocky reef dangerous to ships, in Jude 12. KJV assumes Spilas was a scribe's mis-spelling, and translates as SPOTS in both places.

If the scribe was tired, slips were more likely, omitting a line where two lines started with the same word, writing a line twice, etc. If these made nonsense a later scribe might make a guess that makes sense. (Even PRINTED texts have errors Eg an early KJV had Ps 119:161 as PRINTERS have persecuted, and the printer who left the NOT out so Bibles read "Thou shalt commit adultery" was fined heavily. FFB2 P 177. A scribe might write familiar words - but they may come from the account written in another Gospel. Eg Mt 11:19 KJV has "Wisdom is justified of her CHILDREN," as in Lk 7:35 RV has "of her WORKS" as that is in the earlier Mss. K&Ba P 69, Keny1 P 51. (Of course the CHILDREN Wisdom produces ARE the WORKS done by those who listened to Wisdom and obeyed it.) Papyrus or Vellum were expensive, and copying was a slow process so Mss were corrected, rather than replaced.

REASONS WHY a SCRIBE MIGHT ADD to a Ms

Reverence for the Scriptures protected the text from casual alterations, but a scribe might think the text inadequate, and that something might have been omitted, IF THE FORM IN WHICH HE FOUND THE TEXT seemed to him to be:-

1. INCOMPLETE and could be completed by ADDING FROM PARALLEL SCRIPTURES. This is most obvious in the Gospels. In a church which had only ONE Gospel, additional material from other Gospels was helpful. A scribe in copying the record of a miracle, parable etc in Mark, realising that something is left out that's known through, say Luke, wrote it in. He is neither right, nor wrong, but the purpose of the writer may be obscured by a change of emphasis. There's little point in working mechanically through lists, but where you meet this type of addition/ omission it's well worthwhile meditating on the gain or loss to the impact of the passage.

Footnote **13 The Scribe who wrote the Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll left blanks. These have been filled in by a different scribe, presumably the supervising scribe, and from their best Mss. These filled in sections are closer to the Masoretic Text.

That we have Redemption through His Blood is stated clearly in Eph 1:7 in all Mss. Most Mss, don't have it in Col 1:14, But from 9th Cent on it's in some Byzantine Mss. JRWhi P 162-3. If one had Colossians, but not Ephesians the addition was valuable, whether the scribe adding it believed it had been omitted from Col 1:14 or not. (It seems that God wanted Paul to have a different emphasis in Col from Eph.) When everyone can own a whole Bible this enriching of one book with material from another is no longer needed, but a believer today may be disappointed if he finds it missing from Col 1:14, so NIV puts it as an extra at the bottom of the page.

A similar change is when material is repeated within a passage. As we move from older Mss down through the years Mss of Mk 9 appear with "Where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched," three times, though the older Mss have it only once. Mss of Rom 16 suddenly appear that repeat the second half of verse 20 after vs 24. Similarly Mss of 1 Jn 5:13 appear that repeat the words "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." Rev 1:11 [RT] KJV add a repeat from 1:8 of "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last," made in very few Mss. JRWhi P 185 The Words added or repeated may make the message more emphatic, or may obscure the intended meaning.

2a. UNCLEAR - so EXPLANATORY MATERIAL added. In Rev 1:8 older Mss stop at Omega. Later ones have "The Beginning and the End." This would make the meaning clear if the expression "Alpha and Omega" was no longer in common use. These "Improvements" are sometimes useful to the reader. As time went on Mss of Lk 4:18 appear with the addition of "to heal the broken hearted." The Lord did do that, and by omitting that the NIV translators are not denying He did. But as the words aren't in Isaiah today, it's not likely that He read them to the Synagogue, and the earlier Mss don't have them.

The addition of the explanatory section of John 5 verses 3 and 4 would have been appreciated in an age when there were many pious stories of angels, saints, and miracle-working holy places. Today it stands out as different from anything Scripture records God or angels doing. For me it creates more problems than it solves. That the earlier Mss don't have it, is a relief. As it's similar to many apocryphal "Magical miracles" it may have been an explanation put in the margin that was later copied into the text.

2b. UNCLEAR - so MAKING EXPLICIT TRUTHS THAT ARE IMPLICIT IN EARLIER Mss. This again seems right and natural to me, especially when the passing of time and the changing of language makes the implied truth less definite. (It's like outlining figures or re-tinting them, in a fading picture, and the risks are similar.) Mt 21:12 [Nes] NASB, NIV have TEMPLE, [RT] KJV has TEMPLE OF GOD. KJV makes it more explicit, but there was no other Temple

at Jerusalem. JRWhi P 166 Jn 6:47 He that believeth ON ME hath everlasting life," NIV, NASB follow the earlier Mss and omit ON ME, as it's perfectly clear from 6:35, 40 that Christ is meant. Yet D A Waite in DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE P 158 claims NIV/NASB could refer to believing in anything (Santa Claus, Easter Bunny and/or any false religion) and still have everlasting life. "KJV also has simply BELIEVE TH in Mk 9:23; Rom 1:16; 10:4 making nonsense of his accusation. JRWhi P 170-173.

3. INSUFFICIENTLY REVERENT. Many of us shrink from talking about JESUS without adding LORD, and/or CHRIST. As the years passed reverent scribes added more titles to many Scriptures. K&BA P 285 Occasionally this is unhelpful if a particular Scripture says simply "Jesus" to emphasis the Lord's humanity, as in "Thy holy CHILD/servant Jesus," Acts 4:27 which emphasises the POSITION of weakness to which He humbled Himself. We lose part of the point of such passages if we give the Lord His full rank and title on every occasion.

4. DOCTRINALLY WEAK or WRONG. The filling out of Rom 8:1 with "Who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit," from 8:4 makes 8:1 a challenge to Godly living, which agreed with the Church's shift in emphasis away from the Gospel of Grace. But 8:1 is intended as an absolute declaration of the triumph of Grace - there are plenty of challenges to Godly living later in the chapter where they belong.

In 1 Cor 15:51 "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." Vaticanus, Byzantine Text, Peshitta, Coptic - ALL refers to ALL Believers. But those who thought ALL referred to ALL PEOPLE, INCLUDING THE GODLESS altered it to "We shall all sleep but shall not all be changed." Sinaitic + Alexandrinus, Ephraem. "We shall all be raised, but we shall not all be changed." Western Text and Old Latin versions. "We shall not all sleep, and we shall not all be changed." Lister Papyrus. DavE 160 There's no deliberate heresy involved in such variation - merely the kind of struggles honest preachers still have in trying to reconcile Scriptures which seem inconsistent to them.

CORRUPT TEXTS? As no two Mss are identical, and none free from mistakes, all Mss are in that sense CORRUPT. The EARLIEST Mss are the ones that vary most, and there are two reasons for this. The physical reason is that until state persecution of Christians ceased, they were generally poor. So a church borrowed any part of NT from a neighbouring church, and copied it rapidly under difficulties with no chance of comparing their source text with other copies, so local forms of the text developed with distinctive features. Big churches were likely to have the best collection of NT Mss, but during persecution they would be the first to be raided and their Scriptures burned. Mss of poor quality in obscure places were more likely to survive. Keny2 P 2, 76, FFB2 P 177.

The Spiritual reason is that the Apostles had proclaimed the message of the Gospels in varying words - even the written forms vary. Paul had proclaimed the Gospel in varying words - Romans isn't exactly Galatians. Or Ephesians,

Colossians. As Jn 20:30-31; 21:25 says many TRUE stories of the Lord's deeds and words that didn't find their way into the 4 Gospels were in circulation. The evidence suggests that for the first 100 years getting the message across so as to be understood was thought more important than always expressing it in the same words.

The text was viewed as open to expansion and explanation. K&BA P 51, 75. It took 200 years to form and define the canon, JayG NT Pref. It's not surprising if the text was viewed as less than set in concrete. The NT books were at first used separately - a church might have only 1 Gospel, etc. K&BA P 48 Paul's letters seem to have been the first to be put together in one codex. The oldest surviving is Papyrus 46 approx 200AD. By then the 4 Gospels were also being bound together, but our oldest, Papyrus 45, is from the 4th Century. The "General Epistles" were also grouped by 4th century. K&BA P 48-49. We now have 215 Mss for the whole four Gospels; 717 for Paul's Epistles; 61 for Acts + Catholic/General/Jewish Ep; 279 for Revelation. We have EARLY PAPER for all except 1 & 2 Tim, 2 & 3 John. K&BA 83-85

Manuscript FAMILIES - TEXTS

Once large numbers of Mss became available it made sense to sort into FAMILIES those with similar readings. (They have the same readings because their ancestry goes back to a change made by some scribe. Eg the "Ferrar family" (a sub-family of the huge Byzantine Family) of about 10 Mss from the 12th Century onward put Jn 7:53-8:11 after Lk 21:38 DavE 143, Keny2 P 22-23, Keny3 P 105-106) Comparing Mss within the family shows up slips, and makes it possible to trace changes back to the earlier members where it first occurred. IF the problem/suspected corruption is still there in the oldest of the family, it can be compared with the oldest members of other families. Only very rarely is the original left uncertain. FFB2 P 179-180 (I've ignored lesser possible families such as the Caesarean. Many Mss aren't exclusively loyal to one family or the other - Codex Alexandrinus has Byzantine in Gospels, Alexandrian elsewhere. JRWhi P 45 50 And most of the text is common to ALL families.)

ALEXANDRIAN FAMILY Greek Mss originating in Egypt, Alexandria being its great city. (Also called the Hesychian Text as Hesychius, martyred under Diocletian, is supposed to have edited it.) In them Mark ends at 16:8. The Sinaiticus and Vaticanus Mss etc belong to a small group of these which W&H called the NEUTRAL text, believing they represented an uncorrupted text. No one now accepts W&H claim, as the more ancient Papyrus Texts now available show that they are merely ONE form of the variety of texts in the Alexandrian family. As they differ considerably, any common ancestry was in the 3rd Century - older than any other Text, except possibly the Western Text. FFB2 P 188 DavE 159, Keny2 P 68 The great majority of the Coptic Texts support the Alexandrian. Most of the oldest Mss are ALEXANDRIAN, as its deserts preserve Mss, or Diocletian's burning may have been less efficient in Egypt.

We're shocked to find the OT Apocrypha in a Bible, though all early KJV Bibles included it, as did the LXX. We wouldn't think of including even well-

loved books such as Pilgrim's Progress. However, early Alexandrian Mss often include the Apocrypha, and one or two writings popular with the monks of the early 4th century. Eg the Epistles of Barnabas, and Clement, Shepherd of Hermas, Psalms of Solomon, and writings of Eusebius & Athanasius. tBA P 73, Keny3 P 83 (Just as we're shocked to find that the Byzantine Text Aramaic Peshitta EXCLUDED, II Peter II John, III John and Revelation until AD 505 FGBr P 179.)

Most early Greek Fathers quote from Alexandrian Text. DavE P 159. Athanasius of Alexandria wrote "If all Mss were lost, the text could be reconstructed from patristic quotes." DavE 156-7. Quotes are useful, but either Origen quoted from different texts, or his quotes were erratic. More recently Jeremy Taylor's writings quote "Except a Man be Born Again he cannot see the kingdom of God," 9 times IN 8 DIFFERENT FORMS. Keny1 P 59. Egypt had its share of heretics, but Athanasius, who led the attack on the Arian heresy, was Bishop of Alexandria, then Egypt's capital city.

WESTERN FAMILY - Called Western because it's associated with North Africa, and South Italy. (West of Alexandria, Greece, and Syria.) It's the basis of the Old Latin, and Syriac, translations about AD 150. The latter were replaced by the Peshitta which corrected it to the "Byzantine" Text, before the end of 5th century when Nestorians and Jacobites split. FFB2 P 194. In Western Mss the order of the Gospels is Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, and Aquilla is always listed before Priscilla. They often have both the long and short endings to Mark, and add to Lk 23:53 "20 Men could not move the stone." DavE P 160.

These Mss were written rather carelessly, and often have additions not common to each other, or to Mss from other groups. Eg after Lk 6:4, "The same day beholding a certain man working on the Sabbath He said to him "Man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, blessed art thou. But if thou knowest not, accursed art thou and a transgressor of the law." FFB2 P 186, Keny3 P 89-90 (OR they were written before it was clear just which of the Lord's remembered sayings weren't to be permanently recorded.) The Latin and Syrian Fathers usually quote from the Western Text. DavE 160, Keny2 P 71. Another indication that it's an early text is that in Acts Aramaicisms are more common than in other texts. FFB2 P 188.

BYZANTINE FAMILY Also called Syrian, Antiochean, Ecclesiastical, Koine, or Lucianic TEXT. (Lucian, martyred under Diocletian, is supposed to have edited it.) During Diocletian's persecution churches were demolished and scriptures burned. When Constantine favoured Christianity there was a great demand for copies of the Scriptures. Antioch supplied Bishops and Scriptures to most of the Eastern Roman Empire. K&BA P 58.

The Alexandrian and Western Texts are important because they are ancient, and so closer in time to the originals. The Byzantine Text as a whole isn't ancient. From the first 700 years of the Church, Byzantine Texts make up only about 30 Greek Mss out of 160, and none are from the first 300 years. JRWhi P 151-153. Its Text isn't quoted by any of the Fathers before Chrysostom, 347-407.

AD, and isn't the text from which any of the ancient versions were made in the first 3 centuries. (ie its distinctive readings aren't found in them.) FFB2 P 187. But the fact that 90% of Greek Mss are Byzantine makes it important.

When Christianity became the state religion Mss could be gathered and by comparing them (Textual Criticism) used to establish a standardised authoritative Text. In doing this the Byzantine text conflates (puts together) variant readings - where Alexandrian and Western differ it may put in both readings.

And it replaces difficult readings with easier ones- eg Aramaic-ism Mt 6:1 "Do your RIGHTEOUSNESS before men" becomes "ALMS." DavE 158 FFB2 P 187. This process continued from the earliest form seen in Chrysostom, and in a 4th Century Antiochene commentary. K1 revision 8th Century. Kx 10th Century. Kr revision for liturgical purposes in 12th Century. These increasingly smoothed away roughnesses, assimilated parallel passages, etc. Keny2 P 65-67.

This made it FULLER than the earlier texts, and more carefully edited/corrected, (and so it was ideal for first translations into English, etc.) Once standardised, copies could be checked carefully, and conformity to the "Authorised Text" enforced by law, just as doctrines were. (The Greek Orthodox church also slaughtered the Paulician Believers to enforce Icons as part of the standardised form of worship.) While the great majority of the Greek Mss support the Byzantine text (as the great majority of the LATIN Texts support the Vulgate) we must bear in mind that the Mss from which the [RT] was formed had been copied for 1000 years, by churches which consistently persecuted those who preached the Gospel, so the changes made over the years are not necessarily God-honouring.

It seems God ensured a rapid initial spread of NT, through 250 years of persecution and scattering of God's people, and so ensured that no central religious authority or Dictator was able to enforce their views/convictions on the preserved Text. By the time the Church became powerful P66, P75, etc were buried in the sands of Egypt, and the fact that their text is nearly identical with the most Byzantine Text of 1000 yrs later demonstrates that God has, in His Own way, guaranteed that our NT is close to the Original Text. JRWhi P 47-48 God so over-ruled that only in a few NT verses is the text uncertain, and no doctrine is uncertain.

While the standardising of the Greek Text by the Orthodox Church has been useful, it was associated with the restriction on spontaneous witness and worship, and the setting up of formalised "services" endlessly repeated at set hours. The Bible itself became something to be chanted in correct form - the beauty of the words, and the correctness (In Greek or Latin) and the more often it was recited giving it value, whether it was understood or not. The earlier, less standardised Texts, were partly the result of attempts to use words or expressions that made the truth more clear.

So the Prayer the Lord gave to the Disciples, AS A PATTERN on which they could model their own praying, had added to it THINE IS THE KINGDOM, etc making it suitable for constant collective repetition. It's not in OLD Greek or OLD Vulgate Mss, or the early Fathers. EAN P 91-92 When it appears it comes in a variety of forms - Parts are missing in some Mss and others have also "of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." Such "clusters of readings," are typical of additions to the original text. JRWhi P 252

In Rev 1:6 all the older Mss say God made us A KINGDOM and Priests. (serving an invisible as yet, but coming to reign KING.) [RT] KJV (following 8 late Mss of the Byzantine Text. JRWhi 87) have KINGS, for Kingdom, as by then the Church saw itself as exercising authority for Christ/King Jesus in this world, rather than as a Kingdom. Instead of living a normal life in a Christ-like way, through contact with Eastern religions and Manichean teaching the life of a Hermit or a Monk was accepted as the ideal of Holy Living. So to Prayer, as fellowship with God keeping us in tune with His will in the ordinary life of this world, Mk 9:29, Acts 10:30, 1 Cor 7:5 has FASTING added - suggesting fellowship with God requires withdrawing from ordinary life and its normal pleasures - food, marriage, family.

W&H rather despised the Byzantine Text. But as the editors of the Nestle Text say, although the Byzantine Text didn't exist as such until the 5th Century, some distinctive Byzantine readings have been found in ancient Papyrus Mss. So, the Lucian-Byzantine & Hesychian-Alexandrian Textual Traditions have equal authority from the point of view of Age, Uniformity and defence against pollution (from the Gnostic heresies in Egypt, And the Arian heresies in Syria.) K&BA P 59.

Most Greek Mss follow the Byzantine Text, as, long before Christianity had become legal, the universal speaking of Greek throughout the Roman Empire had faded, and Latin, Coptic, and Syriac were the languages used by the Church in the West, South, and East. The total number of Mss in those languages is comparable to the Byzantine Total. Vulgate & Peshitta are as old as any known Byzantine Mss. These ancient versions are a witness to the ancient Text of the NT. Our faith doesn't rest on a single tradition. [RT] & [Nes] agree 98% of the time. Phil 1:14 [Nes] uses a uniquely Byzantine Reading that's found in an ancient Papyrus. It isn't any longer a case of Modern scholars being against Byzantine Text. JRWhi P 153

ALL ancient Mss differ from the [RT] by being shorter. Hence the accusation that they leave out much of God's Word. The later Mss may be accused of adding to it. Eg Newberry on Mk 12:29-31 gives Sinaitic Ms as JESUS ANSWERED, HEAR, O ISRAEL; THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE LORD. AND THOU SHALT LOVE THE LORD THY GOD WITH ALL THY HEART, AND WITH ALL THY SOUL, AND WITH ALL THY MIND, AND WITH ALL THY STRENGTH. THE SECOND IS THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOUR AS

THYSE LF. THERE IS NONE OTHER COMMANDMENT GREATER THAN THESE . This is shorter than [RT] KJV but without leaving any truth out.

It's easy to rate a Ms or version as GOOD, because it says what WE WANT IT TO SAY, but the things of God require transparent honesty. Acts 8:37 has insufficient support from the Mss for me to rely on it heavily. It's the correct Biblical answer to the Ethiopian's question, even if a Scribe added it later. But I must teach Believer's Baptism from other Scriptures as well. We miss these neatly packaged "proof texts." Their very neatness distinguishes them from most genuine Scripture which requires us to spend time grasping the whole context, and weight, of a larger passage.

RULES used in TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

1. The NT was written in GREEK . Only ONE reading can be original. Almost always the original can be discovered, but sometimes one must choose between equally supported variants. Ancient translations, or quotes can point to the correct reading. K&BA P 275

2. The OLDER Mss are closer in time to the original, and should be closer to it, but only if the Ms copied from was better, and the Scribe was skilled and careful. A Mss from 200AD, has been copied fewer times than one from 1500 AD, and so had fewer chances to be copied wrongly. JRWhi P 154. The older shorter Mss is likely to be closer to the original as Scribes add more often than they omit, but it's not valid for Mss that show a tendency to omit or expand. It's not, as W&H assumed, a simple accretion of errors with each copying. tBA P 74, K&BA P 275 A 13th century Mss MAY have been copied from a 5th century one. FFB2 P 184.

3. More difficult readings are likely to be closer to the original as Scribes tend to smooth and simplify, but the difficulty may be caused by a careless scribe. K&BA P 275 Keny1 P 57.

4. The original reading will fit the sense of passage. Present view of scholars is that such internal evidence should carry more weight than text types. tBA P 76. The reading that fits the writer's style and vocabulary is more likely to be original. DavE 161. Others caution that the internal criteria - context, style, vocab, theological environment of the author, etc - are judged subjectively so can never be the sole basis for a decision K&BA P 275 In Jn 19:29, it's hard to imagine a branch of Hyssop (Hyssopos) long enough to reach up to the mouth of a man on a cross, so it's been guessed that it was a soldier's Javelin (Hyssos) that was used. A Mss has been found with Hyssos in it, but as it's a late Mss the reading is unlikely to be the original.

5. Texts are WEIGHED, (Their age, and general accuracy etc considered) not just COUNTED. DavE 161. Readings supported by 2 FAMILIES of texts are surer than by 1 numerous family. Keny1 P 57. One must not simply opt for this Text or Mss against that. Each passage is a separate matter. K&BA P 275

INFERIOR/SUPERIOR Mss. As a proof that The NT was written soon after Christ, the Sinaitic, and Vatican Mss are superior to those used by Erasmus, and they are closer to the original NT in TIME. Whether closer in wording is arguable. As giving the fullest possible text of the NT, the Byzantine Mss are clearly superior, in the sense that the Amplified NT is superior to KJV, NIV etc.

MODERN TEXTS

To damn the early Mss and Modern translations by associating them with Origen etc makes no sense. All "Church Fathers" seem to have taught Baptismal regeneration, and the best of them taught things that would shock us. To damn Texts and Mss by associating them with the Papal church makes no sense. God's Grace and His Word generated members of His true church in all ages, but ALL Mss came to us through 1200yrs of copying by members of Corrupt, Superstitious churches. The only difference between "Latin Romanists" and "Greek Orthodox" was that the latter were the more successful Persecutors of Bible-Believers/obeyers, and so no "Reformation" occurred among them.

To refight old battles is pointless. No-one who faces the facts today supports either [RT] or W&H T. Dr Ruckman etc say that the Stephanas 1550 Text is the [RT], but Jay Green in his NT preface says his KJ II version is based on the [RT], and then after making the usual wild accusations against everyone who doesn't stick to the [RT] admits he uses the Modern [RT] published by the Trinitarian Bible Society. (Is any other [RT] available today?) He then lists the more than 250 places where it was changed by Dr Scrivener in 1894

Ruckman and other "KJV Only" Christians insist that the [RT] is the same as the Majority Text, [MT], and so is supported by 95% of the Greek Mss. Jay Green says this, and then lists approximately 1,800 changes (+ 350 alternate texts) needed to correct Scrivener's [RT] to make it the same as the Majority Text - Eg Lk 17:36 The [MT] omits "Two men shall be together in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left," [RT] KJV took it from Vulgate. JRWhi P 68 [MT] Rev 5:14 omits [RT] "Him that liveth for ever, and ever," found in only 3 Mss two of which seem to have been copied from the Text of Erasmus. Those two are also the only Greek Mss that support "King of saints" in Rev 15:3 - It's either "King of the ages," NIV; or "King of the nations," NASB. [MT] omits Acts 9:6 "And he trembling and astonished said Lord what wilt thou have me to do, and the Lord said unto him" as it's not in any Greek Mss - again it came from Vulgate. JayG P 939946 JPLe P 4243 JRWhi 6468)

In the same way Ruckman etc say the [Nes] text is the same as the W&H Text, but they also differ at least as often as the [RT] and [MT] do. History has proved that W&H, and Burgon were equally right, and equally wrong. The oldest 93 Mss (On Papyrus) found since 1881 agree with W&H's Text, and Burgon's [RT] about equally often. Keny3 P 189 The personal life and beliefs of W&H is no more relevant to [Nes] than that of Erasmus is to [RT.]

1898Eberhard Nestle published his Greek Text, drawn from the Greek Texts of Tischendorf, W&H, and Weiss. It trimmed off excesses due to too much reliance on Sinaiticus & Vaticanus. K&BA P 195 Keny1 P 183 1927Erwin Nestle, added much wider sourced material- From Greek Mss, Versions, Fathers' quotations. K&BA P 201950 Kurt Aland, took up the task of continuing to research the mass of Mss now available and use them to improve the Text.

1955On the initiative of E A Nida, the American Bible Society decided to form a new STANDARD TEXT as the basis for Easily Understood Translations. This GOOD NEWS TEXT was developed separately though Aland was on GNT Committee, along with reps of Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox churches. This and the [Nes] have become essentially the one text. Good News/TEV is based on it.

Today some Scholars and Translators use [MT] saying the reading given in the majority of Mss is likely to be the original one. This ignores the AGE of the Mss, and the fact that at least half of the Christian church were already using Latin, Syriac, Coptic etc BEFORE the majority of the Greek Mss were written, and there are as many of their Mss as there are Greek ones. JRWhi P 151. In USA [RT]/[MT] translations dominated in 1986

Most scholars and Translators use an "Eclectic" approach = Try to take into account the readings given in ALL types of Greek Mss, giving each its due weight - [Nes] is that type of Text. JRWhi P 151. Although a FINAL truly Eclectic text isn't yet possible as there are so many Mss now to be considered. K&BA P 2425 33 DavE 160 Like KJV, NIV translators do not say what text they followed, simply that they made use of ALL available material - [MT] / [Nes] / [RT].

To say [RT] KJV is totally different in character from [Nes] NIV etc is dishonest as they are the result of the same process of using available Mss and skills by Textual critics/Translators. The thing that has impressed me most about modern translators is the honest concern and care of ALL of them to establish the text and translate it accurately. Eg E A Nida - a Methodist, often accused of being a Modernist - says bluntly on 1 Cor 14:34 "women keep silence in the churches," that it isn't what people want to hear, but it's there in the text and it must be translated without any hint being given that it isn't to be obeyed.

ANCIENT TRANSLATIONS - GREEK OT

Jews in Israel and Babylon continued to speak Aramaic, so could understand Hebrew. Those in Greek speaking areas couldn't, so Greek translations of the OT appear about 300BC. tBA P 71. There were almost 1 million Jews in Egypt, where the LXX translation was made. A story claiming it was made by 6 Rabbis from each of the 12 tribes segregated for 72 days producing identical Translations was made up to support the use of LXX. DavE P 104 FFB2P 146147.

As Newberry noted in the margin of his study Bible, OT quotes in the NT are usually from the LXX. Heb 1:6 Quotes LXX Deu 3243 missing from Masoretic

Text and KJV, but it's in a Hebrew Dead Sea Scroll. Sometimes NT quotes follow the Masoretic Text, but some are different from both. This makes it clear that God's promise to preserve His Word means that He preserves it in varied word forms, not in a single stereotype, static form. FFB2 P 154 (Quotes in early Christian writings show the LXX was widely used in the early church.)

The Pharisees never accepted as God's Word the OT in any language but Hebrew. (Muslims say the only true Koran is the original Arabic.) As LXX became the OT for Christians, few of whom could read Hebrew, the Jews lost interest in it, and rejected it. FFB2 P 151, FGBr P 183, DavE P 107. Other Greek OT translations were made by Aquila, a Jew, AD 170 and soon after by Ebionite/Law-keeping Jewish Christians Theodotion and Symmachus. Origen's Hexapla was a huge effort setting them and the Hebrew text out in six columns. It was used by Jerome in translating the Vulgate. A few fragments only remain today. FGBr P 183 The KJV Translators praise it and the Vulgate, NTR P XVII.

The LXX is a good translation in the Pentateuch, but careless elsewhere. Daniel is very poorly done. It's shorter in Jeremiah, and adds Psalms, some of which are in the Dead Sea scrolls. FGBr P 157. The order of Books in our OT follows the LXX, and it was the old Hebrew order, as the overlap between 2Chr and Ezra shows that Ezra used to follow Kings. Alongside the OT the LXX has the Apocrypha, a record of Jewish History from the time of the Maccabean revolt, and some of the collections of wise sayings, prophetic/apocalyptic books, and devotional tales written by Jews in the years between Malachi and Christ. Bel & the Dragon, etc are fairy tales and Protestants generally follow the Masoretic Hebrew text and rightly reject them. Although there is little difference in the spiritual quality of Esther, and 1 Maccabees the wisdom and Divine guidance shown in excluding from the Canon the Apocrypha in general, is obvious from even a casual reading of it. But Bunyan made a useful point when he wrote that a verse from it "Look at the generations of old and see, did ever any trust in the Lord and was confounded," was a great comfort, and rightly so "as this sentence was the sum and substance of many of the promises." FFB2 P 163

ARAMAIC/SYRIAN etc

Paul addressed the Jerusalem mob in Hebrew/Aramaic, Acts 22, and it was used by the Jerusalem Apostles and those who evangelised Jews and Parthians. But the oldest WRITTEN Aramaic NT's seem to have been translated from the Alexandrian, or Western texts. And Tatian's Diatessaron (Harmony of the 4 Gospels) using mostly these texts appeared in AD 170. In Syriac it was the Standard version for the Assyrian Church until early 5th Century. From then on they used the Peshitta translated by/under Rabulla, Bishop of Edessa AD 435. It's close to the Byzantine text but omitted II Peter, II & III John, Jude, and Revelation until AD 505. FGBr P 179. There are 350 Mss of the Peshitta. The oldest Mss in Armenian & Georgian seem to be from a

Caesarean (Alexandrian type) text, corrected from the Byzantine text in later Mss. FFB2 P 212-16.

The use of Coptic language goes back to the writings of Athanasius. The oldest Coptic NT Mss may be from 4th Cent. The 200 Coptic Mss, in Bohairic and Sahidic forms, follow the Alexandrian Greek Text. K&BA 193 DavE P 169 Keny1 P 233 Wulfilas translated from the Byzantine text into Gothic AD 341 - The first Bible in a Germanic language. Jn 660 "Hardu ist þat þa waurd," is still recognisable! DavE 166

LATIN

Greek was used in preaching the Gospel around the Mediterranean, and early Christian writings were also in Greek. But by AD 200 Tertullian etc were writing in Latin. The Old Latin versions seem to go back to North Africa about 150 AD. They followed the Western Text, and, like it, varied widely. At the Council of Carthage 256 AD Nemesianus and Cyprian had different Latin versions. FGBr P 177, DavE 175, Keny1 P 57-58

When Jerome was asked to edit the existing Latin versions he checked them against the Greek Mss to establish a correct text. The KJV Translators praise his work. **14. Jerome's theology had many faults, but of the Bible he said truly "Ignorance of the Scriptures is ignorance of Christ.. I beg you, live with them, meditate on them, make them the sole object of your knowledge and enquiries." Reformation, Christianity & the world 1500-2000 Fernandez-Armesto & Wilson, P, 30

Jerome's translation became the Bible for the RC Church. By the Middle Ages its Mss varied widely, as Purvey, reviser of Wycliffe, and Erasmus noted. None were Jerome's original, judging by his quotes in his other writings - which had been copied much less often. K&BA 186 FFB2 P 221, Keny3 P 144 In outlying areas such as Bohemia Old Latin versions were still being used and copied in the 12th and 13th centuries. Keny3 P 142

The Council of Trent, 1546 gave it the name Vulgate, declared it the only Bible to be used by the RC church, and urged the need of a uniform text. Pope Sixtus V personally worked through the variant readings and issued a Bull forbidding the use of any other than his 1590 text, damning any who failed to obey. DavE P 180 Clement VIII ordered further correction and issued a better text in 1592 neatly side-stepping his defiance of the Bull of Sixtus V by putting the Title page of the Sixtus edition at the beginning of the new edition! About 8000 Vulgate Mss survive. K&BA P 186 SLGr P 68 Keny3 P 145

IS THE NT TEXT UNCERTAIN?

It may seem so because discussion on Mss and Texts centres on the few and small ways in which they DIFFER. The NT TEXT is by far the most certain of ALL ancient writings. Only a handful of Mss exist of any other contemporary book, and none of the Mss of such books are nearly as ancient. FFB2 P 180 Keny2 P 74-75 "The interval between the dates of the original composition and the earliest extant evidence becomes so small as to be in fact negligible and the

last foundation for any doubt that the Scriptures have come down to us substantially as they were written has now been removed." Kenyon THE BIBLE AND ARCHAEOLOGY. 1940 P 226 quoted in FFB2 P 190 The general result of all these discoveries is to strengthen the proof of the authenticity of the Scriptures. Dave 161. "Not one word in 1000 of the text is seriously uncertain, and not one doctrine is in question because of textual uncertainty. tBA P 76 None rest on disputed texts, although there may be fewer verses supporting some doctrines.

Footnote **14 He translated "with that evidence of great learning, judgment, and faithfulness, that he hath forever bound the Church unto him in debt of special remembrance and thankfulness." NTR P XVIII. It's unclear which Greek Text form he used- Mostly Alexandrian. according to, Keny3 P 142 Mostly Byzantine, according to K&BA 186 (So probably he drew on Alexandrian AND Byzantine Mss to correct the Western Text Old Latin versions.) He finished the NT AD 391. For the OT Jerome checked the LXX against the Hebrew Text. Keny3 P 142-143 He rejected the OT Apocrypha as not in the Hebrew canon, so not BIBLE though valuable. He was over-ruled, and the Apocrypha was retained. DaveE 179.

Dr Hort wrote "Substantial variation. (Between ALL the Mss, making up all the Texts) can hardly form more than a 100th part of the text." Keny1 P 55 This would leave the Text 98.33% pure, whether one used [RT] or [Nes]. Dr G Fee "For most scholars over 90% of all the variations to the NT text are resolved, because in most instances the variant that best explains the origin of the other is also supported by the earliest and best witness." JRWhi P 38-40 I've run through 1st Corinthians and found only 13 places where [RT] and [Nes] differ. Eg Sarkikos/Sarkinos. None seem significant to me.

MAJOR OMISSIONS/ADDITIONS. There are two. The close of Mark's Gospel, and the story of the woman taken in adultery. It seems wise and honest for a translation to PRINT these portions, and to note that the uncertainty remains. It's unrealistic to accuse those who do so of "Denying/Casting Doubt" on Scripture, when God in His providence allowed the uncertainty. Jn 7:53-8:11 is omitted in the oldest Mss, although one leaves a space for it. In others it's found in the margin only, or after 7:36 at end of John, or after Lk 21:38 It seems to be a floating bit of known history. Keny1 P 53

"The Vaticanus & Sinaiticus both leave out the last 12 verses of Mark but there's not one other Mss Uncial or cursive that leaves out this passage." SPSB Mar 84, P 3, over-states. Mk 16:9-20 LONG ending is in 99% of Mss, but not in Sinaiticus or Vaticanus, but the latter has a space for it. It's not in some Old Latin, Armenian, Coptic, and Georgian Mss. Some Mss have both Long and Short endings. K&BA P 285 In 4 Uncials and 1 cursive the short ending follows Mark 16:8 with long ending after it. JPLe P 173 A number of Mss have it marked as being doubtful. Some have additional verses as well, so it's obvious that there WAS uncertainty as to whether it was part of the original written by Mark. There are also some unusual features - it's the only place where the risen Christ is said to upbraid the disciples, link baptism with Salvation, seem to make a GENERAL promise of immunity to snake venom and drinking poison -

these are more typical features of the Apocryphal Gospels, than of the Biblical.
JRWhi P 255257

KING JAMES & THE TRANSLATORS.

James was hardly a PROTESTANT King. He said "Presbyterianism agreeth as well with Monarchy as do God & the devil." He preferred courtly prelates to blunt kirk Ministers, saying "No Bishop, No King." HoA P 244 His wife, (A secret papist.) refused to take the oath to the Church of England. He married his son Charles to RC Henrietta Maria of France who refused to attend his Coronation. GSPa P 144, 160 He hated the Geneva Bible as the notes were seditious. Eg Ex 1;19 marginal note "Their disobedience to the King was lawful, though dissembling was evil" allowed disobedience to kings. HoA P 246 FFB2 P 227

Jan 16th 1604 at Hampton Court (Where the court had been revelling since Christmas.) the Puritans presented a petition with 1000 signatures including 10% of the Clergy, protesting they could not with a clear conscience join in the popish practices in the prayer book, etc. Four Puritans were allowed to come into the King's presence including Dr John Rainolds/Reynolds. They faced 50 60 Anglican Bishops, High Churchmen, Lords of Council, etc. GSPa P 2-3.

James handled the meeting cleverly, threatening to hary the Puritans out of the land, but didn't want the Bishops to have too much power so agreed to Bible Translation as ONE thing he could humour the Puritans about. Bancroft, Bishop of London, who had ridiculed the idea of a new Bible Translation, hastily changed when the King agreed to it. He with Robert Cecil organised the Committee of translators. GSPa P 11. Eyewitness comment from Sir John Harrington "The King talked much Latin and disputed with John Rainolds.. The Bishops seemed much pleased and said His Majesty spoke by the power of inspiration. I wist not what they mean, but the spirit was rather foul-mouthed." GSPa P 7. James squandered thousands of pounds on Entertainment, but approved the Translation as long as it cost him nothing. GSPa P 13, 79.

James had decreed that the Translators be Learned Men, but they also had to be acceptable to him. One summary is that they ranged from the Learned - Lancelot Andrew knew 15 languages, a High Churchman, friend of the poet Edmund Spenser. The Virtuous - Dr Reynolds, Lecturer in Greek. to the Vicious - Richard Thomson, DavE P 200 GSPa P 14, a "debauched drunkard who seldom went to bed sober," according to Prynne, and a constant propagator of Arminianism. GSPa P 3940 Laurence Chaderton, converted through contact with Puritans as a student. His Father sent him 1/. to buy a beggar's bag if he didn't return to the RC faith. John Harding also had Puritan leanings. GSPa P 14. Dr Miles Smith, a Calvinist, but not Puritan. Head of Greek at Oxford. GSPa P 49.

Perhaps learned, but certainly a flatterer of James was Thome. GSPa P 21. OT Translators included Overall, who knew no Hebrew, but taught the Divine Right of Kings, while two of those most expert in Hebrew, Andrew Willett and Dr Hugh Broughton, Puritans, were excluded. SLGr P 165 Barlow who taught "The King's Person and authority is Sacred," was a Translator, GSPa P 43 as were Ravis and

Bancroft who both spoke against the Puritans at Hampton Court GSPa P 50 When James ridiculed the view that his favourite couldn't divorce and remarry, translator Bishop Bilson agreed with the King. GSPa P 152-153 **15.

A letter speaks of 54 Translators, but only 47 are named. JPLe P 28 There were 6 Committees- Westminster OT & Epistles. Oxford OT & Gospels, Acts, Apocalypse. Cambridge OT & Apocrypha. GSPa P 30 They started 1605 Groups finished in 1608/1610 JonB P 7, Keny1 P 304

Translation Rules 1-5. The BISHOP'S BIBLE to be followed, and altered as little as the originals permitted. This included retaining the old Ecclesiastical words eg CHURCH, not CONGREGATION. (Tyndale had been murdered for changing such words. Coverdale had changed them back, and Tyndale's translation was then approved for Church use! FFB2 P 224 JPLe P 23 SLGr P 144-146 Keny1 P 304 See NTR P XXX.

Footnote **15 Broughton had written against a book by KJV Translators Bishops Bancroft and Bilson in which they had taught that the soul of Christ had been in Hell (Gehenna) before Resurrection. In 1609 he wrote "The King's command to have the Law and Gospel learnedly translated has stirred much study and expectation of good, and all true-hearted subjects will be ready for forbearance." GSPa P 106 DavE P 203

6-7 No marginal notes, except to explain Hebrew or Greek, or give refs to other Scriptures. Keny1 P 303 (This avoided being seen as a sectarian translation - the Geneva margins marked it as clearly PROTESTANT.)

8-13. Each translator to translate on his own, and send to others for consideration. Remaining disagreements to be ironed out at General Meeting. Learned men not on Committee to be consulted in this. The directors of the Committees were to be the Deans of Westminster, and Chester, the King's professors of Hebrew and Greek at Oxford and Cambridge.

14. Translations to be used other than Bishops, Tindales, Matthews, Coverdales, Whittingham/Geneva. JonB P 136-140 **16.

When the Committees had done their work, 2 scholars from each centre were paid 13/ a week to meet at Stationers Hall London For 9 months to revise the whole Bible together. Eg in Titus 3:8 choosing between "to exercise thyself in honest trades." /to maintain good works." GSPa P 112-113, 127. Miles Smith and Bilson then spent months revising it to polish the literary effect, etc. JonB P 10, Keny1 P 304 GSPa P 112-113.

After this final Editing Miles Smith was distressed that Archbishop Bancroft made 14 changes, including Acts 1:20 of Judas "His Bishopric let another man take." Smith wrote "He is so potent there is no contradicting him." GSPa P 128 Dr Miles Smith was believed to be the author of preface "To the Reader," Keny1 P 304 This gives a clear understanding of their wholesome attitude towards their work. Everyone should read it because of its honesty and wise humility. (I'll send a copy on request if you haven't one.) Any suggestion

that they were producing an infallible/inerrant/never-to-be-altered translation is unreasonable in the face of its statements.

The flattering nonsense written (by Bilson? Bancroft? GSPa P 133) in the short Epistle Dedicatory, shows to what lengths they had to go in pleasing the king. That he was Anti-Presbyterian/ Protestant as much as he was Anti-Catholic gave KJV its Anglican-compromise character, and so it was able to remain "The English Bible" for Christians of a variety of denominations. We have good reason to thank the God of Grace who so over-ruled that such Translators, working under such a King, produced such a God-honouring translation, that conveyed to its readers at least 90% of the message of the original, in dignified, lively direct English from a stage when the Language was flourishing.

Footnote **16 The BISHOPS BIBLE, produced under the editorship of Archbishop Parker, "improved" Tyndale's simple English text with Ecclesiastical, Latinised, and learned words. Eg for Agape, Tyndale's LOVE replaced by Charity (Latin Caritas) DavE P 195 200 JPLe P 27. Keny1 303 This "High Church" influence was balanced by the Protestant 1560 Geneva Bible, a revision of Tyndale by William Whittingham brother-in-law of Calvin, FGBr P 195 GSPa P 9, SLGr P 156 OT had for Hebrew only Complutensian Polyglot, Antwerp Polyglot, and a single Mss of LXX. The NT had Stephanas 1550 Greek Text JPLe P 42, and writings of Fathers - Sir Henry Saville was editing Chrysostom's work. GSPa P 76-77.

"The KJV triumphed by its virtues. The scholars represented a cross-section of belief. The standard of literary taste and writing was high." The KJV had a strong influence on the English language, morality, culture, ethics, etc. Hoa P 260 261 There's no record of KJV being authorised. FFB1 P XIII. Probably the printer transferred the title page of the BISHOP's Bible, which was "Authorised/ Appointed to be read in Churches." GSPa P 146 **17.

While the world in which the KJV Translators lived was much more religious than ours, secular influences were at work. Christopher Marlowe, a Free-thinking dramatist, was said to be a "scorner of God's Word" to whom "Moses was but a juggler, and Protestants "hypocritical asses." GSPa P 56 Shakespeare was writing at the time but doesn't seem to quote the Bible, though occasionally his work and Bible share ideas in common. GSPa P 108 George Chapman quoted the Bible at times, but in "Bussy D'Ambois" 1607 wrote "Nature lays a deal of stuff together, use by use" implying that Nature could evolve itself without a Divine Purpose. GSPa P 109 A Unitarian, Benjamin Legate preached that Jesus was a mere man, though sinless. He was condemned as a heretic and burned 1611 GSPa P 142

As Gausson in his book "Theopneustia," the classic defence of the Inspiration of the Bible, put it, accurate translation requires only competence & honesty on the part of the translator - God's Word requires no special pleading (Godly bias, or bending the text to support orthodox doctrine) to make its voice clear. He supports this by saying that in spite of the fact that Luther was Godly, his German translation was poorer than the currently used one, which involved translators, some of whom had little faith in God or the inspiration of Scripture.

The Textual Critics who produced the Masoretic Hebrew Text were all Christ-rejectors. That a prominent one, Akiba, believed Bar Kochba was Messiah, so was a follower of an Anti-Christ, is as relevant as the personal beliefs of Westcott & Hort. The Revised Version NT Translation Committee was chaired by Bishop Ellicott - and helpful Bible Commentators such as Alford, Lightfoot, Trench, and Stanley served on it. Still, we regret that among the members was a Unitarian Dr G Vance Smith. Its NT Committee sat 6.5 hrs 4 days a week, 10 months of the year, for 10 years. GSW P 266 The RSV had 118 on its Committee, from 34 Church groups, 5 RC, 1 Greek Orthodox, 1 Jew. JPLe P 110.

The principle of having no Unequal Yoke, 2 Cor 6:14-18, means that we are happy that the NIV panel of 110 scholars were all Bible-believing Evangelicals. It had 20 teams, each having an English Linguist in it. **17a Marginal notes take into account minority views of its Committee. JPLe P 294 And we're happy, too, that the 119 NKJV Translators all signed a statement subscribing to the plenary, verbal inspiration of the original autographs of Scripture. JPLe P 329330

Footnote **17 Between 1611-1614 there were 17 editions of KJV, 6 of Geneva. In 1614 the printing of the Geneva Bible in England was forbidden, but 9 more editions in English were printed overseas by 1644 Bishop Laud ordered copies to be burned, & importers imprisoned. Keny1 P 305 JPLe P 32 **17a, The claim that one of their translators was a homosexual is strongly denied by the NIV Translation Committee. But they say a woman language-style consultant was dismissed when it was discovered that she was a Lesbian.

TRANSLATION METHOD

"Translation it is that openeth the window to let in the light; that breaketh the shell that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtain, that we may look into the most holy place.. without translation into the vulgar tongue, the unlearned are but children at Jacob's deep well without a bucket to draw with." NTR P XVI.

The God-ordained pattern for the translation of His Word is seen in the way the Hebrew OT is translated into the Greek of the NT. (Some clues are provided also by the ways in which the Hebrew/Aramaic spoken by the Lord and His disciples is given in Greek, where we have two accounts of the same incident, but there is less certainty in this as the incidents may be similar, but separate. Eg Forgive us our DEBTS/Opheilema, Mt 6:12. SINS/Hamartia, Lk 11:4.)

TRANSLITERATION. The Hebrew words written in Greek Letters - David, Hebron, and Amen are unchanged. Elijah becomes Elias, Jehoshua/ Joshua, becomes Jesus. (A problem in KJV Heb 4:8.) Pesach (Passover) becomes Pascha, Hallelujah may become Alleluia. So in any language the name of Jesus remains recognisable as Yesu, etc. Transliteration is needed when the required word or concept doesn't exist in a language.

WORD FOR WORD TRANSLATION, with one Greek word representing one Hebrew word. This isn't always possible. as no two languages and cultures

match up exactly. Eg Jews "Thought" with their HEARTS - As a man thinketh in his HEART, and tended to "Feel emotions" with their KIDNEYS, and BOWELS. Song 54 "My BOWELS were moved for him," and Ps 16:7 "My REINS (kidneys) instruct me in the night," don't convey the original thought well. That Hebrew has a small vocabulary (Ruach/Pneuma= Breath, Wind, Spirit) causes problems. We have the opposite problem with English having ONE word for LOVE, and Greek having FOUR words.

Another problem is that words may not fit exactly. In many cultures the word PRAY means to repeat mechanically in correct form magical charms or curses. (As condemned in Mt 6:7.) Their word for GOD may have evil associations, or be female. Do you use that word or do you transliterate - although the transliterated word is meaningless at first, and even after patient teaching of the concept problems will remain. Malaysia has recently banned any Bible translation that uses Allah for God, to make evangelisation of Islamic Malays more difficult.

WORD FOR WORD translation should be used where possible, especially in doctrinal statements such as CHRIST DIED FOR OUR SINS. A good attempt at word for word translation is the 1861 YOUNG'S LITERAL, made by Robert Young (of YOUNG'S CONCORDANCE) but it reads stiffly. Eg Jn 24 Jesus said "What- to me and to thee, woman." A completely literal translation is impossible. 100 different Greek words and particles are left untranslated in KJV. JPLe P 45

It's helpful if, where possible, only one English word is used for each Hebrew or Greek word. The KJV translators chose against this. NTR P XXIX.

As a result Heb. Dabar- a WORD, or THING is rendered by 84 separate English words. In Num 35:11-16 the one Hebrew word is translated as SLAYER, MANSLAYER and MURDERER. In the NT Katargein- to make void is rendered by 17 different words. Logizesthai in Rom 4:3-23 is COUNTED, RECKONED, and IMPUTED. OT quotes identical in Greek NT, but different in KJV English are Rom 12:19/Heb 10:30 Rom 4:3/Gal 3:6. JPLe P 49 But absolute consistency isn't always possible - Hebrew Cherem means dedicated to God for destruction, OR blessing. Chataah is sin, OR sin-offering, Chata in KJV is translated SIN 165x, MAKE TO SIN 29x, CLEANSE 8x, COMMIT SIN 6x, PURIFY SELF 2x, etc.

IDEA FOR IDEA DYNAMIC EQUIVALENT TRANSLATION, making a new start to convey the IDEAS of the original in words and ways natural to the new language is needed when word for word translation doesn't make sense, or convey the truth. BUT there's a risk that the translator will abuse the freedom it gives to interpret the original as he chooses to express a meaning not in keeping with the original. I.e. In trying to make the meaning clear the translator may teach what he thinks the verse should say, rather than translate it without bias.

The Bible is God's WORD given in the WORDS the Holy Spirit chose to have used - 2 Pet 1;21 SPOKE is Laleo, used of speaking words/Rhema, not Lego, speaking truths/ Logos. So a Translator isn't free to add, subtract, or change it, Deu 4:2; Rev 22:18-19. But often replacing ONE Hebrew or Greek word with ONE English word will not work. **18.

EXAMPLES OF EACH TYPE OF TRANSLATION FROM KJV OT TO NT

Micah 5:2 BUT THOU BETHLEHEM EPHRATAH THOUGH THOU BE LITTLE AMONG THE THOUSANDS OF JUDAH; YET OUT OF THEE SHALL HE COME FORTH UNTO ME THAT IS TO BE RULER IN ISRAEL. Mt 2:6 And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah: for out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule my people Israel. (NIV has "be the shepherd" as the Greek word translated Ruler, means Shepherd.) Largely a Word for Word translation, but in the Greek the Bethlehem is distinguished from any other Bethlehem, by the more easily understood description "in Judah," rather than the distinctive EPHRATAH. THOUSANDS, the Hebrew social unit, (along with TENS, and HUNDREDS) is translated "Princes" giving the rank of the leaders of the THOUSANDS, again making it easier to understand. [And giving support to the idea that THOUSANDS in OT may not always be numerical.]

Footnote **18 A computer programmed to translate English to Russian and vice versa was tested by feeding in English, and translating back to English from the Russian - "The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak," came back "The vodka is agreeable but the meat is tasteless." BTM (practical) Oct 1980 P 448 An early English translator, King Alfred, talked about translating sometimes word for word, sometimes meaning for meaning. FFB1 P X. Luther said a translator must not use Hebrew style, rather must understand the Hebrew words and express the meaning freely in the German he knows." EAN P 13-14.

Ps 40:6-8 SACRIFICE AND OFFERING THOU DIDST NOT DESIRE; MINE EARS HAST THOU OPENED: BURNT OFFERING AND SIN OFFERING HAST THOU NOT REQUIRED. THEN SAID I, LO, I COME: IN THE VOLUME OF THE BOOK IT IS WRITTEN OF ME, I DELIGHT TO DO THY WILL, O MY GOD. Heb 10:5 Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not but a body hast Thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do Thy will O God.

Here, along with word for word equivalents, is a Dynamic Equivalent translation that at first seems to have no connection with the OT. The Jew who read Ps 40 in Hebrew would know that behind the word OPENED (Karah= digged or pierced) was the experience described in Ex 21:6; Deu 15:17. The ritual by which a servant volunteered to become the perpetual slave of a loved master, by getting the latter to stab an awl through his ear into the house door-post. The writer of Hebrews quotes from the LXX Ps 40 (NIV Ps 40 helpfully points this out.) because a GREEK person, reading about ears and digging, would be bewildered. So, he is given a simple statement of someone volunteering to come and delight in being a total slave. This fits perfectly with the role the Lord Jesus came to fulfil, so that is how it is quoted.

KJV is thought of as being a LITERAL/WORD FOR WORD translation, loyal to the original Text. Good News/TEV as being a loose DYNAMIC EQUIVALENT translation. Generally this is true, but check these: (The Hebrew & Greek are as used for KJV, quoted from Strong's Concordance.) Gen 447 (+ 7 others) Chalilah- Profanation, a profaned thing. GN/TEV "We swear.." Rom 3:4 (+ 14 others) Me- Not. Genito- Be, become. GN/TEV "Certainly not." The word GOD isn't in the Hebrew or the Greek in any of these places, yet in all, KJV has God forbid in spite of the warnings in Ex 20:7; Mt 5:34-37; Jas 5:12. Also 1 Sam 10:24 Chayah- Live. Melek- King. GN/TEV, Long live the King! KJV, God save the King.

Ps 77:2 Yad- Hand. Nagar- To stretch out. GN/TEV, I lift my hands in prayer. KJV, My sore ran. Mt 27:44 Oneidizo- To revile, defame. GN/TEV, Insulted Him. KJV, Cast the same in his teeth. Acts 19:37 Hierosulos. Hieros- Temple. Sulao- To rob, plunder. GN/TEV, Robbed temples. KJV, Robbers of churches. Mt 9:15 Huios- Adult sons. Numphon- Bridechamber. KJV, Children of the Bridechamber, is more literal. GN/TEV, The guests at a wedding reception, gives the sense. Still, if I was limited to ONE version, I'd choose KJV rather than GN/TEV as the better version. But in the world at large only a dwindling church-educated minority of unsaved take naturally to KJV language.

TRANSLATION STYLES

Writers of NT in "communicating their unique and precious message" avoided both the elaborate style of Greek Rhetoricians, and the vulgarisms of street slang. EAN P 12. "Tyndale set the tone for English translations- Vigorous, Simple, Graceful, Homely. Scripture made him happy so there's something in his rhythms that conveys happiness." SLGr P 144

It's estimated that Tyndale contributed 80% OT and 90% of NT KJV. SLGr P 144-145 Hoa P 120-121. KJV has 90% Saxon words, 10% Latin. (Shakespeare's writing, 85% / 15%.) Hoa P 258-61. The forms of language it used were preserved as part of the cultural heritage of educated and religious Englishmen for 300 years. The only other translation to achieve something similar was the Vulgate, which was for 900 years the Word of God to all Western Europe.

When a translation is written in very simple language the Word of God may be diminished in order to fit those words. That's fine, as long as those who read it realise that what it conveys is MILK of God's Word from which they need to mature into studying God's Word in a fuller, richer, and more accurate MEAT form. KINDNESS used in a simplified modern version to translate Charis/Grace, is so inadequate to express the unmerited favour of God that it shocks us. But in 1945 in the armed forces overseas the handful at our camp who were interested in spiritual things had gathered for a Bible Study. When we reached Jn 1:17 one man asked what GRACE meant. The Chaplain replied "What do you think?" He said "Grace? Graceful - beautiful, I see now, and quoted Truth is beauty, beauty truth. This is all we know, and all we need to know!" That quote

showed him to be well-educated, but he would have been closer to the truth reading "Kindness and Truth came.."

Two GOOD translations FROM THE SAME TEXT may differ because one is a more literal translation. Eg Lk 9:44 KJV "Let these sayings sink down into your ears." NIV "Listen carefully to what I am about to tell you." A balance between the two methods is needed. And a balance between making the truths easier to understand, and being careful to preserve the complex meanings. Every good Translation Committee always has set out to use the evidence they have to find and translate as nearly as possible what Moses, or Paul etc wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. JRWhi P 23-26

KJV REVISION

The KJV translators speak nothing of any final, inerrant, never-to-be-changed translations. After pages praising translations from LXX onward, and pointing out their imperfections they state "that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English.. containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God: As the King's speech which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is still the King's speech, though it be not interpreted by all with like grace, nor so fitly." NTR P XXIII. They defend the value of making changes with a view to improving a translation. NTR XXIV-XXVI.

They continued to revise KJV. Eg 1611 Ruth 3:15 HE went into the cite, 1769 SHE went into the city. JRWhi P 80 Scrivener listed changes in KJV editions, as The LORD, to the Lord thy God, Deu 26:1. Seek GOOD, to seek GOD Ps 69:32 Christ, to THE Christ, Mt 16:16. There is no man good but one, to there is none good but one, Mk 10:17. Approved unto death, to appointed unto death, 1 Cor 4:9. Hath not the Son- of God, added, 1 Jn 5:12. JRWhi P 79.

1653A Bill was introduced into Parliament setting up a Committee to revise KJV "where translation appears to have been wronged by Prelates & Printers.. to agree accurately with Hebrew & Greek, and remove stumbling blocks." The Apocrypha was to be lopped off as merely human, as were Popish and superstitious prints, plates, and pictures, the Canonisation of some- SAINT Luke, etc, and spurious additions (at end of) Epistles. The KJV was accused of numerous mistranslations, also of "speaking the prelatical language." The text needed to be amended "When ye margin is righter than ye line as in 800 places." 1657 SUBCOMMITTEE appointed to handle this but with the dissolution of Parliament lapsed. Hoa P 275 JMbm P 443445

Although the KJV was written in a more literary style than the Hebrew and Greek from which it was translated, it could be understood by those able to read. (Probably always less than 50% of the population, many of whom spoke local dialects, etc.) The KJV language influenced English literature for many years - compulsory attendance at Daily chapel at High School and University meant that educated people generally were familiar with it, and usually valued

that formative influence. Keny1 P 307. Although the English language changed over the years, this kept the KJV within the understanding of educated people. But the Methodist Revival with the conversion of many working class people created a need for a "Modern" translation.

1768 John Wesley, a Greek scholar, used Bengel's revised [RT] Greek Text to Revise the KJV making 12 000 alterations so that "plain unlettered men who understand only their mother tongue" could read and understand God's Word. FFB1 P 129, DavE P 205 BTM(Tech) Jan 1988 P 103 The KJV continued to be used of God to bring many to Salvation, and to build them up in their Christian faith wherever people sought knowledge of God by making the effort to read it. But for the next 100 years many considered the EFFORT was becoming too much of a burden, and the discovery of Earlier Mss meant that a more accurate Greek Text was available from which translation could be made.

1870 Newberry NT. OT later- KJV with a set of symbols to give readers understanding of Hebrew & Greek text. This included readings from Sinaiticus, Vaticanus etc. FFB1 P 133 1871 JN Darby version was similar to RV, but I find it better doctrinally/and in more awkward English.

1881 REVISED VERSION The RV OT was generally well received as making the meaning more clear, and especially putting Psalms etc into lines as poetry. FFB2 P 231-232 The NT had a mixed reception. It was criticised for lacking the elegance and beauty of the KJV - But the GREEK Text isn't generally elegant and beautiful either. And for making too many changes of familiar words not needed by changes in Greek text. It treated the Greek Text too much as if it was classical Greek, not Koine (Common language Greek)- Papyrus discoveries rectified that for recent translators. Its attempt at consistent translation of one English word for one GREEK word was a help to Bible Students. FFB2 P 233-234 Hoa P 312, Keny1 316-318 (As a youth I was told to use it for study, for this reason. Most criticism today is directed at Westcott & Hort.)

1903 Weymouth NT version is in a more literary style. None of these did much to meet the need for a simpler translation.

1913 Moffat NT, OT 1924 was a lively translation, in simpler language that took too many liberties with the Greek Text, by relying too much on versions and variations. FFB2 P 235

Fifty years ago High School Assemblies in NZ, plus weekly "Scripture" in UK schools, were still using KJV, and its form of language, although considered "Quaint, and Amusing" by pupils was still known and used, even if only at the level of "Verily my friend, if thou dost not return my book I shall arise and smite thee." But in England and here the secularisation of Education after World War 2, and huge drop in Sunday School and Church attendance produced a generation to whom KJV language was alien. Continued family and Church use of KJV has given perhaps 5% of young New Zealanders the ability to feel at home in its language as part of their SPIRITUAL life, but even they find it

increasingly difficult to live their life in the world by it, or to use it to evangelise those around them.

This has prompted MANY attempts at putting the Bible into language that could be understood by the unchurched masses. Their need to be reached with the Gospel is a factor, as is the fact that a popular Bible is commercially profitable. And I suspect people keep trying because no ONE attempt yet has been really satisfactory. A SIMPLE LANGUAGE Bible that adequately conveys the complex Glory of God and His Gospel may be impossible.

1929/1946 RSV NT. Bible 1952 Welcomed by World Council of Churches for readability, and supposed conformity to ancient texts. Others objected to the choice of readings with far-reaching theological implications. (A polite way of saying it was adjusted towards abandoning basic doctrines!) RSV states that it's translated from an Eclectic text. No one Text viewed as infallible, each variant reading considered on its merits. tBA P 79, FFB2 P 189, Duple P 110. It's mostly [Nes.]

1946/1970 NEB Protestant UK churches - modern language Translated from Kittel's Biblia Hebraica + speculative amendments, Tasker's NT Gk text. tBA P 79.

1947 JB Phillips LETTERS TO YOUNG CHURCHES - lively and refreshing PARAPHRASE, with at times no textual justification. tBA P 81-82 He had found reading KJV to a youth club in East London ineffective but they were responsive to his attempts at translation. C S Lewis commented "I thought I knew Colossians but your paraphrase.. is like seeing a familiar picture after it has been cleaned." Revised 1972 switching from W&H to UBS TEXT & being careful to be more accurate. DavE 22022

1962 Kenneth Taylor LIVING LETTERS, 1971 LIVING BIBLE. Started as a paraphrase for family devotions. C F Henry comment "Those who prefer to read the Bible in the language and style of the morning paper or TV News Broadcast will feel fully at home with the Living Bible. Readable, but paraphrase at times. DavE P 242 JPLe P 237-238

1966 GOOD NEWS/TEV. American Bible Society. The Good News concept began with the printing of Scriptures for Indians in Central & South America. Dr R G Bratcher, Missionary for Southern Baptists in Brazil led Translation Committee. EAN P 45-46 It used UBS/[Nes] Text. It aimed at using a limited vocab and simple language structure. Used Dynamic Equivalent "How would the author have said it in modern English" style so freely that at times the result is far from the Hebrew and Greek text. tBA P 82 DavE P 244 JPLe P 266 GN Committee continues to revise - has moved back towards traditional words in places 1966 Meeting House, 1976 Synagogue. JPLe P 268-69

1971 New American Standard Version/NASB Perhaps the most accurate modern translation as it retains Hebrew & Greek structure with modern words, but this can give a rather wooden effect. It retains THEE, THOU, THINE, in the Confession Mt 16:16; Mk 8:29; but YOU in Jn 1:38; 6:68-69. JPLe P 195-197.

In Jn 3:36 (and elsewhere) Apeitheo is translated KJV, Believeth not; NASB, Does not obey- So KJV Only writers accuse NASB of promoting a Salvation by works Gospel. But Apeitho means both- Disobey because disbelieve. KJV translates it as DO NOT OBEY in Rom 2:8 etc. Faith and Obedience are inseparable, two sides of one coin. KJV is the official version of the Mormons with their WORKS emphasis. JRWhi P 132-133, 147.

1973 New International Version/NIV NT. Bible 1978 Dr E Palmer + Evangelical Scholars world-wide, under New York Bible Society. Established an OT Text from Kittel, LXX etc. Greek Text- various sources. Dynamic equivalence used where word for word is meaningless. Generally communicates meaning, flows smoothly, and is easily understood. tBA P 80 JPLe P 294 In Isaiah follows Masoretic Text more closely than does RSV. Variant readings found only in [RT] are moved to margin 45x in NT. JPLe P 302-304

While striving for Accuracy, Dignity, and Clarity has moved beyond RSV, & NASB in altering to contemporary style - YOU/Your, for THEE /THOU. Brothers, instead of Brethren, etc. A blend of traditional renderings and innovation. Eg FELLOWSHIP offering rather than PEACE offering. Doesn't shock with striking/novel/racy or coarse renderings. JPLe P 309-316

NIV "reflects without apology the Messianic interpretation of the OT. and conforms to the evangelical understanding of Scripture." JPLe P 324-325 Contrasting criticisms "The NIV is replete.. with the erroneous doctrines of original sin, hereditary depravity, restoration of national Israel, pre-millennialism, and predestination." "The NIV is so close to the RSV that one wonders why all this energy and money was spent on another version." JPLe P 327-328 FF Bruce wrote "Admirable version- fidelity to NT Text and sensitivity to modern usage." "A monument to Evangelical Scholarship, one of the best all-purpose Bibles available to English Speakers." DavE P 248

1979 New KJV NT. Committee of 119 scholars. All signed a statement subscribing to the plenary, verbal inspiration of the original autographs of Scripture. Like KJV it follows the rule that the majority of Greek Mss should be relied on - ie MAJORITY TEXT, [MT]. But it replaces archaic KJV words with modern ones. tBA P 79, DavE 210 JPLe P 329-330, 355

As NKJV uses the Text advocated by "KJV Only" enthusiasts, and the Translators were all "Fundamentally Sound Believers," honesty should have moved them to welcome it. Instead their fault-finding attitude makes them attack it bitterly, arguing that as at times it coincides with other modern translations, it must be corrupted by Romanism, Gnosticism, etc. The fact is that where the [RT] of the KJV differs from the [MT] of the NKJV it is the [RT] KJV that is "Corrupted by Romanism" as the result of RC Humanist Erasmus using material from the RC Vulgate! Dr Spackman re NKJV "It is just as unreliable as the NIV, NASB, Good News, etc and probably more dangerous since many scholars mistakenly believe that the NKJV is based on

the same (Greek) Mss as KJV." SPSB May 85 P 7. Dr Ruckman ABOUT THE NEW KING JAMES BIBLE, 1983 says that NKJV 1 Tim 6:10 changes KJV "For the love of money is the root of all evil" to "For the love of money is the root of all kinds of evil" in order to protect "certain smooth, slick type of cultured intelligentsia who had thick pocket-books.. this bunch of apostate Fundamentalists.." JRWhi P 113. (KJV translation of this verse was changed because it is both a mistranslation of the Greek, and obviously untrue. Evils such as sexual sins, racism, revenge etc don't spring from a love of money.)

2 Cor 2:17 KJV Corrupt Dr Ruckman says NKJV Peddle means that it's all right to corrupt the Word of God as long as you don't peddle it. (The Greek word means PEDDLE FOR PROFIT, and in the case of a wine-seller, corrupting it by watering it down to increase that profit.) And in Rom 1:25 KJV "Who CHANGED the truth of God into a lie," is in NKJV "EXCHANGED the truth.. lie," so as to teach that "It's all right to change the truth of God into a lie as long as you don't exchange it for something." P 15-16. JRWhi P 114-116. Metallasso means to CHANGE one thing for another= Exchange. No man can CHANGE God's truth, it remains forever, settled in heaven far out of his reach. But men can give up God's truth in favour of the Devil's lie. Dr Spackman of Mk 15:37 NKJV "Jesus.. BREATHED HIS LAST." says "This is almost blasphemous!" "My Lord and Saviour voluntarily GAVE UP THE GHOST" SPSB April 1984 P 6. (The voluntariness of His dying isn't in question, NKJV Lk 23:46 reads "Father into Your hands I commit my Spirit." but in Mk 15:37 [RT] & [Nes] both have Ekpneo- Ek- Out. Pneo- To breathe. So, EXPIRED. There is no word for Spirit/Ghost in the verse.) **19.

Footnote **19 Dr J Price Executive Editor NKJV OT points out that KJV could be attacked in that same way- Gen 36:24 NKJV "found WATER" KJV "found MULES." 1 Sam 2:25 NKJV "GOD will judge" KJV omits GOD. Mal 2:12 NKJV "awake and aware" KJV reads "the master and the scholar," following Vulgate. So the KJV could be said to be denying that God's Word is the water of life, that God will judge sinners, and attacks spiritual alertness, replacing it with gutless scholarship. JRWhi P 106-107.

We know that Spiritual truths are beyond any man's unaided understanding, 1 Cor 2:14. Translations can be made so simple that they fail to reveal the complex grace, righteousness, and glory of God and His Gospel. Still becoming all things to all men that by all means we might save some, 1 Cor 9:22 requires us to give them God's Word orally, and in writing, in language that they can understand.

Any new Translation should be challenged, and "If it be of God it will survive," as Gamaliel remarked. The Godly English Puritans challenged the KJV, and continued to use the Geneva Bible, for years after the KJV was printed because King James insisted on the use of "Church" words such as "the OFFICE of a BISHOP. Personally I use KJV often because I've part-memorised it, and its distinctive vocab makes it useful for research in concordances. And, as it uses a fuller text, I get the advantage of having what has been added over the years of copying etc. I think that every lover of God's Word should use KJV or NKJV to have the benefit of that fuller text. NIV has become my main tool for

understanding God's Word, and I believe every lover of God's Word should use it or NASB as faithful to the original Text, in words that can be readily understood, applied to daily living, and witnessing to others who lack understanding of traditional religious vocabulary. I find Good News, JB Phillips, Living Bible, CEV, etc a useful aid in this, though in places their doctrinal inadequacy has to be guarded against. Those who have the time, and the heart to gain a wider, deeper understanding, and the maturity to be aware of the pitfalls they contain, and the humility to seek God's grace for preservation from them, MAY find they can benefit from a wide range of Jewish, Protestant and RC versions.

As the Bible Almanac suggests, any version should be checked as to its attitude to the original Text, and whether it communicates clearly to the modern Reader, and the way it translates verses with important truths such as: THE DEITY OF CHRIST, Jn 1:1; Rom 9:5, Titus 2:13. ATONING DEATH, Rom 3:25; Heb 2:17; 1 Jn 2:2; 4:10. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH, Rom 3:25; 5:1. ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, Mt 25:46. CHURCH GOVT. Acts 14:23; 20:17-28. INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURES, 2 Tim 3:16. FFB1 P 83 Years ago, browsing through second-hand religious books a friend remarked "It's a poor rooster that can't get a grain of wheat out of a muck-heap." True, but he will get muck in his nostrils and would be better employed pecking grains of wheat from a cleaner source.

WHY DO MODERN VERSIONS OMIT PARTS OF GOD'S WORD?

This sounds serious. It's easy to say "How DARE they!" But quite simply the Translators of every version have to face the Mss before them, and decide which Readings represent the original Text. Under God, and with due thought, skill, and prayer they make decisions, and always some things from previous versions are omitted, and some added. Very little IS omitted. It's placed in margins or footnotes, and its degree of Mss support stated. This gives the reader the benefit of knowing of both their existence, and the absolute confidence in the main text as such uncertainties are honestly recorded. And the Early Mss restore some things not in [RT] - Acts 4:25 "by the Holy Spirit" Mt 24:36 "Nor the Son" Acts 16:7 "Jesus" 1 Pet 2:2 "in your Salvation." JPLe P 43

A KJV without the Apocrypha was issued in 1629 but most included it until 1826 when the Bible Society stopped doing so. Geneva Version dropped the Apocrypha in 1640 including a note explaining why. FFB1 P 111, JPLe P 38 When it was omitted, Catholics said THAT was taking away from God's word. But to remove what has been ADDED to the original text is God honouring.

As noted in the earlier section MANUSCRIPTS, READINGS, TEXTS.. Page 23 Scribes copying Mss tended to ADD material for the various reasons given there. The Mss used for the [RT] having been copied for 1200-1400 years, were longer. Modern versions make use of these, but also of older Mss that had been copied for only 200-400 years, and so are generally shorter. BUT NIV Jude 25 using older Mss ADDS, "Through Jesus Christ our Lord before all

ages." It would be nonsense to accuse KJV of OMITTING it, or of NIV Jude 8 OMITTING KJV "Filthy" from before Dreamers because filthy isn't there in any Greek Mss. In Phil 1:14, earlier Mss/ NIV, NASB have "speak the word OF GOD." [RT] KJV omits OF GOD. Acts 4:25 [Nes] NIV; NASB add By the Holy Spirit to [RT] KJV "by the mouth of your servant David." But in Acts 22:16 [RT] KJV On the Name of the Lord, [Nes] NASB, NIV, have only On His Name

Apart from the "Omissions" in Mk 16, and Jn 8 dealt with earlier, that in 1 Jn 5:7-8 is best known. The witness of the Three in heaven wasn't in the Greek Mss Erasmus had, so he left it out of his first Greek Text. He was accused of encouraging Arianism and under Papal pressure agreed to insert it if it was found in a Greek Mss. He did so when one was found. The extra words are first found in writings of Priscillian who was condemned and killed as a heretic in AD 385. They were not in Jerome's Vulgate or the Old Latin versions of Scripture, but came into the Vulgate in the 5th century. The oldest Greek Mss that has them is 11th century, and 2 of the 4 Mss that have it put it in the margin. As their Greek is Latinised they all seem to be back-translations from the Latin. It's not in any ancient version, and not quoted by the Early Fathers although they wrote a good deal in defence of the Trinity. God's work isn't strengthened by making use of dubious witnesses. Even liberals admit the tenacity of the Greek Text, yet on this verse KJV-Onlyists say that important statements like this could disappear from the Greek Mss record for 1000 years. FFB1 P 141-2, FFB2 P 210 Keny3 P 106 EAN P 92 JRWhi P 6062

In Acts 8:37 the uncertain words state valuable truths, which remain true even though it comes through the Vulgate and from a few Greek Mss none older than the 6th Century. Many of us would prefer to have it in Scripture - some would wish the Creeds and Confessions to be there too! The point is, did Luke write it - as judged by the witness of the Mss?

Rom 8:1 in the early Mss is a clear declaration that the Believer is JUSTIFIED AND WILL NOT FACE GOD IN JUDGMENT AND BE CONDEMNED. That, as a result of God's Gracious Justification of us sinners, the Believer should walk in the Spirit and not in the Flesh - and so enjoy the Lord's Fellowship here and now, and look forward to the Bema, is the truth of Rom 8:4. It seems some Grace-denying busybody tried to graft that into 8:1 so as to teach that our security REQUIRED WORKS!

White, after setting out the evidence thoroughly, says, "Almost ALL "deleted" items are copies of verses/phrases found in the NT elsewhere in all Greek Mss - No one is hiding truths, robbing readers of them. The question is simply were they in any particular place in the original. If they don't appear in a Greek Mss for the first 500 years it's not likely they were there in the original Mss. There is no evidence that anyone ever campaigned to remove them for doctrinal reasons, and they, or the truths they state, are there in ALL texts, somewhere." JRWhi P 154-156 (Studying the evidence he gives, is convincing.)

The DEITY of CHRIST

This is an essential Gospel truth derided by Arius, and defended by Athanasius Bishop of Alexandria, who persuaded the Council of Nicea to declare it in the Nicene Creed. All Christians should take seriously any failure to proclaim it. Do Modern Versions, as some claim, attack the Deity and Dignity of Our Lord by removing His Name from HUNDREDS of Scriptures?

A quick check of NT shows NIV uses the name JESUS as often as KJV. CHRIST is in KJV 555 times, in NIV 530 times. KJV has LORD 711 times, NIV 618. To a suspicious mind NIV is 4.5% weaker in confessing that Jesus is the Christ, and 13% less ready to acknowledge Him as Lord. So, it's true that as they read God's Word aloud from the pulpit etc, those who use KJV do indeed say LORD more often.

But as the Lord said in Mt 7:21; Lk 6:46 this is of benefit only if they in fact obey His commands, including 2 Tim 2:23-26; 1 Pet 2:17; 3:15. The bitter attitudes so obvious in SPSB, etc leave little hope that their efforts will pass the 1 Cor 13:1-3 test. And, unless they are more holy and right than Michael, and those they accuse less so than Satan, Jude 9 shames them for their railing accusations.

As White points out, the "OMIT" charts are impressive, but less than honest as they present only PART of the true picture. It's true that the [RT] KJV/ [MT] NKJV in Acts 15:11; 16:31; 1 Cor 5:4; 2 Cor 11:31; 2 Th 1:8, adds CHRIST to LORD JESUS. In Acts 19:10 JESUS is added to LORD. In 2 Cor 4:10 LORD is added to JESUS. In 2 Cor 5:18 JESUS is added to CHRIST. In 2 Jn 1:3 LORD is added to JESUS CHRIST, etc. JRWhi P 45-46 193-196

I prefer the fuller titles, and am uncomfortable when anyone refers to my Lord as Jesus. In preaching the Gospel stories I find it hard to say "JESUS said/did.." and where the name Jesus stands alone tend to add "Lord" or "Christ" without thinking. By doing so I'm not accusing Matthew, John, or Paul of denying or down playing the Deity of Christ. It doesn't surprise me, or seem a matter of right or wrong, that as the NT was copied again and again for 1400 years Scribes tended to honour the Lord by writing His name more fully. That modern versions go back to the briefer form of the earlier Mss isn't wrong either.

The DEITY OF CHRIST is dearly taught in KJV, NASB, NIV, NKJV in Jn 1:1; Acts 20:28; Rom 9:5; Heb 1:8; Col 2:9, (Where Theotes- Godhead/ Deity is defined by Trenchard as the essence of Godhood, the personality of God.) In Col 1:15, NIV, NKJV Firstborn OVER all creation is stronger than KJV, NASB OF every creature/all creation. In Titus 2:13; 2 Pet 1:1, NASB, NIV, NKJV make it clear that Jesus is God our Saviour. KJV weakens this by reading as if they might be TWO different Persons. (The JW's NWT translates as KJV does.) JRWhi P 267

In Jn 1:18 calling the Son The only begotten God, NASB, or God the One and Only, NIV, is a more emphatic declaration that Jesus is God than is Only begotten Son," as in KJV, NKJV. **20

In 1 Tim 3:16 [RT]] KJV, [MT] NKJV, God was manifest in the flesh, is clearer than [Nes] NASB, NIV He was manifest in the flesh, although "He" obviously refers to "God," the last person mentioned. The Byzantine [RT]/ [MT] makes explicit what was implicit in the older texts. That God was manifest in the Flesh is clearly stated in all four versions in Jn 1:1-14.

In 1 Pet 3:15 [RT] KJV, and [MT] NKJV have Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts." [Nes] NASB, NIV have Sanctify/Set apart Christ as LORD, clearly identifying CHRIST as LORD/OT Jehovah. Even RSV, Good News/TEV, etc in this verse say Christ is LORD. In Jude 4 KJV, NKJV following the [RT] [MT] have the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, referring to God and the Lord Jesus as separate persons. Following [Nes] NASB has Our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ. NIV has Jesus Christ our only Sovereign Lord.

In Jn 9:35 [RT] KJV [MT] NKJV the Lord asks the ex-blind man Do you believe in the SON OF GOD? [Nes] NASB, NIV "Do you believe in the Son of Man?" ALL teach elsewhere that Jesus is the Son of God, the question is which title the Lord used of Himself here. The Gospels record Him calling Himself "Son of Man" about 80 times. He is recorded as referring to Himself as the Son of God only in Jn 3:18; 5:25; 10:36; 11:4, none are in conversation with an individual as in Jn 9:35

Footnote **20 There is no basis for the suggestion that Only Begotten God, is a Gnostic corruption suggesting the Son is merely "A God - among many emanations of Deity, etc." The early Christian writers knew a lot more about Gnostics than Dr Ruckman, and they quoted the verse in this form. Gregory of Nyssa used it often to defend the doctrine of the Trinity, and the glory of the Son's Being. Monogenes as Monos= Only, + Gennao- Begotten is possible, but so is Genos- Kind, or Type, which would mean the UNIQUE God. Uniquely God, etc. JRWhi P 198-200 258259 KJV, NASB, NIV, NKJV all translate Monogenes as ONLY when used of children in Lk 7:12; 8:42; 9:38 Used of Isaac, Heb 11:17, and our Lord in Jn 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18, KJV, NASB, NKJV, translate it as Only Begotten. NIV, as One and Only.

Hebrew Olam can mean ancient times, OR eternity. In Micah 5:2 KJV, NKJV translate it as ETERNITY, making the verse refer to the Lord's eternal existence. NIV translates it as ANCIENT TIMES as the ancient citizen of Bethlehem, David, is the human ancestor of the Lord, putting the alternative in a footnote. Both are true, and both are taught elsewhere in all versions.

[In Rev 1:8. [Nes] NASB, NIV has says the Lord God. [RT] KJV NKJV fail to honour the Son - omit God, although it's in most Byzantine Mss. Rev 14:1 KJV, NKJV Behold the Lamb.. having His Father's name written in their

foreheads," following the [RT] - only SIX Greek Mss have this. [Nes] NASB NIV add ..had His Name and His Father's Name.... JRWhi 6468

The VIRGIN BIRTH

As God's Word clearly states, the Eternal Word became Flesh and lived among us, Jn 1:1, 14. The nature and process of that incarnation are beyond our understanding. Confident assertions as to why He had to be virgin-born, and angry denunciation of those who disagree with us, is a desecration of Holy Ground. It's a matter for humble thankfulness, wonder and worship, not for ingenuity or indignation.

In God's providence the NT was written in GREEK, a language marked by precision, so that doctrinal statements are clear, concise, and actionable. In all Mss, Mary the mother of our Lord is said to be a Parthenos - a Virgin, and that the Lord was conceived by the specific intervention of the Spirit of God. Even versions we view with suspicion because the Translators were "Liberals" say something of this. Lk 1:27 RSV "...to a VIRGIN.. Lk 1:34-35 Good News/TEV "I am a VIRGIN.." "The Holy Spirit will come on you, and God's power will rest upon you. For this reason the holy child will be called the Son of God." In Mt 1:23-25 All make it clear that she was a VIRGIN WIFE until after the Lord Jesus was born, and that He would be called Emmanuel - God with us. But while these don't DENY the virgin birth of the Lord the truth is expressed in words that fail to make it as dear and definite as it is in the Greek. Therefore we should preach and teach from translations such as KJV, NASB, NIV, NKJV.

All Greek Mss and English versions make clear that Joseph was "Father" to Jesus only in the sense that he was Guardian/occupied the role of an earthly father, which gave Him His right to David's throne, Mt 1:1-16. In KJV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, Joseph is referred to as "father," or "parent," in Lk 2:41, 48 (His reply points to His true Father). In Lk 2:33 following [Nes]/Older Mss NASB & NIV refer to Joseph and Mary as His "father (in the sense of guardian) and mother." KJV & NKJV following [RT]/[MT] make this doubly clear by writing Joseph and His Mother.

Hebrew is less precise, so the OT Scriptures were sufficiently vague/ had sufficient strands of meaning that they could fit an IMMEDIATE application, and yet contain the seed of a prophecy that perfectly fitted a NT situation- and in some cases a future Kingdom one as well. Hosea 11:1 I called my son out of Egypt, was true under Moses, as well as under Herod, Mt 2:15.

The Hebrew word Bethulah is specifically a virgin. (In Deu 22:15, token/proof of virginity is Bethulim.) A second word Almah is used with a more general meaning of young unmarried woman, virgin - any respectable unmarried woman WAS a virgin. KJV translates it as virgin, Gen 24:43 Song 1:3; 6:8. Maid Ex 2:8; Prov 30:19. Damsels, Ps 68:25 In all these cases the meaning may be "virgin," though it's less certain of the girls who were crazy about Solomon. "Almah is used of a non-virgin in an Aramaic Targum of Judges 19. In Isa 7:14 Aquila's Greek translation has Neanis- Young woman." JPLe P 112, FFB2 P 152

Isaiah 7 gives a Sign, the birth of a baby, with two fulfilments, as is common in prophecy. The sign to Ahaz is that a baby will be born who will eat butter/curds and honey, because of the desolate state of the land, 7:21-25 (No harvest crops.) and by the time he's old enough to know right from wrong, the enemy kings of Syria and Israel, that Ahaz hates and fears, will be gone **21.

As a sign to the house of David, a baby would be born SOME TIME IN THE FUTURE, and He would really be IMMANUEL. His mother would be "Almah" in the sense of a virgin. The LXX translates it as PARTHENOS which is specifically VIRGIN, just as the NT uses the word for Mary, the virgin mother of the Lord.

RSV Isa 7:14 has "a YOUNG WOMAN shall conceive" putting VIRGIN as a footnote. A natural reaction is "That's denying the VIRGIN BIRTH of the Lord, and THAT's denying the Deity of the Lord, and THAT's totally destroying the hope of Salvation- HOW DARE THEY! FIGHT THEM TOOTH AND CLAW!"

Opting to translate Almah as "Young Woman" may well be the result of wishing to deny the reality of Prophecy, or of the virgin birth, but honesty requires us to admit that it's a legitimate translation if the verse stood alone. But the NT quotes it as Parthenos, which clearly means a virgin, and as the all-important fulfilment of Isa 7 is the virgin birth of our Lord, the correct translation of Isa 7:14 is "A VIRGIN shall conceive.." as in KJV, NASB, NIV, NKJV.

Raising such issues in an argumentative way risks blasphemy in talking angrily of matters which are holy. None of us really understand the Person of GOD. I've been told it's HERESY to talk of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit - HE is "God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." It seems true to me, but it would be presumptuous for me to jump up in a meeting to correct a speaker on that point, or to demand he be expelled for heresy!

Footnote **21 The commentary on Isaiah by one of the USA "Early Brethren" F C Jennings, understood Isa 7 in this sense. While the mother of that baby may have been a virgin, the use of Almah in Isa 7:14 leaves the prophecy open to fulfilment by a young woman in the time of Ahaz. (That baby MAY have been called Immanuel, though as Ahaz had refused God's help, Maher Shalal Hashbaz may have been the baby who was a sign to him, Isa 8:18 - a sign that Ahaz was under God's wrath. If so, Isa 8:1-5 is making it clear that he was the son of Isaiah the prophet, and his prophetess wife.)

IS THE KJV AN INERRANT TRANSLATION?

"What should I do where my Bible and my Greek Lexicon contradict? Throw out the Lexicon." THE CHRISTIAN MANUAL OF MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE Dr P Ruckman, P 148 "How many mistakes are there in the King James Bible? None." THE ANSWER BOOK, Dr Gipp, P 154 The KJV has a good deal to contribute to the understanding of God's Word, but such intolerant, irrational, and often bitter attitudes make it difficult for others to accept that contribution. Its followers are

shut off from the glories revealed in God's word in Hebrew and Greek that can't be fully translated into one English word or expression. It also sets them up for distress, disillusionment or escape into unreality in their endeavour to explain inconsistencies, etc. All of that is a high price to pay for the benefit of absolute certainty that one holds in one's hand the very and only words of God in English. JRWhi P 223224 238 **22

To criticise ANY Bible translation risks discrediting God's Word. But, the claim that KJV alone is inerrant, infallible, for all time God's word in English, and that all other English translations are false, or even Satanic counterfeits, requires us to TEST IT, and hold fast to all the good that is in it, 1 Th 5:21. By pointing out imperfections in KJV we're not denying that God worked wonderfully in producing such a good and useful translation. But as its Translators acknowledged, translation is a human stewardship subject to human limitations of knowledge and skill, open for others to do as they did, make good translations better.

That the KJV translators chose not to translate Greek words consistently, NTR P XXIX-XXX, causes problems - Eg the Greek makes a distinction between CHILDREN of God, and SONS OF GOD. Teknon- From Tikto- To Bear is to do with being BORN, saying "GOD is the SOURCE OF OUR LIFE." It has no meaning of MATURITY, yet KJV translates it as SONS OF GOD in Jn 1:12; Phil 2:15; 1 Jn 3:1, 2. This doubts a vital truth. Being brought into life as CHILDREN/ Teknon, Born Ones is DONE FOR US when we put ourselves in the Saviour's hands. Then Scripture challenges us to make the effort to grow up into sonship.

Huios means Children with sufficient maturity to show likeness to their Father, and accept responsibility. In Mt 27:56 Zebedee's Huios (KJV CHILDREN) were men. All Believers are CHILDREN of God, but in Mt 5:9 the Lord challenges them to be Peacemakers, and in Lk 6:35 to Love our enemies, so as to be recognisable as Huios/SONS of God. This is made possible by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and being led by Him, Rom 8:1-4, 14.

Footnote **22 KJV Translators commend the using of even imperfect Translations saying of the LXX that it "dissenteth from the Original in many places, neither doth it come near it, for perspicuity, gravity, majesty; yet which of the Apostles did condemn it? nay, they used it.. which they would not have done, nor by their example of using it, so grace and commend it to the Church, if it had been unworthy the appellation and name of the word of God." NTR P XXIII-XXIV.

Rom 8:19 points to the glorious display of that sonship. 2 Cor 6:18 challenges all God's children to be huios/SONS and daughters. Gal 4:6-7 reminds us we're huios, not slaves. Heb 2:10 reminds us of the cost to our Lord of his sonship, and Heb 2:18 of the cost to us. Gal 3:24 Paidagogos is a child-minding slave/ Guardian not SCHOOLMASTER in Gal 3:24, or INSTRUCTOR in 1 Cor 4:15. In Jn 3:34 KJV adds UNTO HIM - Not in Greek, resulted in the doctrine of different measures of the Spirit in different believers. Jn 20:17 KJV

TOUCH ME NOT, is present tense in Greek, so should be, Do not keep on holding me. Acts 5:30 10:39 SLEW AND HANGED ON A TREE, suggests He was killed before being crucified- should be slew by hanging on a tree. JPLe P 46

Mk 6:20 Suntereo doesn't mean Herod OBSERVED John, but that he shut him up, kept him safe. KJV translates it as PRESE RVE in Mt 9:17; Lk 5:38 In Mk 9:18 Xeraino- to dry out. Withering plants pine away, AND become rigid/brittle. KJV PINETH AWAY doesn't fit the boy's symptoms STIFFENS OUT, NASB or BECOMES RIGID, NIV is better. JRWhi P 224226

Isa 65:11 KJV condemning those making sacrifices to THAT TROOP/NUMBER makes no sense (16:11 margin had correctly Gad & Meni, but the KJV translators were unaware that Gad and Meni were the Babylonian or Syrian gods of FORTUNE and DESTINY.) JRWhi P 227 Gen 1:17, 20 FIRMAMENT suggests something FIRM, solid. Liberals have ridiculed it as meaning a solid brass dome with sun, stars attached, and window holes to let rain through. Some fundamentalists have been just as foolish in suggesting an ice dome, with water above that collapsed to cause the flood. The Bible says it's an open EXPANSE in which BIRDS FLY. That EXPANSE also carries water in clouds, and the expanse continues out into the STARRY HEAVENS.

KJV Acts 12:4 has EASTER where every Greek Mss has Passover. Peter was arrested at the time of the Passover/Feast of unleavened Bread, Lev 23:5-8, and would be killed when it was over. This particular Herod's desire to please the Jews fits recorded history that although Godless at Rome, on becoming king he agreed with the Pharisees to enforce the Law of Moses, THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE JEWS Josephus XIX.7.3. **23

Footnote **23 Ignoring this fact Dr Spackman in SPSB MARCH 84 ridicules the idea that Herod would keep the Passover - Acts 12 doesn't say he did. He then suggests "Easter" must have been in a Ms from which Tyndale or KJV Translators copied, saying that the "Mss preserved in Museums today are only a fraction of those that were available to the translators." (Perhaps 30 were known then - we have now more than 5000) He says there was no need to mention Passover in vs 4 as it's implied in vs 3. Finally he misinterprets Ps 12:7 to mean that every word of KJV is correct/inerrant, having been preserved by the Lord, and one of the words is EASTER. These subjects take up 71 lines. The rest of the article can be summed up as: The heathenism of Easter, 82 lines. Romans not Jews kept Easter, 42 lines. . Easter today, 262 lines. The Crucifixion, including a possibly correct time-line of events, 500 lines. So what, at a glance seems to be a substantial answer says little about why the KJV has EASTER in Acts 12:4, and what it says is largely untrue. He simply repeats the claim that EASTER must be correct because KJV is inerrant, and apart from the distracting facts, uses a few manufactured "facts" to support that claim.

In Lk 2:22 the case for KJV HER purification is more sound. The Law provided for the purification of the MOTHER only, Lev 12. To fit this a few Greek Mss from the 14th Century on, have HER, and apparently not knowing that, but for the same reason Beza put HER in his Text, so it came into the [RT] and KJV. Yet 99.9% of Greek Mss, Erasmus, and Stephanas have THEIR purification, presumably as Father, Mother, and Baby went together to the

Temple to make the purification offering. Dr Ruckman claims KJV putting HER was a case of ADVANCED REVELATION, and argues that Texts and Versions that have THEIR deny that Jesus was sinless. But motherhood isn't sinful, the purification for the mother didn't deal with sin! It solemnised parents and brought them into God's presence at a critical event in life.

1 Ti 3:10 USE THE OFFICE of a deacon," suggests a room in a church building labelled "Deacon's Office," but Diakoneo / to work as a Deacon, means to work as a servant, in any way, spiritual or material, as MINISTERED the Word, or SERVED tables, Acts 6. 1 Tim 3:13 those who HAVE USED THE OFFICE OF A DEACON WELL PURCHASE TO THEMSELVES A GOOD DEGREE sounds like paying a bribe to obtain a University degree, but it means that exercising a stewardship well is a step forward in the Lord's service.

Heb 7:18, Gal 3:15, 17 DISANNULL, doesn't mean the opposite to ANNUL, as DISobey etc do. Set aside, etc makes sense to the less educated. 1 Tim 2:9, SHAMEFACEDNESS can be misunderstood as putting women down. The Greek word simply means modesty. Strain OUT a Gnat was mis-read and mis-printed as strain AT a gnat. DavE P 202 FFB2 P 230

Rom 14:23 KJV "He that DOUBTETH is damned if he Eat" tortured me for years, my mind being the kind that sees many sides to any issue, and my conscience the kind that registered guilt over any action, as being less than perfect. The Greek Diakrino means to distinguish between things that are different, to waver between alternatives, etc. NIV "He that HAS DOUBTS is CONDEMNED if he eats," expresses the truth of the Greek which means that if we insist on "Eating" or whatever, against the unease of our CONSCIENCE BEFORE GOD we're condemned as being disobedient children of God. KJV DAMNED seems to suggest that we are damned as Christ-rejecting sinners are.

ANYONE CAN UNDERSTAND KJV LANGUAGE?

Some readers may have no problem. I'm not one of them. Even after a lifetime of wide reading, and nearly 50 years of studying with the KJV, I still find words I can only GUESS at- eg "Brigandine." It doesn't happen to matter with THAT word, but it's my experience that reading modern versions enriches any study. Often new ideas I meet in them turn out to be there in the Greek Text, and in KJV but not recognised because the language clouds the truth. My experience with Emmaus Students was that many have to struggle to understand KJV.

Abase, Abjects, Abode, Adjure, Albeit, Almsdeeds, Ambassage, Amend, Apt for war, Aright, Assay to go Asswage, Astonied, Avouch, Be AT CHARGES with, Botch, Bruit, Chapiters, Chapmen, Daysman, Draught house, Fray, Froward, Hough, Inditing, Plat, Requite, Sith, Sodering, Suborned, Tabret,

Trow, Wot^teth, etc. are unfamiliar words which may fascinate some, but distract attention from the truth being stated, and give a sense of unreality, distance from the world of daily living, and so rob the reader of the sharp challenge, and assured comfort of God's knowledge of/concern with them, right where they are.

A Dictionary will give meanings for these words IF the dictionary is big enough, and IF the reader has the skill and patience to wade through all the other possible meanings. This is heavy going for half the population. The modern simple dictionary they use might not have the KJV meaning in it. And the translators' limited understanding of life in Bible Lands and the names of animals is shown up when we use a Dictionary, eg:

COCKATRICE - Isa 11:8; 14:29, 59:5; Jer 8:17. My dictionary says: "Basilisk or Cockatrice. A Fabulous reptile, hatched by a serpent from a rooster's egg, blasting by its breath or look." It turned people into stone.

SATYR - Isa 13:21; 34:14. "One of a class of Greek rural deities in human form with horse's ears and tail. Or as represented by the Romans, with goat's ears, tail, legs, and budding horns; a lustful or beastly minded man; (rare) an orangutan."

UNICORN - Num 23:22 etc. "A fabulous animal with a horse's body, and a single straight horn." When the KJV was translated apparently such fabulous animals were believed to exist, though the Hebrew of Deu 33:17 has HORNS of A UNICORN (singular), but KJV translated it as UNICORNS to keep the idea of a single-horned animal. Any reader finding such words in their Bible, would be inclined to reject God's Word as being not only out of date and irrelevant, but a collection of fables as well.

The Dictionary may be no help in important verses like Jn 38 LISTETH has nothing to do with a LIST of things, a ship LISTING to starboard, or even someone LISTENING. It means WANTS TO, CHOOSES TO. For Acts 1:3 He showed Himself alive after His PASSION." The dictionary will say PASSION is an outburst of temper, OR of sexual emotions.

Guessing may solve some words - Mt 24:7, DIVERS/Diverse, different places. Josh 7:9 ENVIRON us. Environment, surroundings, surround. Mt 26:7 Thy speech BEWRAYETH/Betrays. Rom 10:21 A GAINSAYING/Against saying, contradicting. Ruth 2:3 Her HAP was/Happened to LIGHT ON/Alight? Rom 15:11 LAUD/Applaud Him. 1 Sam 6:7 Two MILCH KINE/Milk Cows. Ex 5:19 MINISH/Diminish. 1 Chr 12:19 on ADVISEMENT/taking advice. Ruth 4:4 to ADVERTISE thee. Prov 9:14 To call PASSENGERS/Passers by.

But intelligent guesses may add to the confusion: Mt 19:14 SUFFER the children.. doesn't involve suffering. Jn 4:5 The PARCEL of ground, earth wrapped up for posting? Jn 7:17 If any man WILL do His will. (is willing to.) Neither Prov 8:27 Set a COMPASS, or Acts 28:13 Fetched a COMPASS

involved using a Compass. I Sam 27:10 made a ROAD is a matter of RAIDING, not of ROAD-MAKING. TARGET 1 Sam 17:6 isn't something to aim at. Isa 31:1 STAY ON horses. Rodeo winners? Acts 21:3 We DISCOVERED Cyprus. PUBLICAN as a Tax-collector. Song 212, Voice of TURTLE (dove). Ps 4:2 LEAS ING - Telling Lies not renting property.

Rom 2:11 No RESPE CT of persons with God= No FAVOURITISM- God does treat people with RESPE CT. Num 16:30 Go down QUICK into the pit. Not a SPEE DY burial, but BURIED ALIVE. 2 Cor 11:6 RUDE in speech= speak plainly and simply, not speak RUDELY. Prov 6:12 the NAUGHTY person. Jer 24:2 NAUGHTY figs, are rotten and worthless. 1 Ki 10:2 a very great TRAIN-Heb Chayil= Force. Prov 27:22 "BRAY a fool" has nothing to do with dorkeys. Jer 51:2 I will send unto Babylon FANNERS- Heb Zur= Strangers. Deu 11:30 CHAMPAIGN has nothing to do with Champagne. There is nothing wistful in Lk 2:49 "WIST YE NOT," merely "Aren't you WISED UP TO the fact!" Ex 2:3 SLIME is tar, Jer 4:22 SOTTISH- Heb Sakal= FOOLISH, not DRUN KE N. Amos 7:14 SYCAMORE fruit= wild figs/ Sycamine. MEET= Appropriate. Lk 1:8 EXECUTED the priest's OFFICE, lacks the usual sense of both words. Hab 27 BOOTIES Acts 5:2, 6 BEING PRIVY, WOUND HIM UP sound amusing rather than solemn to modern ears. Acts 21:15 the CARRIAGES didn't have wheels. Mat 2:16; 19:1, etc COASTS are neighbouring areas. 1 Tim 1:6 VAIN JANGLING = empty talk.

Many of these may seem trivial, but is anything in God's word to be regarded as TRIVIAL? Shouldn't we treasure the small things and be careful to present them correctly to readers! And, some confusions deal with important matters: 1 Cor 10:24 commands us to seek another man's WEALTH = welfare, not to try to get his money! 1 Th 5:14 The FEEBLE-MINDED who need COMFORTING are the easily discouraged who need encouraging. Obscurity in KJV Lev 25:35; 1 Cr 26:18, isn't important, in Jas 1:21 it is. In Isa 37:36 it allows the goddess to mock at the idea that people can wake up and find themselves dead.

THEE /THOU/THY. To my generation, addressing God as YOU, seems rather irreverent, but the idea that THEE /THOU is reverent, respectful address has no basis in fact. It was normal usage when addressing any individual in Hebrew, Greek or in OLD FASHIONED English - "THOU fool, this night shalt THY soul be required of THEE ." That these have dropped out of English is a loss, as we can't automatically tell whether the word YOU used in a Scripture is singular or plural. Eg "Let him be to YOU (singular) as a publican. Mt 18:17.

This paragraph is quoted from the Scripture Preservation Society Bulletin Aug/Sept 85 P 1. (My comments are in italics) "THOSE TERRIBLE THESE & THOUS - To make the Bible able to be understood by the ordinary fellow - sounds so noble and well-meaning. But the other side of the coin is this the PROTESTANT Text is replaced by the Pope's ROMAN CATHOLIC text. (It is the KJV, that in fact is the more ROMAN CATHOLIC version because it Relies on [RT] with its use of the RC Vulgate Text.) "Of course, the Bible Believer just laughs at this tremendous problem of archaism. He knows that his book is GOD'S book and has NEVE R been written in "the language of the day" so that any blasphemer,

jester, and scoffing intellectual can pick it up and get God's "secret things" and tread them underfoot." (See Page 3) "Any idiot can see that the authorised text is NOT in the language of the Elizabethan Englishman, by comparing it with the Dedicatory," (It uses the "Royal Plural," addressing a King as THEE was an insult.) "and To the Reader" (KJV Preface - Uses YOU because it's not addressed to an individual. Shakespeare's Sonnet xxiii beginning "Shall I compare THEE to a summer day? THOU art more temperate..": is an example of his use of Thee & Thou. And the Quakers used Thee & Thou in conversation for many years after 1611.) "The language of the KJV is that of the HOLY GHOST, that's why it beautifies, elevates/.. why it's so easy to memorise EVE N FOR CHILDREN FIVE YEARS OLD AND YOUNGER." (They easily memorise nonsense words too.

In fact the NT Greek is largely in the language of the common people, and so was the KJV when it was written, more so than Shakespeare's plays, see P 43 People need to be able to read and understand God's Word. If they have to struggle with the words and sentence structure their mind isn't free to take in the truths and their heart is distracted from fellowship with their Lord. Even if they can make sense out of what they read, or the mistakes don't matter, DO THEY GET THE FEELING THAT IT IS RELEVANT? That God is speaking to them right where they are? Over-simplified versions that are easy to read are of little use as they trivialise the Truths of God's Word. But if we insist that people today must receive God's Word in the traditional language dear to us, we're in danger of being like the Pharisees who LADE men with burdens grievous to be borne, Lk 11:46 because WE can handle KJV language with our little finger. But I do you to wit brethren, that to bruit abroad the Gospel, in KJV language only, sith thou so list, availeth naught if no man hearkeneth thereto.

CONCLUSION

"But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him," 1 Cor 12:18. My brothers and sisters in Christ DIFFER from me - see things differently from the way I do, because GOD MADE THEM DIFFERENT. God put them in the same body as me because in His wisdom and love He saw we needed each other and the body as a whole needed us both. We dare not ignore the beliefs, needs, and ministry of a single one of them. We daren't say it doesn't matter if division comes as long as the majority are with us, or feel proud if we're one of a select minority. We daren't lightly grieve or drive away a single member of our fellowship. To do so is an insult to the Lord, and a disgrace to His Name in the local community.

"The Accuser of the Brethren is cast down," Rev 12:10. Why should we help him by accusing our brothers in Christ! We must be careful to speak well of the Lord, and of all His people, especially those in our local fellowship, or if we can't, we must be silent. No matter how worried or frustrated we feel about differences among us we daren't whisper one word of it to those outside our fellowship, whether unsaved, or Christians. If we do, we obstruct effective witness.

"But speaking the truth in love, grow up into Him in all things which is the Head, even Christ; from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth," Eph 4:15-16. To love and be loyal to the TRUTH, is essential, or the Spirit of Truth can't use what we say or do, but equally whatever isn't done in LOVE, is mere empty noise, 1 Cor 13:1-3.

"Whatever you do do it heartily, as to the Lord," Col 3:23 "Rejoice in the Lord.. Let your moderation/gentleness be known by all, the Lord is near," Phil 4:5. The key to hearty, enthusiastic, joyful Christian life and service is consciously living in the presence of the Lord, and that same living in His presence is what makes us moderate/gentle in our response to those who disagree with us.

"Wherefore my beloved brethren be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath; for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God," Jas 1:19-20 In spiritual warfare, spiritual weapons alone are effective. We dare not use anger, ridicule, criticism, half-truths, etc as they are the Devil's weapons. Until recently Decency prevented almost everyone from highlighting scandals in even HUMAN families. The worst thing about criticising ANY version may be that it invites counter-criticism, and when we begin to shout at each other, no-one can hear the whisper of God's voice.

Phil 2:1-16 is wholesome reading, with the example of the LORD, and the exhortation that we give preference to one another and their views on things, and so do everything without murmurings and disputings.

Gal 2:20 Shames us with its reminder that we've no rights to claim, no right to insist that others and the local Assembly submit their consciences to ours and do things as we believe they should be done Those crucified with Christ have no arms free to fight with brothers, no legs free to walk out in division.

Although this is dear in Scripture, in the history of God's people we see the Devil's tactics succeed time and again. We should not be ignorant of them, 2 Cor 2:11. He works to:

DISTRACT- Get us to take our eyes off the Lord, and to concentrate on areas of disagreement, or what we see as faults in others.

DIVIDE- Once our eyes are off Christ, and the vision of His Grace, Greatness, and Glory ceases to hold us, it's easy for Satan to set us against each other. The mote in our Brother's eye looms large to us.

DEFILE- Sometimes God-dishonouring things are introduced and condoned, and that defiles the Church. But ALWAYS when hearts are Divided by quarrelling, the spirits of all concerned are defiled with harsh words said, suspicions voiced, accusations and threats made, support for each party canvassed for, ungracious devaluing of each other. Then the Holy Spirit is grieved, and the consciences of all concerned so hardened that repentance and restoration is unlikely, because His work is quenched.

DESTROY- Not only the spiritual life of those for whom Christ died is destroyed as the young in the faith are stumbled, but the testimony of the fellowship in the District is destroyed. No matter what high motives are professed, division destroys an assembly.

Nowhere in Scripture does it say it's sinful for us to have disagreements. They are part of the testings and trials of life for which God has provided the remedy in Christ. Read Rom 14:1-15:7; 1 Cor 8:13; 9:19-27; 10:12-11:1, and you will see set out how God wants His people to deal with disagreements between Believers as to what is right and good. If the use of KJV or NIV etc shocks us, think how much more we would be shocked if our brethren kept the Jewish Sabbath. So apply the teaching to your situation by reading it as "Some of you are STRONG and believe you can use all versions, and some of you are WEAK / have a sensitive conscience in the matter and believe that only the KJV is permissible," and see how God decrees you should behave, whichever side you take.

It may be helpful to notice that the "Progressive" STRONG boast of and rely on KNOWLEDGE. They can argue a rational case for what they believe. They can mix readily with the unsaved, and reason with them readily in presenting the Gospel without what they would call petty scruples, IF they genuinely serve the Lord. But they must not sneer at or set a bad example to those whose consciences restrict them. The "Conservatives," those with a WEAK / sensitive conscience in the matter seem to be acting more instinctively, from the heart, and maybe it's their love and devotion to the Lord that moves them to be vegetarians etc rather than to risk association with idols. This sensitive conscience may not be entirely healthy, but it must be respected. But it gives them no right to dictate to others what they may or may not do.

If all in our fellowship were of one group or the other, it would be unbalanced, and ineffective. The "Progressives," generally younger folk, who can't see why we should fuss about details instead of getting on with the job of witnessing, are almost our only hope of evangelising and winning souls for the Lord. Without the "Conservatives," generally older, better taught, and more spiritually sensitive to what is honouring to the Lord, there is little hope of converts being built into stable and Godly church members. It seems to me that there always has been tension between the "Evangelists" and the "Teachers," in our Assemblies. When I listen to old people talking of the exciting days of revival and successful evangelism, it seems to me that those the Lord used as Evangelists, weren't careful to conform to strict "NT Assembly Teaching." They sound difficult to live with. Revivals were lively, but rather lawless situations, and years of patient shepherding and teaching might well have been needed (and if the Lord grants us revival, still may be) before stable well-behaved Assemblies resulted.

It seems to me that this requires the young to show consideration for older folk by speaking reverently so as not to distract them from worship, and by making the effort to enjoy KJV when it's read. But if it's desired that young men should learn to voice their thanksgiving and praise to the Lord, in prayer, they

shouldn't be criticised for doing so in simple reverent language that is natural to them.

It seems to me that those who reach out to evangelise and teach must be free to do so with versions such as NIV or NKJV, (Or initially with simpler, less adequate versions) that set out the basic truths of Scripture loyally, but in language that doesn't raise a barrier between preacher and audience. It's true that some young children enjoy archaic language, whether in Scripture or Fairy Tales, but it is not easy for them, or older people to relate it to life here and now.

I have lived in, and loved the KJV for 50 years. I know the power of the poetry of its words to convey the majesty of the Almighty, and the grace of the Son of God become man, and the tragedies and triumphs of our humanity, but I also know the frustrations Bible students face if limited to it. And even as an aging KJV-Bible-conditioned learner from the Word of God, who uses it constantly in study, I know the barriers that it erects between God and modern man.

I'm uneasy with changes. Many seem unwise to me. I'd be delighted to hear of any fellowship of believers who, limiting themselves to the old version, and the old ways, are winning numbers of sinners for Christ, building them up in Him so that their transformed lives are an effective witness to the world. It should be possible. A broken heart before God, and a spirit of unity, and obedient love are far more important than ANY methods. Meanwhile we must make the best of the realities of a changing world, while holding fast to an unchanging God as we hold forth the Word of Life. It's not a comfortable state, but better than sleep.

Brethren, let us love one another, for love is of God, 1 Jn 4:7. Let us rejoice that CHRIST is preached, through all or any translation, no matter how suspicious we are of its translators or users, Phil 1:18.

Brethren let us hold fast the Word of God, in its substance, and in the form of words we find conveys it best, 2 Tim 1:13, even though it puts us to the burden of comparing Scripture with Scripture, and translation with translation. KJV Translators wrote "As St Augustan saith, variety of translations is profitable for the finding of the sense of the Scriptures." NR P x. Limiting themselves to KJV has twice in my lifetime misled a Brother reading "It pleased the Lord to bruise Him" Isa 53:10 to say that in some mysterious way GOD HAD PLEASED TO ENJOYED bruising His Son.

I believe anyone who TEACHES & PREACHES God's Word needs to use at least THREE versions in preparing his messages. KJV/NKJV will give him the FULLEST text of the Bible, even if it includes traditional material built up over 1000 years of use in the Greek church, much of which is helpful. NIV/NASB will give a reliable modern translation. LB/GN/CEV/ Amplified etc, though less accurate, provide him with examples of attempts to express God's Word in the language of the man in the street - including examples of how NOT to say it.

Now unto Him who is able to keep you from falling, and to present you before His glorious presence without fault, and with great joy- to the only God our Saviour be glory, majesty, power and authority, through Jesus Christ our Lord, before all ages, now, and for evermore! AMEN.

APPENDIX I

The SCRIPTURE PRESERVATION SOCIETY

This Society has advocated KING JAMES ONLYISM in NZ. I took its Bulletin for four years, to test whether it Spoke the Truth in Love with a view to building up God's people into stable, mature, Christ-likeness, Eph 4:11-16. I was disappointed. Here is a sample:-

SPSB March 85D Pearce, In response to a letter expressing surprise at KJV being claimed as inerrant when it used one FOLD for both Aulee, and Poimnee in Jn 10:16, and so missed the point the Lord was making (In the PAST one FOLD, separating Israel from the Nations. In the FUTURE one FLOCK the Church, a fellowship of Jew & Gentile Believers.) Instead of an answer Pearce gave a series of insults and counter questions - Why did NIV translate Aulee as Sheep PEN in 10:1 and FLOCK in 10:16? (Both are PEN in any NIV I've seen.) Why out of 18 times Poimen is in the text does NIV etc translate it only once differently? "surely a more aggravated case of inconsistency." (NIV translates IT 17x as SHEPHERD where it refers to shepherds of Sheep, or the Lord as our shepherd, and translates it as Pastor in Eph 4:11, where it's listed along with Evangelists, and Teachers.) "Why did they NOT EVEN TRANSLATE the words "tees poimnees" in 1 Co 9:7?" (NIV translates them as "Tends a flock." That no-one claims NIV is inerrant etc is totally ignored. This "answer" closed with "Thanks for the opportunity to answer your question!"

An ANALYSIS of SPSB 1983

POSITIVE MATERIAL- 21 Pages. Defending [RT] KJV 18 pages. Exhortations to Evangelism 3 pages. Positive Teaching 2 pages. (Their attempts at reconciling apparent contradictions in Scripture were sometimes helpful, but often forced and unconvincing.)

NEGATIVE MATERIAL- 64 Pages. Attacking NON-KJV versions and those supporting them 28 pages. Attacking RC Church & Doctrines 22 pages, Open Brethren, 6 pages, Charismatics 4 pages, JW's 3 pages, Darwin 1 page

This shows it to be a Spring sending forth Sweet and Bitter water, Jas 3:9-11. SWEET when it rightly praises the KJV for its beauty, dignity, and beneficial influence. Or, reminds us of the many souls blessed through it. BITTER when it denounces and curses all more recent translations and translators, as evil, corrupt, Popish etc, and uses half-truths and slanders to stir up strife and hatred among Believers. In stirring up a group of young Christians to denounce their elders for using the "Satanic NIV," and proclaim that they would form a church that God could bless by using only KJV it was obviously functioning as a ROOT OF BITTERNESS, Heb 12:15. That the young folk were soon disillusioned and drifting was no comfort.

The Bible IS a wonderful, and precious book. But emotive, abusive language used to defend it fits the old "Argument weak here, shout like the Devil," pattern. Behind the facade of expressed earnest concern For God and His Word the bitter spirit and divisive effect marked it as associated with Satan in his divisive "Angel of Light" approach. 1 Cor 13:1-3 assured me that this attitude could accomplish nothing for God. Instead of feeding my

soul with the beauty of Christ it was spiritually deadening, urged me to efforts that would allow me to be proud of my superior spirituality by using KJV, less able to communicate God's Word to the ignorant, and constantly exhorted me to look for errors in other versions, and to hate those that used those versions.

APPENDIX II - FOOLISH & HURTFUL STATEMENTS

(Ignorance, and making untrue statements based on it, is inevitable at times, for all of us, but to choose to remain in ignorance when knowledge is available, is sin, 2 Pet 3:5. To make inaccurate statements in condemning others defies the Ninth of God's Ten Commandments.)

COPYRIGHT & COMMERCIALISM SPSB Oct 83 P 4. "KJV isn't COPYRIGHTED because you can't copyright God's Word. You can only copyright man's word." Bibles are copyright when first published to prevent inaccurate copies being made, and protect investment. JPLe P 109 Queen Elizabeth gave Christopher Barker the sole right to print Bibles, Prayer-books, etc. At his death in 1599 the right passed to his son Robert. The monopoly lasted 100 years. Robert Barker laid out 3500 pounds to print KJV. GSPa P 134-135 For many years Oxford and Cambridge University presses were the only ones allowed to produce good quality Bibles in the British Empire. Only a few years ago a friend of mine was informed that he could no longer import OXFORD Bibles direct, and must pay a fee of about 20% to their local agent to do it for him. And they had a bid in for CAMBRIDGE University Press so as to control CAMBRIDGE Bibles as well. The Living Bible by 1974 had made \$20000000 profit which was used to support Tyndale House Bible Translators in 42 countries. JPLe P 237-238

MARGINAL NOTES Dr D A Waite "The diabolical nature of the NKJV shows itself in their printing the various readings of the Greek text in the footnotes. They print all sides and take their stand on none of them. By doing so they confuse the readers." JRWhi P 57. The KJV Translators condemn this attitude saying that God has made the essential doctrines of salvation clear, but "it has pleased God.. here and there to scatter words and sentences of difficulty and doubtfulness to save us from over-confidence. It is better to make doubt of those things that are secret, than to strive about those things that are uncertain." "In such a case, doth not a margin do well to admonish the Reader to seek further, and not to conclude or dogmatise upon this or that peremptorily." NTR P XXVIII. The KJV 1611 had 7000 marginal notes, and still has some - See Footnote **8. Page 15

THE ALEXANDRIAN CULT Anyone who reads the SPSB, or Ruckman, will find he says anyone who doesn't believe KJV 1611 is inerrant, etc, and so are prepared to use other versions (= Almost all Christians of all sorts, in all ages) belongs to the "Alexandrian Cult." He says they teach we can't have any final knowledge of right and wrong etc. (But we have such knowledge available in ANY good translation. The textual and translational variants don't affect any Bible truth. When the Lord was on earth there was no WALLED OFF INERRANT TEXT judging by OT quotes. We don't have to believe in cockatrice in order to know God's will, or Good from Evil.)

He claims those who deny the inerrancy of [RT] & KJV follow the Gnostics and Philosophers from Alexandria in Egypt - we should leave them because God called His Son OUT of Egypt (So why not call His Scriptures out of Egypt via Tischendorf etc!)

Any association between Alexandrian Mss and Gnostics is only in the mind of the critic. There IS some association with Athanasius, as I've read that he mentions that Hesychius edited them, but there is no evidence of any association with the Gnostic Mss from Nag Hamada. Gnostics were common in Egypt, and Arians were in Syria, but that doesn't make the Alexandrian Mss Gnostic, and the Byzantine ones Arian.)

MODERN VERSIONS BANISH ATONEMENT FROM NT KJV has it only in Rom 5:11. The Greek has Katallage- Reconciliation, and KJV translates it Reconciliation in Rom 11:15; 2 Cor 5:18, 19. ATONEMENT in the OT is Kaphar to Cover, referring to the covering of Sin by an animal sacrifice, as a shadow, foreshadowing the atoning death of Christ. The Greek word for this is Hilasmos- Propitiation, 1 Jn 2, 4:10.

Quotes from NEW AGE BIBLE VERSIONS Gail Riplinger 1993 of which she wrote in the Jan/Feb 1994 THE END TIMES AND VICTORIOUS LIVING NEWSLETTER. "Each discovery was not the result of any effort on my part, but of the directed hand of God - so much so that I hesitated to put my name on the book. I used G. A. Riplinger, which signifies to me, God and Riplinger - God as the author and Riplinger as secretary." JRWhi P 99. Among its "God inspired" statements are : P 22 "The KJV calls believers to take up the cross, the new versions omit this." They have it 3x, but omit it from Mk 10:21- the parallel accounts Mt 19:21; Lk 18:22 don't have it in this incident. JRWhi P 159 P 455 quotes Isaiah 263 NASB "The steadfast in mind Thou wilt keep in perfect peace." and condemns them for leaving out the key words "On Thee." KJV has "On Thee" in italics because it's not in the Hebrew. AND the NASB goes on to say "Because he trusts in Thee!" JRWhi P 97-98 On P 375-376 she says that KJV is the only Bible that distinguishes between Lord/Adonai, and LORD/Jehovah, but NASB, NIV, NKJV, RV, RSV all do. JRWhi P 98

P 225 She quotes Westcott & Hort as saying Sinaiticus and Vaticanus Mss "should be accepted as the true readings" but omits "until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary." And, "are very pure and excellent," whereas W&H wrote that of the COMMON ORIGINAL source from which the readings they in common had descended. JRWhi P 99-102 P 305 "Under the century-old spell of the W&H Text, NIV Editor Edwin Palmer comes to this chilling theological conclusion!: [There are] few clear and decisive texts that declare Jesus is God." Dr Palmer actually said Jn 1:18, as inspired by the Holy Spirit, is one of those few clear and decisive texts that declare that Jesus is God. But without fault of its own the KJV, following inferior Mss, altered what the Holy Spirit said through John, calling Jesus "Son." JRWhi P 103

"God has always given His word to ONE people in ONE language to do ONE job; convert the world." THE ANSWER BOOK Dr S Gipp, P 32 JRWhi P 147. If we accept his claim that the Masoretic Text is that errant word in Hebrew, we must give up "They pierced my hands and my feet in Ps 22:16, and with the Jews read "Like a lion they are at my hands and feet." And James quoted LXX, not Masoretic in Acts 15:17.

JayG NT PREFACE after complaining that modern versions leave out dozens of references to the Godhood of Jesus, etc. says "This is due to their arbitrary dependence on an Alexandrian textbase instead of that body of God's words which have been universally received and believed for 19 centuries known as the [RT.]" (But before 1516 the Greek Mss had no standing in Western Christendom, where the only

Christian Reformation occurred.) He talks of "7 textual critics, adjusting it (Sinaiticus) like a nose of wax to suit their purposes." (The final adjustment was towards Byzantine Text, from which the [RT] came!) "It was found in a waste-paper basket," (The NT wasn't, and the NT is the part people are interested in.) and "Vaticanus left on a shelf unused." (Because it is in GREEK and they used the Latin VULGATE.) SPSB APRIL 84 P 8. "The Sinaiticus was found in a trash pile." See P 20

Where did our King James Bible come from?

SPSB Oct 83 P 3.	The so-called "corrupted copies" are in fact the Greek Mss of the Alexandrian and Western Texts. Instead of being from the originals, they are the ONLY Mss for years. The so-called "accurate" copies, are the the Byzantine Text. Only a very few of the first 1000 years, were used for
x	They were ALL used for the [MT] (In fact ALL Mss are Corrupt/
DISTANT x	enses that no two are
the first 400 x	The [RT] KJV used
Greek Mss of x	Vulgate
these, none from x	R.C.
the [RT] KJV. x	
NKJV. x	
inaccurate in the x	
identical. x	
also Mss of the Latin, R.C. x	
Translation, the official Bible of the x	
Church.	

The lower Graph represents the TRUE situation

The [RT] KJV

Mss of the Alexandrian and Western Texts -

uses these -

Mss of the Byzantine Text -

+

(The [MT] NKJV uses ALL of these.)

the Vulgate

[Nes] NASB, NIV, use ALL the Mss

Dr P Ruckman THE CHRISTIAN HANDBOOK OF MSS EVIDENCE 1976 P 50 "People who believe there was a Septuagint before the time of Christ are living in a dream world, as no copy of LXX can be produced older than 300AD so it wasn't written until 100-200 AD - It coincides with NT because copied from NT! (But there are no copies of Masoretic HEBREW OT before 900) "The Translation of the Seventy interpreters (LXX). prepared the way for our Saviour among the Gentiles." KJV Notes To Reader XVI.)

Dr P Ruckman claims the Greek and Hebrew Mss should be corrected to conform to the "Inspired" 1611 KJV as it's a variation from the Greek and Hebrew is in fact "advanced revelation." THE CHRISTIAN'S HANDBOOK OF MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE 1990 P 126 JRWhi P 109 124 **24

Footnote **24 When Stewart Custer wrote of Ruckman's claim that the KJV readings are superior to the Greek, Ruckman replied "Well are they? If not, would you mind demonstrating why they are not? Surely Stewsie-woosie wouldn't accuse another Christian of lying, after the way he has been carrying on without attempting to prove that man was lying! If Ruckman said the above and it was wrong, why didn't Stu baby list the chapter and verse in the Holy Bible that prove Ruckman was wrong." CUSTERS LAST STAND Dr P Ruckman. 1981 P 40 JRWhi P 110-111. Ruckman etc claim a translation can be better than the original as in the Bible all TRANSLATIONS (2 Sam 3:10; Col 1:13; Heb 11:5) improved on the original!!

SPSB Dec 1982 P 3 "Every version in English except God's Holy Authorised version comes from the same source as the RC versions." Yet P 6 lists RC Complutensian Polyglot under KJV. And [RT] KJV includes material from RC Vulgate that isn't in any Greek Mss. And in SPSB March 1983 P 4 "The Latin Bibles of the Lollards (Vulgate) are listed in "The Biblical Line," as against "the Line of corruption." And of course he ignores the [RT] material that Erasmus put there from the R.C. Vulgate, which only KJV uses.

"There are only two streams of Bibles: The Masoretic Text-[RT]-KJV. The Gnostic/Roman Catholic-ALL other English Translations." But there are MANY streams, [RT] is one small stream in the Byzantine family, apart from material from the Vulgate.

SPSB May 1983 P 7 "KJV has many Mss predating Sinaiticus and Vaticanus (331 AD)." There are in fact NONE!

As noted already the early Papyrus Mss have readings that are found later in both the Alexandrian AND Byzantine Texts, but the bulk of their material is common to ALL texts. What BECAME the [RT] came from many sources, and to say that "KJV had many Mss before AD 331 is about as accurate as the next quote. "This led to a very embarrassing question asked of him (John Calvin) by Jacob Arminius." HYPER CALVINISM Dr P. Ruckman 1984 P 11. Arminius was less than 4 yrs old when Calvin died! JRWhi P 126

"The true text of Scripture has always been preserved in some Ms somewhere." (This ignores the hundreds of years of textual criticism that established the Masoretic Text. The [RT] took 100 years of patient, hesitant textual criticism work by the Roman Catholic humanist Erasmus, and Protestant Stephanas & Beza to establish. There is no more evidence of a True-to-the-original NT Greek Mss than there is of the Book of Mormon Gold Plates. The same patient process of collecting and comparing Greek Mss brought the current [Nes], and [MT] into existence, and continues to improve them.

"Today's scholars CAN'T be better translators than the KJV ones, they were men of unparalleled ability. Everything in the world has deteriorated since 1611, including the atmosphere and education."

A TAPE from GRACE BIBLE CHURCH - "Why I believe the KJ Bible." features a confident and persuasive speaker, but his reliability is shown when he reports the Lord as SAYING IN THE TEMPLE "Bring me the Scroll of Isaiah." (Check Lk 4:17.)

P 87 "SATAN'S MASTERPIECE, the new ASV," Dr Ruckman writes concerning the Rev 2219 reading BOOK of life "the reader may be interested to know (in the cause of scientific exegesis and documented evidence) that the Authorised Reading is found in the Greek [RT]," yet [Nes] doesn't mention it. He calls this "Cunning craftiness," Eph 4:14. It's not in [Nes] as it's in no Greek Mss. The [RT] gained this and other readings from the Vulgate. Yet Ruckman says Modern versions are polluted by Roman Catholicism, and [RT] isn't!) JRWhi 6468

Dr P Ruckman ABOUT THE NEW KING JAMES BIBLE P 4. talks about the Alexandrian Cult running from Origen AD 250 to Farstad, Editor of NKJV. JRWhi P 112. He can give no basis for his statement, and although similar statements linking Origen with the Sinaiticus Mss, Westcott & Hort, [Nes] and modern versions are made constantly I have yet to read any attempt to support such claims from the record of History. Oddly enough there IS a clear link between Origen and the KJV through the [RT] as Erasmus, the originator of the [RT], said he admired Origen, and his method of interpreting the Bible! SLGr P 82

Dr Spackman, "How fortunate we are today to be able to hold in our hands the preserved, infallible, inerrant, inspired word of God, the King James 1611 Bible. SPSB May 85 P 7- Fortunate indeed, as I've never seen one - check your KJV - Unless Ruth 3:15 reads "HE went into the city," you haven't got the 1611 KJV, so haven't got the inspired word of God! Such sincere, earnest nonsense is surprising, but God's promise in 2 Th 2:11-12 may well be relevant. After all have Ruckman, Spackman etc believed/obeyed the truth of 2 Tim 2:24-26?)

E. Read 11.11.97. Revised 1.9.98

(Criticism / Correction / Addition is welcomed. Please feel free to use this material in any way you wish, to the glory of God.)

Other booklets:

LISTENING TO THE LORD - I Kings 1-8; I Kings 9-22; II Kings; Habakkuk, Ruth, Haggai; Romans 1-4, 5-8, 9-11, 12-16; 1 Corinthians 1-4, 5-7, 8-11, 12-14, 15-16; 2 Corinthians 1-4, 5-9, 10-13; Colossians; 1 Thessalonians; 2 Thessalonians. 2 Peter & Jude; Revelation 1-5; 6-22

LOOKING TO THE WORD OF GOD - Abortion Protests, and Lessons from Sodom; Guidance; The Believer and Evil; Outline of Pre-Reformation Church History; A.N. Groves and the Brethren Movement - Reformation towards the NT Pattern.

Copies of these are gladly supplied free from E. Read, F2 55 Middleton Rd, Christchurch 4, New Zealand.