

HISTORY & HERITAGE OF THE BIBLE

SESSION SEVEN: THE IDEOLOGY OF OUR THEOLOGY

Week	Date	Subject	Hayden	Due
7	Apr 5	IDEOLOGY IN THEOLOGY (Scholars & Scriptures): Reality in History (Scribes & Scrolls) / FINAL EXAM	135-166	Quiz 3 & Report

INTRODUCTION

The Apostle Paul prophesied a coming great apostasy in his epistle to the Thessalonians. He declared there would “come a falling away” (2 Thess. 2:3); and then added that the “mystery of iniquity doth already work” (2 Thess. 2:7). Later, on his journey to Jerusalem, he gathered together the bishops that were over the churches in Ephesus and said, “of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.” (Acts 20:30-31) Even in Paul's day, apostasy was being built. But cinsе you’re not yet feeling me like I need you to, can I let Paul give you

AN EXPERIENTIAL EXEGESIS OF HOW APOSTASY WORKS

Later in his labors, Paul pointed out three ways apostasy was working.

1. False knowledge was exalted above the scriptures, 1 Tim 6:20

“O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science falsely so called.” (1 Tim. 6:20) The Greek word translated *science*, is, *gnosis*. Gnosis means knowledge. In this context is meant the hidden, mysterious, secretive esoteric knowledge that the Gnostics claimed about Jesus either being phantom and not man, or being man and not divine. False teachers were placing their own interpretations on Christian truth by reading human ideas into it. This tendency grew and increased until a system bearing the name of Gnosticism was established.

2. The literal meaning of scripture was spiritualized away, 2 Tim 2:16-18

“But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as cloth a canker: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already and overthrow the faith of some” (2 Tim. 2:16-18). One way prominent teachers could say that the resurrection was past was to teach, as some of their descendants do today, the resurrection is a spiritual process that takes place at conversion. Turning the Bible into an allegory became a passion of some of the early church fathers. In our day, allegorizing is not only a passion, but is also a refuge from truth.

3. Philosophy is substituted for scripture, Col 2:8

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8). Henry Milman, Dean of St.

Paul's Cathedral, wrote a three volume history of Christianity in 1855 in which he talks about what was going on in early Christianity. He says, "Even before the days of Christ, the very existence of the Jewish religion was threatened by intellectual leaders of the Jews who were carried away with the subtleties and glamour of pagan philosophy. This same temptress quickly ensnared multitudes who bore the name of Christian. "Greek philosophy exercised the greatest influence not only on the Christian mode of thought, but also through that on the institutions of the Church. In the completed church we find again the philosophic schools."

The greatest enemies of the infant Christian church were not found in triumphant heathenism, but in the flood of heresy which. This is what brought on the Dark Ages. So if we give our lives to advancing the message of the Bible, how do we know the Bible we hold in our hand is the actual word of God?

Prov 22:20-21 Have not I written to thee excellent things in counsels and knowledge, 21 That I might make thee know the certainty of the words of truth; that thou mightest answer the words of truth to them that send unto thee?

Many pastors completely negate the results of their preaching because they cannot point anyone to the certainty of the words of truth. They get up, and say they have something that they really don't intellectually believe they have. And

Thesis: Any time you take away from the authority of the scriptures, you lose some of the anointedness of the Spirit.

That does not mean you will not be successful building a church with an NIV. But it does mean you will not be successful building the kind of Philadelphian church God wants us to have in a Laodicean age. So in order to summarize some of the technical material we looked at in the last three weeks, I want to take that same material and see what Jesus himself said, what the disciples believed, what the role of Satan is, and what the battle is all about.

How is it that we can remain victorious through the battle? That's the ideology of our theology. What about the reality in history? There were discoveries, as we are going to see. There was a disaster, when certain men—even saved men—acted on their unbelief. But there are answers, and there is an argument that we want to make sure you have answered as a result of this course.

1A SCHOLARS AND SCRIPTURES

GEN 18:14 Is any thing too hard for the LORD?

PSA 119:89 For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.

PSA 100:5 For the LORD is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations.

1B WHAT JESUS HIMSELF SAID

The first reason I know that the Bible I have is the very words of God, is because of the

nature of scripture itself. We can know the Bible's nature from what Jesus said about it.

Heb 10:7 Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God.

In the scroll of the roll it stands written of me, and that's what I came to do. Jesus was not a critic of the words of the Bible. He simply affirms what the Bible says.

John 5:39 Search **the scriptures**; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.

You think you have eternal life in the Torah apart from the teacher. Well think again, because if you search there you will find me. That's why you have life in the scriptures, because they witness to the Savior. What happens if we don't search the scriptures?

Mat 22:29 Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing **the scriptures**, nor the power of God.

If you don't search the scriptures you are making a big mistake, because

Point 1. You do not have God's power if you do not have his words.

So knowing the certainty of the words of truth is critical.

MAT 21:42 Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in **the scriptures**, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?

Here, Jesus quotes Psalm 118:22. Even after 1100 years of copying and recopying, the Old Testament available to the chief priests and elders was regarded as God's words by the Son of God (and he ought to know). It was something they could lay their hands on and read with their own eyes. Jesus was not a textual critic; he simply affirmed the scriptures **as they then stood in time, in the hands of his people**. What about the apostles?

2B WHAT THE DISCIPLES BELIEVED

When the disciples were with their Rabbi, their Master, they sometimes had a hard time understanding his teachings.

John 2:22 When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed **the scripture**, and the word which Jesus had said.

They remembered that it was written in their Old Testament. When they put that together with the words of the Lord, they believed the Bible. So the disciples were not critics of the Bible. They did not add, eliminate, or change words based on what the original must have said. There was no practice of textual criticism because the Levitical priests had been practicing textual preservation all along.

LUK 24:27,45,32 And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all **the scriptures** the things concerning himself. 45 Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, 32 And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us **the scriptures**?

So not only did the chief priests and elders have scripture, the disciples also had scripture. They were not textual critics of the scripture, either.

1TI 5:18 For **the scripture** saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his reward.

In one verse, Paul quotes Deuteronomy 25:4 and Luke 10:7 and calls them both together Scripture. One writing was 1555 years old; the other was about 20 years old. Still later, Jude 17-18 quotes 2 Peter 3:3 with the authority of Scripture. So none of the disciples were textual critics, but there is someone who does deign to stand up and criticize God's word.

3B THE ROLE OF SATAN

Gen 3:1 Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, **Yea, hath God said**, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?

“Eve, did God really say that? Was that in the original? Are you sure you didn't miss something in translation? I mean, after all, no mere mortal human being can know the thoughts of God. God was using imperfect human language to convey his ideas. Maybe the receptor language was not adequate to express his true meaning? And besides, you cannot perfectly translate from one language exactly into another anyway. Yea, hath God said?” That is the same way critics plant the seed of doubt in the minds of Christians today. They do it by opening for question the accuracy and clarity of the text of God's word, because

Point 2. If Satan can get you to doubt God's word then he has moved you from a position of faith.

If he cannot keep you from trusting God for salvation, he will struggle to get you to stop trusting God in the scriptures—and thereby wipe-out your power for ministry. That is his role. You better recognize that, **if you ever find an error in your Bible, it will not be the Holy Ghost who showed it to you.** Hello somebody!

4B WHAT THE BATTLE IS ALL ABOUT

This is what the battle is all about. Satan hates God's written word just like he hates God's incarnate word, Jesus Christ. He wants people to be confused about the nature and purpose of the Bible, just like he wants them to be confused about the nature and purpose of Jesus. He wants us to be facing both ways, to be running around unsure of the truth and how to act on it. So the battle rages today for the Bible. It is a Satanic attack of the serpent on the scriptures. But hold on one second, because it is also a human attack. It is also a humanistic attack, because Satan uses tools. He is an agency and so he has agents. He transforms himself into an angel of light, and then he uses false apostles, false scholarship, and oppositions of science falsely so-

called. We were warned.

2 Tim 3:13 But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.

Deceivers will come. They will create confusion concerning the scriptures. So it will be doubt, but also deception. It will be a Satanic attack, and also a humanistic attack. Yea, hath God said? How can we be sure of what God is saying today? Do we have to take our human mind and critique the original text of the Bible or criticize the English text of the Bible? Was the original lost? Do we have to go around trying to find it in the mass of rotting codex that history has left behind? Is man true and God a liar all these years? We are not left to the doubts of Satan or to the deceptions of men. In talking about the advantages the Jews had Paul says,

Rom 3:2-4 Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God. 3 For what if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?

Some people don't believe. Does that mean God has been unfaithful to his word? Just because your pastor or priest or professor or peers or parents can't find it, does that mean God has failed in making it clear?

4 God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.

Don't come to the wrong conclusion just because the NIV is the most popular selling translation. It is written. Even if it was written a thousand years before Paul quoted it, Paul believed it, and was not critical of the text. So what is the real objective Satan has in this battle?

2 Tim 3:15-16 And that from a child thou hast known **the holy scriptures**, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 16 All **scripture** is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

Timothy had the scriptures. Timothy's grandmother knew where to find the scriptures. Paul says, when you can identify something as scripture, then you have something that was given by inspiration. So the question is not, Is the King James Bible inspired? Were the translators inspired? Was it double inspiration (of the originals and then of the translation)? No, the question is this: is the King James Bible scripture? Because if it is, then it is God's words, given by a process of inspiration. And remember, all through these verses, **the scripture is not tied to the original writings.**

Defn.: Scripture does not equal originals; scripture is that which was written and recognized as authoritative.

Jesus did not have the originals when he said to search the scriptures. The disciples did not have the originals when they believed the scriptures. Timothy's mother did not have the originals when she taught Timothy the scriptures. When Paul translated the Hebrew into Greek and then quoted it, that was still scripture. So scripture stands independent of the originals, irrespective of time, place, language, intervening years, numbers of copyists, etc.

Scripture is words breathed-into by God. When you say a word, you breathe. Try saying something without breathing into the words you want to say. It can't be done. What was breathed out was not a process of superintending. God did not breathe a subjective process that we cannot put our fingers on with certainty. It was not concepts. What he breathed was an objective revelation in written communication, caught and passed-on in word packages.

It was not inhaling but inspiration. It was breathed-into, not exhaled. And it was not a person who was breathed into. It's not that the writers were inspired. What was breathed-into was words. Whenever we can identify scripture, in our age and in our language, we have something breathed-into by God.

Point 3. Just like God put his breath into dust and made it a living soul, God puts his breath into the Bible and makes it his living word.

That is how the authority of God is mediated, manifested and made known through his word. Yes it is just paper and ink—just like man is only clay. But when it has God's Spirit in it, through it and upon it, it is scripture. Let me give you a

SUMMARY

In every age, God has given understanding to the spirit of man by inspiration. In this dispensation he has inspired a divine revelation we know as scripture. That scripture, irrespective of age or original language, is what we know as the word of God; it bears his nature and his eternality. Let's define Biblically what our attitude toward it should be.

Psa 119:89-90 For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven. 90 Thy faithfulness is unto all generations: thou hast established the earth, and it abideth.

PSA 119:140 Thy word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it.

PSA 119:144 The righteousness of thy testimonies is everlasting: give me understanding, and I shall live.

PSA 119:152 Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them for ever.

PSA 119:160 Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever.

PSA 119:128 Therefore I esteem all thy precepts concerning all things to be right; and I hate every false way.

2A SCRIBES AND SCROLLS

Here is a stack of Bibles. Good News. NIV. New English. New American Standard. Revised Standard. Living. Berkely. Phillips. What is the reality on the ground? Am I saying God could not do the same thing now that he did in 1611? No. Am I saying that he could never give us an eighth printed revision in the line of the Authorized Version? No. But the reality is he hasn't, and

I know that he hasn't by looking at two things: the evidence and the alternatives.

As to the alternatives, you need to realize this. The dilemma is not in choosing among hundreds of English translations. The issue is not the translations, but the text behind the translation. It is the source of the text behind the New Testament. The choice is not between the AV and the NIV, NASB, NRSV, or anything else.

Point 4. There are not 200 choices because there are only two main sources: a God-preserved text and a man-made text

The King James Bible comes from one source. No other modern translation comes from that same source. All other modern English translations come from a different Greek text, and all this has happened just within the last 150 years. How did we get into this dilemma? You're asking good questions today. It was forced on us by the alliance of the modern scholars and the publishing houses. The modern textual critic and the modern Bible publisher conspire together to increase profits and it ends up confusing the church. I'm not saying that's their intent or their motive, or they do it consciously, or that they are not sincere.

There are two sources—two separate lines of Bibles. They are very different when you consider that the doctrine of inspiration, preservation, and the word of God itself is at stake. These two lines of Bibles represent two entirely different approaches to the Bible, including two philosophies of inspiration and two methods of translation. On the one hand you have a Bible given to us by people who believed God gave us his word, and then that he preserved it. On the other side you have Bibles that are a product of human opinion and rationalization. Oh, and human scholarship. But one side understood the Satanic attack on scripture, the other is willingly ignorant of it or totally oblivious to it. So let's delineate the debate.

1B THE DEBATE: HISTORY OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

1C THE GENEALOGICAL METHOD OF CLASSIFYING MANUSCRIPTS

Let's say Paul wrote an original manuscript. A manuscript is called a manuscript because it is hand-written. This was the days before the printing press, so up until 1450 AD everything was a manuscript. The original copy is called the autograph. What if another church wanted a copy? They made one. When the copies got into circulation, everybody wanted one. So pretty soon they were making copies of copies. The more copies were made, the more variations there were. Most of them were unintentional and therefore fairly easy to spot, but some significant ones were deliberately made by ancient scholars who were unbelievers. And the hardest variant to catch would be the one where they left something out, because you simply would not know it was ever there. They corrupted the word of God on purpose to fit their theological heresies. If a man believed Christ was only God up until the cross—but that he lost his deity and became a mere mortal once they put him on the cross—then he would remove references indicating the deity of Christ while he was on the cross. He would not allow the dying thief to call Jesus Lord, for example.

Defn.: Scriptorium—a copy room for scribes.

About 200 AD, *scriptoria* were established at the major churches and major schools, where manuscripts started to be mass-produced. So today there exist over 5,686 copies of MSS, all with variations in them, called variant readings. Textual critics in the late 1800s felt that these

copies fell into three basic groups based on a family relationship among the readings of various manuscripts. Now follow this. The modern scholar looks back at that situation, and he says, Those three groupings of manuscripts represent three types of text. One is an Eastern text centered around the Baptist Temple in Antioch of Syria. Another is a text centered around Bob Jones University in Caesarea. And the third is a “Western” text centered around a liberal Catholic seminary in Alexandria in Egypt. Some scholars added in a family from Jerusalem. Most scholars today reject anything but the Western Alexandrian text line and the Eastern Byzantine text line as being true families, so they only allow two families of texts. Kurt Aland further complicates things by talking about a strict text and a free text, but this was called the genealogical method of textual criticism. Put the MSS into basic families, and then make your ruling regarding variant readings based on what you believe about those families of texts. Don’t get confused yet, because we just got started.

The Genealogical Method		
TWO FAMILIES OF TEXTS		PHANTOM FAMILY
“Western”	Eastern	Caesarean
Alexandrian from Hesychius	Koine from Lucian	
Egyptian	Byzantine (Antioch)	
	Traditional or <u>Received Text</u> (<i>Textus Receptus</i>)	Most current scholars challenge its existence
	Majority Text	
5% of existing MSS	95% of existing MSS	
Intentional corruptions	Unintentional errors	
NIV, Etc.	KJV	Mystery

So, here it is. Here is how the rational Greek mind operates. Even though over 80% of the readings may be the Eastern or Byzantine or Traditional text, it is only allowed one vote. The Alexandrian text has equal weight (or even greater weight because the MSS are older). When Western is divided from Alexandrian and made its own family, then they have doubled the vote. It has a louder voice than the Received Text. This is the way they overthrew the variant readings found in the majority of MSS. They took a family of manuscripts that had been corrupted early-on by Gnostic scholars and other heretics for doctrinal purposes (like weakening the deity of Christ), and used them to overthrow the majority of manuscripts. As they did so they set up certain protocols to follow in their emerging science of textual criticism.

2C CANONS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Defn.: Canon—an accepted principle or rule; a criterion or standard of judgment.

Textual critics have invented their rules as they went along (i.e. they do not come from principlizing the Bible). These basic rules are called canons. Let me point out the key canons of textual criticism, because these are the rules that textual critics and scholars actually play the game by. What we are teaching here in a very short time is the basic fundamentals of textual criticism. It is the way the modern Greek texts were constructed. Do NOT try this at home. Most pastors don’t even know the rules when they get into arguing over the word of God. It’s a shell game and they don’t know how it’s played.

1) External Canon: Manuscripts must be weighed, not counted

That's another way of saying we will overthrow the majority reading by assigning more weight to an older reading, under the assumption that the older reading is closer to the original. They refuse to concede that maybe it's old and still exists because that MS had been tampered with and therefore no one used it. Or because climate conditions in Egypt preserved it, but Alexandria was the hotbed of religious heresy.

2) Internal Canon: The reading is to be preferred that best explains the others

This is the genealogical principle, which means we view the evidence in terms of text-types or families of manuscripts.

3) Transcriptional Probabilities: *Lectio difficilior lectio potior* (the more difficult reading is the more probable original reading)

The assumption was that no one would purposely mess with God's word. So that means that the more absurd the reading, the more true it must be, because after all, no one would ever take the word of God and make it sound stupid. At least no one except

2 Tim 3:8 Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.

1 Tim 6:5 Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth,

2 Cor 2:17 For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.

Modern textual critical scholars do not believe those verses apply to how they view the evidence. So to them, the more difficult it is to explain the reading, then the greater chance it is original. After all, those apostles were no scholars, anyway. So the original reading must have been the one that says the apostle made a mistake in what he was trying to say. Those guys were only fishermen. (I am unmasking for you the real assumptions of the critics.)

4) Transcriptional Probabilities: *Lectio brevior lectio potior* (the shorter reading is the more probable original reading)

They have other external canons related to intrinsic probabilities that sound just as absurd. The reading that is counter to church usage is best. The disharmonious reading is best. The less familiar reading is best. The reading which seems to be ungrammatical is best. The reading which includes unfamiliar words is best. The reading which is susceptible to a heretical interpretation is best.

Defn.: Conflation—a composite reading; to confuse and then blend two readings of a text.

In other words, no one would ever take away from the word of God. All those nasty little Byzantine scribes ever did was think of ways to add to it (called conflation), and harmonize it, and make it look like everything cross-referenced. Yes, my pretty. We believe in evolution, don't we? That means it started off as a skeleton and the New Testament filled-out its doctrine over

centuries of time. So the shorter reading must always be the correct one. Now, I want you to notice three things.

- (A) That the more absurd reading is the original is only right if you do not accept verbal **inspiration**. You are saying that the writers were ignoramuses, therefore they must have written incorrect things.
- (B) That the shorter reading is the original is only right if you do not accept continuous **preservation**. You are assuming that the Holy Spirit fell asleep, allowed his word to be lost for eighteen some-odd centuries, and only lately did we re-find it.
- (C) That the older the reading is the more probable original is only right if you venerate **tradition**. You are superstitiously following a relic for no objective reason.

It is amazing to me, that they want lately, newly discovered MSS that were not in common use for centuries, and yet they refuse a late, majority-received text. They venerate an older corrupt set of MSS, and yet reject the old-school traditional reformation text. So

- We say the traditional, eastern, Byzantine majority text is the original because it's easier to read, and the original was given by inspiration
- We say the traditional text is the original because it is longer and every word was preserved in history
- We say the traditional text is the original because it was used and worn-out and so the copies we have are in the majority but are later in date

Those are all theological arguments by the way (which is why the modern critical textual scholars reject them). Another thing I want you to notice is practical. In practice, almost every time you have to consider a variant reading in the New Testament, the rules cancel each other out! In other words, the harder reading is the longer, and the shorter reading is the easier. That means the textual critic is left to sit in judgment on the word of God and choose as he pleases, based upon subjective criteria and his own subjective biases and presuppositions. The conclusion of this genealogical method and these canons of textual criticism was that the *Textus Receptus*, the Received Text, the Traditional Text was deemed vile and unreliable.

3B THE DISASTER

The disaster was the publication that came out of all of this. In 1871 two scholars by the name of Westcott and Hort published a new Greek text, following the genealogical method of MS classification, which was based on the discovery of two very early Greek MSS, and incorporating the canons of textual criticism they invented as we have described. But that wasn't enough. They used the appearance of this Greek text to call for a revision of the King James Bible, because

Point 5. A new text should always result in a new translation.

So they assembled more scholars, and in 1881 they produced the Revised Version of the Bible. The Americans, being more conservative in their theology and wanting a more literal translation, were not pleased. But they had signed an agreement they would not issue a competing translation for twenty years. So in 1901 the Americans came out with their rendition,

called the American Standard Version. Two philosophies have come out of this disaster.

TWO BASIC PHILOSOPHIES OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

1. The true text has never been lost but was preserved

The first philosophy is that the true text was never lost, but faithfully preserved by the priesthood of believers down through the centuries. In this method, textual criticism is a pure science with the goal of finding out what has been preserved continuously in an unbroken line of succession, or what was standardized and approved by the priesthood of believers.

—It believes in the supernatural, it trusts in God's overriding providence, and it observes the hand of the Holy Spirit through history.

2. The text is part of an evolutionary process continuing today

The modern philosophy of textual criticism is that the true text is the product of an evolutionary process that is still not over today. And

—Whatever was true was lost very early.

It is the same philosophy held by every cult group in America. They teach that the truth was lost in the first century, and only their founder has recently discovered it.

During about fourteen centuries when the New Testament was transmitted in handwritten copies, numerous changes and accretions came into the text. Of the approximately five thousand Greek manuscripts of all or part of the New Testament that are known today, no two agree exactly in all particulars. Confronted by a mass of conflicting readings, editors must decide which variants deserve to be included in the text... Textual scholars have developed certain generally acknowledged criteria of evaluation. These considerations depend ... upon probabilities, and sometimes the textual critic must weigh one set of probabilities against another.

Since textual criticism is an art as well as a science, it is inevitable that in some cases different scholars will come to different evaluations of the significance of the evidence.

Bruce Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (New York: UBS, 1975)

I would put his last statement this way: if textual criticism is as art as well as a science, then there is not objective, externally verifiable accountability over what the textual critic-scholar produces, and we can therefore justify the capricious prejudices of unsaved men who are now touching the text. That was not what happened in the history of the traditional text, as we saw. By 1633 the scholars came to the same evaluation of the evidence. So much so, that in the space of about 160 printed editions since 1516, they were able to deliver to the world "the text received by all, with nothing changed or corrupted."

So you have to recognize that prior to 1871 this new Greek text never existed, standardized and printed in one spot, on the face of the earth. The Byzantine majority text did. It was prevalent everywhere. But this new one is the worst corruptions of thousands of scattered MSS, all drawn together. So they had to take the majority text as the basis, but they always replaced it wherever Aleph and B agreed with each other, and sometimes replaced it even where they disagreed among themselves. Here a little, there a little, every where a little. Old MacDonald made a text, eeny-meeny-miny-mo.

Defn.: Eclectic—selecting what appears to be best from various sources.

Today that text has come down to us being called the eclectic text. The word eclectic means to pick and choose from various sources. But in this case, it does not mean to pick and choose from the MS evidence. It means to pick and choose between the extant Greek MSS on one side, and the subjective biases and opinions of the textual critics on the other.

Practically, they made up their Bible as they went along. It never existed before they published it. Five unsaved people—the authors of the modern eclectic Greek text—have chosen what should be in your NIV. Or your NASB. So this was utter disaster. Never before in the history of Christianity was Satan able to do to God's word what he has been able to do through textual criticism.

Point 6. Centuries of persecution and destruction did not wipe our English Bible out, but a few decades of manipulation and corruption has stolen its authority.

That's why manuscript evidence in this course is so very important, because even the weight of the entire persecutions of the Roman emperors were not able to accomplish against the word of God what has been done in the last 150 years. We now have a relative text, not an absolute text—because every year new manuscripts are found, new scholars are crowned, new evaluations are made—and so new translations are copyrighted and produced.

4B THE DILEMMA: WHICH BIBLE?

1 Tim 6:20 O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:

This is why we are in the Laodicean age today. This is why the Philadelphian-age Bible scholars did not reproduce themselves by discipleship. They were corrupted with bad seed by scholars called textual critics. At the first it didn't seem major because there were only two choices: the AV or the RV. But it still cut the heart out of godly men seeing themselves reproduced in the next generation. Why? Because they accepted this brand new text, and this new philosophy of communication and translation theory uncritically, as science. They did not criticize its assumptions, its philosophy, or its methods. They did not examine the original sources. They criticized into doubt and distrust the Authorized Version that had been passed down to them. The truth hurts, but it was an unmitigated disaster.

Not initially, because God's people rejected it, by and large. Look how long it has taken this new text to make inroads. It's been over a hundred years since they came out with the English Revised Version and only in the last few years has the NIV sold more copies than the AV. So there was by no means a massive movement to these new Bibles made from this new text. But

as the years went by, the advertising hype became more and more effective and things began to change. All kinds of translations sprung up.

- Liberal scholars revised the Revised Version into the Revised Standard Version. It has since been revised again to include inclusive language, so they call it the New Revised Standard Version.
- Then came a man who was an evangelical named J.B. Phillips. He made a translation of the New Testament in 1958.
- Then some fundamentalists decided to jump on the haywagon. So the American Standard Version was revised into the New American Standard Bible in 1971, revised again in 1995.
- Then there was the Living Bible paraphrased by an evangelical. Now there is a New Living translation as well.
- Then the liberal wing of Southern Baptists countered with a dynamic equivalence translation called the Good News Bible or TEV, Today's English Version.
- The conservative wing of Southern Baptists has more recently countered with the Holman Christian Standard Bible in 2004.
- All the little evangelicals from all over the world got together and produced the New International Version for the International Bible Society. Eventually they further specialized it into an Nlrv, reader's version for kids, and the magazines for boys and girls that claim to contain the New Testament, and the TNIV which has gender-neutral inclusive language.
- Evangelical and Reformed scholars got together, took the 1971 RSV text, changed its liberal interpretations, and published an essential literal translation called the ESV or English Standard Bible in 2001. This has been a process of steadily working our way right back to received text readings and King James type translations.
- There is also the CEV Contemporary English Version
- The NCV New Century Version
- The NAB New American Bible for the Catholics
- The REB Revised English Bible
- The Message translation

But they all come out of the same eclectic Greek text, not the traditionally received text (or out of a "reasoned eclectic" process used by the translators). That has led to the dilemma today: which Bible is the word of God? Any of the above? All of the above? None of the above? That's the only choice! If it IS any of the above, how do I find it? What canons do I use?

5B THE DEFENDERS: ARGUMENTS

You say, Wow! Didn't anybody criticize this brand-new Greek text at the time of its introduction? Yes. One of the foremost defenders of the received text was John Burgon, Dean of Chichester. He wrote a book in 1861 on the inspiration of the Bible. Then he wrote a book saying that the last half of Mark 16 should be in the Bible, and any text that called itself a Bible that didn't have it was false, and he showed from textual criticism the reasons why. Then he wrote a book against the Revised Version called *The Revision Revised*. His associate, Henry Miller, wrote a book on textual criticism. Another scholar named Herman Hoskier wrote a book called *Codex B and its Allies*, criticizing those two manuscripts.

The defenders showed that the traditional text was the true text. The true text was preserved in the majority of MSS. The received text, inherited from the Eastern Church, had been

preserved through the priesthood of believers. While Satan and Rome were able to kill almost all the true Bible believers, they were not able to eliminate the text. They showed this through a variety of evidences. There were a multitude of countries and church leaders. They showed the unbroken historical continuity over fifteen centuries as God's people used what came to be known to us as the Byzantine family of texts.

Dean Burgon shredded the modern text, but scholars ignored that. When the new translations came along, true Bible believers began to examine them. All the modern translations really form their own family! Look at it this way. They all leave out the name of Satan in the same places. They all take out similar references to the blood of Christ. They all change the word hell to the grave. They all remove the word, Lucifer, from Satan.

Then the defenders started looking at these two scholars, Westcott and Hort. They found they were enamored with philosophy and mysticism. They were involved with occult spiritualist organizations, contrary to Old Testament prohibitions. They had a fascination with Mary.

6B THE DECISION: ANSWERS

So what are we going to make of all of this? Three facts that favor the received text.

1) The correct MSS are in the majority

Of all the Greek MSS still in existence (there are about 5,745 as of January, 2005) how many of them belong to the traditional text? At least 80-95%. They are in harmony with one another. They have the easier readings. They have the longer readings. Their weight should be counted for what it is. Your only alternative is to give up on the authority of the Bible altogether, because

Point 7. Inspiration means nothing without preservation.

And preservation means nothing without inscripturation (which may be in the original language or through a translation).

2) Besides that, the received text also goes back earlier than the other text

The northern climate and common, regular use simply didn't preserve early examples of it.

3) Plus, the received text still has a variety of early evidences to back it up, like versions, church fathers, and lectionaries

It was used in North Africa, in Asia and in Europe. The Alexandrian text was used in mainly one place: Egypt (a type of the world). The received text was also translated into other languages very early on. It was translated into the Syriac Peshitto. It was translated in Africa into the Coptic. It was translated into the Old Latin before Jerome, but there are no translations that come out of the Alexandrian text as a whole. Then there are the early church fathers in 87,000 scripture quotations, and the majority of those quotations are taken from what is today known as the received text. There are more than 2000 lectionaries, and all of them come from the received text because the church of God had rejected the Alexandrian text.

- 4) The traditional text was received and believed by God's people for over a thousand years

Compare that with how little the Alexandrian text was used, and how long it sat dormant and undiscovered until Satan brought it back, just at the right time, when Christians wanted a fourth revolution to put them on the same footing with Darwin, Freud and Marx.

- 5) Then take a look at the MSS representing the Alexandrian text, because Sinaiticus leaves out 4000 words from the gospels alone; it adds 1000 words and changes the reading in another 1500 places.

That MS is so filled with mistakes that at least three editors worked on it, some of whom probably didn't even know Greek because of the preponderance of nonsense readings. There were so many corrections it had multiple correctors! But when you begin looking at it in detail, you find that it adds six new books to the Bible while it contains our earliest copy of the Septuagint (which is a Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament).

How about Vaticanus? It leaves out 1000 sentences. It adds 500 words. It changes words around 2000 times. And 17,000 times it differs with its brother found in the Sinai in terms of variant readings! And check this: it leaves out five books of the New Testament and adds five more that are not supposed to be there. No wonder the Pope didn't want to poop with it, and put it back down in the cellar! (You can kiss my Vatic-anus.)

Point 8. Bad copies were rejected by God's people but harbored by monks and Popes.

7B THE DEAL: MODERN VERSIONS

Let me summarize by saying our real problem with all modern translations is three-fold.

THE PROBLEM WITH MODERN VERSIONS

1. They are not a product of the operation of the Holy Spirit through the priesthood of believers
2. They have a faulty text to translate from

If I am a Christian who presupposes the Bible to be the mind of God, and assumes God is totally consistent with himself in scripture and in history, you cannot tell me that five unsaved men who made up the word of God as they went along, can give me a textual basis for a new translation. It doesn't add up, Biblically, historically or even rationally and logically.

3. They have a false philosophy of translating work

Two glaring problems with the modern versions compared to the King James are the issues of the spirituality of the translators and the dumbing-down of the English text.

1C SCHOLARSHIP VS SPIRITUALITY

There is still a demand for scholarship in today's translating, but there is indifference about the spirituality of the translators.

2C ANGLICIZATION OF THE TEXT

Modern Bibles tend to translate the Hebrew and Greek into today's slang, with more idiomatic English expressions. The AV was to be "as consonant as can be to the original Hebrew and Greek," yet the translators preserved the text with a gravity, seriousness and rhythm. But the modern translator doesn't want his work to be recognizable as a translation at all. It is a difference between two competing philosophies. The form in which God gave his word is important. It should only be changed minimally in the translation. It is not proper to change the revelation of God to suit modern English usage.

3A TYING UP LOOSE ENDS

1B WHAT IS THE SEPTUAGINT?

THE SEPTUAGINT (abbreviated LXX) is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament. Scholars today say it was translated as early as the third century BC in Alexandria, Egypt, but in its present form it was probably the work of a Church Father named Origen (because the earliest complete example we have is preserved in codex Aleph and B from AD 350).

ORIGEN ADAMANTIUS (184-254 AD) was a North African church leader from Alexandria, Egypt. He believed in baptismal regeneration and pointed to his childhood baptism as the "apostolic source" of his Christianity. He was taught by Clement of Alexandria. Clement had succeeded the Gnostic Church Father Pantaenus (AD 180) as president of the "catechetical school" in Alexandria. Clement's curriculum for young Origen was a mix of Platonic, Philonic, and Stoic philosophies. He studied for several years under Ammonius Saccas (170-243), who was the founder of neo-Platonism.

Origen did not believe the Genesis account of Adam and Eve was true history. He intimated that infants who were not baptized would go to hell. He denied the literal resurrection. He accepted Judith and Tobit (part of the Apocrypha) as inspired books. He believed in the reincarnation of the soul and transmigration of the soul after death. He created the Hexapla.

Hexapla: A collection of the scriptures in six languages in parallel columns; specifically, the edition of the Old Testament published by Origen, in the 3rd century.

Origen created the Hexapla (from the Greek word meaning "six columns"). It was a six version parallel Old Testament, comparing the ancient Greek versions of the OT side by side. The first column was the original Hebrew, column two was a Greek transliteration of the Hebrew, column three was a translation by Aquilla (95-137, an Ebionite [a heretical cult]), column four was by Symmachus (160-211, another Ebionite who rejected the Pauline epistles), column five was by Origen, and column six by Theodotian (another Ebionite). Scholars today assume that Origen's fifth column is his revision of a LXX originally translated 200-300 years before Christ. There are fragments of the Pentateuch in Greek that date from the 2nd century BC, and of the minor prophets that date from the 1st century BC. In all probability, the complete LXX found in Aleph and B is Eusebius' copy of Origen's fifth column work. It was translated in classical Greek (not the common Greek language).

Before 1947, the oldest Hebrew text in existence was from about AD 900. People assumed the LXX was made in Alexandria, Egypt about AD 250 by 72 Jews. This assumption is based on one Letter of Aristeas (full of other myths and fables, it says that 72 Jews came up with a translation that was then called "the Seventy"). Scholars assume it preserves an older, therefore

superior Hebrew text, so except for all the absurdities it contains, they use it to “correct” (in reality, corrupt) the Masoretic text preserved by the scribes. The bottom line is that the LXX has errors in many places. The New Testament often corrects the LXX. In no less than 175 of their 263 direct quotations of the Old Testament, the Apostles contradict what we have today as the LXX reading. My contention is that in the places where it matched they were not quoting from the LXX, but rather that the LXX text was made to conform to their quotations at a later date.

2B WHAT IS THE APOCRYPHA?

Canon: The collection of books accepted as Holy Scripture; the books of the Bible recognized by the Christian church as genuine and inspired.

Apocrypha: The name is Greek and means hidden or secret (hence spurious) writings. It is applied to fourteen books that formed part of the Septuagint, but not of the Hebrew canon recognized by the Jews of Palestine. The Council of Trent included all but three of these books in their canon of inspired books, having equal authority with the Old Testament. The German and English Reformers grouped them in their Bibles under the title Apocrypha, as not having dogmatic authority, but being profitable for instruction. The Apocrypha is now omitted from the King James's Bible.

These books were written in the 3rd to 1st centuries BC. We do not know by whom they were written. They were not in the Hebrew Old Testament even though they are found in the LXX. They were written in the interim period between Malachi and Matthew (397 BC-AD 37), after prophecy, oracles, and direct revelation from God had stopped. The Jews never recognized them as part of Scripture. Jesus never quoted them (nor anyone else in the New Testament). The early church did not recognize them as being inspired. The Roman Catholic Church at the council of Trent in 1546, declared them to be Scripture because they bolster beliefs in certain unscriptural doctrines like purgatory. We reject them for the following reasons.

1. None of them were written in Hebrew
2. None of the writers claims to be writing inspired words
3. None of them were acknowledged as Scripture by the Jews and therefore were never sanctioned by Christ (you can see his definition of the canon in Luke 24:44)
4. They were not allowed among the sacred books in the first four centuries of church history
5. They contain statements that contradict Scripture and contradict themselves (like when the two books of Macabees has Antiochus Epiphanes dying three different ways and in three different places)
6. They include doctrines that contradict the Bible (such as praying for the dead, purgatory, and sinless perfection)
7. They teach lying, suicide, assassination, and use of magical incantations

The Apocrypha was included as part of the Old Testament in the Latin Vulgate of Jerome because it was part of the LXX of Origen. It was removed from the Old Testament and placed between the testaments by Miles Coverdale during the English Reformation. It continued to be inserted between the Testaments in every English Bible printed up until about 1820. Once removed from the Old Testament by the Protestants these books were not placed on the same level as Scripture, but they were seen as valuable because they were ancient documents that illustrated the customs, manners, language, and opinion of the East. They also provided

historical evidence of the time between the Testaments.

2B SHOULD WE ACCEPT THE ITALICS AS AUTHORITATIVE?

Italics: These are words introduced into the English rendering **by the translators**, as opposed to being found in the Hebrew or Greek.

It is a tribute to the translators' honesty. They confess that the word is not found in the Hebrew or Greek, but is needed to give the sense of the passage in English. We accept them as they stand as the words of God in English for the following reasons.

1. When Peter quotes the Old Testament in Acts 2:25, it includes what the translators had put in italics in the OT. If this was done consciously on the part of the translators it shows their incredible attention to detail. If it was done unconsciously, it shows the superintendence of God in this seventh printed revision of the English text.

2. Eliminating the italics in 2 Sam 21:19 would create a contradiction about who killed Goliath.

3. God has always been free to "add many like words" that might be necessary to understand the sense in another tongue (Jer 36:32).

1B WHAT ABOUT THE ERRORS IN THE AUTHORIZED VERSION?

1C ACTS 12:4—EASTER

Type: A figure or representation of something or someone to come.

A priori: Knowledge and conceptions assumed or presupposed prior to experience, in order to make experience rational or possible.

It is alleged that the word "Easter" is not found in the Greek text. The Greek word is *pascha* (Passover)—an obvious and glaring mistranslation. The only thing such objections prove is the pride and inconsistency of the Authorized Version's critics and here's why.

1. The event took place during the days of unleavened bread (Acts 12:3)

2. The days of unleavened bread followed Passover (Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7; 1 Cor 5:7-8; Num 28:16-17)

3. The King James was not the first English version to translate it as Easter (Coverdale's Bible did, Matthew's Bible did, the Great Bible did, the Geneva Bible did, and the Bishops Bible did). Easter was considered an acceptable translation for Passover, as the Passover was considered the Jewish easter.

4. What the King James translators understood better than the modern translators (because ALL modern versions read "Passover"), is that Herod was an Edomite who worshipped Roman gods.

They have preserved for us the aspect of Herod as a type of the coming Antichrist who will again imprison believers just as Herod did Peter. Herod was indeed waiting until after his observance of Easter (Ashtar day), not Passover, as modern versions incorrectly translate.

2C MATT 23:24—STRAIN AT A GNAT

3C ACTS 28:15—THE THREE TAVERNS

CONCLUSION

These are only a few of the more notorious examples you might face. God will show you a lot more if you will approach the King James Bible with the *a priori* assumption that it is the “certainty of the words of truth” in English and without error. Contradictions and errors are only apparent, not real. If you do not approach your Bible (in English) the same way David approached his Bible (some of which even by then was centuries old), then you don't have a book worthy of belief and a God worthy of worship.

Psalms 119:31—I have **stuck unto thy testimonies**: O Lord, put me not to shame.

Psalms 119:116—Uphold me according unto thy word, that I may live: and **let me not be ashamed of my hope**.

Psalms 119:159—Consider how **I love thy precepts**: quicken me, O Lord, according to thy lovingkindness.

Psalms 119:161—Princes have persecuted me without a cause: but **my heart standeth in awe of thy word**.

PRO 22:20-21 Have not I written to thee excellent things in counsels and knowledge,
PRO 22:21 That I might make thee know the certainty of the words of truth; that thou mightest answer the words of truth to them that send unto thee?

You have a decision to make. Did he or didn't he? A lot of that answer will be settled by answering one thing in your own mind: could he or couldn't he? If you know him, then you know that he could. If you know that he could, then it's no problem believing that he did. And if he really did, then you know what you have in the Authorized Version King James Bible.

QUIZ #3

NAME: _____ NUMBER SCORE: _____

	Type	QUESTION	Ans	Ref
1	T/F	God is only the editor of the Bible, not its author	F	p. 106
2	T/F	In the Bible, three distinct natures have coincided in one volume	F	p. 106
3	T/F	What the Bible is gives us the key to understanding how the Bible was produced	T	p. 106
4	T/F	Scripture is the breath of God taking form on the pages of the Bible	T	p. 107
5	T/F	All of the Bible was dictated directly by God	F	p. 109
6	T/F	Luke admits that some of his writing was based on research	T	p. 109
7	T/F	God is the source of inspiration and men were the means and the result is God's message	T	p. 113
	T/F	Matching 8. Plenary inspiration ___D___ 9. Verbal inspiration ___A___ 10. Canon ___C___ 11. Apocrypha ___B___	A. Each word is inspired B. Books that are not genuine scripture C. Official collection of authoritative books D. Inspired in its entirety	p. 113
12	T/F	There must be a distinction between what the Bible teaches (which is always right), and what the Bible records (which may be a falsehood)	T	p. 114
13	T/F	Only a few historical incidents in the Bible have been disproved by an archaeological discovery or literary document	F	p. 116
14	T/F	Inspiration ensures the accuracy of historical events recorded by the Bible	T	p. 116
15	T/F	The idea that God would inspire the Bible but then leave its future in doubt by subjecting it to chance is just something we have to accept	F	p. 120
	T/F	Who Wrote the Bible? 16. Moses ___C___ 17. Nathan the prophet ___A___ 18. Joshua ___E___ 19. Gad the seer ___A___ 20. Apostles and prophets ___F___ 21. Ezekiel ___D___ 22. Samuel the seer ___A___ 23. David ___B___	A. 1 Chron 29:29 B. 1 Chron 28:19 C. Deut 31:24 D. Ezekiel 1:3 E. Josh 24:26 F. Eph 2:20; 1 Thes 2:13; 1 Cor 14:37	p. 120
24	T/F	Only one or two books were added to the Jewish canon after Malachi wrote	F	p. 124
25	T/F	Israel's prophets and priests were the "managing editors" of the Old Testament	T	p. 124

26	T/F	A testament is Aramaic for an official covenant or agreement	F	p. 126
27	T/F	When it comes to the Old Testament, "Jesus approved this message" (Matt 5:17-18)	T	p. 129
28	T/F	Initially it was the apostles themselves who decided what books should be recognized as God's word in the New Testament	T	p. 130
29	T/F	Church Fathers and church councils in the 2 nd and 3 rd century simply recognized what the apostles had already authorized	T	p. 130

-0=A -1=97A -2=93A- -3=90B+ -4=86B -5=83B- -6=79C -7=76C- -8=72D+ -9=69D
-10=66D- -11=62F

GRADING SCALE

A 97-100 4.0	A- 92-96 3.7	
B+ 89-91 3.3	B 86-88 3.0	B- 83-85 2.7
C+ 80-82 2.3	C 77-79 2.0	C- 74-76 1.7
D+ 71-73 1.3	D 68-70 1.0	D- 65-67 0.7
F -65	0.0	