Our Bible Translated

Table of Contents

DAWN BIBLE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
PO BOX 521167
LONGWOOD, FL 32752-1167

1-800-234-3296

www.dawnbible.com

Our Bible Translated

TO CHRISTIANS THE BIBLE is a divine revelation, written by holy men of old, who wrote as they were moved by the Spirit of God. (II Pet. 1:21) However, it was not originally given in the convenient form in which it is now possessed by millions throughout all parts of the earth. Neither were the original copies of the Bible written in the English language.

The ancient Hebrew language, in which the Old Testament portion of the Bible was written, is now the official language of Israel, while the language used in Greece today somewhat compares with that which was used in the original writings of the New Testament.

All modern versions of the Bible are translations. Today, it seems, a new translataion of the Bible appears every few years. Ever since the *Revised Version* published in 1881-1885 appeared with corrections of many of the mistakes of the authorized *King James Version*, which is so widely used in the Christian world even today, many new versions have come upon the scene. About the same time, *Rotherham's Emphasized Bible* was published

(1872, 1st edition; 1902, 3rd edition), with considerable refinement of accuracy, though the reading is not smooth and easy. Seven diaglotts (Greek, with English translation between the lines) have appeared from 1864 to 1990, of which five merit fair praise for accuracy: Marshall (1958), Concordant (1975), Kingdom Interlinear (1969), Douglas (1990), and Wilson (1864). Richard Weymouth both compiled his own Greek text from the ancient manuscript evidence and translated it into English in 1902 (now in its 5th edition).

The original *Revised Version* (RV) was revised by the American committee in 1901, and became known as the *American Revised Version* (ARV), or the *American Standard Version* (ASV, copyrighted). The copyright to this 1901 ASV Bible was procured by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the 1920's, and they began a revision to the ASV in 1946, publishing the *Revised Standard Version* (RSV) in 1952, using twentieth-century language. This work, conducted by a committee of many scholars, received wide publicity because it was sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches of the USA. Dissatisfaction with compromises of accuracy and precision in the RSV led the Lockman Foundation to independently revise the ASV, publishing the *New American Standard Bible* (NASB, or NAS) in 1971, with a few, sometimes biased, revisions up through the NAS95 edition. More recently, *Revised Version Improved and Corrected* (RVIC, 2020) makes some corrections to the ASV and adds footnotes showing diverse readings of the

better ancient manuscripts.[1] The *New Revised Standard Version* (NRSV)in 1989 may have taken a slight step backwards in accuracy, though the *English Standard Version* (ESV) in 2001 is a better revision of the RSV and is comparable to the NASB for accuracy.

C.H. Dodd spearheaded a modern-English committee translation starting from scratch, with scholars from Scotland, England, Wales, and Ireland, publishing the *New English Bible* (NEB) in 1961-1970. It was further revised in 1989 as the *Revised English Bible* (REB), perhaps to some benefit. The *New International Version* (NIV, 1973, with minor revisions thereafter) strives for readability, though at substantial compromise of fidelity to the original language.[2] Somewhat better is the *Holman Christian Standard Bible* (HCSB, 1999). Progressively less accurate are the modern-English *New Century Version* (NCV, 1987); *New King James Version* (NKJV, 1979), which boasts of rejecting the most ancient manuscripts; and *Contemporary English Version* (CEV, 1995).

Among Roman Catholic translations, the *New American Bible* (NAB, 1970) represents the first Roman Catholic departure from the Latin Vulgate text, in favor of translating from the Hebrew and Greek texts; it is perhaps comparable to the REB

---

1 RVIC (2000 edn.) is accessible free at:
https://herald-magazine.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/rvic18-b.pdf

2 E.g., In the Epistles the Greek word sarks (σάρξ), "flesh," is often translated "sinful nature," except when it is applied to Jesus Christ. The NIV claim of "safeguard… from sectarian bias" must be evaluated accordingly.

and NEB for accuracy. Somewhat less accurate Roman Catholic translations are the *Jerusalem Bible* (1966), *Douay-Rheims/Confraternity Bible* (1609/1950), and Knox (1950); and in the New Testament only, Lattey/Westminster (1913-1935) and Kleist-Lilly (1954). From the Syrian Orthodox Church, Lamsa translates from the Aramaic (1957), with mixed results.

Other notable English Bibles, in approximate order of decreasing faithfulness to the original languages, include: *Sacred Name Restoration Bible* (Traina, 1963), which is simply a modification of the *Rotherham*, with some compromise of accuracy in the New Testament; *New World Translation* (NWT, 1960) of the Jehovah's Witnesses (overall better than many would have supposed, but not as good in the New Testament as their *Kingdom Interlinear*); David Stern, *Complete Jewish Bible* (CJB, 1998), from a Hebrew Christian perspective, having significant merit for the scholarly; *Amplified Bible* (1965) which adds words to elucidate the meaning, much more accurate in the Old Testament, while bending to theological biases in the New; *Anchor Bible* (1964-date, still not complete); Verkuyl's *Berkeley Bible* (1959); Darby (Plymouth Brethren; French translation is said to be better); Smith-Goodspeed, *An American Translation* (1923, 1927); *New Living Translation* (NLT, 1996, 2004), which is a substantial improvement over the *Living Bible* (1971); *Today's English Version* (TEV, also called *Good News Bible*), the best of the simplified English translations; Ferrar Fenton (1903); and Young's *Literal* (1862). More recently, the Christadelphians' *New European Version* 2013 merits

praise for accuracy. The *NET Bible* (www.bible.org/netbible) is above average.

Among translations of the Old Testament only, Jewish Publication Society's Margolis translation of 1917 (JPS) is overall more accurate than the 1985 revision, or Isaac Leeser (1854), and much better than Harkavy (1916), and than the Brenton (1851) or Thomson (1808) translations of the Greek Septuagint.

In decreasing accuracy of New Testaments only, John Bowes (1870, hard to find); Wuest (1961), an expanded translation truer than the *Amplified*; *Weymouth* (1902); *Schonfield* (1985), from a non-Christian Jewish perspective; *Moffatt* (1913); C.B. Williams, *The New Testament in the Language of the People* (1937). Still less faithful to the original languages include: *Simple English Bible* (SEB, 1983), a simplified translation; *Barclay* (1976), with many good footnotes; *Twentieth Century New Testament* (1901), shows awareness of many Hebrew idioms expressed in Greek (as do Lamsa and Ferrar Fenton); *God's Word* (Lutheran, 1995); *Phillips* (1958), which endeavors to preserve the style of the original (more than the strict accuracy); and Peterson's *The Message* (1993).

In addition, there are many study Bibles available, containing footnotes which may or may not be helpful to a sincere reader. Notable among them are the *Companion Bible*, which contains many footnotes concerning corrections of translation or due to better manuscript evidence; and the *Thompson Chain Reference Bible*; both based on the *Authorized Version* (AV) commonly known as the *King James Version* (KJV).

When the highly publicized *Revised Standard Version* was published in 1952, many Protestant Fundamentalists or Evangelicals were opposed to it. The opposition on the part of some was very bitter, manifesting itself in public burnings of the new translation. In many quarters it was condemned as a work of the Devil. Such opposition continues to many of the succeeding translations that have appeared.

It is well to realize that no translation of the Bible is perfect. Our own observation is that where vital doctrines of the divine plan are not involved, these new translations frequently state the thought more clearly than does the *King James Version*. However, the new translations are not always entirely trustworthy either. This can be ascertained by consulting reliable Greek and Hebrew concordances and lexicons of the Bible.

CHANGED MEANING OF WORDS

When the *Revised Standard Version* (RSV) of the Bible was issued, the publishers called special attention to the changed meaning of many English words since the *King James Version* was first published. This is true, and the use of modern English in the new version helps to clarify some texts. For example, the *King James Version* translates Psalm 119:147: "I prevented the dawning of the morning, and cried: I hoped in thy Word." The *Revised Standard Version* of this text reads: "I rise before dawn and cry for help; I hope in thy words." The NASB reads: "I rise before dawn and cry for help; I wait for Thy words." Obviously, these readings are more

correct, for David could not very well "prevent" the "dawning of the morning" from happening. In older English the word "prevent" meant "to precede," so it was a correct translation when first used, but not now.

Another English word which has greatly changed in meaning is "hell". Originally it meant "to cover", or "conceal". In Scotland burying potatoes in the ground for the winter was referred to as "helling" the potatoes. Putting a thatched roof on a cottage was "helling" the cottage. Now, through misuse, hell usually suggests fire and torment. In the RSV translation, this word was not used to translate *sheol* of the Old Testament and *hades* of the New Testament. Instead, these words are usually left untranslated, as did the earlier RV and ASV. This is a step in the right direction, but the student of the Bible would have been much better informed on the state of the dead had *sheol* and *hades* in every instance been properly and uniformly translated.

In Matthew 16:18, the *King James Version* translates *hades* by the English word hell, in the expression "the gates of hell." Here the RSV translates *hades* by the word "death." This is better than the word "hell", with its modern meaning, but it still leaves the student to determine what "death" might be. The NASB leaves *hades* untranslated. Probably the best translation of *sheol* and *hades* would have been "oblivion." This, indeed, is the Bible's own definition of *sheol*, as given in Ecclesiastes 9:10.

In some texts which deal with God's great plan of redemption and restoration, the *Revised Standard Version* is not as accurate as the *King James Version*. Acts 3:21 is an example. Here the *King James*

Version uses the word "restitution", which is an equivalent of the Greek word which it translates. The text is part of the Apostle Peter's sermon in which he explains that following the second coming of Christ there would be "times of restitution of all things."

The *Revised Standard Version* (RSV) uses the word "establishing" instead of "restitution", omitting the prefix "re", which is definitely contained in the Greek text (apokatastasis). By this omission the reader is not made to realize that what is to be established as a result of Christ's return had previously existed, particularly life and man's lost dominion over the earth. (Matt. 25:34) The NASB does well in calling it "*the* period of restoration." The ESV also does well, "until the time for restoring all the things about which God spoke." The NIV rendering, "until the time comes for God to restore everything" still preserves the thought, but it is a paraphrase. The TEV misses the nuance in another paraphrase, "until the time comes for all things to be made new."

A text which more seriously tests the integrity of the translators is Rev. 22:12, which in the KJV says, "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward *is* with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." In the majority of later manuscripts this last verb is in the future tense—evidently future at the time of writing—which the KJV so translates. The RV, ASV, and *Rotherham* follow the better and older manuscripts in saying, "...according as his work is," where "is" is to be understood contemporary to the time spoken of. But many translations corrupt the verb to a past tense, "...according to what he has done," as does the NIV, and similarly

the ESV, RSV, NASB (though corrected by footnote in some editions), and TEV. NKJV dodges the issue by omitting the verb, "...according to his work," as do NEB and *Phillips*.

Another challenging text is John 1:18, where the ancient manuscripts read, "No man hath seen God at any time; an only begotten god, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*." *Rotherham* reads, "an Only Begotten God;" and NASB reads, "the only begotten God" (with a footnote that "Some later mss. read *Son*"). But a majority of translations create twisted or incomprehensible paraphrases, such as "God only begotten" (RV^{mg} and ASV^{mg}); "God the One and Only"; "the only God"; "The only Son, who is the same as God"; etc. Some, including NKJV and NEB, simply reject the manuscripts. The reader should well respect translations which translate difficult texts as they were written, and not alter them to any particular theology, mainstream or otherwise.

HOW WE GOT OUR BIBLE

The story of how the Bible reached us in its present form is an interesting one. The first copies were handwritten, and in manuscript form—not necessarily in book form at all. These manuscript copies of the Bible were exceedingly scarce in the days of the Early Church. Not all the individual members of those early congregations possessed them. It was not until perhaps the year A.D. 120 that the books of the New Testament, as we know them, were complete, assembled together, and available for use, but even then they were very scarce.

Seemingly larger congregations of Early Christians possessed manuscript copies of at least parts of the Bible. There were some manuscripts of the Old Testament in the Hebrew language, and some which had been translated from the Hebrew into the Greek language. The main Greek translation of the Old Testament was known as the *Septuagint Version*, though Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and others also made Greek versions.

Besides, there were copies of the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the various apostolic epistles, and the Book of Revelation—all in manuscript form. These have reached us by long and complex chains of circumstances, including the hand copying of manuscripts and translating, both of which were often done under most trying conditions.

The early translators were usually persecuted—sometimes even unto death—not just by the worldly, but by their contemporary religionists, who often took the viewpoint, as one of the early translators expressed it—that "ignorance is holiness." The bitter opposition manifested by some against the *Revised Version*, the *Revised Standard Version*, and other more recent attempts to improve the accuracy of our English Bible, indicates that human nature has not changed much since those early days.

One of the first English versions of the Bible was translated by John Wycliffe about the year 1367, although no part of it was printed before the year 1731. Concerning the death of Wycliffe, one of the church writers at the time said:

"On the feast of the passion of St. Thomas of Canterbury, John Wycliffe, the organ of the devil, the

enemy of the church, the idol of hypocrites, the restorer of schisms, the storehouse of lies, the sink of flattery, being struck by the horrible judgment of God, was seized with palsy throughout his whole body."

Wycliffe was referred to by another writer as "that pestilent wretch, the son of the old serpent, the forerunner of Antichrist." He was evidently himself keenly aware of the opposition that would be aroused by his translation of the Bible, and in the preface had the following inscribed:

"God grant us, to ken and to kepe well Holie Writ, and to suffer joiefulli some paine for it at the laste."

The first book to be printed was the Bible. It was published by Johann Gutenberg, the inventor of moveable type for the printing press. This was in 1455 or 1456. It was in Latin, and bound in two volumes. Then followed other Bible versions: German (1466), Italian (1471), Catalan (1478), Czech (1488), Ancient Greek (1517), Dutch (1522), and French (1530).

Then in 1525 came *Tyndale's English Version* of the New Testament and in 1535 of the Bible—the first English translation to be printed. The language of Tyndale's translation was essentially the same as that in our Common, or *King James Version*. Tyndale, even as former translators of the Bible, was vilified and persecuted by the orthodox church of his day.

In order to complete his task he was forced to leave England, and he became an exile in Germany. But it was this, in the providence of God, that put him in touch with the printing press. This resulted

later in large quantities of his printed Bible being smuggled into England contrary to the decree of the church, and distributed among the people. It was in the year 1524 that Tyndale left his native land, never to see it again, and as the historian states:

"At Hamburg, in poverty and distress, and amid constant danger, the brave-hearted exile worked on his translation, and so diligently that the following year we find him at Cologne with sheets of his quarto New Testament already in the printer's hands."

It was difficult enough to stop the circulation of the Wycliffe Bible, when it required months to finish a single copy. But what could be done about Tyndale's translation? These books were pouring into the country in great numbers because they were coming off the printing press at the rate of a hundred a day, and at a price within the reach of many.

The Bishop of London hit upon what he thought was an excellent plan to put a stop to this plague. He contacted a man by the name of Augustine Pakington, a merchant trading between England and Antwerp, and asked what he thought of the possibility of buying up all of Tyndale's copies of the Bible, bringing them to England, with the secret intention of burning them. Pakington was a friend of Tyndale's and sympathetic with what he was doing, so he quickly agreed with the bishop, saying:

"My lord, if it be your pleasure, I could do in this matter probably more than any merchant in England, so if it be your lordship's pleasure to pay for them—for I must disburse money for them—I will insure you to have every book that remains unsold." The bishop agreed to this, thinking, as

one humorous writer of the time said, "that he hadde God by the toe, whenne in truthe he hadde, as after he thought, the devil by the fiste."

What happened is this: Tyndale accepted the offer, charged a good price for the Bibles he had on hand, and with the money paid his debts and then published a much larger and better edition. Hence the bishop's plan acted as a boomerang, and *Tyndale's Bible* continued to pour into England.

Poverty, distress, and misrepresentations were Tyndale's constant lot. Prison and death were ever staring him in the face. Finally, in October 1536 he was strangled at the stake and then burned to ashes, fervently praying with his last words, "LORD, open the King of England's eyes."

After this, various translations appear such as the *Coverdale Bible*, the *Great Bible*, the *Geneva Bible*, and others. There was also published in 1568 the *Bishop's Bible*. And then, in January 1604, at a conference of bishops and clergymen held in the drawing rooms of Hampton Court Palace, the first suggestions were made which led to the revision of versions then in use. This, in turn, led to our authorized *King James Version* in 1611.

To prepare this translation, forty-seven learned men from Oxford, Cambridge, and London were selected as impartially as possible from high churchmen and Puritans, as well as from those who represented scholarship totally unconnected with any party. King James I authorized that the cooperation of every Bible scholar of note in the entire kingdom should be secured. Excellent rules were adopted to govern the work of translating. Never before had such labor and

care been expended upon translating the English Bible. The language of the *King James Version* follows closely the pattern of that used by Tyndale in his translation. Revised and improved by a committee of such excellent scholars, it has stood the test of more than four hundred years of popular use.

Since the publishing of the *King James Version* of the Bible, many other translations have appeared for the use of students of the Bible. In addition to the first official revision of the *King James Version* starting in 1881 in both England and the U.S.A., we have seen such translations as *Weymouth, Moffatt,* Wilson's *Emphatic Diaglott*, as well as study Bibles such as *Scofield's*, the *Thompson Chain Reference Bible*, and Bullinger's *Companion Bible*. All of these have their merits, but none of them is any more than a translation. All translations thus far made have one thing in common, which is that they reflect more or less the theological viewpoints of their translators.

MANUSCRIPTS

Probably the greatest weakness of the *King James Version* is the fact that when it was translated only eight manuscripts were available from which the work could be done—the oldest one dating back only to the tenth century. Since then, about 3,400 manuscripts have come to light, some of them dating back as early as the fourth century, and a few even back to the second century, making the New Testament the second best preserved book of antiquity. A few Dead Sea Scrolls of the Old Testament even date before the time of Christ.

This fact has been given a great deal of publicity in connection with the new Protestant translations of the Bible. Some have the idea that these older manuscripts have only been recently discovered; but this is only partially true. Many students of the Bible have known of the older manuscripts, and for centuries have been taking advantage of the more accurate presentation of God's Word which they afford.

The original writings of the Bible are all still lost or destroyed, therefore manuscripts now available are merely copies, usually copies of copies, many times removed. The value of a manuscript for critical textual examination depends largely upon its age, with those written before the time of Constantine tending to be especially good. The oldest manuscripts, and therefore tending to be the most valuable, are written in printed-style (pre-uncial) letters, in the style of the original writings of the Bible. They contain no punctuation, and they show no division between words.

The Old Testament was divided into chapters, as they now stand, by Cardinal Hugo, in the middle of the thirteenth century. These chapters were divided into verses, as we now have them, by Rabbi Nathan and adopted by Robert Stephanus, a French printer, in his edition of the Latin *Vulgate*, in 1555. The chapter and verse divisions in the New Testament, likewise were done in 1551, long centuries after the original manuscripts were written.

Punctuation was not used in the original writings of the Bible, nor does it appear in the oldest of the

manuscripts, as our punctuation was not generally used until the end of the fifteenth century. It is important to keep this fact in mind when we study any English translation of the Bible, and to remember that the punctuation is not a part of the inspired record.

Generally speaking, the punctuation of all the English versions of the Bible is very good, but at times it has helped to confuse the meaning of the text. The accompanying lines in Greek are the words of Jesus to the thief on the cross (Luke 23:43), as appeared from the pen of the original recorder:

ΑΜΗΝΣΟΙΛΕΓΩΣΟΙΣΗΜΕΡΟΝΜΕΤΕΜΟΥΕ-
ΣΗΕΝΤΩΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΣΩ

Or in English, VERILYUNTOTHEEISAYTODAY-
WITHMETHOUSHALTBEINTHEPARADISE

When punctuation was introduced into this statement—which in the King James Version says: "Verily I say unto thee, today shalt thou be with me in paradise," the misplacement of the comma makes it appear that Jesus expected to be in Paradise with the thief on the very day he died. But, where did Jesus go that day? Does not Acts 2:27-32 say Jesus was in hell? which is not usually considered Paradise. By placing the comma where it should be, in harmony with what the Master really meant, Jesus' words simply emphasized that the promise he was making to the thief was made on a day when, from the human standpoint, it seemed impossible that it could be fulfilled: "Verily I say unto thee this day, with me shalt

thou be in Paradise."—Luke 23:43, *Rotherham Translation.*

It is well also to remember that all the manuscript copies of the Bible were written by hand, and that each additional copy of these copies, when needed, also had to be written by hand, letter by letter, at a great expense of time and trouble. And very often, also at some expense of the original correctness. Careful though the scribe might be, it was well nigh impossible to keep from making some mistakes. Their mistakes were similar to the mistakes even an experienced secretary commonly makes today. One letter could be mistaken for another. The scribe's eye might slip from a word to the same word in an adjacent line, either skipping words or duplicating them. If the manuscript were read to the scribe he might confuse two words of similar sound. Remarks and explanations written in the margin might, sometimes, in transcribing, be inserted into the text, as though they had been corrections of accidental omissions.

In these, and various other ways, errors might creep into the copy of the manuscript. Naturally these errors would be repeated by succeeding copyists. To these, at times, would be added other errors of his own. It is evident, as copies increased, that errors would also be liable to increase. Therefore, as a general (though not rigorous) rule, the earlier the manuscript the more nearly correct it is likely to be.

Even in the case of the printed Bible, errors are liable to occur, as all acquainted with the publishing business are painfully aware. And

this despite every precaution and care in the preparation of copy by proofreaders and editors with years of training and experience. For example, in an edition of the Bible published in 1653, 1 Corinthians 6:9 reads: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God?" In an old version known as the Printer's Bible, Psalm 119:161 reads: "Printers have persecuted me without a cause."

THREE OLDEST GREAT MANUSCRIPTS

Bible manuscripts are commonly classified in three groups: Papyri (on paper-like fibrous fabric made from the dried papyrus plant), about half of which were written before the time of Constantine (before 313 A.D.); Uncials (easier to read), which are written in block letters on vellum, or parchment (dried animal skins, usually from sheep or goats, which began to be used when papyrus became too costly), mostly from the 4th to 10th centuries; and Minuscules, which have cursive writing (faster to write) on vellum or occasionally paper. Almost all Christian manuscripts were written in codex form (bound as a book), not as scrolls, perhaps to facilitate cross-referencing related scriptures.

The three oldest known nearly-complete (major) manuscripts of the New Testament available for use today are those designated the *Sinaitic* [**א**, or **01**], the *Vatican* 1209 [**B**, or **03**] (both mid-4th century), and the *Alexandrian* [**A**, or **02**] (early 5th century). The *Sinaitic*, however, is complete. The *Vatican* has a number of pages lost in Paul's epistles (Heb. 9:14-end,

and the pastoral epistles), and the entire Book of Revelation is lost. The *Sinaitic* manuscript is so named from the place it was found in a convent at the foot of Mt. Sinai. It was discovered in pieces by the great German scholar and manuscript hunter, Dr. Constantin von Tischendorf, in 1844 and 1859. The *Vatican* 1209 became known when it was temporarily taken to Paris as a spoil of war. *Sinaitic* has many more careless errors, while *Vatican* 1209 is more likely to have theological alterations.

The *Alexandrian* manuscript is the latest of the three, has a good text from Acts to Revelation but is also incomplete, lacking thirty-one folios consisting of Matt. 1:1-25:6, John 6:50-8:52, and 2 Corinthians 4:13-12:6. The original of this manuscript can be seen at the British Museum, but copies which exactly represent it are kept in many of the principal university and public libraries. A late Arabic inscription on the first sheet states that it was written "by the hand of Thekla the Martyr." (ca. 330 A.D.), but the manuscript lettering looks to be a century too late. Much of the New Testament is also covered by ancient papyrus manuscripts from a century or more earlier. These generally support *Sinaitic* and *Vatican* 1209.

PAPYRUS AND OTHER MANUSCRIPTS

Important papyrus discoveries number more than a hundred and include: Papyrus manuscripts from Oxyrhynchus, which had been a Christian community in ancient Egypt, comprise about a third of all New Testament papyri: p^1 was the first

papyrus published, in 1898, a careful and strict text from Matt. 1, dating to the 3rd century A.D. The Chester Beatty papyri of the 3rd century: p^{45} has parts of all four gospels and Acts; p^{46} (ca. 200 A.D.) has the greater part of Paul's epistles, with Hebrews coming between Romans and Corinthians (implying Paul was believed to be the author); and p^{47} which contains a good text of the center third of Revelation. p^{52} of ca. 125 A.D., contains a few verses in John 18:31-33, 37-38, including Pilate's question, "What is truth?" [Claims by the school of higher criticism that John's writings could not have preceded the late 3rd century had already fallen from favor when this fragment was published in 1935.] The third great papyrus find is the Bodmer Papyri, published 1956-1961: p^{66} (ca. 200 A.D.) constitutes most of John's gospel; good, though not quite as reliable as p^{75}; p^{72} (ca. 300 A.D.), with most of Peter and Jude; p^{74} (7th century), with the greater part of Acts and the General Epistles, is of high quality in spite of the late date; and p^{75} (3rd century), with the greater part of Luke and John, contains a strict text (highest quality). p^{115} (ca. 300 A.D.) contains several high quality fragments of Revelation 2:1-15:7.

Some manuscripts of later date also preserve the text type of *Sinaitic* and *Vatican* 1209 and other high quality manuscripts. Among 300 uncials and nearly 3,000 minuscules:

Ephraemi (**C**, or **04**); 5th century, is a palimpsest: the Bible text was mostly scraped off, so the writings of St. Ephraem could be written over it! About 209 leaves throughout the Bible were recovered, with about 60% of the New Testament

preserved. The epistles are very good, and it is our best, yet incomplete, text in Revelation (but its 616 instead of 666 in Rev. 13:18 shows that it too is not perfect).

L (**019**); 8th century, very good in Mark, but not in Matthew.

Z (**035**); early 6th century palimpsest of Matthew; very good.

Ψ (**044**); ca. 800, very good in Mark and good in the General Epistles (James-Jude).

048; 5th century double palimpsest (two successive texts scraped off), 21 fragments; very good in Acts and Paul's epistles.

070; 6th century Greek-Coptic diglot (not interlinear), with other parts of Luke and John designated **0110, 0124, 0178-0180, 0190, 0191,** and **0202**; very good in Luke.

0281; ca. 700, fragments of Matthew; very good.

Minuscules

33; 9th century, good in Paul's epistles.

81; 1044 A.D., very good in Acts, good in Paul's epistles.

1611; 12th century, very good in Revelation.

1739; 10th century, very good in the epistles.

2053; 13th century, Revelation (preserves an early 6th century text, with Aecumenius' commentary); very good.
2427; was a good 20th century forgery of Mark; worthless.

Ancient Versions

Coptics (various Egyptian dialects, headed by copsa and copbo); ca. 3rd to 9th centuries; very good except in Revelation.

Latin Vulgate; ca. 5th century; very good except perhaps in the gospels.

Armenian; 5th century; very good in Paul's epistles.

Other good versions are: Old Syriac (sy^s, sy^c), 4th century gospels; some Old Latin (the Afra Latin, it^e, it^k), 3rd or 4th century gospels; Georgian (geo^A, geo^B), 6th century gospels; Syriac-Harkleian (sy^h), 7th century Revelation.

No single manuscript contains the Nestle-Aland text (in any of its 28 editions, the latest of which is also GNT^5), the so-called Textus Receptus (TR, or Byzantine Text), or the Majority Text (which takes the reading seen in the most manuscripts, regardless of perceived quality; very similar to TR). The earliest manuscript with a TR text type is **026** (also known as **Q**) of the 5th century, while the only papyrus with such a text type is p^{73}, with seven verses of Matthew from the 7th century. Fewer than 10% of pre-Constantine papyri support a so-called Western Text, while the large majority loosely or strictly support the GNT/Nestle-Aland texts. There is less variation among most of the early

manuscripts than among the multitude of Majority Text manuscripts.

KING JAMES ONLY?

When the *King James Version* was first published, it was vehemently attacked by the scholarly but vociferous Dr. Hugh Broughton. Similarly, with the publication of the *Revised Version* in the 1880's, some have defended the *King James Version* (KJV, or AV) as the only real Bible in existence—Dean John Wm. Burgon, and the more moderate Frederick H.A. Scrivener, leading the way. Some today insist: 1. The Massoretic (Hebrew) Text, together with its vowel points, were written by Moses and preserved in copies to this day; 2. The New Testament Greek text was preserved in some remote place and somehow found its way to Desiderius Erasmus in time for his Greek New Testament (four editions: 1516, 1519, 1522, 1527); 3. The translators of the Hebrew and Greek were divinely inspired to create in English the only true Bible today; 4. Any other Bible translation is of Satan. However:

1. Today the Dead Sea Scrolls from two thousand years ago come in three text types of approximately equal numbers of manuscripts: a. Virtually a Massoretic Text (e.g., 1QIsa^{b}, 4QIsa^{f}, MasPs^{b}); b. Agreeing more with the Greek Septuagint (e.g., 4QSam^{a}); c. Somewhat free texts deviating from the Massoretic and from all versions (e.g., 1QIsa^{a}). None of these manuscripts contains the vowel points. The KJV follows the versions in Ps. 22:16, "…they pierced my hands and my feet," rather than the Massoretic (verse 17), "…Like a lion *they are at* my hands and my feet."

2. Approximately a hundred Greek New Testament manuscripts and fragments are now known, which are older than the oldest exemplar of the Textus Receptus (TR), **Q** (**026**) of the 5th century. That is far too many to accept Burgon's hypothesis that ℵ, A, B, C, etc., were preserved only because they were too defective to be used. (Moreover, their early correctors did not change them into TR texts.) Erasmus' Greek manuscripts were missing the last six verses of Revelation; so he translated the Latin back into the Greek! One may ask, Which of the fifteen editions of Textus Receptus is the true edition? or is it the sixteenth—the Majority Text? (In Revelation, there appear to be two "Majority Texts:" the Koine, designated M^K; and a later text with Andreas' commentary, designated M^A) No single manuscript anywhere has the text of any edition of Textus Receptus or of the Majority Text. The deliberate falsification of one text in TR is well documented (1 John 5:7-8).[3] So the evidence for the miraculous preservation of TR from apostolic times is evidently to be found only in the imaginations of the theory's advocates.

---

3 Erasmus' first two editions did not add the Three Heavenly Witnesses clause ("Comma Johanneium") in I John 5:7-8, which had already been added into the later Latin Vulgate manuscripts. His rivals, the Computensian Polyglott editors at Alcala, Spain, accused him of falsifying the Bible and extracted from him a concession to include the clause in his third edition if even one Greek manuscript could be located containing it. The ink was scarcely dry when the Alcala editors brought Ms. 61 to him. Reluctantly, he therefore added the interpolation in his third edition. Robert Stephanus (Estienne) added it in his four editions (1546-1551), as did the Elzevirs in their seven editions (1624-1678). Thus is the sordid history of Textus Receptus.

Some insist Origen in the third century is responsible for creating the text of early manuscripts. Indeed, Origen did say most manuscripts of his time read "Gadarenes" in Matt. 8:28 and "Bethany" in John 1:28, and he recommended changing them to "Gergesenes" and "Beth-Abara" respectively. But it is the critical texts that read the former, while the *King James Version* reads the latter. Thus, it is Textus Receptus and the *King James Version* that have been influenced by Origen, and not the critical texts.

3. If the *King James Version* were the only true Bible, then French, Germans, Spanish, Romanians, Chinese, etc., would never have had a true Bible. And the whole world would have been fifteen centuries without a true Bible. To claim inspiration for the fifty or so translators, employed by the church-state and undoubtedly not baptized as adults, is far more than the translators claimed for themselves.[4] And again, one may ask, Which King James Version? The 1611 edition? or the 1614 edition with over 400 changes? or perhaps the 1762 edition of Thomas Paris (mostly changes in orthography), or the 1769 edition of Benjamin Blaney with over 75,000 changes (mostly in diction) – the one commonly in print today? And why was not Tyndale

---

4 David Bercot quotes the KJV-1611 Preface, explaining its 760 marginal notes: "Just as it is a fault of unbelief to doubt those things which are evident, so also to determine such things as the spirit of God has left questionable, even in the judgment of the judicious, can be no less than presumption... Likewise, to note the diversity of meaning in the margin where the text is not so clear, is indeed good; in fact, it is necessary."

so inspired (seeing he also translated from the TR text)? or Coverdale, or the Protestant translators of the Geneva Bible?

The *King James Version* is literarily the most excellent translation of the Bible in any language, commonly exceeding that of the original languages, but sometimes at the expense of accuracy. For example, in Matt. 27:44, The thieves also… "cast the same in his teeth" preserves neither of the two Greek words translated "reproached him" in some of the diaglott translations. Nor in Acts 12:4 is there reasonable justification for translating "pascha" (Passover) to be "Easter," which then had been a heathen feast.

4. Because the first three assumptions are in error, we should do our best to conform our Bibles to the best available Hebrew and Greek texts, and to translate them objectively.

C. Tischendorf, C.R. Gregory, E. Nestle, B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, K. Aland and others have issued critical editions of the Greek New Testament, which enables one to also correct English and other Bible versions from most of the alterations of centuries of copying—particularly if one reads Greek. Tischendorf's Tauchnitz edition of the New Testament (1869) and the Variorum Bible (1893) attempted to make corrections known to the English-reading world, each with a critical apparatus of a few selected manuscripts.

On an accompanying pages we present an abbreviated list of interpolations and other corrections. Many have found it helpful to strike out these interpolations in their own Bible translations, so

that when they read the sacred Word they will not be reading thoughts that have been injected into it by man.

To take proper notice of these spurious passages which were added through the centuries is not in the category of "higher criticism". It is simply using sanctified common sense, with the aid of concordances and old manuscripts now available, to discover as nearly as possible the purity of God's inspired Word (often called "lower criticism", or "textual criticism"). Higher criticism, on the contrary, is a deliberate decision on the part of the worldly-wise that the historical records of the Bible, its prophecies and its miracles, are but legendary, and at best allegorical tales by which lessons in morality and righteousness are taught. God's inspired word is better.

INTERPOLATIONS AND OTHER ALTERATIONS, AND WHY

From the lists of spurious passages, sentences, and words compiled by Tischendorf and others, we have selected for comment what seem to be the most important from the standpoint of the effect they have upon the teachings of the Bible as a whole. In each case we have offered a brief suggestion as to how the interpolation (or other variant) changes the meaning of the text. In some cases we have suggested a possible reason why the copyist who made the addition may have thought it desirable.

These selections follow, and the spurious text, or portion of text, is shown in bold-face type at the beginning of the paragraph, followed immediately by our own observations. To save space, we have

not quoted the entire passage in which these interpolations appear. We strongly recommend, however, that the reader look up these passages in his own Bible, which may likely be the *King James Version*, and study it in connection with the observations suggested.

Matthew 6:13—"For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen." These words from 1 Chron. 29:11 which were added to our Lord's Prayer make it contradictory, as Jesus taught us to pray, "Thy kingdom come." It would be useless to pray for God's kingdom to come if the divine rule were already fully operative in the earth. At the time these premature words were wrongly added to the Lord's Prayer, it was a common belief that Christ's kingdom was already ruling through the church-state systems of the Roman Empire, hence this effort to make the Bible support the claim.

Matthew 16:2-3—"When it is evening, ye say, *It will be* **fair weather: for the sky is red. And in the morning,** *It will be* **foul weather to day: for the sky is red and lowring. O** *ye* **hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not** *discern* **the signs of the times?"** This is merely a tradition, having slight foundation in fact (except when there is a breeze from the west). The use of such a statement in the inspired Word tends to discount the authority of the whole Book in the minds of reasoning people.

Matthew 17:21—"and fasting." That this is spurious is evident from the fact that Jesus cast out the devil to which reference is made without being prepared by a season of fasting.

Matthew 25:6—"cometh" To announce that the Bridegroom is coming is contrary to the prophecies which show that none would know in advance the time of his arrival. With the spurious word "cometh" out of the text, the statement reads, "Behold the Bridegroom," which indicates a recognition that Christ has already returned and is present.

Mark 16:9-20—All these verses are spurious. Christians are not promised protection from harm resulting from snake bites and drinking poison, as in the 18th verse that says: **"They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them."** This, like many other interpolations, tends to make the Bible seem unreasonable.

Luke 22:68—"me, nor let me go." These added words give the thought that Jesus was attempting to put up a defense that would result in acquittal, but this was not the case. Jesus knew that he was to die as man's Redeemer, and that his hour for the supreme sacrifice had come, so he was not asking to be set free.

Luke 23:34—"Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." Some copyist added these words with the evident

thought of revealing the Master's benevolence toward his enemies, but apparently they are not in harmony with the known facts. Whatever Jesus requested of the Heavenly Father would be granted. But those who crucified him were not forgiven. It was a national sin for which they have suffered severely.

John 1:18—"the only begotten Son," originally read "an only begotten god," referring back to verse 1. E.C. Colwell suggested the change was probably "made for theological consistency," which would be an unacceptable reason to retain the *King James* reading.

John 3:13—"which is in heaven." Jesus, the Son of Man, was not in heaven at the time of his dialogue with Nicodemus. Whoever added these spurious words may have incorporated an earlier scribe's comment from the margin.

John 5:3,4—From the word "waiting" in the third verse through verse four. These words reflect superstitions which played such an important role in the religious lives of professed Christians during the Dark Ages.

John 7:53-8:11—All these verses are spurious. A very interesting story, sometimes found elsewhere in John, or even late in Luke, but not written by the Apostle John.

Romans 8:26—"for us" These two little words may seem like a harmless addition to this text, but

when we analyze the passage we find that by their use the Holy Spirit, or power of God, is made to appear as a person who intercedes at the throne of grace on behalf of Christians, with groanings which cannot be uttered. By omitting these added words, we get the real meaning of the text. It is the Christian's own spirit, which oftentimes, for the lack of adequate words to express himself, approaches God in the attitude of prayer.

I Corinthians 6:20—"and in your spirit, which are God's." An evident attempt to bolster the erroneous theory which was introduced into the church during the Dark Ages that the "spirit" is an entity separate and distinct from the body.

I Corinthians 15:51,52—should read:**"Behold, I tell you a mystery: We shall all fall asleep, but we shall not all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, in the last trump:"** Five of the very best manuscripts read this way (as does the Armenian, and somewhat the Latin), contrasted with only two of the very best (and five hundred others of lesser quality and later date) which read like the *King James Version* and most modern versions. The way these high-quality manuscripts read is clearly unacceptable to anyone dedicated to an immortal-soul theology; hence the perceived feeling of need to change it by transferring "not" to the earlier clause.

Ephesians 5:30—"of his flesh, and of his bones." The body of Christ glorified, of which Christians are prospective members, is not a fleshly body, as these words tend to indicate.

I Timothy 3:16—"God" This change is seen in the *Alexandrian* manuscript, where a single horizontal line was added to ΟC ("who") to change it to ΘC ("God"). The alteration to the word "God" in this text represents another effort to prove that Jesus and God are one and the same. The personality discussed in this text is Christ Jesus, who is introduced in verse 13. According to the Greek text, the word "who" should be used instead of "God".

I John 3:16—*"of God"* These words were supplied by the translators and are not in any Greek text. This may have been another effort to have the Bible seem to prove that God and Jesus are the same. God did not lay down his life for us, but the Son of God did. It is better to read: "Hereby perceive we love," or "…*godly* love."

I John 5:7,8—"in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth." These words were added in an effort to prove the Trinitarian doctrine. Only nine Greek manuscripts contain these words, all of late date, against five hundred which do not. Not even the early Latin manuscripts contained them. Most versions currently reject them. It is the only expression in the *King James Version* of the Bible that would in any way prove a triune God, but it is spurious, and so should not be accepted as part of the inspired Word.

Revelation 20:5 – "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." The *Sinaitic* and nearly seventy others

never contained this sentence, while about 112 manuscripts include it in at least five different forms; only after the 13th century do most manuscripts contain it. These words were added at a time when the church began to claim it was fulfilling scriptural promises concerning the thousand-year reign of Christ. The dead were not being raised during this pseudo-millennium so it was convenient to make the inspired record teach that the resurrection should not be expected until the close of the thousand years.

Revelation 21:24—"of them which are saved" The copyist who added these words had evidently lost sight of the divine promises to bless all the nations of the earth. While the Scriptures do not teach the ultimate universal salvation—universal reconciliation—of all individuals, yet all the families of the earth are to have an opportunity to be blessed during the kingdom reign of Christ, which fact these added words tend to annul.

THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES

There is not much that need be said analytically concerning the Old Testament manuscripts. It is rather surprising to realize that the earliest Hebrew manuscripts in existence, for much of the Old Testament, do not date back earlier than about the 9th centry A.D. Since 1947, however, manuscripts of the Book of Isaiah and parts of the others (except for the short Book of Esther) have been discovered which date back as far as the first and second centuries before Christ. However, this

general lack of complete early Hebrew manuscripts is less important than it might seem.

As far as can be learned, there appears to have been a gradual, though a not too critical, revision of the Palestine manuscripts going on almost continually from the days of Ezra. History indicates that from the Dispersion, this process of Hebrew manuscript revision ceased. At that early date, the Hebrew Old Testament was made as nearly correct as the best scholarship of the Jewish academies could make it. After this, the older manuscripts gradually disappeared. A manuscript of the Book of Isaiah (1QIsa[a]), discovered in the Dead Sea Scrolls, is close to those from which our English versions of the Bible have been translated, while another Isaiah scroll (1QIsa[b]) is nearly identical. The Hebrew Old Testament is the best-preserved book of antiquity.

While it is true that most of the existing Hebrew Massoretic manuscripts are not very old, yet much dependence can be placed upon them, owing to the great reverence the Jewish scribes held for the Word of God, and their consequent carefulness in transcribing. It is said that these scribes were so scrupulous that even if a manifest error appeared in the copy from which they were transcribing they would not change the text, but would write an explanatory note in the margin, giving the proper thought.

It is claimed, also, that even if one letter were larger than another, or a word running beyond the line, or other irregularity, they would copy it exactly as found. Another important factor which enters into the accuracy of the Old Testament is

that in the recensions more than one person was occupied in making the copies. One scribe copied the consonants; another inserted the vowels, points, and accents, in fainter ink; a third revised the copy; and a fourth wrote in the Masorah—notes which keep track of variants, editing changes in the past, and methods for detecting scribal errors.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

This, briefly, is the story of the Bible as it has come to us from earliest times, all the way to the *King James Version*—and now to the most modern translations. To keep the story short, not all the details have been presented. But our hope is that the question, how our Bible has reached us, has been answered comprehensively enough to increase our enthusiasm for its use, and to cause its influence to be more effectual in our lives.

Equally important to the purity of the Bible, in obtaining the most exact and best translation and separating from it the interpolations of men and mistranslations, is an understanding of the message of the divine plan which it presents. Of great assistance to this end is the availability today of Hebrew and Greek concordances listing every word in the Bible, together with the meaning of the Hebrew or Greek term from which it is translated.

Likewise, we believe that it is due time for God's Word to be better understood. Therefore, there have been other valuable helps provided by God. Most important among these is the book, "The Divine Plan of the Ages." It is the first volume of a series of six entitled, "Studies in the Scriptures."

Thousands have been helped to a better understanding of the harmony of the Bible through the use of these wonderful volumes, and we commend them to every thoughtful person interested in the study of God's precious and inspired Word.

SIGNIFICANT CORRECTIONS

The following list of interpolations and alterations is taken from notes by Constantin von Tischendorf and his successors, and from Nestle-Aland and UBS Greek New Testament editions. The list below summarizes those changes most likely to alter the understanding of the texts in which they appear. Correcting our translations is not "correcting the Bible" but "returning to the Bible."

Matthew 5:22—*omit* "without a cause"
Matthew 6:4,6,18—*omit* "openly"
Matthew 6:13—*omit* "For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen"
Matthew 6:25—*omit* "or what ye shall drink"
Matthew 16:2—*omit* "When it is evening, ye say, it will be fair weather: for the sky is red."
Matthew 16:3—*omit this entire verse*
Matthew 17:21—*omit this entire verse*
Matthew 18:11—o*mit this entire verse*
Matthew 18:12—*read* "doth he not leave the ninety-nine on the mountains, and go and seek that... *for* "...leave the ninety-nine, and goeth into the mountains, and seeketh that..."
Matthew 19:17—*read* "Why askest thou me concerning good? One is good; but if thou wilt…"

Matthew 20:7—*omit* "and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive"
Matthew 22:13—*omit* "and take him away"
Matthew 23:14—*omit this entire verse*
Matthew 24:31—*omit* "sound of a"
Matthew 24:36—*add* "nor the Son," *after* "angels of heaven,"
Matthew 24:41—*read* "two *shall be* grinding at the mill; one *woman* is taken, and one *woman* is left." [translation only; optional]
Matthew 25:6—*omit* "cometh"
Matthew 25:13—*omit* "wherein the Son of man cometh"
Matthew 26:28—*omit* "new"
Mark 3:29—*read* "an eternal sin" *for* "eternal damnation"
Mark 6:11—*omit* "Verily…for that city"
Mark 6:51—*omit* "beyond measure, and wondered"
Mark 7:8—*omit* "For…as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do"
Mark 7:16—*omit this entire verse*
Mark 9:24—*omit* "with tears"
Mark 9:29—*omit* "and fasting"
Mark 9:44—*omit this entire verse*
Mark 9:45—*omit* "into the fire that never shall be quenched"
Mark 9:46—*omit this entire verse*
Mark 9:47—*omit* "fire" (*literally*, "...to be cast into Gehenna")
Mark 9:49—*omit* "and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt"
Mark 10:34—*read* "after three days" *for* "the third day"
Mark 14:68—*omit* "and the cock crew"

Mark 15:28—*omit this entire verse*
Mark 16:9-20—*omit all these verses*
Luke 1:28—*omit* "Blessed art thou among women"
Luke 1:78—*read* "will visit us" *for* "hast visited us"
Luke 2:5—*read* "who was betrothed to him" *for* "his espoused wife"
Luke 2:14—*read* "peace among men of his good pleasure" *for* "peace, good will toward men"
Luke 5:38—*omit* "and both are preserved"
Luke 9:54—*omit* "even as Elias did"
Luke 9:55-56—*omit* "and said, Ye know not… but to save them."
Luke 22:43-44—*omit both these verses*
Luke 22:68—*omit* "me, nor let me go"
Luke 23:17—*omit this entire verse*
Luke 23:34—*omit* "then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do"
Luke 24:42—*omit* "and of an honeycomb"
John 1:18—*read* "an only begotten god" *for* "the only begotten Son"
John 3:13—*omit* "which is in heaven"
John 5:3—*omit* "waiting for the moving of the water"
John 5:4—*omit this entire verse*
John 7:53-8:11—*omit all these verses*
John 8:59—*omit* "going through the midst of them, and so passed by"
John 9:35—*read* "man" *for* "God"
John 12:25—*read* "loses" *for* "shall lose"
John 16:16—*omit* "because I go to the Father"
Acts 2:1—*omit* "with one accord"
Acts 6:3—*read* "full of spirit and wisdom" *for* "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom"
Acts 6:8—*read* "grace" *for* "faith"

Acts 8:37—*omit this entire verse*
Acts 9:31—*read* "church" *for* "churches"
Acts 13:19-20—*read* "And when he had destroyed seven nations in *the* land of Canaan, he gave *them* their land for an inheritance, for about four hundred and fifty years: also after these things he gave *them* judges until Samuel *the* prophet."
Acts 18:5—*read* "earnestly occupied with the Word" *for* "pressed in the spirit"
Acts 18:21—*omit* "I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem: but"
Romans 3:22—*omit* "and upon all"
Romans 6:12—*omit* "it in"
Romans 7:6—*read* "being dead to that" *for* "that being dead"
Romans 8:26—*omit* "for us"
Romans 9:28—*read* "For the Lord will make an account on the earth, finishing it and cutting it short." *for* "For he will finish…upon the earth."
Romans 11:6—*omit* "But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work"
Romans 14:6—*omit* "and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it"
Romans 16:24—*omit this entire verse*
I Corinthians 2:1—*read* "mystery" *for* "testimony"
I Corinthians 5:7—*omit* "for us"
I Corinthians 6:20—*omit* "and in your spirit, which are God's"
I Corinthians 7:5—*omit* "fasting and"
I Corinthians 10:28—*omit* "for the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof"
I Corinthians 15:24—*omit* "cometh" [translation only]

Galatians 3:1—*omit* "that ye should not obey the truth"
Galatians 3:17—*omit* "in Christ"
Galatians 5:19—*omit* "adultery"
Galatians 5:21—*omit* "murders"
Ephesians 5:9—*read* "light" *for* "spirit"
Ephesians 5:30—*omit* "of his flesh, and of his bones"
II Thessalonians 2:9—*omit* "Even him," [trans lation only; optional]
I Timothy 3:16—*read* "who" *for* "God"
I Timothy 4:12—*omit* "in spirit"
I Timothy 6:5—*omit* "from such withdraw thyself"
II Timothy 4:1—*read* "by both his appearing" *for* "at his appearing"
II Timothy 4:14—*read* "will reward" *for* "reward"
Hebrews 12:18—*read* "fire that might be touched and burned" *for* "mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire"
Hebrews 12:20—*omit* "or thrust through with a dart"
I Peter 3:8—*read* "humble" *for* "courteous"
II Peter 1:1—*read* "our God and *our*" *for* "God and our" [translation only; ambiguous]
II Peter 3:10—*read* "exposed" *for* "burned up"
I John 3:16—*read* "godly love" *or* "the love" *for* "the love *of God*" [translation only]
I John 5:7-8—*omit* "in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth"
I John 5:13—*omit* "and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God"
Jude 3—*read* "our common salvation" *for* "the common salvation"

Jude 4—*read* "our only Master and" *for* "the only Lord God, and our"
Revelation 1:17—*omit* "unto me"
Revelation 2:22—*read* "her" *for* "their"
Revelation 6:1,3,5,7—*omit* "and see"
Revelation 9:13—*omit* "four"
Revelation 11:17—*omit* "and art to come"
Revelation 12:12—*omit* "the inhabiters of" *and omit* "of" [*before* "the sea"]
Revelation 13:1—*read* "he stood" *for* "I stood" [making this first clause be Rev. 12:18]
Revelation 14:5—*omit* "before the throne of God"
Revelation 14:12—*omit* "here are they"
Revelation 15:3—*read* "ages" *for* "saints"
Revelation 16:5—*read* "the holy" *for* "and shalt be"
Revelation 16:7—*omit* "another out of"
Revelation 16:17—*omit* "of heaven"
Revelation 21:24—*omit* "of them which are saved" *and omit* "and honor"
Revelation 22:14—*read* "wash their robes" *for* "do his commandments"

And probably also,
I Corinthians 15:51-52—*read* "Behold, I tell you a mystery: We shall all fall asleep, but we shall not all be changed in a moment, in *the* twinkling of an eye, in the last trump:" [*or*, "… in the *time* of the last trumpet."] *for* "Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump:"
Jude 22-23—*read* "And on some *who are* wavering,

have mercy; and some save, seizing *them* out of *the* fire; and on some have mercy with fear, hating even the garment spotted by the flesh."

Revelation 20:5—*omit* "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished."

Revelation 20:6—*read* "the thousand years" *for* "a thousand years"

Here we rely more on the ancient and high-quality manuscripts ("internal evidence"), and somewhat less on hypotheses as to how the variants originated ("external evidence"), than does the UBS Greek New Testament Committee, though almost all of the conclusions are the same. Exceptions are in I Corinthians 15:51-52, I Peter 3:18 (except GNT 1st edn. agrees), Revelation 15:3 and 20:5. Greek New Testament is unsure in II Peter 3:10, and non-committal in Revelation 9:13 and 20:6.

The first two editions of this booklet recommended changes in still other texts, based on the *Sinaitic* manuscript alone. Comparison with hundreds of other manuscripts reveals too little support to continue to recommend these changes:

Matthew 23:35; 24:10; 27:52-53 [translation problem only];
Mark 4:37; 7:14; 10:30; 14:30,72
Luke 16:16; 17:12; 18:11; 23:5
John 1:25; 4:9; 5:25; 19:23; 21:25
Acts 15:32; II Timothy 3:3; I Peter 2:5
Revelation 5:3; 6:2; 9:4; 10:6; 16:11; 18:22; 21:26; 22:3

In some cases a perceived problem may be resolved by better translation:

Matthew 27:51-53—*read* "and the earth did quake; and the rocks were rent; and the tombs were opened; and many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleepwere awakened; and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many." [Compare Luke 24:51-53]

Mark 4:37—*read* "the ship, so that it was now filling." *for* "…it was now full."

Acts 15:32—*read* "and settled them." *for* "and confirmed them." [and similarly in Acts 14:23; 15:41; *and probably also in* 18:23.]

Hebrews 7:3—*read* [Melchizedek] "without father, without mother, without genealogy, neither beginning of days nor end of life having *been recorded*,"