

4. Respectability of the witnesses— Dean Burgon, who is the only man who ever collated the Gospels of the five oldest manuscripts of the New Testament, viz. **Alexandrinus (A), Vaticanus (B), Sinaiticus (Aleph), Ephraemi (C), Beza (D)**, presents some interesting data on these old uncial manuscripts. “It is discovered that in 111 (out of 320) pages of an ordinary copy of the Greek Testament, in which alone these five manuscripts are collectively available for comparison in the Gospels, ... the serious deflections of **A** from the **Textus Receptus** amounts to only 840; whereas in **C** they amount to 1,798; in **B**, 2,370; in **Aleph** 3,392, in **D** to 4,697. The readings are peculiar to **A** within the same limits are 133; those peculiar to **C** are 170. But those of **B** amount to 197; while **Aleph** exhibits 443 and the readings peculiar to **D** (within the same limits) are no fewer than 1,829... We submit that these facts... which result from merely referring five manuscripts to one and the same common standard... are by no means calculated to inspire confidence in codices **A, B, Aleph, C, D**: codices, be it remembered which come to us without character, without any history, in fact without antecedents of any kind.” (Burgon, **Revision Revised**, pp. 14-15). Shrivener says of **Sinaiticus**: “It must be confessed, indeed, that **Codex Sinaiticus** abounds with similar errors of eye and pen, to an extent not unparalleled, but happily rather unusual in documents of first-rate importance... Letters, and words, even whole sentences, are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately canceled; while that gross blunder (*Homeoteleuton*) whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding it occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament, though this defect is often supplied by a more recent hand.” (Scrivener, **Full Collation of the Sinaiticus**, pg. 31.) Referring to the five oldest manuscripts of the New Testament, Scrivener says: “The reader has but to open the first recent critical work he shall meet with, to see them scarcely ever in unison; perpetually divided two against three, or perhaps four against one.” (Scrivener, Introduction, etc.

Vol. 11, page 277). Burgon says: “We venture to assure him (Bishop Ellicott), without a particle of hesitation, that **Aleph, B** and **D** are three of the most scandalously corrupt copies extant; exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anywhere to be met with; ... having become, by whatever process (for their history is wholly unknown), the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and intentional perversions of truth... which are discoverable in any known copies of the word of God.” Burgon, **Revision Revised**, p. 16).

5. Continuity—The list of evidences we have given, shows this. And the very term “traditional text” used for the **Textus Receptus** speaks for the continuity of the reading. Continuity can be established far more easily than any other so-called family of manuscripts. So why change?

6. Evidence for the entire passage or context —is about equal as I am best able to determine.

7. Internal Reasonableness— Why would a Christian need to “wash his robes” (Revelation 22:14) when he himself has already been washed? “...unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.” (Revelation 1:5).

Verse 5 is talking about us! We are washed in His blood and have eternal life **now** (cf. I John 5:12). It should be apparent that verse 14 is not a Church Age passage at all, but applies to the Millennium and after. The believers spoken of in Revelation 22:14 must “do his commandments” to have access to the tree of life, (cf. Revelation 12:17, 14:12). They need access to this tree because, being saved during the Great Tribulation or the millennium, none of them are born again. Even as Adam— these, if they partake of the tree of life, will never die.

All things considered, why should one change this passage when the evidence doesn't demand it? The **Textus Receptus** reading certainly seems more reasonable.

The cry is “To the Greek, that we may know the word of God.” It seems, however, that the final authority is not any Greek text in existence, but the

Greek scholar who interprets the Greek text. From his vast library, it seems, he will be able to give us God's word— albeit, not without error. Several problems do arise, however:

1. The Greek scholars can't even agree among themselves about the different readings of many texts, or the manuscript evidence for them.

2. They often go against the rules they themselves have established, in the determination of a reading. Folks, it's really very simple; if God hasn't given us His word where any man can get a hold of it in English, we'll never be able to get it out of a host of Greek manuscripts (Psalm 118:8, Zechariah 4:6) with the help of all the scholars in the world.

If a man will bend the evidence at one point, he'll do it at another. Let me quote L. Gaussen, DD., from his book entitled, **The Divine Inspiration of the Bible**, published first in 1841:

“If the language of the sacred books has been so far left to the ever fallible choice of human wisdom— and if divine wisdom, which alone is infallible, have not controlled and guaranteed it— I am exposed incessantly to the temptation of abstracting something from it, modifying something in it, or adding something to it.

We ask, where do they mean to stop in the course they have begun? And by what reasons would they stop those, in their turn, who would fain advance farther than they are willing to go? They make bold to correct one saying of God's word; what right, then, have they to censure those who would rectify all the rest? Creatures of a day, during which they fleet through this world, with the everlasting book of God in their hands, they are foolhardy enough to say to him: This, Lord, is worthy of thee, this is not worthy of thee! We repeat it: **Where will they stop in this fatal task?”**

© Copyright 1981
Linton M. Smith Jr.

P.O. Box 135
Adamsville, AL 35005

SCHOLASTIC SKULLDUGGERY

by Dr. Linton M. Smith Jr.

This paper has a twofold purpose:

First of all, I wish to demonstrate that most so-called “scholars” have a preconceived bias against the **King James Bible** and the **Textus Receptus** Greek text upon which it is based. This we will do by using Dean John Burgon's **Seven Tests for Weighing Manuscripts** to evaluate the evidence for and against the reading of Revelation 22:14, as found in the **1611 Authorized Version**.

Revelation 22:14 was chosen because:

1. It is clear to see that the reading of the **King James Version** is completely different from that of all modern day versions. Therefore, the issue has nothing to do with the clarity of the reading, but simply which of two readings is to be accepted as Scripture. By what authority shall we determine which of these is truly the word of God in this passage?

2. Bible believer's are often told that certain changes aren't important because they don't affect doctrine. However, changing this verse does affect its doctrinal meaning.

3. The manuscript evidence for this text is available to even a novice Greek student. So, no scholar can claim *ignorance* as an excuse for changing the reading. They didn't act in ignorance, they just went against the plain textual evidence and chose the Westcott and Hort reading anyway.

Secondly, I would like to establish the scholastic credibility of the proponents of the King James Bible —we know whereof we speak. We will establish the veracity of the **KJV** reading by examining the Greek manuscript evidence as found in: **The Greek New Testament** (United Bible Society, edited by Aland and Metzger), **Novum Testamentum** (23rd edition

of Nestles Greek Text), **The Emphatic Diaglott** (according to the Griesbach rescension. Better known as Vatican Manuscript No. 1209), **The Westcott and Hort Greek Text, Word pictures in the New Testament** (by A.T. Robertson), **The Expositor's Greek New Testament** (by W.R. Nicoll), and H.C. Hoskier's work on **Revelation**.

I have complete confidence in our King James Bible and would never change one word in it using any Greek text. So why go to all the trouble of dealing with the Greek manuscript evidence? Simply to demonstrate that you can't always trust the scholars. The only infallible authority on earth is your King James Bible. God has given us His word and put it where any fool can find it— *in plain English*. From backwoods, hillbilly preachers, to seminary graduates, there are many who still trust God, and know where to find *His words*— in **THE Book**. I might add, I have more confidence in an *uneducated* hillbilly preacher who believes God's word than in all the seminary graduates I ever met, who think they are able to correct it. Isn't it marvelous, that one can simply attend a seminary for a few years, and become an expert at finding the errors in our Bible. And, although these *scholars* don't even agree among themselves about what is Scripture and what is not, they still expect us to believe that *their corrections are without error*.

Note that the Scripture text we are dealing with has been altered in every new version on the market. This follows the line of corruption from the Westcott and Hort Greek text and the attending English **Revised Version** of 1881. Even the **Thompson Chain Reference Bible** and the **Scofield Reference Bible** (old and new) have the RV note suggesting the King James reading is in error. **The Ryrie Reference Bible** follows this same line of conjecture, and in the **Rice Reference Bible** foot-note for Revelation 22:14, Dr. John R. Rice goes so far as to say of the King James reading, "[T]his is a very unfortunate translation." Is the KJV reading an "unfortunate translation?" Is it in error? Should it be changed? Do we dare challenge these *scholars*?

I believe that the King James reading is **not** in error and should **not** be changed. And, **yes**, we do

challenge their authority for such a change. Furthermore, we believe that most of these men have never examined the manuscript evidence for the reading themselves. They have only copied the footnotes of others on this verse. How marvelously convincing are the words "**most** mss say"— "**the oldest** mss say"— and "**the best** mss say". Don't you believe it until you examine the evidence for yourself!

The Two Readings of Revelation 22:14:

- ☞ "Blessed are they that do his commandments," (**King James Version**) and;
- ☞ "Happy are they who wash their robes," (**All other versions**).

Now here are Dean John Burgon's **Seven Tests for Weighing Manuscripts**.

1. Antiquity or Primitiveness
2. Consent of witnesses, or number
3. Variety of evidence or catholicity
4. Respectability of witnesses
5. Continuity or unbroken tradition
6. Evidence of the entire passage or context
7. Internal considerations or reasonableness

I understand the evidence for the Receptus reading of the King James to be:

1. R—Syrian, Byzantine, Antiochan
2. 1—12th
3. 046—8th—Byzantine
4. 94—12th—Alexandrian
5. 104 (7)
6. 459 (45)
7. 680 (104)
8. 1380 (151)
9. 1611—12th—Alexandrian
10. 1678 (140)
11. 1778 (203)
12. 1841 (127)
13. 1854—11th—Alexandrian
14. 1859—14th—?
15. 2042—14th—Alexandrian
16. 2050 (143)
17. 2065—15th—?
18. 2073—14th—?

19. 2080 (178)
20. 2138
21. 2325 (155)
22. 11th—Western
23. 2432—14th—?
24. it.^{sig}—13th
25. sy.—2nd century (all or most agree)
26. sy.^h—(Harclean)
27. sy.^{ph}—(Philoxenian)
28. cop.^{bo}—3rd
29. Tcy—4th
30. Andrew
31. Beatus—8th
32. Arethas—10th
33. Tert—3rd
34. Cypr—3rd

(The numbers in parentheses are according to Hoskier's numbering system).

I understand that the Alexandrian reading has behind it the following:

1. Aleph — 4th
2. A—5th—Alexandrian & Byzantine
3. 1006—11th—Alexandrian
4. 2020—15th—Byzantine
5. 2053—13th—Alexandrian
6. it.^{ar}
7. it.^c—12th
8. it.^{dem}—13th
9. it.^{div}—13th
10. it.^{haf}—19th
11. vg.—4th
12. cop.^{sa}—3rd
13. eth—6th
14. Ath—4th
15. Ful—6th
16. Apri—6th
17. Prim—6th
18. PS —Amb—6th
19. Haymo—9th
20. (N)?—6th Byzantine

Now let's evaluate this evidence according to Burgon's Seven Tests:

1. Antiquity— based on the fact that the Receptus reading is found in the second century (**sy**), third century (**Tert**), **Cyp**, (**cop**^{bo}), and 4th century (**Tyconius**) and the **Alexandrian** reading only in the fourth century (**Aleph**), the third century

(**cop**^{sa}), and the fifth century (**A**), it seems that *antiquity speaks for the Receptus reading*. Bishop Ellicott and Archdeacon Palmer wrote a pamphlet in defense of the **Westcott-Hort Greek Text** in which they are compelled to admit that: "*This remarkable statement completes the pedigree of the Received Text. That pedigree stretches back to a remote antiquity. The first ancestor of the Received Text was, as Dr. Hort is careful to remind us, at least contemporary with the oldest of our extant manuscripts, if not older than any of them.*" (Two members of the New Testament company on the Revisers Greek text, p. 11-12 as quoted by Wilkinson, **Our Authorized Bible Vindicated**, p. 55).

2. Number of witnesses— for the Receptus reading— **sy** (all or most Syrians in agreement: "**R**" (046, as well as by the mass of later manuscripts), (**Nestle's 23rd edition**, p. 68-69). See also our list of evidences for the **KJV** reading.

3. Variety of Evidence— the Receptus reading is found in the Uncials, cursives, the early church fathers, and in early translations. The Alexandrian, Byzantine, and Western families have manuscripts with the Receptus reading in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 8th, 10th, 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries. The variety of evidence is there. Burgon says: "...[T]he **Uncials** and the whole body of **Cursive** copies. They are (a) dotted over at least 1,000 years; (b) they evidently belong to so many diverse countries...Greece, Constantinople, Asia Minor, Palestine, Syria, Alexandria, and other parts of Africa, not to say Sicily, Southern Italy, Gaul, England, and Ireland: (c) they exhibit so many strange characteristics and peculiar sympathies: (d) they so clearly represent countless families of manuscripts, being in no single instance absolutely identical in their text, and certainly not being copies of any other Codex in existence... that their unanimous decisions I hold to be an absolute irrefutable evidence of the Truth. If again only a few of these copies disagree with the main body of them, I hold that the value of the verdict of the great majority is but slightly disturbed." (Burgon and Miller, **The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established**, p. 51).