

**Early Manuscripts,  
Church Fathers,  
and the  
Authorized Version**



**WITH MANUSCRIPT DIGESTS  
AND SUMMARIES**

**J. A. Moorman**



**Early Manuscripts,  
Church Fathers,  
and the  
Authorized Version**



**WITH MANUSCRIPT DIGESTS  
AND SUMMARIES**

**J. A. Moorman**



***EARLY***  
**MANUSCRIPTS**  
**CHURCH FATHERS *and***  
**THE AUTHORIZED VERSION**

\* \* \* \*

**WITH MANUSCRIPT DIGESTS AND SUMMARIES**

**Published by**  
The Old Paths Publications  
[www.theoldpathspublications.com](http://www.theoldpathspublications.com)  
[TOP@theoldpathspublications.com](mailto:TOP@theoldpathspublications.com)  
June 2012

**J. A. Moorman**

# CONTENTS

## EARLY MANUSCRIPTS and THE AUTHORIZED VERSION

### PREFACE, ACKNOWLEDGMENT, DEDICATION

### SECTION ONE

#### THE BATTLE FOR THE DOCTRINAL HEART OF SCRIPTURE

CHAPTER	TITLE
I.	ADOPTIANISM: THE DARK SECRET Removal of the Name “Jesus” Removal of “Lord” and “Christ” What Lays Behind This Disassociation
II.	THE “FIRST RULE” IN TEXTUAL CRITICISM
III.	THE “STANDARD TEXT” AND CATHOLIC COOPERATION
IV.	THE CRITICAL TEXT: “ECLECTIC” OR BOUND TO ALEPH-B An Actual Count
V.	THE REMARKABLE ALTERATIONS OF CODEX SINAITICUS



## **SECTION TWO**

### **A SUMMARY OF MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE**

#### **TWELVE SUMMARIES**

#### **STANDARDS OF COMPARISON**

<b>CHAPTER</b>	<b>TITLE</b>
I	THE PAPYRI FRAGMENTS
II	THE OLD UNCIALS (1)
III	THE OLD UNCIALS (2)
IV	THE "ALPHABET" AND "O" UNCIALS
V	THE CURSIVE MANUSCRIPTS
VI	FAMILIES ONE AND THIRTEEN
VII	THE OLD LATIN
VIII	JEROME'S VULGATE Editions Rather than Individual Manuscripts The Vulgate Summary
IX	THE SYRIAC VERSIONS Peshitta Sinaitic and Curetonian Philoxenian and Harclean Palestinian Summary



X	THE COPTIC VERSIONS Sahidic Bohairic Minor Coptic Versions Summary Overall Margin for Three Primary Versions
XI	THE GOTHIC, ARMENIAN AND ETHIOPIC VERSIONS Gothic Armenian Ethiopic Summary
XII	THE FATHERS TO CHRYSOSTOM Selective Citation The Burgon and Miller Material A Disadvantage for the Traditional Text Tatian's Diatessaron Summary

**SECTION THREE**

**A MANUSCRIPT DIGEST OF 356 DOCTRINAL PASSAGES**

Format, Symbols and Abbreviations  
The Digest

**EARLY CHURCH FATHERS and  
THE AUTHORIZED VERSION**

**INTRODUCTION**

CHAPTER	TITLE
---------	-------



I.	TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND THE CHURCH FATHERS The Search for a “Good Critical edition” Frederic Kenyon Bruce Metzger Kurt Aland IGNTP Gordon Fee Conclusion
II.	SOME INFLUENTIAL PATRISTIC WORKS Eusebius Jerome Gennadius “A Catholic Enterprise” Angelo Mai Jacques Paul Migne The Berlin and Vienna Editions Dean Burgon’s Index The Roberts, Schaff Editions
III.	GUIDELINES FOR THE DEMONSTRATION

CHAPTER	TITLE
---------	-------



IV.	<p>THE SUMMARY, WITH BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES:</p> <p>Alexander</p> <p>Ambrose</p> <p>Aphrahat</p> <p>Athanasius</p> <p>Athenagoras</p> <p>Basil</p> <p>Clement</p> <p>Cyprian</p> <p>Cyril</p> <p>Dionysius</p> <p>Ephraem</p> <p>Eusebius</p> <p>Gregory, Nazianzen</p> <p>Gregory, Nyssa</p> <p>Gregory-Thaumaturgus</p> <p>Hilary</p> <p>Hippolytus</p> <p>Ignatius</p> <p>Irenaeus</p> <p>Justin Martyr</p> <p>Malchion</p> <p>Methodius</p> <p>Novatian</p> <p>Origin</p> <p>Polycarp</p> <p>Pontius</p> <p>Tatian</p> <p>Tertullian</p> <p>Victorinus</p> <p>Anonymous Works</p> <p>Apocryphal Works</p> <p>Chronological Summary</p> <p>Geographic Summary</p>
-----	---

CHAPTER	TITLE
---------	-------

V.	THE DIGEST All passages Cited are "Distinctly Byzantine" An Invitation 149 Doctrinal Passages
----	---

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY
-----------------------

INDEX
-------



## PREFACE, ACKNOWLEDGMENT, DEDICATION

The Authorized Version of the Scriptures is the receptus of doctrinal truth. It is fuller and more distinct doctrinally than any other version. The first *profitable* outcome of inspiration is doctrine (II Tim. 3:16). The first purpose of Scripture is to establish doctrine. It is not surprising that the doctrinal heart of Scripture should have borne the fury of Satan's attack through the centuries, and especially during the Second and Third. A number of early witnesses show the scars of this warfare in the disfiguring, defacing and deletion of doctrinal truth. God, however, has been faithful to His promise and there has always been a Traditional Text in which truth remained pure and full. And, even here, when the attack reached its full fury, if there was any scattering or diminishing, the Holy Spirit who had promised to *guide into all truth* (Jhn. 16:13) would show where to find the missing part.

When we come to the King James Bible, we feel that we have come home! We know that it is the final chapter of the Traditional Text. We know that whatever may have been scattered or diminished along the way has been brought home and clarified in its pages. The fact that the AV has been the *sole* Standard these past 400 years, and conscious of the many Scriptural promises concerning preservation, we have certainty and confirmation as to this assurance.

The present volume places before the reader an entire range of evidence, and demonstrates how the early manuscripts, versions, and fathers bear witness to the doctrinal heart of the Authorized Version. With some revision this work combines the author's *Early Manuscripts and the Authorised Version*, and *Early Church Fathers and the Authorised Version*. These were published by The Bible for Today in 1990 and 1992.

A battle has raged over the doctrinal heart of Scripture. As early as the days of the Apostle Paul, there were *many* who were seeking to *corrupt the word of God*, (II Cor. 2:17). This corruption and defacement is especially obvious in several of the very early manuscripts. Their surprisingly good current condition, and scarcity of similar types of manuscripts, is clear proof that they were wisely avoided in the transmission and recopying process. Yet more recent times, have seen them brought out of their dusty hiding places to form the basis of modern bibles.

The following presentation represents something of a breakthrough. Here the reader is able to accurately access how the different strata of an entire range of manuscript evidence votes with respect to 356 doctrinal passages that are present in the AV but missing from modern bibles.

In preparing this material, I acknowledge my debt and gratitude to those choice servants who labor in the defense of the Received Text and Authorized Version; to all missionaries who go the extra mile in making certain that their

foreign language translation is based on the Received Text; and to all who stand, like the pastor, whose letter I received, placed I John 5:7 after his signature.

I am very thankful for the *huge* effort of my wife in typing the original drafts; and to Dr. H. D. and Patricia Williams, and James Grumblatt for their massive labor of much retyping and placing the material into an electronic format.

Most notably we mark the fact that for many years Dr. D. A. Waite has stood at the forefront in the defense of the Standard Bible and Traditional Text. His efforts have been tireless. His voice often the first to be heard. His work has had a beneficial effect around the world, with many being alerted to this crucial issue. His founding of the Dean Burgon Society has provided a forum for others to enter into the defense. With gratitude, this volume is dedicated to a true and consistent champion of the faith, Dr. D. A. Waite.

Jack Moorman  
London, 2005

## **SECTION ONE**

### **THE BATTLE FOR THE DOCTRINAL HEART OF SCRIPTURE**

The repeated argument that “not one doctrine” is affected by the current controversy between the Authorized Version and Modern Versions, is of course, completely wide of the mark. There has not been a “wholesale” removal of doctrine from these new Bibles. You can still teach the Deity of Christ, or the Second Coming, or the Trinity from the New International or New American Standard Versions. But, you will do so with greater difficulty! You will have to look harder! You will find some key component parts missing! And, you may find yourself having to explain some things “you never knew before”! See, *only begotten God* in *NASV* at John 1:18.

In this first section, we look at some areas which are not so well-known among God’s people. In fact, I think we have here some *depths of Satan* (Rev. 2:24) which go far deeper than most have imagined.

## **CHAPTER I**

### **ADOPTIANISM: THE DARK SECRET BEHIND**

### **THE TEXT OF THE MODERN VERSIONS**



It has long been known that names and titles of Christ occur less frequently in the NIV/NASV than in the Authorized Version. In the AV, the complete signature is given to our Saviour's Person. When the Bible writes this in full, it is "the Lord Jesus Christ."

Notice how substantial the amount of omission is in two of the prominent versions.

	NASV	NIV
Lord	35	35
Jesus	73	36
Christ	43	44
Total Omissions	156	115

This can hardly be brushed aside in the way the following attempts do:

One common objection...is that in a relative few cases the names "Christ" and "Lord" are omitted when referring to Jesus. (A tract by Homer Kent, President of Grace Theological Seminary, *The King James Only*).

The removal of "Christ" and "Lord" are a strike against our Saviour's deity in every place it occurs. But what are we to say about the removal of "Jesus", the "name which is above every name", but the name which, nevertheless, speaks of our Lord's humanity.

As we now show, "Jesus" is often removed from an *association* with other titles or works of Deity. In other words, "Jesus" is frequently made to stand alone, or not at all!

## REMOVAL OF THE NAME "JESUS" FROM ASSOCIATION WITH TITLES AND WORKS OF DEITY

**Jesus is removed from:**

MATTHEW	
4:12	the prophecy of the great light (12-16)
4:18	the call to discipleship (18-22)

4:23	the miracle working ministry in Galilee (23-25)
8:29	association with the title “thou Son of God”
12:25	healing of the blind and dumb demoniac (22-30)
13:36	the interpretation of “wheat and tares” (36-43)
13:51	association with the title “Lord” (which is also removed)
14:14	the immediate account of a miracle
14:22, 25, 27	much of the account of walking on the sea
15:16	the discourse about defilement (10-20)
15:30	the immediate account of a miracle
16:20	association with the title “the Christ”

MARK	
1:41	the immediate account of a miracle
5:13	the immediate account of a miracle
5:19	association with the title “Lord”
6:34	the “feeding of the 5,000” (32-44)
7:27	healing of the Syrophenician woman’s daughter (24-30)
8:1	the “feeding of the 4,000” (1-9)
8:17	the discourse concerning leaven (14-21)
11:14	the “cursing of the fig tree” (12-14)
11:15	the “cleansing of the Temple” (15-19)
12:41	the account of the widow’s mite (41-44)
14:22	the account of the Last Supper (22-25)



LUKE	
7:22	the answer of miracles to John the Baptist (19-23)
9:43	an account of miracles and coming crucifixion (43-45)
10:21	a prayer of union with the Father (21-22)
13:2	an exhortation to repent (1-5)
24:36	the upper room appearance to the disciples (36-53)

JOHN	
3:2	a confession of His miracles
5:17,19	a declaration of union with the Father (17-47)
5:14	immediate association with “that prophet”
13:3	a statement of union with the Father

ACTS	
3:26	association with the title “His Son”
9:29	association with the title “Lord”
19:10	association with the title “Lord”

ROMANS	
15:8	association with the title “Christ”
16:18	association with the titles “Lord” and “Christ”

1 CORINTHIANS	
5:5	association with the title “Christ”
16:22	“Jesus Christ” association with the title “Lord”

II CORINTHIANS	
4:10	association with the title “Christ”
5:18	association with the title “Christ”

COLOSSIANS	
1:28	association with the title “Christ”

II TIMOTHY	
4:22	“Jesus Christ”... association with the title “Lord”

I PETER	
5:10	association with the title “Christ”
5:14	association with the title “Christ.”

## REMOVAL OF “LORD”, “CHRIST” AND OTHER TITLES OF DEITY FROM IMMEDIATE ASSOCIATION WITH THE NAME JESUS

The underlined words are removed from Modern Bibles

MATTHEW	
13:51	Jesus saith unto them, Have ye...Yea, <u>Lord</u>
23:8	Then spake Jesus (verse 1)...for one is your Master, <u>even Christ</u>
28:6	for I know that ye seek Jesus...Come see the place where the <u>Lord</u> lay

MARK	
1:1	The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, <u>the Son of God</u>
9:24	Jesus said unto him, if thou canst believe .. <u>Lord</u> I believe



11:10	Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh <u>in the name of the Lord</u> : ... And Jesus entered
-------	--

LUKE	
9:57	<u>Lord</u> I will follow thee ... And Jesus said
9:59	<u>Lord</u> , suffer me first ... Jesus said
23:42	And he said unto Jesus, <u>Lord</u> , remember me

JOHN	
6:69	We believe and are sure that thou art <u>that Christ</u> , the Son of the living God. Jesus answered...

ACTS	
15:11	through the grace of the Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u>
16:31	Believe on the Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u>
19:4	that they should believe on ... <u>Christ</u> Jesus
20:21	faith toward our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u>

ROMANS	
6:11	but alive unto God through Jesus Christ <u>our Lord</u>
16:20	The grace of our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u> be with you

I CORINTHIANS	
5:4	In the name of our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u>
5:4	with the power of our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u>
9:1	have I not seen Jesus <u>Christ</u> our Lord
16:23	The grace of our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u> be with you

II CORINTHIANS	
4:10	Always bearing about in the body the dying of the <u>Lord</u> Jesus
11:31	The God and Father of our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u>

GALATIANS	
6:17	for I bear in my body the marks of the <u>Lord</u> Jesus

I THESSALONIANS	
2:19	in the presence of our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u> at his coming
3:11	and our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u> direct our way unto you
3:13	at the coming of our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u>

II THESSALONIANS	
1:8	that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u>
1:12	That the name of our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u> may be glorified

I TIMOTHY	
1:1	and <u>Lord</u> Jesus Christ which is our hope
5:21	I charge thee before God, and the <u>Lord</u> Jesus Christ

II TIMOTHY	
4:1	I charge thee therefore before God, and the <u>Lord</u> Jesus Christ

TITUS	
1:4	from God the Father and the <u>Lord</u> Jesus Christ

HEBREWS	
---------	--

3:1	consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, <u>Christ</u> Jesus
-----	---

1 JOHN	
1:7	the blood of Jesus <u>Christ</u> his Son cleanseth
4:3	And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus <u>Christ is come in the flesh</u> is not of God

II JOHN	
3	and from <u>the Lord</u> Jesus Christ

REVELATION	
12:17	and have the testimony of Jesus <u>Christ</u>
22:21	The grace of our Lord Jesus <u>Christ</u> be with you all.

Here we have 86 examples where the Modern Versions disassociate the name “Jesus” from other titles and acts of Deity. These are examined further in the Manuscript Digest.

## WHAT LIES BEHIND THIS DISASSOCIATION?

The separation of “Jesus” from “Christ” occurs far too often to look for any cause other than deliberate editing in certain N.T. manuscripts. That there was a strong movement in the early centuries which could result in such a systematic editing, there can be no doubt! The foremost error regarding the Person of Christ, is of course, to deny His true Deity and true Humanity. The chief means by which this was done, and which finds expression down to our own day, is technically known as “Adoptianism” or “Spirit Christology.” Here: Jesus of Nazareth, an ordinary man of unusual virtue, was “adopted” by God into divine Sonship by the advent of the “Christ-Spirit” at His baptism. Therefore, Jesus became Christ at His baptism, rather than, the fact that He was always the Christ from eternity. Though united for a time, Jesus and Christ were thus said to be separate personages.

This heresy is expressed in a number of ways. *Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (Under “Adoptianism”) cites the following early example:

The Holy Spirit...is regarded as the preexistent Son ... The Redeemer is the virtuous man chosen by God, with whom that Spirit of God was



united. As He did not defile the Spirit, but kept Him constantly as His companion, and carried out the work to which the Deity had called Him...He was in virtue of a Divine decree, adopted as a son ... (*The Shepherd of Hermas*).

Many names and groups are associated with this wicked teaching, foremost of whom were the Gnostics.

The liberal J.N.D. Kelly writes:

There was a great variety of Gnostic systems, but a common pattern ran through them all. From the pleroma, or spiritual world of aeons the divine Christ descended and united Himself for a time (according to Ptolemy, between the baptism and the passion) to the historical personage...These were tendencies on the fringe, yet Gnosticism at any rate came within an ace of swamping the central tradition. (*Early Christian Doctrines*, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958, pp. 141,42).

Ponder carefully Kelly's statement about how near this came to *swamping the central tradition*! In the Summaries we will be looking more closely at Egypt; but notice for now that Kelly's mention of Ptolemy and Gnosticism takes us to that city which gave such force and rise to the Gnostic error - Alexandria.

The Digest in Section Three shows clearly that it is the small group of Alexandrian manuscripts which consistently disassociate "Jesus" from "Christ". Along with Aleph and B, Papyri 46 follows the same trend. This favorite papyri among editors of the Critical Text covers parts of Romans to Hebrews, and dates from 200 AD, making it just about the oldest manuscript we have. But, in I Cor. 15:47, *it reveals its dark secret!*

the second man is <u>the Lord</u> from heaven	AV
the second man is from heaven	Aleph* B
the second man is <u>the spirit</u> from heaven	P46

Very much in line with what *The Shepherd of Hermas* said!

As we near the end of the New Testament, and the Spirit of the Living God is setting out His final admonitions and warnings, we now begin to understand better one passage in particular –

And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist...(I John 4:3).

In fact there is a fivefold warning at the end of the Bible concerning this heresy! See I John 2:22; 4:3; 5:1; 5:5; II John 7,9.

This then, is the dark secret of the Modern Bibles: they are based on manuscripts tainted by the heresy of "Adoptionism.", and this completely undermines the doctrinal heart of Scripture.

## CHAPTER II

### THE "FIRST RULE" IN TEXTUAL CRITICISM

The Westcott and Hort theory produced a table of about eight or ten "canons" by which Textual Criticism operates, and which greatly affects the Bible's doctrinal heart. You will not have to look at these "rules" for long before realizing that they are "weighted" in the direction of their own predetermined preference for the Alexandrian Text. For example: if the Alexandrian Text is shorter than the Traditional, then one firm rule is "The shorter reading is to be preferred." And, if above ninety percent of the manuscripts support the Traditional Text and the remaining ten percent must be divided between the Alexandrian (which struggles to get even 3%), Western and Caesarean texts, then of course "numerical preponderance counts for nothing, the Traditional Text is merely one of four competing 'text types'". And, should it be pointed out that the Alexandrian Text is less distinct doctrinally: then it is an established fact that "there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for doctrinal purposes during the early centuries." And, on it goes! A number of authors have exposed this partiality, and in our *Missing in Modern Bibles*, (See also *Modern Bibles the Dark Secret*), I give a simplified overview of these "canons". But, let it be noted, that it is their "FIRST RULE" that allows them to get away with the other rules!

Textual Criticism has long played a perverse game with what they are only too aware is substantial pre-350AD evidence for the Traditional Text. To them, the Traditional Majority is always that of a *derived* text (and that, simply because they say so!). With respect to the early centuries, it is not allowed to stand on its own. The pre-350AD evidence which is plainly there, is in the majority, and witnesses strongly to the Traditional Text, is not a witness at all, but is made to be merely *secondary sources* which were later developed into the Traditional Text.

When they say, "there are no distinctive Byzantine readings before 350", it is in fact circular reasoning, for by their logic, if it is before 350, then it cannot be Byzantine! It is much like the evolutionist dating the strata by the fossils, and the fossils by the strata. The pre-350 era is solely the domain of Aleph and B, and the few manuscripts which support them. The mass of manuscripts as represented by the Authorized Version must not be allowed to intrude into that era. Their evidence is ruled out of court.

What, however, are they to do with the clear and substantial evidence to the contrary? Here they have been forced to a second line of defense: “Well, there may be Byzantine readings before 350, but there is no Byzantine Text”! To this we naturally reply that given the large number of passages involved, how can you have one without the other?

I think you will see from the evidence in the following, how wickedly dishonest this line of argument is. There, in many hundreds of places, we have called upon the early witnesses to vote between the Traditional Text and that of Aleph-B. The results are convincing; but it must also be said, that in the early centuries there was indeed a warfare over the doctrinal heart of Scripture, and that in more recent times our opponents have been very adept at “moving the goal posts”!

## CHAPTER III

### THE “STANDARD TEXT” AND ROMAN CATHOLIC COOPERATION

In recent years Kurt Aland has encouraged the use of the term “Standard Text” for the critical edition (Nestle) of which he has been the chief editor. Whether others will be quite so ready to call it that, is not clear. However, it is clear that the “Standard Text” has become the *first* Greek edition since the Reformation over which Catholics and Protestants could cooperate fully. It has been an “ecumenical break through” which has made the doctrines of the Bible “more acceptable to all.” In fact, the earlier editions of the Nestle text were technically “off limits” to the Catholic Church, with backing instead being given to the editions of three of their own scholars - Vogels, Merk and Bover.

... they were intended to meet the overwhelming “competition” of the popular Nestle edition which was circulating widely even in Roman Catholic circles. The fact that the Nestle text was produced by the Bible Societies, which were still under official Catholic proscription, only aggravated the situation. (Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987, p. 26).

Except for some differences in paragraphing, punctuation and spelling, the texts of the two most popular critical editions — Nestle Aland and United Bible Societies — are now identical. This is primarily through the efforts of Kurt Aland, director of the Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Munster, West Germany; and Eugene Nida, Translations Secretary of the American Bible Society. For many years Aland has been editor of the Nestle Text, which by 1963



had reached its 25th edition. This has always been the most popular critical edition and is based firmly on the Aleph B text of Westcott and Hort.

The United Bible Societies' edition is of more recent origin. In 1955 through the initiative of Nida, a committee was established to prepare an edition especially for missionary translators. Those invited to participate were Matthew Black of St Andrews, Scotland, Bruce Metzger of Princeton, Allen Wikgren of Chicago University, as well as Kurt Aland who would now be working on both editions.

It should be noted that this is the United Bible Societies text. Initially three societies sponsored the project — the American, National of Scotland and Wurtemberg of W. Germany. These were joined by the Netherlands Bible Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society. But, in fact, it became the Greek text of the worldwide United Bible Societies, a union of national societies which dates back to the thirties. It was envisaged that it become the standard base for all future translation work carried out by these national societies. It has furthermore become an interconfessional text, as it is officially recognized by the Roman Catholic Church. At about the time the first edition was published (1966), Carlo Martini — rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute of Rome, and later Archbishop of Milan, and Cardinal — was invited to serve on the editorial committee.

Kurt Aland writes:

What of the present scene where the reader of the Greek New Testament now meets the new "Standard text"? By this we mean the text officially published and distributed by the United Bible Societies and also officially by the Catholic Church - a significant new factor in the present scene. (*Ibid*, p. 30).

In any event, the new "Standard text" is a reality, and as the sole text distributed by the United Bible Societies and by the corresponding offices of the Roman Catholic Church - an inconceivable situation until quite recently. (*Ibid*, p. 35).

The first edition was published in 1966, and as stated in the preface, the work was carried out "on the basis of Westcott and Hort's edition". A second edition appeared two years later. "Only a few changes were introduced" (Aland p. 33), but these set the stage for the common text. Further changes were agreed, and with the publication of *UBS 3* in 1975 and *Nestle Aland 26* in 1979 the quest for textual identity between the two editions was realized.

This has all resulted in a marked increase of Roman Catholic involvement in Bible Society work:

It was disclosed in the 1987 Annual Report of the United Bible Societies (p. 193) that “of the 573 current UBS projects of Scripture translation, there is active Roman Catholic participation in 161, and there have been over 160 interconfessional Bibles and New Testaments published since 1968.” This represents a massive increase in Roman Catholic influence over the work of Bible translation in the past twenty years. (*Trinitarian Bible Society Quarterly Record*, April—June 1989, p. 12).

Yet, many missionaries, pastors and Bible colleges who claim to be conservative and fundamental use the “Standard Text” as their standard too!

## CHAPTER IV

### THE CRITICAL TEXT: “ECLECTIC,” OR BOUND TO ALEPH AND B

Driving through Birmingham, England, I passed an “establishment” called “The Artful Dodger”. And, frankly, there is not a better way to describe Textual Criticism. It shifts, it turns, it establishes, it overturns, it rewrites, it restates, it examines, it ignores, etc. Textual Criticism would have us believe that it is the arbiter of the kind of Bible we should read; but all it can offer is a provisional, preliminary and eclectic kind of “Bible”. It is in their use of “eclectic” that new meaning has been brought to the word, “artful”.

The well-known statement in the *NIV* introduction claims:

The Greek text used in translating the New Testament was an eclectic one (viii).

According to the dictionary definition eclectic means:

1. Selecting what is considered best from different systems and sources.
2. Composed of elements selected from diverse sources.

Most involved in Textual Criticism would accept this as a reasonable description of their approach to the N.T. Text. In reading their material, you will find that some claim to be “more eclectic than others”. Yet, despite all that we hear about this approach, when it comes to the current Critical Text — has it really been a case of “selecting what is considered best from different sources”? Hardly at all! The primary source of the *NA 26*, *UBS 3* has altered very little since F.J.A. Hort wrote:

Accordingly, with the exceptions mentioned above, it is our belief (1) that readings of Aleph B should be accepted as the true readings until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary, and (2) that no readings of Aleph B can be safely rejected absolutely, though it is sometimes right to place them only on an alternative footing, especially where they receive no support from the Versions or the Fathers. (*The New Testament in the Original Greek Introduction and Appendix*, New York: Harper Bros., 1882, p. 225).

But, does not the introduction to *NA 26* tell us that the narrow base used by Westcott and Hort is now finished?

The view is becoming increasingly accepted today that...neither Codex Vaticanus nor Codex Sinaiticus (nor even P75 of two hundred years earlier) can provide a guideline we can normally depend on for determining the text. The age of Westcott—Hort and of Tischendorf is definitely over. (*Nestle Aland -26th Edition*, 1981, p 43\*).

This is simply not the case! Despite their statements about “eclecticism”, and a “broadening of the manuscript base” very little of substance has changed in the latest Critical Edition. It is still the Aleph-B text of Westcott and Hort.

Notice how J. K. Elliott, a frequent reviewer of the *UBS* and *NA*, comes around to this conclusion:

Commenting first on the earlier *UBS* editions he writes:

As for the *UBS* text itself, it claims to be eclectic. In a sense this is demonstrably so, in so far as it does not regularly follow only a few MSS in the way Tischendorf (8) or Westcott and Hort do. Sometimes readings appear which do not reflect the text of the traditional “best” MSS (“A Second Look at the United Bible Societies’ Greek N.T.”, *The Bible Translator*, 26 (1975), p 327).

However, after giving ten examples of departures from the “best MSS” (Aleph and B), he continues:

The cult of MSS ... is a questionable principle, especially in a text which purports to be eclectic. Metzger’s *Commentary* p. 271 states that the text of Acts is intended to be eclectic, but in practice it is the shorter Alexandrian text which has usually been printed (*Ibid*).

Preference for Aleph B has caused the editors to print the Attic form ephee found in these MSS at Mark 9:12, 38; 10:20, 29; 12:24; 14:29. (*Ibid*, p. 332).

Regarding the third edition of *UBS*, Elliott says:



...the general verdict of UBS 3rd edn. is that its text is closer to Westcott and Hort's text. It is in many ways a "safer" text than the first and second UBS editions insofar as many more of the readings of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus appear in UBS 3rd edn. ("The United Bible Societies Greek New Testament: A Short Examination of the Third Edition", *The Bible Translator*, 30 .1979 p. 138).

It should be pointed out, though, that in order to bring the text of NA-26 into line with UBS-3, it had to depart from a number of the Aleph B readings in NA-25.

...as if to underline their reluctance at abandoning the readings of NA 25, the editors frequently bracket the newly added text...The resultant text...is, however, still close to Hort. (Elliott, "An Examination of the Twenty - Sixth Edition of Nestle Aland Novurn Testamentum Graece," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 32 '1981, p. 22).

## AN ACTUAL COUNT

The key determinate in the Westcott and Hort theory is that a reading supported by both Aleph and B should virtually always be incorporated in the text. When they divide preference will generally be given to B. Taking into account that the Vaticanus MS omits I Timothy - Philemon, Hebrews 9:15 - end and Revelation; I counted 216 instances in the NA-26 apparatus where it's text departed from an Aleph-B reading. In most cases this would also represent a departure from the Hort text. The count was of the original readings of Aleph and B, not subsequent scribal alterations.

216 departures over 559 pages of text, or  
one departure for every 2.6 pages, or  
about one departure in every 32 verses

How can this be called "eclecticism"? Well, if you are very "artful" it can be! Aleph and B do not always provide a comfortable bed for the modern "standard" text to rest upon. They frequently disagree, and in other places the evidence against them is such that it cannot be ignored by the critical editors. It is because, and *only* because of these two factors, that Textual Criticism has had to exercise its "eclectic facilities". If Aleph and B were more in agreement, the word "eclectic" would not be mentioned! In short, the "Standard Text" is nearly as bound to Aleph and B, as the one drafted by Westcott and Hort over one hundred years ago. And, it is these two manuscripts which most corrupt the doctrinal heart of the Bible.

## CHAPTER V

## THE REMARKABLE ALTERATIONS IN CODEX SINAITICUS

That a battle raged in the early centuries over the doctrinal heart of Scripture is nowhere more manifest than in the scriptorium where Codex Aleph was copied! Among the early manuscripts it seems to have far more than the usual number of corrections and alterations. Indeed, Scrivener speaks of this manuscript being “disfigured with corrections” (*Plain Introduction*, p 90). Two of our summaries show that these alterations generally move away from Aleph’s characteristic Alexandrian base to the kind of text underlying our Authorized Version.

In the doctrinal passages of the Manuscript Digest the Aleph-correctors support the AV by a margin of:

70 – 19

In Nestle Aland-26 they side with the Traditional text against Codex Vaticanus by:

473 – 181

The question naturally arises, and given the early date of Aleph (c 350), it is one of the most important that can be asked in textual criticism: When in relation to the actual penning of the manuscript were the alterations made? Prior to 1934, when Aleph was acquired by the British Museum, the two scholars most able to give a firsthand opinion of its paleography were Constantine Tischendorf and Kirsopp Lake. They believed that Aleph in its Old and New Testaments and Apocrypha was the work of four scribes designated A, B, C, D. They postulated that many different hands were involved in the corrections: some at the time of production, some during the 5th/7th century, and others later.

With the benefit of new techniques including ultraviolet lamps, H.J.M Milne and T.C. Skeat of the British Museum were able to undertake a far more thorough investigation. Their findings were published in *Scribes and Correctors of Codex Sinaiticus* (London, 1938). They concluded that in fact Aleph was the work of three scribes rather than four — A, B and D; and that the New Testament was penned mainly by Scribe A with a few portions going to Scribe D.

Scribe A	Nearly all of the New Testament
Scribe D:	Matthew 16:9 - 18:12; 24:36 - 26:6 Mark 14:54 - 16:7 Luke 1:1 - 18 I Thessalonians 2:14 - 5:28 Hebrews 4:16 - 8:1 Revelation 1:1 - 5

Coming to the correctors, Milne and Skeet were persuaded that the numerous corrections in Aleph were carried out by fewer hands than previously thought, and reinforced the conclusion of Tischendorf and Lake that many were carried out shortly after the manuscript's completion (see *Scribes and Correctors*, pp. 40 - 50). Before the manuscript left the scriptorium it was corrected by the scribes themselves, and in fact, by the scribes designated above as A and D (*Ibid*, p. 41). The importance of this conclusion is not difficult to see:

These early corrections...can all be recognized with ease and certainty as the product of the scriptorium, and as all are in consequence contemporary with the main script, they stand in this respect on more or less the same footing for the purpose of textual criticism. (*Ibid*, p 40; emphasis mine).

Regarding the nature of these alterations, Milne and Skeat indicate that in the Old Testament it was merely a case of the scribes correcting their work with reference to the single (probably) exemplar they were using.

In the New Testament, however, there are signs of a further revision, of actual collations with another textual tradition. (*Ibid*, p 45, emphasis mine).

Thus, all was not lost in that long ago scriptorium, the penmen of this corrupted Alexandrian manuscript were able to correct it in numerous places with the God-given text that underlies our King James Bible. Of course, the correcting didn't go nearly far enough, but that which did take place was noteworthy.

It remains to be pointed out that Tischendorf, followed by Lake divided the correctors of Sinaiticus into five chronological groups and, not to be confused with the original scribes, they were designated A, B, C, D, E. Of these, the British Museum researchers concluded:

The A and B corrections we have shown to be contemporary with the manuscript, since they are attributable to the scribes of the text themselves. The C correctors have been assigned by some to the fifth, by others to the seventh century, and lack of comparative material enforces caution upon whoever would decide between the two dates. The medieval D and E correctors are of slight importance. (*Ibid*).

In the Manuscript Digest, drawing upon the citations of *NA 26*, A and B have been designated Aleph 1,2; while C is Aleph 3, (D and E are not cited ). We will not here be able to study the correctors of the other early uncials, but what has been seen in Aleph sets the stage, and opens up a very strong and early line of evidence in behalf of the Traditional Text and it's doctrinal heart.



## **SECTION TWO**

### **A SUMMARY OF MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE**

There has been a vast amount of valuable and painstaking research into the manuscript evidence of the New Testament. Over the years in the midst of a busy church planting/tract distribution/Bible Institute schedule, I have tried to gather what is most valuable from the past and keep up with the more important current research. It is easy to be buried beneath it all! In my view there needs to be a brief, definitive summary of the manuscript evidence: something that would allow us to see exactly where the Old Latin stands, or the uncials (all of them), or the church fathers, etc. For example, if you want to look into the characteristics of the Old Latin manuscripts, Herman Hoskier's *Genesis of the Versions* (London 1911) is one of the most important works to consult. But even if you read it through - and I wonder that anyone ever has - it would be difficult to get a good overview of the subject because of his failure to adequately summarize.

Nevertheless, the lack of summary in Hoskier's enormous research is far to be preferred to the partial, selective, and biased conclusions made in behalf of the Alexandrian Text: e.g. "Manuscript A has a good text in Acts." "A study of Mark 11 shows a Caserean tendency." "The Vulgate text is inferior in the Gospels," etc. This enables Textual Criticism to dismissively reject and withhold evidence that rightly belongs to the Traditional Text. In the same vein they have said, "Witnesses should be weighed not counted." Of course they should be both weighed and counted; and I think the following will show why *they have had a problem with counting*.

It is believed that these summaries will help the student come to firm conclusions as to the entire range of manuscript evidence.

#### **TWELVE SUMMARIES**

1.	Papyri
2., 3.	Early Uncials - judged by two criteria
4.	The "Alphabet" and "0" Uncials
5.	Cursives
6.	Families 1 and 13
7.	Old Latin
8.	Vulgate

9.	Syriac
10.	Coptic
11.	Gothic, Armenian, and Ethiopic
12.	Church Fathers to Chrysostom, UBS Evidence

These provide a full picture and any others to be added would be of a more secondary nature.

## STANDARDS OF COMPARISON

In the first instance we want to know whether these witnesses support the Doctrinal Text of the Authorized Version or the diminished text of the Modern Versions. The material gathered into the Manuscript Digest is brought to bear on this question. Where available evidence was not consistently or fully cited for the doctrinal passages, as in the case of the Old Latin and Church Fathers, I have instead shown how they vote in a large number of passages where the Traditional Text (Byzantine Majority) stands against readings supported by Aleph and B. In this latter, many of the doctrinal passages would be included. In the case of the Old Uncials both criteria of comparison were used. The basis of comparison is always stated at the beginning of each summary.

The basic sources for the information compiled in the Digest and Summaries were the Greek New Testaments of: Tischendorf-8th, Nestle Aland-26th, United Bible Societies-3rd, and the manuscript charts given in *The Text of the New Testament* by Kurt and Barbara Aland. Legg on Matthew and Mark, and the *IGNTP* on Luke 1-12 were cited. The author's other digest in *KJVM* was also used at times, here citations were gathered from von Soden, Hodges and Farstad, Aland's *Synopsis* on the Gospels, and Hoskier on Revelation.

Most of the summaries are based on the citations gathered into the Manuscript Digest from these sources. Turning to the Digest you will see that the witnesses are divided under the headings AV and NIV. Whereas material on the AV side is always that which supports the Authorized Version; "NIV," though usually referring to the reading adopted in the *New International Version*, may on occasion refer to a reading in the footnote or that of the *New American Standard Version*. This is always stated. Therefore while it is usually AV against NIV, in a number of places it is AV versus readings that have found some acceptance in the Modern Versions. It should also be noted that while the Byzantine Majority usually supports the AV side, and Aleph-B the NIV side, there are times when these witnesses switch and divide.

## SUMMARY I : THE PAPYRI FRAGMENTS

## **Basis of Comparison : Doctrinal Passages from the Manuscript Digest**

Our oldest extant manuscripts are the papyri. They are the remains of a kind of text which did not live very long, and rather than spread widely among God's people suffered an early death and burial, in the sands of Egypt. In his valuable *The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism*, Harry Sturz has shown how frequently the earliest papyri support the kind of distinctive Byzantine readings found in the Authorized Version. By "distinctive Byzantine", he means readings found in the mass of later manuscripts, but not supported by Aleph, B and one or two other early witnesses. These papyri/majority readings have caused a real problem for those holding to the Alexandrian Text. However, in the specifically doctrinal passages the papyri will more generally side with the Aleph and B against the majority.

As with Aleph and B - their doctrinal definition stripped away - the papyri were soon discarded by early believers, with few copies made. After examining a number of heretical readings in early Egyptian manuscripts,

Edward Hills concludes:

Thus we see that it is unwise in present day translators to base the texts of their modern versions on recent papyrus discoveries or on B and Aleph. For all these documents come from Egypt, and Egypt during the early Christian centuries was a land in which heresies were rampant. So much was this so that, as Bauer (1934) and van Unnik (1958) have pointed out, later Egyptian Christians seem to have been ashamed of the heretical past of their country and to have drawn a veil of silence across it. This seems to be why so little is known of the history of early Egyptian Christianity. In view, therefore, of the heretical character of the early Egyptian Church, it is not surprising that the papyri, B, Aleph, and other manuscripts which hail from Egypt are liberally sprinkled with heretical readings. (*The King James Version Defended*, Des Moines; The Christian Research Press, 1984, p. 134).

## **THE SUMMARY**

Only those papyri cited in the Manuscript Digest are listed. The approximate date, mainly by century is given in the second column. (A small "c" stands for circa.) The general section of the N.T. - in which what is usually only a fragment - is given in the third column.

E = Gospels (Evangelists)

A = Acts

P = Epistles of Paul including Hebrews

G = General Epistles

R = Revelation

The specific portions of the N.T. covered by the papyri are recorded in *Nestle Aland* 26. The fourth column (containing numbers in parentheses) shows the times a papyri fragment *appears* to be extant for a passage in the Manuscript Digest, but for some reason Aland has not cited it. The first number (where two are given) represents a fair amount of likelihood; the second, doubt. Otherwise, a single number is given, with or without a question mark.

Papyri	Date (Century)	Section	Times extant but not cited	AV	“NIV”
P3	VI/VII	E			1
P5	III	E	(1?)		2
P8	IV	A			1
P11	VII	P	(3?)		2
P13	III/IV	P	(1)		3
P15	III	P			1
P20	III	E	(1?)		
P21	IV/V	E			1
P25	IV	E		1	
P26	c 600	P			1
P34	VII	P	(1)		
P35	IV?	E			1
P36	VI	E			1
P37	III/IV	E			2
P38	c 300	A			1
P41	VIII	A	(2)	1	
P44	VI/VII	E	(2)		
P45	III	EA	(5?)	9	13



P46	c 200	P	(4, 7?)		37
P47	III	R			7
P49	III	P			1
P50	IV/V	A		1	
P59	VII	E	(1?)		
P60	VII	E	(2)		1
P61	c 700	P	(1?)		
P63	c 500	E		1	
P64	c 200	E	(1?)		
P66	c 200	E	(1)	9	27
(P67)	part of P64	E			1
P69	III	E			1
P71	IV	E	(1?)		
P72	III/IV	G	(1?)	3	12
P74	VII	AG	(7, 3?)	2	14
P75	III	E	(4, 4?)	11	50
P77	II/III	E		1	
P79	VII	P	(1)		
P81	IV	G	(1?)		
P83	VI	E	(1?)		
P84	VI	E	(1)		
P86	IV	E	(1?)		
P88	IV	E			1
TOTALS			(26, 32?)	39	182

A manuscript like P75 is fairly similar to Codex B, and when it supports the AV side you can usually expect to find B in support also. Only seven of the 88 papyri are more than small fragments.

This is the only summary chart among the twelve showing a paucity of support for the AV doctrinal text. In the Christian Book Stores of 2nd/3rd Century Egypt you had to do a little shopping around before finding a Traditional Text Bible ... but they were there!

## SUMMARY II: THE OLD UNCIALS (1)

### **Basis of Comparison: Every Reading in NA - 26 Where the Traditional Text Opposes Vaticanus**

In this summary we draw upon the apparatus of Nestle Aland 26 and show the results when the other old uncials are asked to cast a vote in the many places where the Byzantine Majority opposes Codex B. Since this cursive majority is a chief supporter of the Authorized Version, and since Codex B easily ranks foremost among the supporters of the Modern Version text: should we not pit them together and allow Codices Aleph, A, C, D along with their correctors to join the conflict? The "Five Old Uncials" have formed the basis of textual criticism during these past two hundred years, but to my knowledge this particular comparison has not been made. Keep in mind, also, what was said about the Aleph correctors in Section I.

I have attempted to note every place in the NA apparatus where the two rivals oppose each other. (B does not have I Timothy - Philemon, Hebrews 9:15 to end, and Revelation). Here are the results: first for each manuscript, and then the combined totals:

	<u><b>With the Majority</b></u>	<u><b>With Vaticanus</b></u>
<b>CODEX ALEPH (IV)</b>		
<b>THE GOSPELS</b>		
Original	757	1504
Corrected	183	124
<b>ACTS</b>		

Original	155	333
Corrected	43	12
<b>EPISTLES OF PAUL</b>		
Original	381	513
Corrected	223	30
<b>GENERAL EPISTLES</b>		
Original	130	161
Corrected	24	15
<b>TOTALS</b>		
Original	1423	2511
Corrected	473	181
Combined	1896	2696

<u>With the Majority</u>	<u>With Vaticanus</u>
--------------------------	-----------------------

<b>CODEX A (V)</b>		
<b>GOSPELS</b>		
Original	1704	211
Corrected	13	0

ACTS		
Original	203	283
Corrected	9	2
EPISTLES OF PAUL		
Original	134	166
Corrected	4	2
TOTALS		
Original	2443	1049
Corrected	29	2
Combined	2472	1051

CODEX C (V)		
THE GOSPELS		
Original	882	566
Corrected	229	14
ACTS		
Original	148	156
Corrected	25	4
EPISTLES OF PAUL		
Original	304	265
Corrected	40	4
GENERAL EPISTLES		
Original	102	114
Corrected	15	5

TOTALS		
Original	1436	1101
Corrected	309	27
Combined	1745	1128

CODEX D 05 (V)		
THE GOSPELS		
Original	1120	783
Corrected	20	3
ACTS		
Original	178	101
Corrected	10	8
TOTALS		
Original	1298	884
Corrected	30	11
Combined	1328	895

CODEX D 06 (VI)		
EPISTLES OF PAUL		
Original	449	369
Corrected	287	10
Combined	736	379



<b>TOTALS FOR ALEPH, A, C, D-05, D-06</b>		
<b>THE GOSPELS</b>		
Original	4463	3064
Corrected	445	141
<b>ACTS</b>		
Original	684	873
Corrected	87	26
<b>EPISTLES OF PAUL</b>		
Original	1268	1313
Corrected	553	44
<b>GENERAL EPISTLES</b>		
Original	366	441
Corrected	43	22
<b>TOTALS</b>		
Original	6781	5691
Corrected	1128	233
Combined	7909	5924

The impression is often given that these five (actually six) oldest and most famous uncials give conclusive support to the text of the modern versions. Nothing could be further from the truth! B strongly supports it. But the support of Aleph is hardly overwhelming: from 2-1 in the Gospels and Acts to about 10-7 in Romans to Jude, with its correctors supporting the Traditional Text by 5-2. And then A, C, and the two D manuscripts give overall majority support to the AV side.

What was said earlier about “partial, selective, and biased conclusions” is given a revealing example in Kurt Aland’s assessment of Codex A:

The text is of uneven value...inferior in the Gospels, good in the rest of the New Testament. (*The Text of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987, p. 107).

To Aland, this manuscript from the early 400's is "inferior in the Gospels" because it gives overwhelming support to the Traditional Text! But how can he call it "good in the rest of the N.T." when it moves only marginally to the side of Codex B?

Therefore, if the Modern Version Text cannot get conclusive support from the "Five Old Uncials"-the so-called *best manuscripts*- where is it going to get it? We will have to leave this to others to look for the answer.

### SUMMARY III: THE OLD UNCIALS (2)

#### Basis of Comparison : Doctrinal Passages in the Manuscript Digest

When we leave the overall textual picture given in the previous summary of the "Five (Six) Old Uncials" and concentrate more on their doctrinal passages, we see them weakening somewhat (especially in Revelation). This helps to explain why Codex C became a palimpsest, and others were virtually ignored during a thousand years of transmissional history.

<u>AV</u>	<u>"NIV"</u>
-----------	--------------

CODEX ALEPH		
Original	58	290
Corrected	70	19
TOTAL	128	309
CODEX A		
Original	140	153
Corrected	3	0
TOTAL	143	153

<b>CODEX B (Missing 1 Tim., - Phile; Heb. 9:14 - end; Rev.)</b>		
Original	21	294
Corrected	5	2
TOTAL	26	296

<b>CODEX C</b>		
Original	90	129
Corrected	41	3

TOTALS	131	132
--------	-----	-----

<b>CODEX D-05 (Gospels and Acts)</b>		
Original	77	110
Corrected	6	2
TOTAL	83	112

<b>CODEX D-06</b>		
Original	30	56
Corrected	38	2
TOTAL	68	58

Therefore, while B, and to a lesser extent Aleph are on the side of the diminished text, the combined figures for the four other uncials reveal a stand-off (425-455). Hardly the overwhelming support Modern Version proponents claim from these sources! Therefore we ask, if they cannot get decisive support from the “Five Old Uncials”, where are they going to find it? Just about everywhere else we look in these summaries shows that they are on the minority side of the evidence.

## **SUMMARY IV:**

### **THE “ALPHABET” AND “0” UNCIALS**

#### **Basis of Comparison: Doctrinal Passages in the Manuscript Digest**

Beginning with Aleph (01), A (02), B (03) on down to 0274, we have at least 274 uncial manuscripts, many of which contain only a small part of the New Testament. The “0” system of numbering was adopted in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, with the first 45 uncials in the list retaining their previous Roman or Greek letters of designation. Sinaiticus - Aleph is the only instance where a Hebrew letter is used.

The list did not extend beyond the “Alphabet” uncials in Tischendorf’s day, but it is to his credit that he consistently cited the 40+ uncials available to him. Later editors have been much more selective in their presentation of the “0” uncials. Usually it has been a case of concentrating on those which show divergence from the Traditional Text and ignoring the rest. Thus, it is not possible to give as full a picture as we would like. However, Aland’s material compensates for this, and allows us to at least show whether, and how many times, a manuscript is extant for the passages in the Digest. Given the readiness of the critical editors to list everything possible for their text, it can be reasonably assumed that most of what appears in the fourth column of these next two lists will support the Doctrinal Text of the AV.

The first number (where two are given) in the fourth column represents the times a passage is extant though not cited for the manuscript. Here, Aland has

specifically shown that the manuscript contains the verse in question. In the second there is far more uncertainty as he indicates the chapter in which the verse is being sought is incomplete. Where only a single number is given, the “?” indicates this latter, and without “?” the former.

The Alphabet and O uncials give important insights into the kind of manuscript that was being copied between the fifth and ninth centuries. *They leave no question about the matter!*

## THE “ALPHABET” UNCIALS

<u>UNCIAL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Times Extant But Not Cited</u>	<u>AV</u>	<u>“NIV”</u>
---------------	-------------	----------------	---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

Dabs	IX	P		50	30
E-07	VIII	E		169	9
E-08	VI	A		16	8
F-09	IX	E		148	4
F-010	IX	P		29	48
G-011	IX	E		168	6
G-012	IX	P		29	48
H-013	IX	E		145	6
H-014	IX	A		15	3
H-015	VI	P		3	5
I-016	V	P	(19)	5	6
K-017	IX	E		164	18



K-018	IX	APG		90	18
L-019	VII	E		73	93
L-020	IX	APG		122	16
M-021	IX	E		168	13
M-022	VI	E	(13,1?)	31	8
O-023	VI	E	(1,18?)	6	1
P-024	VI	E		17	4
P-025	IX	APGR	(1)	101	60
Q-026	V	E	(2)	10	1
R-027	VI	E	(4)	10	4
S-028	949	E		171	10
T-029	V	E	(5)	3	11
U-030	IX	E		170	8
V-031	IX	E		162	14
W-032	V	E	(5)	92	76
X-033	X (IX/X)	EG		107	20
Y-034	IX	E	(84,1?)	80	6
Z-035	VI	E		4	9
Gamma 036	X (IX)	E		139	14
Delta 037	IX	E		138	39
Theta 038	IX (VIII/IX)	E	(6)	111	48
Lambda 039	IX (VII/IX)	E		79	5

XI-040	VIna VIII <sub>ubs</sub>	E	(5)	2	11
Pi-041	IX	E		143	24
Sigma 042	VI	E		76	12
Phi-043	VI	E	(5,5?)	54	12
Psi-044	VIII/IX	EAPG	(30)	131	85
Omega 045	IX (VIII)	E	(85,1?)	77	5
Totals			(265,26?)	3308	818

These important witnesses move strongly to the side of the AV Doctrinal Text: by at least 4 - 1. Coming now to the “0” uncials I have only listed those which are known to be extant among the passages in the Manuscript Digest.

## THE “0” UNCIALS

<u>UNCIAL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Times Extant But Not Cited</u>	<u>AV</u>	<u>“NIV”</u>
---------------	-------------	----------------	---------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

046	X	R		6	
047	VIII	E	(163, 11?)	1	2
048	V	APG	(12)	3	11
049	IX	APG	(70, 6?)	30	4
050	IX	E	(1)	2	
051	X	R	(4)	5	
053	IX	E	(1)	4	1

054	VIII	E	(1)	6	
055	XI	EG	(181)		
056	X	APG	(122)	27	2
060	VI	E	(2)		
061	V	P	(1)	1	1
063	IX	E	(5)	18	1
064	VI	E	(6)		
065	VI	E	(1)		
067	VI	E	(2, 3?)	3	2
068	V	E		1	
070	VI	E	(11)	3	2
071	V/VI	E			1
073	VI	E	(2)		
074	VI	E	(1)	4	2
075	X	P	(52, 1?)	2	
078	VI	E	(2)	2	
079	VI	E	(1)	1	
083	VI/VII	E	(6)		5
084	VI	E			2
085	VI	E			2
086	VI	E			2
088	V/VI	P			2
090	VI	E		2	
091	VI	E			1

093	VI	AG	(1)		
095	VIII	A			1
096	VII	A			
097	VII	A			
099	VII	E		1	
0102	VII	E	(3)	2	
0103	VII	E	(3)		
0104	VI	E	(2)	2	
0105	X	E		1	
0106	VII	E	(3)	3	2
0107	VII	E	(2)	1	2
0111	VII	E	(1)		1
0112	VI/VII	E		2	
0113	V	E			4
0114	VIII	E	(1)		
0115	IX/X	E	(1)	2	
0116	VIII	E	(6)	5	1
0117	IX	E	(1)	3	
0119	VII	E		1	
0120	IX	A		1	
0121a	X	P		1	1
0121b	X	P	(1)	3	1
0122	IX	P		1	
0124	VI	E		6	4

0125	V	E			1
0130	IX	E	(3)	2	
0131	IX	E	(1)		1
0132	IX	E	(1)		
0133	IX	E	(3, 30?)	4	
0134	VIII	E	(2)		
0135	IX	E	(5)	8	
0136	IX	E			1
0137 (Part of 0136)	IX	E		1	
0138	IX	E		5	
0141	X	E	(39)		2
0142	X	APG	(123)	26	4
0143	VI	E	(1?)		
0144	VII	E	(1?)		
0146	VIII	E	(1)		
0148	VIII	E		1	
0149 (Apparently the same as 0187)	VI	E			1
0150	IX	P	(84, 1?)		
0151	IX	P	(89, 3?)		
0154	IX	E	(1, 4?)		
0155	IX	E			
0156	VIII	G			2
0157	VII/VIII	G	(1, 1?)		



0160	IV/V	E	(1)		
0161	VIII	E		1	
0163	V	R			1
0165	V	A	(1)		
0167	VII	E	(1)		
0170	V/VI	E			1
0171	IV	E	(1)	1	
0175	V	A			1
0176	IV/V	P		1	
0179	VI	E			1
0180	VI	E		1	
0181	IV/V	E	(1, 1?)	1	
0186	V/VI	P	(1)		
0187	VI	E	(1)		
0188	IV	E		1	1
0197	IX	E		2	1
0199	VI/VII	P	(1)		1
0201	V	P			
0202 (Part of 070)	VI	E	(1?)		
0204	VII	E	(1)		
0206	IV	G	(2)		
0208	VI	P	(1)		1
0209	VII	APG	(2)	2	
0211	VII	E	(179, 1?)		1