

Scriptures and Doctrine :: trying to buy the Textus Receptus!

trying to buy the Textus Receptus! - posted by leaf (), on: 2006/5/26 8:57

Can anyone help! I've looked all over the web for a shop that sells Textus Receptus texts. Not the old Trinitarian society one but a decent usable one. Everywhere I look its the minority text in every colour and binding known to man but no Receptus, can anyone help! :-o

Re: trying to buy the Textus Receptus!, on: 2006/5/26 9:24

Stever posts:

If you purchase the Interlinear Greek-English New Testament by Jay P. Green, Sr. you will have the "Textus Receptus" that created the King James Bible.

You can also purchase The Interlinear Greek-English N.T. by Berry.

Both books are available on Amazon.com however, I prefer Green's book over Berry's.

In both of these books you will find the Textus Receptus from which the KJV was translated in 1611. Literal modern English words appear between the Greek lines and under each word, making it possible for anyone to make an accurate check of all Bibles versions. The KJV appears in the margins. Notice in how many ways modern translations vary from the Greek text.

Textus Receptus

Before we consider the King James Version (KJV) and a few of the modern translations in use today, let us first consider certain Greek texts from which all New Testament translations are derived. Foremost amongst these is the Traditional Received Text (Textus Receptus), also called the Byzantine Text or the Majority Text because it is based on the vast majority of manuscripts still in existence. These extant manuscripts (MSS) were brought together by various editors such as Lucian (AD 250-312), Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza and the Elzevir brothers to form the text known as Textus Receptus, the name given to the Majority Text in the 17th century. The most notable editor of all was Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) one of the greatest scholars the world has ever known. When the early Protestant Reformers of the 16th and 17th centuries decided to translate the scriptures directly from Greek into the languages of Europe, they selected Textus Receptus as their foundation Greek document. It is vitally important to understand why they did so.

Wilkinson writes in his book Truth Triumphant: Quote: "The Protestant denominations are built upon that manuscript of the Greek New Testament sometimes called Textus Receptus, or the Received Text. It is that Greek New Testament from which the writings of the apostles in Greek have been translated into English, German, Dutch and other languages. During the dark ages the Received Text was practically unknown outside the Greek Church. It was restored to Christendom by the labours of that great scholar Erasmus. It is altogether too little known that the real editor of the Received Text was Lucian. None of Lucian's enemies fails to credit him with this work. Neither Lucian nor Erasmus, but rather the apostles, wrote the Greek New Testament.

However, Lucian's day was an age of apostasy when a flood of depravations was systematically attempting to devastate both the Bible manuscripts and Bible theology. Origen, of the Alexandrian college, made his editions and commentaries of the Bible a secure retreat for all errors, and deformed them with philosophical speculations introducing casuistry and lying. Lucian's unrivalled success in verifying, safeguarding, and transmitting those divine writings left a heritage for which all generations should be thankful." (Ref: J2)

The King James Bible Old Testament was translated from the Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text; named after Jacob ben Chayyim, under whose editorship it was printed in 1524-5).

Two Bibles

In his book Which Bible? David Otis Fuller says this about Textus Receptus. Carefully note Fuller's first point that all churches (we could now add all Bible students) fall into one of two basic study categories:

1) Those who use a variety of Bibles influenced by the Minority Text (the Nestle/Aland Text). For 45 years I was in this camp; but I thank God for opening my eyes.

2) Those who only study Bibles based on the Majority Text, from which came the Received Text - Textus Receptus. I have now joined this camp.

Fuller continues: Quote: "First of all, the Textus Receptus was the Bible of early Eastern Christianity. Later it was adopted as the official text of the Greek Catholic Church. There were local reasons which contributed to this result. But, probably, far greater reasons will be found in the fact that the Received Text had authority enough to become, either in itself or by its translation, the Bible of the great Syrian Church; of the Waldensian Church of northern Italy; of the Gallic Church in southern France; and of the Celtic Church in Scotland and Ireland; as well as the official Bible of the Greek Catholic Church.

All these churches, some earlier, some later, were in opposition to the Church of Rome and at a time when the Received Text and these Bibles of the Constantine type were rivals. They, as represented in their descendants, are rivals to this day. The Church of Rome built on the Eusebio-Origen type of Bible; these others built on the Received Text. Therefore, because they themselves believed that the Received Text was the true apostolic Bible, and further, because the Church of Rome arrogated to itself the power to choose a Bible which bore the marks of systematic depravation, we have the testimony of these five churches to the authenticity and the apostolicity of the Received Text." (Ref: F1)

Why did the early churches of the 2nd and 3rd centuries and all the Protestant Reformers of the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries choose Textus Receptus in preference to the Minority Text?

The answer is because:

Textus Receptus is based on the vast majority (90%) of the 5000+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the Majority Text.

Textus Receptus is not mutilated with deletions, additions and amendments, as is the Minority Text.

Textus Receptus agrees with the earliest versions of the Bible: Peshitta (AD150) Old Latin Vulgate (AD157), the Italic Bible (AD157) etc. These Bibles were produced some 200 years before the minority Egyptian codices favoured by the Roman Church.

Remember this vital point.

Textus Receptus agrees with the vast majority of the writings of the early Church Fathers (Patristics) 86,000+ citations!

Textus Receptus is untainted with Egyptian philosophy and unbelief.

Textus Receptus strongly upholds the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith: the creation account in Genesis, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the virgin birth, the Saviour's miracles, his bodily resurrection, his literal return and the cleansing power of his blood!

Textus Receptus was - and still is - the enemy of the Roman Church. This is an important fact to bear in mind.

Reverend Gipp comments further: Quote: "The Majority Text has been known throughout history by several names. It has been known as the Byzantine text, the Imperial Text, the Traditional Text and the Reformation Text as well as the Majority Text. This text culminates in the TEXTUS RECEPTUS or Received Text which is the basis for the King James Bible, which we know also as the Authorized Version....We describe this text with the term "Universal," because it represents the majority of extant MSS which represent the original autographs. Professor Hodges of Dallas Theological Seminary explains, "The manuscript of an ancient book will, under any but the most exceptional conditions, multiply in a reasonable regular fashion with the result that the copies nearest the autograph will normally have the largest number of descendants." (Ref:B3)

Continuing from page 66 in Gipp's book: Quote: "Professor Hodges concludes, 'Thus the Majority text, upon which the King James Version is based, has in reality the strongest claim possible to be regarded as an authentic representation of

f the original text. This claim is quite independent of any shifting consensus of scholarly judgment about its readings and is based on the objective reality of its dominance in the transmissional history of the New Testament text.' " (Ref:B4)

In his book *God Wrote Only One Bible*, Jasper J Ray pens the following testimony about Textus Receptus: Quote: "Wonder of wonders, in the midst of all the present confusion regarding manuscripts, we still have a Bible we can trust. The writing of the Word of God by inspiration is no greater miracle than the miracle of its preservation in the Textus Receptus. All criticism of this text from which was translated the King James Bible, is based upon an unproved hypothesis: i.e. that there are older and more dependable copies of the original Bible manuscripts. No one in nineteen hundred years, has been able to prove that one jot or tittle has been inserted or taken out." (Ref:D3)

In his book *Final Authority*, William P Grady provides further interesting details about Textus Receptus, the Received Text:

Quote: "For instance, over 5,000 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament exist today ranging from small fragments containing two or three verses to nearly entire Bibles. Their ages vary from the second to the sixteenth century; the manuscripts are ending with the arrival of printing. By comparison, there exist only ten quality manuscripts of Caesar's Gallic War composed between 58-50BC... "Once again, the outstanding features of the Received Text is its high percentage of agreement among so many thousands of independent witnesses. This agreement is often placed at about 90 percent; in other words, 90 percent of all existing manuscripts agree with one another so miraculously that they are able to form their own unique text..."

If the critic of your King James Bible is correct in his rejection of the underlying Textus Receptus, then he is also under the greatest pressure to account for its existence. To complain of fabrication is one thing, but to account for its universal prevalence is quite another. Whenever a large body of ancient documents are seen to be in agreement, this inexplicable harmony becomes their greatest evidence for legitimacy. Simple arithmetic confirms that the nearer a particular reading is to the original, the longer the time span will be for descendants to follow. The longer the family is, the older the original source must be."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I pray that this is helpful to you.

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2006/5/26 12:26

www.e-sword.net I believe you can download the TR.

Re: - posted by leaf (), on: 2006/5/30 14:15

Thanks Everyone, I now have a Textus Receptus but, still feel that it's a scandal how difficult they are to come by!

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2006/5/30 16:31

<http://www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/>

is another source (<http://www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/>) Trinitarian Bible Society

and again

(<http://www.amazon.co.uk/exec/obidos/ASIN/0907861873/qid%3D1149021039/202-7450668-8612662>) Amazon

and for the americans

(<http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0907861873/qid1149021039/102-2417793-6935338?n283155>) Amazon USA

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 1:06

Quote:
-----Textus Receptus is based on the vast majority (90%) of the 5000+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the Majority Text.

Let us not forget the Johannine Comma.
<http://www.bible-researcher.com/comma.html>

(1).....if the passage were original, no good reason can be found to account for its omission, either accidentally or intentionally, by copyists of hundreds of Greek manuscripts, and by translators of ancient versions.

The TR is 'based' on on the MT, but it is not exact in every way. The TR has its own 'additions' to the text.

If nothing else this shows that the TR is not 'perfect'...

Clearly Im not a KJVonly-er...as I dont believe God speaks english, nor favors english in any way.
The TR and the KJV bible are great resources, great works for the cause of the Lord.... yet not perfect.

I wouldnt trust the Minority Texts as far as I can toss my minivan...but anyone who believes the TR or the KJV 'perfect' is greatly deluding themselves....the Comma is proof of that fact.

The ACTUAL Majority Texts, not the TR with its added Comma, should be the basis for our NTs.

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 1:39

Stever responds:

The Comma Johanneum is a fraud, put forward by Metzger who will lie in order to make his chosen "newer versions" (NIV, NASB, etc.) more palatable to an unsuspecting Church:

The truth of the matter, and Metzger's withdrawal of his charge from all of his newer versions of his book "The Text of the New Testament" can be found here:
<http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/mythsabout-erasmus.html>

"In the 3rd edition of The Text of the New Testament Bruce Metzger corrected his false assertion about Erasmus as follows: "What is said on p. 101 above about Erasmus' promise to include the Comma Johanneum if one Greek manuscript were found that contained it, and his subsequent suspicion that MS 61 was written expressly to force him to do so, needs to be corrected in the light of the research of H. J. DeJonge, a specialist in Erasmusian studies who finds no explicit evidence that supports this frequently made assertion" (Metzger, The Text of The New Testament, 3rd edition, p. 291, footnote 2)."

The first two editions of Erasmus' Greek New Testament in the early 16th century omitted the following words from 1 John 5:7-8 -- "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth." This portion of Scripture containing a clear Trinitarian statement is called the Johannine Comma. It was added to the third edition of the Erasmus Greek New Testament and it was not again seriously questioned until the 19th century.

There are two popular myths regarding Erasmus and 1 John 5:7 that are parroted by modernists, evangelicals, and even fundamentalists today who defend the modern versions against the KJV.

The first myth is that Erasmus promised to insert the verse if a Greek manuscript were produced. This is stated as follows by Bruce Metzger: "Erasmus promised that he would insert the Comma Johanneum, as it is called, in future editions if a single Greek manuscript could be found that contained the passage. At length such a copy was found--or made to order" (Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, 1st and 2nd editions).

The second myth is that Erasmus challenged Edward Lee to find a Greek manuscript that included 1 John 5:7. This originated with Erika Rummel in 1986 in her book *Erasmus's Annotations* and was repeated by James White in 1995 (*The Truth about the KJV-Only Controversy*).

In *A History of the Debate over 1 John 5:7,8*, Michael Maynard records that H.J. de Jonge, the Dean of the Faculty of Theology at Rijksuniversiteit (Leiden, Netherlands), has refuted both myths. de Jonge, a recognized specialist in Erasmian studies, refuted the myth of a promise in 1980, stating that Metzger's view on Erasmus's promise "has no foundation in Erasmus's work. Consequently it is highly improbable that he included the difficult passage because he considered himself bound by any such promise."

De Jonge has also refuted the new myth of a challenge (which Rummel devised in reaction to the burial of the promise myth). In a letter of June 13, 1995, to Maynard, de Jonge wrote:

"I have checked again Erasmus's words quoted by Erika Rummel and her comments on them in her book *Erasmus's Annotations*. This is what Erasmus writes in his *Liber tertius quo respondet* ... Ed. Lei: Erasmus first records that Lee had reproached him with neglect of the MSS. of 1 John because Er. (according to Lee) had consulted only one MS. Erasmus replies that he had certainly not used only one ms., but many copies, first in England, then in Brabant, and finally at Basle. He cannot accept, therefore, Lee's reproach of negligence and impiety. 'Is it negligence and impiety, if I did not consult manuscripts which were simply not within my reach? I have at least assembled whatever I could assemble. Let Lee produce a Greek MS. which contains what my edition does not contain and let him show that that manuscript was within my reach. Only then can he reproach me with negligence in sacred matters.'

"From this passage you can see that Erasmus does not challenge Lee to produce a manuscript etc. What Erasmus argues is that Lee may only reproach Erasmus with negligence of MSS if he demonstrates that Erasmus could have consulted any MS. in which the Comma Johanneum figured. Erasmus does not at all ask for a MS. containing the Comma Johanneum. He denies Lee the right to call him negligent and impious if the latter does not prove that Erasmus neglected a manuscript to which he had access.

"In short, Rummel's interpretation is simply wrong. The passage she quotes has nothing to do with a challenge. Also, she cuts the quotation short, so that the real sense of the passage becomes unrecognizable. She is absolutely not justified in speaking of a challenge in this case or in the case of any other passage on the subject" (emphasis in original) (de Jonge, cited from Maynard, p. 383).

Jeffrey Khoo observes further: "Yale professor Roland Bainton, another Erasmian expert, agrees with de Jonge, furnishing proof from Erasmus's own writing that Erasmus's inclusion of 1 John 5:7f was not due to a so-called 'promise' but the fact that he believed 'the verse was in the Vulgate and must therefore have been in the Greek text used by Jerome'" (Jeffrey Khoo, *Kept Pure in All Ages*, 2001, p. 88).

Edward F. Hills, who had a doctorate in textual criticism from Harvard, testifies: "... it was not trickery that was responsible for the inclusion of the Johannine Comma in the Textus Receptus, but the usage of the Latin speaking Church" (Hills, *The King James Version Defended*).

In the 3rd edition of *The Text of the New Testament* Bruce Metzger corrected his false assertion about Erasmus as follows: "What is said on p. 101 above about Erasmus's promise to include the Comma Johanneum if one Greek manuscript were found that contained it, and his subsequent suspicion that MS 61 was written expressly to force him to do so, needs to be corrected in the light of the research of H. J. DeJonge, a specialist in Erasmian studies who finds no explicit evidence that supports this frequently made assertion" (Metzger, *The Text of The New Testament*, 3rd edition, p. 291, footnote 2).

The problem is that these myths continue to be paraded as truth by modern version defenders.

A recommended resource for further study is Michael Maynard, *A History of the Debate over 1 John 5:7-8: a tracing of the longevity of the Comma Johanneum, with evaluations of arguments against its authenticity* (Comma Publications, P.O. Box 1625, Tempe, AZ 85280-1625, receptus@sprynet.com; a second edition is scheduled for publication sometime in late 2005).

Stever concludes:

When will it ever end? The Textus Receptus is not corrupt. The "Scholars" that support the newer versions are the ones with the truly spurious charges. They are the corrupted ones, trying to make the Minority Text equal to the Majority Text by fabricating stories and creating lies about it!

God bless,

Stever :-)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

FOC wrote:

.

THIS IS FALSE- SEE ABOVE POST BY STEVER

Quote:

-----Textus Receptus is based on the vast majority (90%) of the 5000+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the Majority Text.

Let us not forget the Johannine Comma.
<http://www.bible-researcher.com/comma.html>

(1).....if the passage were original, no good reason can be found to account for its omission, either accidentally or intentionally, by copyists of hundreds of Greek manuscripts, and by translators of ancient versions.

.

THIS IS FALSE- SEE ABOVE POST BY STEVER

The TR is 'based' on the MT, but it is not exact in every way. The TR has its own 'additions' to the text.

If nothing else this shows that the TR is not a 'perfect' translation....as if translation could ever attain perfection to begin with.

Clearly I'm not a KJV-only-er...as I don't believe God speaks English, nor favors English in any way.
The TR and the KJV Bible are great resources, great works for the cause of the Lord.... yet not perfect.

I wouldn't trust the Minority Texts as far as I can toss my minivan...but anyone who believes the TR or the KJV 'perfect' is greatly deluding themselves..
..the Comma is proof of that fact.

The ACTUAL Majority Texts, not the TR with its added Comma, should be the basis for our NTs

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/5/31 1:39

\$10 bucks says Stever drops an Atomic Bomb on FOC :-P ;-)

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/5/31 1:40

Whoa! Stever dropped in his post less than one minute before me! HAAH :-P

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/5/31 1:56

Stever,

If the earliest of the Byzantine Texts do not have 1 John 5:7,

Aren't we kind of in trouble?

I mean, after all, since Byzantine is where the Textus Receptus comes from, wouldn't it make the most sense in this case, that the earliest Byzantine (and majority) Byzantine are the best?

I heard 1John5:7 is only in a few of the 5000 Byzantine texts we have. Is this true?

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 9:30

FYI, I presented ONE source for the Johannine Comma.

IF youd like, I can dig up literally hundreds of other sources that I used in my studies that show the information as well....

THIS IS TRUE - SEE THE FACTS THEMSELVES

that the Comma is not present in the MAJORITY of Greek manuscripts

I absolutely LOVE to see an attack on the messenger when the FACTS begin to fail.

THIS IS TRUE - SEE THE FACTS THEMSELVES

the Comma isnt present in the MAJORITY of greek manuscripts...SUPPOSEDLY where the Textus Receptus is from !!!...therefore...REGARDLESS of who presents this fact..the comma has MOST of the greek manuscripts standing a gainst it.....it does not belong...that is what its own family of texts present...the GMTs

Stever, NOTHING in your long post PROVES that the Comma is indeed contained within the MAJORITY of greek texts..
..so all I saw was you calling me and this Metzger chap liars without actually providing a single word of proof to the contrary.

Your long post is concerning some argument I care nothing about pertaining to Erasmus....who cares....IS THE COMMA IN the MAJORITY of greek manuscripts?

No, it is not.....

to repeat....

I wouldnt trust the **Minority** Texts as far as I can toss my minivan...but anyone who believes the TR or the KJV 'perfect' is greatly deluding themselves....the Comma is proof of that fact.

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 9:42

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

\$10 bucks says Stever drops an Atomic Bomb on FOC :-P :-)

\$20 says that bomb stever dropped was a complete dud.

I dont give a hoot about some arguement against the author of that site...attacking the writer instead of what they present is a typical tactic for KJVonlyers from my experience.

Who cares about Metzger or Erasmus....the Johannine Comma ISNT found in the MAJORITY of Greek texts...THAT is all that matters...not some distraction about Erasmus.

stever didnt refute the assertion, he attacked the writer...

again..

I wouldnt trust the **Minority** Texts as far as I can toss my minivan...but anyone who believes the TR or the KJV 'perfect' is greatly deluding themselves....the Comma is proof of that fact.

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 10:00

Ill start posting items FROM KJV advocates themselves who ADMIT that the Comma isnt found in the MAJORITY of greek manuscripts....apparently, according to some, this would mean that the MAJORITY of Gods word was 'corrupt' for centuries :rolleyes:

Readers, this will take some time as Im involved with getting my website updated, but I will prove that those KJVonlyers who are HONEST with themselves MUST admit that the Johannine Comma doesnt have the backing of the MAJORITY of greek manuscripts.

If THEY admit it isnt present, then who cares about this Metzger distraction?

http://av1611.com/kjbp/faq/holland_1jo5_7.html

"The passage is called the Johannine Comma and is not found in the majority of Greek manuscripts."

"The External Support: Although not found in most Greek manuscripts, the Johannine Comma is found in several."

"It is clear that the reading found in the Textus Receptus is the minority reading with later textual support from the Greek witnesses. Nevertheless, being a minority reading does not eliminate it as genuine."

...even the studied KJV advocates admit that the very texts to which they say the TR BELONGS (the GMTs) is MISSING the Comma !!!

this site says that the Comma is NOT present in the majority of GREEK texts...but IS present in the LATIN texts.

"While the Greek textual evidence is weak, the **Latin** textual evidence for the Comma is extremely strong".

That in itself is very suspicious to me.

Is the TR based on the LATIN texts or the GREEK texts as the KJVonly camp insists?

It almost seems as if its based on the Latin, not the greek, if the GMTs dont contain the Comma, but the Latin ones do...

Guess its time for the KJVonlyers to stop calling the TR the 'Majority Text' since it is supported from the Latin, not the greek..

.

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 10:11

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

Stever,

If the earliest of the Byzantine Texts do not have 1 John 5:7,

Aren't we kind of in trouble?

I mean, after all, since Byzantine is where the textus receptus comes from, wouldn't it make the most sense in this case, that the earliest Byzantine (and majority) Byzantine are the best?

I heard 1John5:7 is only in a few of the 5000 Byzantine texts we have. Is this true?

It is true and if you look MOST of the KJVonlyers who have actually done their homework will AGREE that the Comma is missing from the very family of texts they say the TR belongs to...the GMT.

There are arguments for the Comma, many that make a LOT of sense, including grammatical issues when the Comma is removed....but that is proof of nothing....it is overshadowed horribly by the Comma not being present in the MAJORITY of Greek texts....the one place it should be in abundance *IF* the KJVonlyers were correct that the TR IS the Majority Text....make sense?

additionally, no, we're not in trouble.

I believe God has permitted just enough of this sort of thing so that we do not 'worship' a book as being perfect instead of God.

Probably for the same reason God hid the body of Moses. Men have a knack of wanting to worship idols instead of God.

We see enough bible worship as it is, making the letter a god as almighty as the author Himself.

What we need for salvations sake is there.

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 10:30

Additionally...

I am not 'against' the KJV bible, nor am I an advocate for the Minority Texts or any bibles that use them. I believe the **ACTUAL** GREEK MAJORITY TEXTS (over the TR which apparently is influenced by the latin texts) are the ones to be trusted for our NT...meaning that where a discrepancy exists, the Greek is what I consider correct.

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 10:55

Here is a site that is rabidly KJ only from what I can tell....and yet...

"For the absence of the Johannine comma from all New Testament documents save those of the Latin-speaking West the following explanations are possible"

<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/kjvdcha8.htm>

IS the TR based on the ACTUAL GREEK MTs or the LATIN texts themselves?
Sure seems to be the Latin...

The TR nor the KJV bible is THE authority, or the end all, beat all resource for the body of Christ.

They are both wonderful works...no more, no less.

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/5/31 16:38

Something to note,

Although the comma is not found in the earliest majority byzantine manuscripts, (which does bring in the valid question, of "then why is it in the TR?), we should note that the comma is found in other ancient sources.

One of the sites you linked to says,

Quote:
-----"Likewise, the anti-Arian work compiled by an unknown writer, the Varimadum (380 AD) states: "And John the Evangelist says, . . . ' And there are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one'." Additionally, Cassian (435 AD), Ca ssiodorus (580 AD), and a host of other African and Western bishops in subsequent centuries have cited the Comma. Therefore, we see that the rea ding has massive and ancient textual support apart from the Greek witnesses."

We must remember that Erasmus was a textual critic. Maybe this is why the comma is not in his first 2 editions of the gr eek text. Perhaps later on he found out that several external sources contain the comma, and decided it was scripture s o he went with the minority on that point within the 3rd edition? This seems reasonable to me.

I do believe 1John5:7 is scripture. This verse seals the deal. We see the trinity all throughout the Bible, and 1John5:7 set s the record straight. I see no reason why a mss. copyist would add it, but I see plenty of reason why someone would re move it. Or there is always the chance that 1john 5:7 was simply lost by an early byzantine copyist.

For the record, I have not done much study, and am not a "KJV Only", but I do believe the KJV is the living Bible and is t he closest translation to the originals we have in the english language.

And here's some internal evidence that 1 John 5:7 is scripture:

Quote:

Internal Evidence: The structure of the Comma is certainly Johannine in style. John is noted for referring to Christ as "the Word." If 1 John 5:7 were an interpretation of verse eight, as some have suggested, then we would expect the verse to use "Son" instead of "Word." However, the verse uses the Greek word logos, which is uniquely in the style of John and provides evidence of its genuineness. Also, we find John drawing parallels between the Trinity and what they testify (1 John 4:13-14). Therefore, it comes as no surprise to find a parallel of witnesses containing groups of three, one heavenly and one earthly.

The strongest evidence, however, is found in the Greek text itself. Looking at 1 John 5:8, there are three nouns which, in Greek, stand in the neuter (Spirit, water, and blood). However, they are followed by a participle that is masculine. The Greek phrase here is oi marturountes (who bare witness). Those who know the Greek language understand this to be poor grammar if left to stand on its own. Even more noticeably, verse six has the same participle but stands in the neuter (Gk.: to marturoun). Why are three neuter nouns supported with a masculine participle? The answer is found if we include verse seven. There we have two masculine nouns (Father and Son) followed by a neuter noun (Spirit). The verse also has the Greek masculine participle oi marturountes. With this clause introducing verse eight, it is very proper for the participle in verse eight to be masculine, because of the masculine nouns in verse seven. But if verse seven were not there it would become improper Greek grammar.

Even though Gregory of Nazianzus (390 AD) does not testify to the authenticity of the Comma, he makes mention of the flawed grammar resulting from its absence. In his Theological Orientations he writes referring to John:

... (he has not been consistent) in the way he has happened upon his terms; for after using Three in the masculine gender he adds three words which are neuter, contrary to the definitions and laws which you and your grammarians have laid down. For what is the difference between putting a masculine Three first, and then adding One and One and One in the neuter, or after a masculine One and One and One to use the Three not in the masculine but in the neuter, which you yourselves disclaim in the case of Deity?

It is clear that Gregory recognized the inconsistency with Greek grammar if all we have are verses six and eight without verse seven. Other scholars have recognized the same thing. This was the argument of Robert Dabney of Union Theological Seminary in his book, The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek (1891). Bishop Middleton in his book, Doctrine of the Greek Article, argues that verse seven must be a part of the text according to the Greek structure of the passage. Even in the famous commentary by Matthew Henry, there is a note stating that we must have verse seven if we are to have proper Greek in verse eight.

However, the question still stands: Why don't the early Byzantine manuscripts contain 1 John 5:7?

I wish philologos was still around. :-(

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 17:19

Quote:
-----Although the comma is not found in the earliest majority byzantine manuscripts, (which does bring in the valid question, of "then why is it in the TR?),

PRECISELY !

KJVonly advocates clearly maintain, even violently so, that the TR IS the MT....and yet we have this terrible contradiction.

The TR cannot be based solely on the MT or the overwhelming evidence IN the MT would clearly show that the Comma doesn't belong....based on sheer numbers.

Quote:
-----we should note that the comma is found in other ancient sources.

that's not right of you to do this....it's very misleading.

We can say that the OLDEST manuscripts are the Minority texts, therefore THEY are the correct ones....are they?

They disagree among themselves more than all of the Greek MTs, even though they are only a handful of texts.

Stating that the comma is present in other sources does not validate it in any way ...those very sources may be the corrupted ones.

Older does not mean better or more reliable.

Quote:
-----Perhaps later on he found out that several external sources contain the comma, and decided it was scripture so he went with the minority on that point within the 3rd edition? This seems reasonable to me.

To keep from turning this into something uglier than it has to be, I will simply suggest you keep searching all the facts....there's much more to this issue than Stever or I have presented.

Quote:
-----I do believe 1John5:7 is scripture.

"Belief" isn't what makes something 'true'....facts are.

The Comma does seem to fit the concept of the rest of the passage, and I believe was honestly part of John's intent...but that doesn't mean that John actually wrote the Comma himself.

Quote:
-----I see no reason why a mss. copyist would add it, but I see plenty of reason why someone would remove it.

And why exactly would they remove it?

The trinity is clearly presented in Scripture, removing the comma pretty much does nothing as far as understanding the trinity.

this is equivalent of some Catholics saying the Jews omitted some books of canon to try to dismiss the Christ. If this were true, the Jews were completely oblivious since they left the one book that is the most convincing pertaining to the Messiah....Isaiah.
IF the Jews wanted to do away with Christ, as some Catholics maintain, they sure did a lousy job of picking which books to omit from OT canon.

Same with the Comma.
There are other passages, such as John 1;

Joh 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

...that show who Jesus is....and also OT passages that clearly state who this Man Jesus is...

"Isa 9:6 For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

...among others.

IF the comma WERE authentic...and IF there was a conspiracy to omit the trinity from the texts, the bonehead who decided what to omit surely should have been fired on the spot.

Quote:

For the record, I have not done much study, and am not a "KJV Only", but I do believe the KJV is the living Bible and is the closest translation to the originals we have in the English language.

I believe it to be the greatest translation of all time....and always will be.

But that doesn't validate the Comma and it doesn't change the fact that there is no such thing as 'perfect' translation.....you students of foreign languages know what I'm talking about.

There are some Hebrew phrases that CANNOT be rendered 'perfectly' into English...that alone keeps the KJV Bible from being 'perfect'

Quote:

-----However, the question still stands: Why don't the early Byzantine manuscripts contain 1 John 5:7?

why indeed..

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 17:28

Additionally, I believe that the Comma was a sidebar notation, presenting an 'interpretation' of what the passage in John might represent, and at a point was mistakenly or purposely added to the text.

This removes the 'conspiracy' factor (in that the conspirators would have to be complete morons to have missed all the rest of the trinity related scriptures), allows for the Comma to be 'authentic' in that it DOES show the intent in the passage it is in...and also makes sense of why it is not present in so many GREEK texts where it surely should be contained

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/5/31 22:38

Instead of getting just a TR, why not just get NA27 or UBS4? Any verses that are in question will be highly footnoted with all/most variants. Any reason for just looking for a TR itself?

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/5/31 23:13

Just for discussion's sake, Metzger in his Textual Commentary on the NT offers this brief blurb as to why the committee he was part of ruled out 1 John 5:7/8:

A) External Evidence (1): The passage is absent from every known Greek manuscript except eight, and these contain the passage in what appears to be a translation from a late recension of the Latin Vulgate. Four of the eight manuscripts contain the passage as a variant reading written in the margin as a later addition to the manuscript. The eight manuscripts are as follows:

61: codex Montfortianus, dating from the early 16th century.

88 (variant reading): a variant reading in a 16th century hand, added to the 14th century codex Regius of Naples.

221 (variant reading): a variant reading added to a 10th century manuscript in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

429 (variant reading): a variant reading added to a 16th century manuscript at Wolfenbützel.

636 (variant reading): a variant reading added to a 16th century manuscript at Naples.

918: a 16th century manuscript at Escorial, Spain.

2318: an 18th century manuscript, influenced by Clementine Vulgate, at Bucharest, Rumania.

2) The passage is quoted by none of the Greek Fathers, who, had they known it, would most certainly have employed it in the Trinitarian controversies (Sabellian and Arian). Its first appearance in Greek is in a Greek version of the (Latin) Acts of the Lateran Council in 1215.

3) The passage is absent from the manuscripts of all ancient versions (Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Slavonic), except the Latin; and it is not found (a) in the Old Latin in its early form (Tertullian Cyprian Augustine), or in

the Vulgate (b) as issued by Jerome (codex Fuldensis) or (c) as revised by Alcuin (first hand of codex Vallicellianus).

The earliest instance of the passage being quoted as part of the actual text of the Epistle is in a fourth century Latin treatise entitled Liber Apologeticus (chap 4), attributed either to the Spanish heretic Priscillian (died about 385) or to his follower Bishop Instantius. Apparently the gloss arose when the original passage was understood to symbolize the Trinity (through the mention of three witnesses: the Spirit, the water, and the blood), an interpretation that may have been written first as a marginal note that afterwards found its way into the text. In the fifth century the gloss was quoted by Latin Fathers in North Africa and Italy as part of the text of the Epistle, and from the sixth century onwards it is found more and more frequently in manuscripts of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate. In these various witnesses the wording of the passage differs in several particulars.

(B) Internal Probabilities. (1) As regards transcriptional probability, if the passage were original, no good reason can be found to account for its omission, either accidentally or intentionally, by copyists of hundreds of Greek manuscripts, and by translators of ancient versions.

2) As regards to intrinsic probability, the passage makes an awkward break in the sense....

Just thought I'd interject these comments.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/5/31 23:56

Just a personal note on the grammar of the passage in question. The participle in question, *maturountes*, has nothing grammatically to do with the words following after it in 7/8.

"*oi maturountes*" in 1 John 5:7 is present active participle nominative plural masculine, functioning adjectivally in the sentence (as required by the definite article). Participles agree with the words they are modifying in case, number, and gender. This word's case is nominative. It's number is plural. It's gender is masculine.

It would be IMPOSSIBLE for this word to be modifying any of the words of, "*o Pater, o Logos, kai to Agion Pneuma*" (the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit) in the TR variant. Likewise, it doesn't modify any of the modern renderings of 7/8 either, "*to pneuma kai to udor kai to hima*" (the Spirit and the water and the blood). The reason? All these words are all in the SINGULAR. And since participles modify the words that they agree with in case, number, and gender, it would be impossible for "*oi maturountes*" to modify any of these words, for "*oi maturountes*" is PLURAL.

The only word that "*oi maturountes*" can possibly modify is the word "*treis*" (three) which comes prior to it in verse 7, which is nominative, masculine, and PLURAL. Grammatically, both these variants are rather basic Greek, with no grammatical problems.

Edited

(Non-TR) Greek of 1 John 5:7-8:

hoti treis eistin oi maturountes to pneuma kai to hudor kai to hima kai oi treis eis to en eisin

My personal translation:

There are three bearing witness: the Spirit and the water and the blood and these three are in one (agreement).

Re:, on: 2006/6/1 0:01

Sorry, misunderstood :)

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/6/1 0:11

FOC,

Saw your comment before you revoked it and this thread was started with a question and it has developed as most threads tend to, all well and good. But, if you cannot keep it charitable and excuse yourself from the use of "moron's" and "boneheads" and other such items I suggest you take it somewhere else, we have a very low tolerance for this sort of thing here. Agree, disagree or leave well enough alone.

The same goes for the remainder here. Take a step back and look what you are disputing over and before who...

Re: - posted by leaf (), on: 2006/6/1 5:56

Hi, just to answer 'why only a TR and not UBS4' etc. Already have a UBS4 as well as Metzger's decisions for the text chosen. But, notwithstanding the current debate, over time I have become convinced of the primacy of TR and it is now my chosen text. I understand other people's views on this, but, I am happy with the decision I have come to.

My own view on the more vociferous comments is that, I respect other's views and hope that in our zeal we do not fall into the judgement of our brothers and sisters. The truth needs only love and loyalty as its companions it is powerful enough of its self. Whatever our views, the truth is a sharp edged sword it does not need the blunt instruments of offensive thoughts or words to cut its way through. :-)

Re:, on: 2006/6/1 11:34

you know what...it simply isn't worth this.....you folks believe what you wish..

Crsschk...there was not a single word in what I deleted that was inflammatory, and I resent the implication that there was....I misunderstood what the person was asking, simple as that..

additionally, I will refrain from using those words.

The Johannine Comma doesn't come from the GMTs, that much is fact....the TR, therefore, is NOT unspoiled *IF* we claim it IS the GMT....as KJVonlyers often try to assert.

Either the TR IS the GMT and it DOES have additions to the text, the Comma, OR; it simply is NOT the MT, but is based upon them and also upon other texts....thus is NOT this work of perfection that many errantly believe it to be as they also errantly believe of the KJ translation.

either we accept the facts as they stand or we make up reasons to not accept them....regardless, I am done with this thread.

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/10 4:15

Hey FOC, :-) what do you think of this? Especially the part I put into bold print?

Quote:

While the Greek textual evidence is weak, the Latin textual evidence for the Comma is extremely strong. It is in the vast majority of the Old Latin manuscripts, which outnumber the Greek manuscripts. **Although some doubt if the Comma was a part of Jerome's original Vulgate, the evidence suggests that it was. Jerome states:**

In that place particularly where we read about the unity of the Trinity which is placed in the First Epistle of John, in which also the names of three, i.e. of water, of blood, and of spirit, do they place in their edition and omitting the testimony of the Father; and the Word, and the Spirit in which the catholic faith is especially confirmed and the single substance of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is confirmed.

Other church fathers are also known to have quoted the Comma. Although some have questioned if Cyprian (258 AD) knew of the Comma, his citation certainly suggests that he did. He writes: "The Lord says, 'I and the Father are one' and likewise it is written of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, 'And these three are one'." Also, there is no doubt that Priscillian (385 AD) cites the Comma:

As John says "and there are three which give testimony on earth, the water, the flesh, the blood, and these three are in one, and there are three which give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one in Christ Jesus."

(http://av1611.com/kjbp/faq/holland_1jo5_7.html)

To me this argument is the most conclusive... These early fathers could not have quoted 1 John 5:7, had it not been in the canon.

Notice how clear Priscillian quotes 1 John 5:7-- this is 385AD. So how can people believe 1 John 5:7 was simply a margin note from the 10th century?

And Cyprian (258AD), though I suppose his quote is more debatable... It seems very clear to me. What else could he be quoting, and *"likewise it is written of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, 'And these three are one'."*

258 AD is pretty early. Before the Alexandrian text even! 8-)

Re:, on: 2006/6/10 12:16

I think I'd like to see the sources of the comments from Cyprian and Priscillian.

Telling me they said something doesn't make it so.

I want to see exactly what they wrote, *IF* they actually quoted the comma or not.

There is a lot of scripture, OT as well, that shows us the Trinity...this conclusion that the three are indeed one can be drawn without the comma entirely.

So far you have presented me with what I saw 100 times already during my studies on this. Just quotes, but no sources. Nothing has convinced me that the comma was original, but only a sidebar notation that ended up in the text.

If you can get the sources of these quotes from these men and link them so I can study them for myself (with all the stuff I saw, I can't remember if I read the actual sources of these comments, I do remember seeing the assertion that they were made, which I did take into account, but this doesn't prove that the comma was in the original autographs)

Additionally, there is an aspect of this I will not discuss with others so that none of our Catholic brethren are offended. Not even thru PMs.

This is one of the topics that got me warned on Christianforums due to some points that need to be made that will offend many Catholics as I quickly found out...as discussion about the 'fathers' of the church can do at times when one disagrees with their theology, etc.

If you haven't, take a LOT of time to study many of these early church 'fathers' to see what they believed and taught...what they were capable of.

That may help you see that there may be more to the Comma than meets the eye.

Telling me that the 'fathers' quoted the comma doesn't mean much to me, if you understand my meaning.

Showing me that it was actually in MOST of the texts...THAT would prove something to me.

Please see if you can track down the sources of the quotes from those two men and post links and I'll look at the stuff again.

Nothing would please me more than to see that the comma belongs....but then, that would mean that a whole set of Greek manuscripts that God allowed the Eastern churches to use were 'corrupt' as the GMTs do not support the Comma as a whole.

Conclusion:

Quotes of ECFs are meaningless if the majority of texts don't support the Comma.

There are a LOT of things these 'fathers' believed and said that aren't exactly IN scripture.

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/10 13:51

Cyprian (258 AD) - Treatises 1 5:423.

Priscillian (385 ad) - Liber Apologeticus.

Re:, on: 2006/6/10 14:05

Ill take a look at those as soon as I can.

I hope you understood my post completely. I am trying to not offend anyone, but let you see that there is more to my opinion than simply someone saying that the Comma was a notation that entered the text.

Quotes of these men sadly isnt enough to prove anything.

Not even a direct quote of the Comma in 150 a.d. would prove anything as it could well have been added to one or more "minority" texts (not that this is the case, merely an example) and still not have been present in the original autographs or in the Majority of manuscripts in circulation in the church.

I pray you see the direction Im going and you understand why I will most likely have to maintain my current understanding on this.

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/10 23:25

I'm with you, no worries.

One thing I believe would benefit this discussion is that if we all just relaxed a little bit. I believe we who are in Christ Jesus are all on the same side, even if our choice of manuscripts and/or theology disagrees. :-P

Let me know what you find out about those quotes, I'm interested too. But if you find them to be so, you better not go on saying that the comma was a margin note added in the 10th century. ;-)

Re:, on: 2006/6/11 14:43

Hi chuck.

I probably wont say it was added then.

What i will say is for you to do a short study on something called the 'false decretals'.

It is unrelated to the Comma, but may lay some foundation for you as to why I may not 'trust' everything I see and read but require 'proof' such as seeing that the majority of texts actually contain the comma.

Again, to keep from offending anyone, Ill leave it at that.

Re:, on: 2006/6/11 18:22

Hi FOC:

Some time ago you indicated that you were aware of many discrepancies between the Textus Receptus and the King James, other than the "Comma" issue.

Have you had the time to prepare that list? I would be very interested in it.

God bless,

Stever :-D

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Hi chuck.

I probably wont say it was added then.

What i will say is for you to do a short study on something called the 'false decretals'.

It is unrelated to the Comma, but may lay some foundation for you as to why I may not 'trust' everything I see and read but require 'proof' such as seeing that the majority of texts actually contain the comma.

Again, to keep from offending anyone, Ill leave it at that.

Re:, on: 2006/6/11 22:27

Could you give me an exact quote, stever..a post to look at.
Something seems odd in what you claim I stated.

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/12 2:45

FOC, I believe this is the post that Stever was referring to:
(in specific, the bold)

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Quote:

-----Textus Receptus is based on the vast majority (90%) of the 5000+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the Majority Text.

Let us not forget the Johannine Comma.

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/comma.html>

(1).....if the passage were original, no good reason can be found to account for its omission, either accidentally or intentionally, by copyists of hundreds of Greek manuscripts, and by translators of ancient versions.

The TR is 'based' on on the MT, but it is not exact in every way. The TR has its own 'additions' to the text.

If nothing else this shows that the TR is not 'perfect'...

Clearly Im not a KJVonly-er...as I dont believe God speaks english, nor favors english in any way.
The TR and the KJV bible are great resources, great works for the cause of the Lord.... yet not perfect.

I wouldnt trust the Minority Texts as far as I can toss my minivan...but anyone who believes the TR or the KJV 'perfect' is greatly deluding themselves..
..the Comma is proof of that fact.

The ACTUAL Majority Texts, not the TR with its added Comma, should be the basis for our NTs.

Re:, on: 2006/6/12 10:08

So I said ...

"The TR is 'based' on on the MT, but it is not exact in every way. The TR has its own 'additions' to the text."

...exactly what I thought, you may have exaggerated my words and intents.
I never implied their were "many" additions.
Even ONE is enough to show that there is a difference...

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

FOC, I believe this is the post that Stever was referring to:
(in specific, the bold)

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Quote:

-----Textus Receptus is based on the vast majority (90%) of the 5000+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the Majority Text.

Let us not forget the Johannine Comma.

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/comma.html>

(1).....if the passage were original, no good reason can be found to account for its omission, either accidentally or intentionally, by copyists of hundreds of Greek manuscripts, and by translators of ancient versions.

The TR is 'based' on on the MT, but it is not exact in every way. The TR has its own 'additions' to the text.

If nothing else this shows that the TR is not 'perfect'...

Clearly Im not a KJVonly-er...as I dont believe God speaks english, nor favors english in any way.

The TR and the KJV bible are great resources, great works for the cause of the Lord.... yet not perfect.

I wouldnt trust the Minority Texts as far as I can toss my minivan...but anyone who believes the TR or the KJV 'perfect' is greatly deluding themselves..
..the Comma is proof of that fact.

The ACTUAL Majority Texts, not the TR with its added Comma, should be the basis for our NTs.

Re:, on: 2006/6/12 12:33

Quote:

FOC wrote:

So I said ...

"The TR is 'based' on on the MT, but it is not exact in every way. The TR has its own 'additions' to the text."

...exactly what I thought, you may have exaggerated my words and intents.

I never implied their were "many" additions.

Even ONE is enough to show that there is a difference...

XXXXXXX

Stever responds:

So your position is that because of the comma alone, that you consider to be a "mistake", that does not offer false doctrine in any way, we should throw away the King James?

What are the "additions" of it's own, other than the comma? You said "additions", not "addition".

The late Herman C. Hoskier gave thirty years to the task of collating a majority of the available manuscripts containing the text of Revelation. His conclusion, based upon the 200 plus extant manuscripts he examined, was:

"I may state that if Erasmus had striven to found a text on the largest number of existing MSS in the world of one type, he could not have succeeded better ... "

XXXXXXXXXXXX

God bless,

Stever :-)

XX

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

FOC, I believe this is the post that Stever was referring to:
(in specific, the bold)

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Quote:

-----Textus Receptus is based on the vast majority (90%) of the 5000+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the Majority Text.

Let us not forget the Johannine Comma.

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/comma.html>

(1).....if the passage were original, no good reason can be found to account for its omission, either accidentally or intentionally, by copyists of hundreds of Greek manuscripts, and by translators of ancient versions.

The TR is 'based' on the MT, but it is not exact in every way. The TR has its own 'additions' to the text.

If nothing else this shows that the TR is not 'perfect'...

Clearly Im not a KJVonly-er...as I dont believe God speaks english, nor favors english in any way.
The TR and the KJV bible are great resources, great works for the cause of the Lord.... yet not perfect.

I wouldnt trust the Minority Texts as far as I can toss my minivan...but anyone who believes the TR or the KJV 'perfect' is greatly deluding themselves..
..the Comma is proof of that fact.

The ACTUAL Majority Texts, not the TR with its added Comma, should be the basis for our NTs.

Re:, on: 2006/6/12 13:22

Quote:

So **your position is that** because of the comma alone, that you consider to be a "mistake", that does not offer false doctrine in any way, **we should throw away the King James?**

Heres my position.

the KJV is not "perfect" as some of you might teach...no translation in existence is 'perfect' as well they couldnt be.

Ive made my point clear enough.

If you call the TR the GMT (greek majority texts) , and the GMT DOESNT confirm that the Comma belongs...then you have one of two choices.

- 1) admit that the TR ISNT based on the GMT alone but on latin texts as well.
- 2) admit that the TR IS the GMT and has additions that dont belong

Your choice.

EITHER way, the fact is that the TR does NOT agree with the MAJORITY of Greek manuscripts but the LATIN ones.

So either quit calling the TR the GMT or simply accept the fact that if it IS the GMTs, then it is not 'inerrant' as those GM

Ts themselves do not back the Comma.

And please, dont play off like a "s" that I added to the word "addition" makes this case any less of a problem than it is. My adding "s" to the word "addition" does not make the TR a "perfect" tranlation in any way, shape or form.

Instead of making me explain the "s" at the end of "addition" you OUGHT to be more concerned with the actual problem here...the fact that the TR and the KJV bible has the Comma that is NOT backed by the very texts some here say it was founded on.

anything else?

If not, Id like to leave this thread now.

I have already stated that there are aspects to this issue that I will not discuss again to keep from offending catholics.

And I will ask WHERE i have ever stated to throw away the KJV.

You either retract this comment publically or I WILL report you to moderation.

STATE THE FACTS...quote what i SAY....do not put words into my mouth again !

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/12 13:39

Steve's

Quote:

-----You can also purchase The Interlinear Greek-English N.T. by Berry.

You can also purchase The Interlinear Greek-English N.T. by Berry.

In both of these books you will find the Textus Receptus from which the KJV was translated in 1611.

This is a popular misconception. There is no definitive version of the Textus Receptus and no one knows exactly which what text lies behind the King James Version. The Textus Receptus is NOT a manuscript it is a thesis. It is a thesis I subscribe to, but it is NOT a manuscript.

Scrivener's version which is often regarded as the text 'behind the KJV' is no such thing. It is Scrivener's reconstruction of a text which he summised must underlie the KJV.

In other words Scrivener's KJV Greek text is a thoughtful piece of reverse engineering. He has constructed a Greek text using the KJV. An interesting exercise and a useful one but NOT the Greek text behind the KJV.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/6/12 14:19

Great to see you back Ron!

Quote:

-----In other words Scrivener's KJV Greek text is a thoughtful piece of reverse engineering. He has constructed a Greek text using the KJV. An interesting exercise and a useful one but NOT the Greek text behind the KJV.

I didn't realize this. So we do not have a copy of the actual Greek Text from which the KJV was translated?

Re: Textus Receptus - posted by aeryck (), on: 2006/6/12 15:41

What of the Stephanus 1550 used by <http://www.blueletterbible.org> ?

The Authorized Version of 1611 (King James Version) utilizes the Textus Receptus ("Received Text") as the basis for the Greek New Testament. The Textus Receptus is based upon various Greek texts as well as some influence by the Latin Vulgate. The earliest work being prepared by Desiderius Erasmus, revised by Robert Estienne (better known as Stephanus), and further revised by Theodore Beza. The text produced by each, is substantially the same, there are some variations between their various editions.

The Blue Letter Bible utilizes the Stephanus 1550 edition.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/12 15:51

Quote:

-----I didn't realize this. So we do not have a copy of the actual Greek Text from which the KJV was translated?

No we don't. We have the product of scholars who sought to recapture the original text from the existing manuscripts. The Textus Receptus is not a manuscript, it is a consensus edition of the Greek text which went through several editions starting with Erasmus... none of these editions is 'the Textus Receptus'. The phrase used by scholars in this field of biblical research usually refers to 'textforms' rather than 'text'. There is no 'Textus Receptus' TEXT but there is an clearly identified 'Byzantine TextFORM'.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/12 15:57

Quote:

-----Robert Estienne (better known as Stephanus)

...was one of a series of biblical scholars who worked to reconstruct the 'original' text of the New Testament. But as your own quote makes clear the Textus Receptus (better the Byzantine Textform) was constructed from various Greek texts and even a little help from the Vulgate!!

The Stephanus text, if re-translated would not produce 'exactly' your KJV. Scrivener's text would but that is because he started at the end and worked backwards to the beginning. I use Scrivener's as my basis for Greek word studies but am not afraid to listen to others.

Re: Sources - posted by aeryck (), on: 2006/6/12 16:06

Philologos,

Where are you getting your information from ?

Where does the Bible come from ?

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/12 16:21

Good to see you back Ron!

What's your take on this... Is the comma canonical or noncanonical, why?

Re: Fool Stop - posted by aeryck (), on: 2006/6/12 16:30

Chuck, (any relative of Norris)

It was the fool stop that really keeps us all puzzled. How exactly God kept His book together through the ages.

Re:, on: 2006/6/12 17:50

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

Good to see you back Ron!

What's your take on this... Is the comma canonical or noncanonical, why?

I think a much better question would be this...

Ron, is the Johannine Comma supported beyond a shadow of doubt by the Greek Majority texts?

If you believe so, could you post a list of actual greek manuscripts that contain the Comma for us?

Re:, on: 2006/6/12 17:54

deleted by Foc....not willing to get into this discussion any deeper

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/12 17:57

deleted for FOC...

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/12 18:45

Quote:

-----What's your take on this... Is the comma canonical or noncanonical, why?

there were no punctuation marks at all in the original. In fact there were not even spaces between the words!

and to speak plainly, no I don't believe that verse is part of the original scripture.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/6/12 19:23

(snippet from previous post)

The passage is absent from every known Greek manuscript except eight, and these contain the passage in what appears to be a translation from a late recension of the Latin Vulgate. Four of the eight manuscripts contain the passage as a variant reading written in the margin as a later addition to the manuscript. The eight manuscripts are as follows:

61: codex Montfortianus, dating from the early 16th century.

88 (variant reading): a variant reading in a 16th century hand, added to the 14th century codex Regius of Naples.

221 (variant reading): a variant reading added to a 10th century manuscript in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

429 (variant reading): a variant reading added to a 16th century manuscript at Wolfenbuttel.

636 (variant reading): a variant reading added to a 16th century manuscript at Naples.

918: a 16th century manuscript at Escorial, Spain.

2318: an 18th century manuscript, influenced by Clemenitine Vulgate, at Bucharest, Rumania.

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 1:19

Steve posted:

Quote:

So **your position is that** because of the comma alone, that you consider to be a "mistake", that does not offer false doctrine in any way, **we should throw away the King James?**

xxxxxxxxxx

FOC responded:

Here's my position.

the KJV is not "perfect" as some of you might teach...no translation in existence is 'perfect' as well they couldn't be.

I've made my point clear enough.

If you call the TR the GMT (greek majority texts), and the GMT DOESN'T confirm that the Comma belongs...then you have one of two choices.

- 1) admit that the TR ISN'T based on the GMT alone but on Latin texts as well.
- 2) admit that the TR IS the GMT and has additions that don't belong

Your choice.

EITHER way, the fact is that the TR does NOT agree with the MAJORITY of Greek manuscripts but the LATIN ones.

So either quit calling the TR the GMT or simply accept the fact that if it IS the GMTs, then it is not 'inerrant' as those GMTs themselves do not back the Comma.

And please, don't play off like a "s" that I added to the word "addition" makes this case any less of a problem than it is. My adding "s" to the word "addition" does not make the TR a "perfect" translation in any way, shape or form.

Instead of making me explain the "s" at the end of "addition" you OUGHT to be more concerned with the actual problem here...the fact that the TR and the KJV bible has the Comma that is NOT backed by the very texts some here say it was founded on.

anything else?

If not, I'd like to leave this thread now.

I have already stated that there are aspects to this issue that I will not discuss again to keep from offending Catholics.

And I will ask WHERE I have ever stated to throw away the KJV.

You either retract this comment publicly or I WILL report you to moderation.

STATE THE FACTS...quote what I SAY....do not put words into my mouth again !

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Nasty, nasty. If I say that I have a wife, then you know that I have one wife. If I say I have wives, then you know that I have

ve more than one.

What was posted here was your own response, and nothing more. You said: "additions", but now you say "addition".

So, I guess you mispoke.

Lighten up, don't take this so seriously. We all make mistakes.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/13 2:47

Fact: The comma first ended up in the Byzantine Textform in the 10th century by the way of a sidebar notation, later in 14-16th? century somehow ending up in the text itself.

Fact: While the Greek textual evidence is weak, the Latin textual evidence for the Comma is extremely strong. It is in the vast majority of the Old Latin manuscripts, which outnumber the Greek manuscripts. Although some doubt if the Comma was a part of Jerome's original Vulgate, the evidence suggests that it was. Jerome states:

"In that place particularly where we read about the unity of the Trinity which is placed in the First Epistle of John, in which also the names of three, i.e. of water, of blood, and of spirit, do they place in their edition and omitting the testimony of the Father; and the Word, and the Spirit in which the catholic faith is especially confirmed and the single substance of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is confirmed." -Prologue To The Canonical Epistles.

(The Latin text reads, "si ab interpretibus fideliter in latinum eloquium verterentur nec ambiguitatem legentibus facerent nec trinitatis unitate in prima joannis epistola positum legimus, in qua etiam, trium tantummodo vocabula hoc est aquae, sanguinis et spiritus in ipsa sua editione ponentes et patris verbique ac spiritus testimonium omittentes, in quo maxime et fides catholica roboratur, et patris et filii et spiritus sancti una divinitatis substantia comprobatur.")

Fact: Cyprian (258 AD) writes: "The Lord says, 'I and the Father are one' and likewise it is written of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, 'And these three are one'." - Treatises 1 5:423.

Fact: Priscillian (385 AD) writes As John says "and there are three which give testimony on earth, the water, the flesh, the blood, and these three are in one, and there are three which give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one in Christ Jesus." - Liber Apologeticus.

Fact: the Varimadum (380 AD) states: "And John the Evangelist says, . . . 'And there are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one'." - Varimadum 90:20-21.

Fact: Additionally, Cassian (435 AD), Cassiodorus (580 AD), and a host of other African and Western bishops in subsequent centuries have cited the Comma. Therefore, we see that the reading has massive and ancient textual support apart from the Greek witnesses.

-(Some other sources include the Speculum (or m of 450 AD), Victor of Vita (489 AD), Victor Vitensis (485 AD), Codex F reisingensis (of 500 AD), Fulgentius (533 AD), Isidore of Seville (636 AD), Codex Pal Legionensis (650 AD), and Jaqub of Edessa (700 AD). Interestingly, it is also found in the edition of the Apostle's Creed used by the Waldenses and Albigensians of the twelfth century.)

(Please, someone inform me if my facts are wrong, I really want the truth. This is my current understanding and I don't want to be mislead/mislead anyone...)

Also,

Quote:

-----**Internal Evidence:** The structure of the Comma is certainly Johannine in style. John is noted for referring to Christ as "the Word." If 1 John 5:7 were an interpretation of verse eight, as some have suggested, then we would expect the verse to use "Son" instead of "Word." However, the verse uses the Greek word logos, which is uniquely in the style of John and provides evidence of its genuineness. Also, we find John drawing parallel

els between the Trinity and what they testify (1 John 4:13-14). Therefore, it comes as no surprise to find a parallel of witnesses containing groups of three, one heavenly and one earthly.

The strongest evidence, however, is found in the Greek text itself. Looking at 1 John 5:8, there are three nouns which, in Greek, stand in the neuter (Spirit, water, and blood). However, they are followed by a participle that is masculine. The Greek phrase here is *oi marturountes* (who bare witness). Those who know the Greek language understand this to be poor grammar if left to stand on its own. Even more noticeably, verse six has the same participle but stands in the neuter (*Gk.: to marturoun*). Why are three neuter nouns supported with a masculine participle? The answer is found if we include verse seven. There we have two masculine nouns (Father and Son) followed by a neuter noun (Spirit). The verse also has the Greek masculine participle *oi marturountes*. With this clause introducing verse eight, it is very proper for the participle in verse eight to be masculine, because of the masculine nouns in verse seven. But if verse seven were not there it would become improper Greek grammar.

Even though Gregory of Nazianzus (390 AD) does not testify to the authenticity of the Comma, he makes mention of the flawed grammar resulting from its absence. In his *Theological Orientations* he writes referring to John:

... (he has not been consistent) in the way he has happened upon his terms; for after using Three in the masculine gender he adds three words which are neuter, contrary to the definitions and laws which you and your grammarians have laid down. For what is the difference between putting a masculine Three first, and then adding One and One and One in the neuter, or after a masculine One and One and One to use the Three not in the masculine but in the neuter, which you yourselves disclaim in the case of Deity? -(Fifth Orientation the Holy Spirit.)

It is clear that Gregory recognized the inconsistency with Greek grammar if all we have are verses six and eight without verse seven. Other scholars have recognized the same thing. This was the argument of Robert Dabney of Union Theological Seminary in his book, *The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek* (1891). Bishop Middleton in his book, *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, argues that verse seven must be a part of the text according to the Greek structure of the passage. Even in the famous commentary by Matthew Henry, there is a note stating that we must have verse seven if we are to have proper Greek in verse eight. -(Actually the 1 John commentary is the work of "Mr. John Reynolds of Shrewsbury," one of the ministers who completed Matthew Henry's commentary, which was left incomplete at Henry's death in 1714.)

While the external evidence makes the originality of the Comma possible, the internal evidence makes it very probable.

((http://av1611.com/kjbp/faq/holland_1jo5_7.html) http://av1611.com/kjbp/faq/holland_1jo5_7.html)

I know I am restating much of what has already been said, and I hope I do not annoy some of you. But I just don't get why 1 John 5:7 cannot be Scripture. The comma must have support from early pre-alexandrian text forms (hence the quote from 258 AD!)

Please excuse my ignorance.. But I don't understand what the big stink is about. Please, someone help me understand, because, to me, this seems all too simple--

For some reason (which I do not know), the comma is missing from the early Byzantine text form-- I must admit I find this troubling. However, later in the 10th century the comma is found in the margin notes-- Perhaps a copyist in the 10th century discovered the comma was in other external sources and cited by early church fathers, so he decided to make it a side-bar margin, just in case it was really Scripture-- then perhaps later on a copyist in the 14-16th? century decided it was indeed Scripture and thus included it in his copy-- and so it continues down on and eventually into the KJ Bible.

Please, somebody tear this apart and show me where it's wrong... if you have the time. Because to me it seems very likely 1 John 5:7 is Scripture and should be in our Bibles.

Adam

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/13 2:48

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----What's your take on this... Is the comma canonical or noncanonical, why?

-----and to speak plainly, no I don't believe that verse is part of the original scripture.

Why?

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/13 3:30

In further thinking, I must admit, that it is contradicting, that the "Byzantine Manuscript Only" camp will claim the Byzantine Textform to be perfect, and then will also claim the King James/Textus Receptus to be perfect. This is impossible, because the King James/Textus Receptus disagree with the earliest Byzantine Textform Manuscripts. (Example being 1 John 5:7)

Further, it seems almost circular that the "King James Only" camp claims majority is best, while holding fast to the minority reading for 1 John 5:7.

Which is more accurate, Textus Receptus/King James or early Byzantine manuscripts?

I still believe 1 John 5:7 is Scripture. But... these are very important points.

Adam

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/13 5:37

Quote:

-----and to speak plainly, no I don't believe that verse is part of the original scripture.

Why?

King Jimmy gathered the evidence together in an earlier post today. As far as I recall the history Erasmus added these verses to his edition of the Greek text so as not to offend the ecclesiastical authorities. Erasmus was ever a loyal son of the Catholic Church and never became part of the Reformation. He presumed, apparently, that Jerome must have got it from somewhere to have put it into his Latin Vulgate and so it was there 'must' have been earlier evidences... This was a departure from the scientific method of creating his Greek text.

Re: trying to buy the Textus Receptus! - posted by enid, on: 2006/6/13 7:16

About 2 weeks ago leaf said he had found a Textus Receptus. So why is the discussion still continuing? Just get a Bible, read it, believe it and do as it says! Ezra 7v10. God bless.

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 9:07

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

In further thinking, I must admit, that it is contradicting, that the "Byzantine Manuscript Only" camp will claim the Byzantine Textform to be perfect, and then will also claim the King James/Textus Receptus to be perfect. This is impossible, because the King James/Textus Receptus disagree with the earliest Byzantine Textform Manuscripts. (Example being 1 John 5:7)

Further, it seems almost circular that the "King James Only" camp claims majority is best, while holding fast to the minority reading for 1 John 5:7.

Which is more accurate, Textus Receptus/King James or early Byzantine manuscripts?

I still believe 1 John 5:7 is Scripture. But... these are very important points.

Adam

Heres what I think.

I think that only the original autographs were 'perfect' and those copies that were possible an exact copy of those autographs.

I don't believe that ANY of the manuscripts are 'perfect' that are in existence today, having at least minor alterations...none changing doctrine.

Even among the minority texts I believe the differences are GREATLY exaggerated by the KJVonly camp...the minority texts, while I don't like them simply because of their histories and that they do have so many varied passages, STILL teach the gospel basics and the differences are so great that one would read them and end up in hell.

My belief is that the ACTUAL GMTs are the closest to the original autographs, but i dont fool myself into believing that even these are a word for word "perfect" copy of the letters that Paul and the others wrote. They are close enough.

As is the addition of the Johannine Comma.

the Comma doesnt alter doctrine, it also helps the reader make the connection that the passage seems to want to relate without the Comma.

The reason I dont believe the Comma belongs and was added is simply that the majority of the texts that *I* trust do not contain it.

The evidence against it far outweighs what is for it, in my opinion.

But it no more changes doctrine than any of the other small differences in the texts.

Was it written by John himself? Not in my opinion.

Does it matter that its there? Absolutely not.

Would I rely upon it for proving the trinity? By no means as there is too much mystery surrounding it...it really isnt needed to to prove the trinity from scripture at all.

My ONLY real issue with this whole topic is the KJVonly stance.

IF KJVonlyers want to say their bible is a "perfect" translation and that the underlying text was 'perfect' as some KJonlyers do, then they need to explain the Comma and why it isnt backed by the very texts they SAY this translation is based upon.....

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 9:09

Quote:

enid wrote:

About 2 weeks ago leaf said he had found a Textus Receptus. So why is the discussion still continuing? Just get a Bible, read it, believe it and do as it says! Ezra 7v10. God bless.

: -)

typically the threads evolve on their own.

We're 'continuing' as we find the topic worth discussing.

The edit function - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/6/13 9:52

Quote:

-----deleted by Foc....not willing to get into this discussion any deeper

Quote:

-----deleted for FOC...

Brothers, please do not abuse the edit function, this is not it's intention. It leaves the readers in confusion as the threads are developing by taking out context that others may be responding to and following. If you feel you have misspoken, make a correction, give an apology, clarify, what have you, but leave what you have written intact please. Have some consideration for others here.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/13 9:58

Quote:
-----I think that only the original autographs were 'perfect' and those copies that were possible an exact copy of those autographs.

Sorry, don't understand this point.

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 12:00

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:
-----and to speak plainly, no I don't believe that verse is part of the original scripture.

Why?

KingJimmy gathered the evidence together in an earlier post today. As far as I recall the history Erasmus added these verses to his edition of the Greek text so as not to offend the ecclesiastical authorities. Erasmus was ever a loyal son of the Catholic Church and never became part of the Reformation. He presumed, apparently, that Jerome must have got it from somewhere to have put it into his Latin Vulgate and so it was there 'must' have been earlier evidences... This was a departure from the scientific method of creating his Greek text.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever responds:

It seems like the description of who Erasmus really was involves his ties to Roman Catholicism. Erasmus, a Roman Catholic who fueled the reformation by producing the Protestant Bible, that relied on different text than the Catholic bible (the Catholic bible, that fuels all of the newer versions).

I would like to post this, to provide a broader window of understanding about this man, who lived at a time when most men were Roman Catholic. Erasmus believed that the work that he did would have an impact on Roman Catholicism and reform it. He was mistaken, to be sure, but the work he did is irrepachable:

AN ASSESSMENT OF ERASMUS

Erasmus was a "Christian" humanist, the illegitimate son of a Roman Catholic priest, and was himself an ordained priest. He taught Greek at Cambridge University from A.D. 1510 to 1514. He was not a "great" man of faith -- but he was completely committed to the truth and reality of the Christian faith. Moreover, compared to Westcott and Hort (and a few others to be mentioned later) Erasmus was a giant of faith in that he humbled himself and his intellect, professing that the Bible was the absolute Word of God.

As to the criticism that Erasmus was a Roman Catholic -- in his day, almost all of Christendom was Roman. He flourished before and at the onset of the Reformation. He did not oppose the teachings of the Roman Church, but he vehemently protested the abuses within the Church. Erasmus decried the emphasis on ritual as opposed to a simple godly life as wrong and believed that such could be corrected by placing into every man's hand the Bible in his own language. He did not want to do away with the ritual of Rome, but he wanted a genuine spirituality to accompany it. He disapproved of Protestantism, viewing it as an evil because of all the division it brought.

The Christian humanistic elements in Erasmus' thought were completely dissimilar from the contemporary connotation of "humanism", meaning instead "men eminent for human learning" -- especially in relation to the revival of learning in literature and language (notably Latin and Greek).

In his day the term "humanist" designated a member of a distinct 'international intellectual club' that was dedicated to studying the humanities or liberal arts. Due to his great erudition, depth of thought, elegance of style and biting irony, Desiderius Erasmus stood forth among these intellectuals as the unrivaled "prince of humanist".

Erasmus' humanism found expression in his insistence to return to the original sources in order to uncover truth

h. Thus, his edition of the Greek N.T. was a natural manifestation of his Christian humanistic bent. By means of this text he hoped to see the Roman Church renewed from within.

As a Christian humanist, Erasmus was naturally not always consistently Christian in his thinking, nevertheless, we maintain that God providentially used Erasmus—much as God used Erasmus' contemporary Martin Luther even though Luther became bitterly anti-Semitic in his latter years. At least Erasmus was not untrue to his ordination vows as were Wesley and Scott and Hort. They neither believed nor held to the thirty nine articles of the Anglican church in which they had been ordained. They actually espoused the cause of Romanism and modernism.

Moreover, neither Erasmus' theology nor his being a Roman Catholic has anything whatsoever to do with his Greek text. In producing it, he merely followed the manuscripts which had been preserved by the usage within the Greek Orthodox Church. He knew the Vulgate was corrupt and his humanist values led him to believe that he was getting to the source of God's truth by turning to the manuscripts of the Greek Church.

One of Erasmus' greatest mistakes was his belief that the Roman Catholic Church could be reformed from within. The Lord Jesus said that you cannot put new wine into old wine skins. If Jesus the Christ could not reform the religion of Israel which originally had been the only God-ordained religion on the earth, who are we to think we can change for the better the traditions of any denomination or religious organization? By the power of the Holy Spirit we can influence and cause a positive change in the hearts of individuals be they priests, preachers or laymen—but organizations—but organizations are married to their doctrines and traditions!

Erasmus knew almost all of the important variant readings known to scholars today—but more than 470 years ago. This may be proven from a perusal of his notes. Dr. Frederick Nolan (1784-1864 A.D.) was a Greek and Latin scholar who, as an eminent historian, researched Egyptian chronology and spent twenty eight years tracing the Received Text to its apostolic origin.

After surveying Erasmus' notes, Nolan recorded:

"With respect to manuscripts, it is indisputable that he was acquainted with every variety which is known to us; having distributed them into two principle classes, one of which corresponds with ... the Vatican manuscript ... to the church, he was aware, was infested with Origenists and Arians; and affinity between any manuscript and that version, consequently conveyed some suspicion that its text was corrupted."

In producing his first edition, Erasmus was under an incredible work load. Due to publication problems and deadline pressure, his first edition had many typographical errors, misprints, and misspellings. This led to much undue criticism. His work was greatly disfigured only in the sense mentioned, but the Text was providentially protected. God has not preserved the Text miraculously for then there would have been no such glosses, and all the various uncials and cursives would read the same, word for word. In the case of providential guidance, we can see that there is a human as well as a divine side to the preservation of the Text. For the most part, these errors were eliminated by Erasmus in his later editions. Such things as these are, however, not factors which need to be taken into account insofar as evaluating the "Textus Receptus"—a designation by which his work later came to be known.

The year after Erasmus published, Luther used the Textus Receptus (TR) for the basis of a German translation of the New Testament.

Shortly thereafter, God—but using Luther and his translation, brought about the Reformation.

Luther and Erasmus knew each other. They did not always agree. One of the chief areas of disagreement between them was Luther's conviction that the Roman church was incapable of being reformed and he thought that Erasmus should join him in leaving. However Erasmus believed that he could better bring about reform by working from within the system. He was quite wrong.

TYNDALE TRANSLATES THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS INTO ENGLISH

William Tyndale, a godly young English priest (A.D. 1494-1536), left Oxford to study Greek at Cambridge under the influence of Erasmus. Tyndale was so gifted and fluent in seven languages (Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English, and French) that one would think each was his native tongue. It was Tyndale's great desire to put the Bible into the language of the English speaking people. Relying 99% on the 1522 3rd edition of Erasmus' Greek text, in 1526 A.D. Tyndale fulfilled that longing, producing the first complete printed N.T. in the English tongue.

As a result of his publication, the Roman Church despised, hated and persecuted Tyndale. In A.D. 1535 at Antwerp, Bel

gium, he was betrayed by Henry Phillips and made the prisoner of Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor. Found guilty of heresy for translating and publishing the Bible, in October 1536 Tyndale was tied to the stake whereupon he cried out in a fervent loud voice: "Lord, open the King of England's eyes". He was then strangled and his body publicly burned.

Following the completion of the New Testament, most of the men who translated the Bible manuscripts into the language of the common people were put to death. History reveals the surprising fact that it was members of the clergy, those who were supposed to be the ministers of Christ, who directed and carried out nearly all of the deeds of martyrdom and the cruelties which accompanied them. For the past 150 years the attack has become more "civilized". Now members of the clergy and ecclesiastic scholars merely carry out these cruelties and atrocities against their translations, while safely sitting in air conditioned offices—often supported by tithe money.

LATER EDITIONS OF THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS

Later, Stephens (Stephanus) updated Erasmus' work with several editions, the best being his third in 1550. **It is this form of the Textus Receptus that is generally preferred by English scholars. The difference between Stephens' undertaking and the last edition of Erasmus is almost imperceptible such that for practical purposes, Erasmus' and Stephens' texts are the same.**

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 12:05

FOC posted:

"Heres what I think.

I think that only the original autographs were 'perfect' and those copies that were possible an exact copy of those autographs.

I dont believe that ANY of the manuscripts are 'perfect' that are in existence today, having at least minor alterations...none changing doctrine."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever responds:

I do not understand what you are trying to say. Please document your position.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 15:30

I think this discussion between you and I is over, stever.

Readers, did I make myself clear enough?
I believe I did.

Stever, I have said quite enough for your amusement.

You can accept the facts as they stand, or you can reject them and pretend like the facts dont exist.

Fact....the GMTs dont back the Comma.

accept it, reject it, your stance is not my problem to worry about...the facts, ones accepted even by KJVonlyers, stand for themselves.

This will be my last post to you and do not PM me again about this matter.

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 15:39

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----I think that only the original autographs were 'perfect' and those copies that were possible an exact copy of those autographs.

Sorry, don't understand this point.

My bad..I've been sidetracked horrible with work the last couple days on my website.

My point was supposed to be that the only writings I consider 'perfect' were the original autographs and possibly (if any exist) EXACT duplications of said autographs.

but since we arent in any position to compare what we have to the original autographs, we cant know if what we have in the greek is an exact copy of the originals or not.

My view is that we look to the texts that are the most numerable and agree the most.

I personally dont believe we have anything that is a word for word copy of what Paul, Luke, John, etc, wrote.

What we have conveys the same message as the originals tho, and that is close enough.

I dont need this mythical 'perfect' translation to know that Jesus was born of a virgin and died on a cross for my sins.

Not sure if that helps...let me know if I need to clarify anything else.

I apologize for typos, my hands have been bothering me (neuropathy), Ive been distracted with my website as well, so I need to make sure to proof read a bit better before I post and run :D

Re: The edit function, on: 2006/6/13 15:43

Sorry.

I made a comment that would have drawn me into yet another aspect of this discussion that after posting i realized I didnt want to get into.

I believe I should have the right to retract my words if I decide I dont want to get in any deeper than I am.

Other than that, I will refrain from deleting posts I make.

Quote:

crsschk wrote:

Quote:

-----deleted by Foc....not willing to get into this discussion any deeper

Quote:

-----deleted for FOC...

Brothers, please do not abuse the edit function, this is not it's intention. It leaves the readers in confusion as the threads are developing by taking out context that others may be responding to and following. If you feel you have misspoken, make a correction, give an apology, clarify, what have you, but leave what you have written intact please. Have some consideration for others here.

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 19:30

FOC posted:

"The TR is 'based' on on the MT, but it is not exact in every way. The TR has its own 'additions' to the text."

Stever's response:

If there were "additions" to the text, I would be very concerned and would not support the KJV.

That was the intent of my post. But now you concede that you misspoke, and there is only one "addition", the comma.

So my friend, for one comma I will surely not throw the KJV away.

May God bless you, and may God heal your hands and body, in Jesus Name. Amen

Stever

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

FOC wrote:

I think this discussion between you and I is over, stever.

Readers, did I make myself clear enough?

I believe I did.

Stever, I have said quite enough for your amusement.

You can accept the facts as they stand, or you can reject them and pretend like the facts dont exist.

Fact....the GMTs dont back the Comma.

accept it, reject it, your stance is not my problem to worry about...the facts, ones accepted even by KJVonlyers, stand for themselves.

This will be my last post to you and do not PM me again about this matter.

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 20:16

Would a MODERATOR please inform this poster to STOP implying that I ever said for ANYONE to throw away their KJ bibles ?

This post...plus this from Stever before..

STEVE:

"So your position is that because of the comma alone, that you consider to be a "mistake", that does not offer false doctrine in any way, we should throw away the King James?"

...is starting to get quite annoying.

I have NEVER told anyone to throw away their KJV, I use one every single day and Im getting quick sick of this posters false implications and accusations

STEVER...please stop responding to me.

You do NOT have a "perfect" translation with the KJV.

You seem to be ticked off that your bible has a flaw....and a blatant one at that.

there ARE other issues with the KJV...rendering issues are evident in both the OT and the new.

am I interested in adding this item to the discussion here...NO, Im not...so LEAVE ME ALONE about it !

Your KJV is NOT this perfect creation some of you believe and the Comma being IN your bible while the very texts its based on NOT supporting it PROVE that its not perfect.

Your entire arguement has now turned to the word 'additions' I used before...you seem to actually believe that THAT is some sort of defense in this matter...it isnt...and if you dont see that fact, Im afraid no one in here is going to be of much help to you.

and yes, at this point I AM aggitated because you are simply purposely trying to make it appear like I said to throw your bibles away.

I will start PMing a mod if necessary.

This is the last time I will tell you to stop implying I said something I didnt before I go to SermonIndex (the admin) about you.

Quote:

Stever wrote:

FOC posted:

"The TR is 'based' on on the MT, but it is not exact in every way. The TR has its own 'additions' to the text."

Stever's response:

If there were "additions" to the text, I would be very concerned and would not support the KJV.

That was the intent of my post. But now you concede that you misspoke, and there is only one "addition", the comma.

So my friend, for one comma I will surely not throw the KJV away.

May God bless you, and may God heal your hands and body, in Jesus Name. Amen

Stever

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Re: The Johannie Comma, on: 2006/6/13 20:20

I would like to post this from Floyd Nolen's Book, Which Version is the Bible that offers insight into this issue:

APPENDIX B - The Johannine Comma

FIRST JOHN 5:6-8

6. This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. 7. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. (KJB)

The embolded portion of the passage is omitted from the NIV and RSV and is footnoted or missing in nearly all modern versions, reading instead, "There are three that bear record, the Spirit, and the water and the blood" or something closely akin.

Comment: This Scripture has been entitled the "Johannine Comma" by textual critics. The verse as found in the King James is the strongest single Scripture on the Holy Trinity. As such, it is not surprising that it should be the subject of vehement debate and an object of Satan's attack. It is a shameful, sad comment upon our time as to how readily modern Christians will surrender this and other passages on "textual grounds" without bothering to delve more closely into the evidence.

Dr. J.A. Moorman — a dedicated Godly minister, capsuling the posture of modern textual criticism which insists upon the omission of the passage, has set forth the following particulars:

- 1.The passage is missing from every known Greek manuscript except four, and these contain the passage in what appears to be a translation from a late recension (revision) of the Latin Vulgate. These four are all late manuscripts. They are a 16th century ms (#61), a 12th century ms (#88) which had the passage written in the margin by a modern hand, a 15th century ms (#629), and an 11th century ms which has the passage written in the margin by a 17th century hand.
- 2.The passage is not quoted by any of the Greek Fathers who would have employed it as proof in the Trinitarian controversies (Arian and Sabellian) had they known of the section. Its first appearance in Greek is in a Greek version of the (Latin) Acts of the Lateran Council in 1215.
- 3.The section is not present in the mss of all the ancient versions except the Latin. Even then, it is not found in the Old Latin in its early form and it is not in Jerome's Vulgate (c.405).

The earliest instance of the passage being quoted as part of the actual text of First John is a fourth century Latin treatise. Supposedly the "gloss" arose when the original passage was understood to symbolize the Trinity (through the mention of three witnesses; the Spirit, and the water and the blood). This interpretation, they tell us, may have been written as a marginal note at first and, as time went on, found its way into the text.

The "gloss" was quoted by Latin Fathers in North Africa and Italy in the 5th century as part of the text of the Epistle. From the 6th century on, it is found more and more frequently in mss of the Old Latin and Vulgate.

4.If the passage were original, a compelling reason or reasons should have been found to account for its omission, either accidentally or deliberately, by all of the copyists of hundreds of Greek mss and by translators of ancient versions (called "transcriptional probability" - p. 30). Lastly, they inform us that the passage makes an awkward break in the sense (called "intrinsic probability" - p. 30).

There it is! These are the standard arguments that have been repeated ad nauseam. It certainly sounds convincing, but is the entire story being told?

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Part 1 of 5 parts on the "Johannine Comma".

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 20:26

Readers.

lets stick to the facts that even the most learned of KJonlyers will admit.

Fact; the TR and the KJV is said to be based on the greek majority texts.

Fact: the KJV contains the Johanne Comma

Fact: the greek majority texts do NOT support the Comma.

All the arguments presented about scholars did this and that and said this and that are meaningless when the facts are looked at.

The very greek texts that the KJV is supposedly based on DO NOT SUPPORT the Johannine Comma...as every honest KJVonlyer will admit (look around, there are a LOT of good articles out there from KJonlyers who are very learned and very honest and will readily admit this fact)

the math is very easy in this issue.

Re: "Johannie Comma", on: 2006/6/13 20:29

Part 2 in the discussion of the Johannie Comma from the book "Which Version is the Bible" by Floyd Nolen Jones:

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE "COMMA"

First, we straightforwardly concede that the Johannine Comma has the least Greek supportive evidence by far of any New Testament passage. However, there is much to be offered in defending its inclusion in Scripture. As to external evidence, we begin by apprising the reader that the Nestle-Aland 26th edition lists 8, not 4, Greek manuscripts as having the section. Another is cited by Metzger and the UBS 1st edition, bringing the total to nine. Further, the Nestle-Aland critical apparatus mentions that other Greek manuscripts contain the reading in the margin.

It is usually held by critics that a number of these mss are merely copies of the Vulgate at I John 5:7, but their wording is carefully couched with subtle qualifying words (i.e., "appears to be") that reveals to the prudent reader that such is by no means certain. Thus, the list of Greek mss presently known to contain the "Comma" is not long, but it is certainly longer (and growing) than what many would have us believe.

Though there is a paucity of support for the text in the Greek speaking East, there are some late Eastern versions that include the portion under question such as the first Armenian Bible (published 1666) which was based primarily on an Armenian mss dated 1295 and the first printed Georgian Bible, published at Moscow in 1743.

As to the critics' contention that "the passage is not quoted by any of the Greek Fathers who would have employed it as proof in the Trinitarian controversies had they known of the section", OUR FIRST REPLY IS THAT NO SUCH CONTROVERSY EXISTED.

During the first age of the Church, the subjects debated between the Christians and the heretics were over the divinity and the humanity of Christ. The contests maintained with and between these heretics did not extend beyond the consideration of the second Person—whether the Son possessed one subsistence or two persons instead of two subsistences and one person, etc. They did not assume the form of a Trinitarian controversy, hence no suitable occasion arose to cite the verse in question.

Secondly, the early eastern Fathers are silent on nearly everything for the simple reason that their literary works have not survived to the present. Relevant to this, Harry A. Sturz has made the point "... there are no earlier Antiochian Fathers than Chrysostom (died 407) whose literary remains are extensive enough so that their New Testament quotations may be analyzed as to the type of text they support".

Moorman notes that there is reason to doubt that any serious search has been carried out on the eastern Fathers from Chrysostom forward or on the versions, for since Westcott and Hort a cloud has fallen on the textual scene and very little attention has been given to I John 5:7. Yet crucial to the issue at hand is whether there are any references to the passage prior to 1522, the year it was supposedly added to the Bible by Erasmus.

The favorable evidence is stronger in the early Latin west. The "three heavenly Witnesses" is contained in practically all of the extant Latin Vulgate mss. Although not included in Jerome's original edition, around the year 800 it was taken into the text of the Vulgate from the Old Latin mss. It was part of the text of a 2nd century Old Latin Bible. The passage is cited by Tertullian (died 220), Cyprian of Carthage (died 258), and Priscillian, a Spanish Christian executed on a charge of heresy in A.D. 385. It is found in "r", a 5th century Old Latin manuscript, and in a confession of faith drawn up by Eugenius, Bishop of Carthage, in 484.

After the Vandals over-ran the African provinces, their King (Hunnerich) summoned the bishops of the African Church and the adjacent isles to deliberate on the doctrine bound within the disputed passage. Between three to four hundred prelates attended the Council at Carthage while Eugenius, as bishop of that See, drew up the Confession of the orthodox in which the contested 7th verse is expressly quoted.

That the entire African Church assembled in council should have concurred in quoting a verse which was not contained in the original text is altogether inconceivable. Such loudly proclaims that the 7th verse was part of its text from the beginning. The verse was cited by Vigilus of Thapsus (490), Cassiodorus (480-570) of Italy, and Fulgentius of Ruspe in North Africa (died 533). Moreover, this is not a complete listing. Therefore, early testimony for this key Trinitarian verse does exist.

[illegible]

This is the end of part 2 of a 5 part post

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 20:31

The Johannine Comma (1 John 5:7-8)

The so-called Johannine Comma (also called the Comma Johanneum) is a sequence of extra words which appear in 1 John 5:7-8 in some early printed editions of the Greek New Testament. In these editions the verses appear thus (we put brackets around the extra words):

ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ
μαρτυροῦντες τὸ πν
εῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καP
54; τὸ αἷμα καὶ οἱ τρεῖ
ς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν.

The King James Version, which was based upon these editions, gives the following translation:

For there are three that bear record , the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

These extra words are generally absent from the Greek manuscripts. In fact, they only appear in the text of four late medieval manuscripts. They seem to have originated as a marginal note added to certain Latin manuscripts during the middle ages, which was eventually incorporated into the text of most of the later Vulgate manuscripts. In the Clementine edition of the Vulgate the verses were printed thus:

Quoniam tres sunt, qui testimonium dant spiritus, et aqua, et sanguis: et hi tres unum sunt.

From the Vulgate, then, it seems that the Comma was translated into Greek and inserted into some printed editions of the Greek text, and in a handful of late Greek manuscripts. All scholars consider it to be spurious, and it is not included in modern critical editions of the Greek text, or in the English versions based upon them. For example, the English Standard Version reads:

For there are three that testify: 8 the Spirit and the water and the blood; and these three agree.

We give below the comments of Dr. Bruce M. Metzger on 1 John 5:7-8, from his book, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. (Stuttgart, 1993).

After μαρτυροῦντες the Textus Receptus adds the following: ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ,ὁ Πατήρ,ὁ Λόγος,καὶ τὸ Ἅγ ιον Πνεῦμα· καὶ οὗτ οι οἱ τρεῖς ἔν εἰσι. καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ. That these words are spurious and have no right to stand in the New Testament is certain in the light of the following considerations.

(A) External Evidence.

(1) The passage is absent from every known Greek manuscript except eight, and these contain the passage in what appears to be a translation from a late recension of the Latin Vulgate. Four of the eight manuscripts contain the passage as a variant reading written in the margin as a later addition to the manuscript. The eight manuscripts are as follows:

- * 61: codex Montfortianus, dating from the early sixteenth century.
- * 88: a variant reading in a sixteenth century hand, added to the fourteenth-century codex Regius of Naples.
- * 221: a variant reading added to a tenth-century manuscript in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.
- * 429: a variant reading added to a sixteenth-century manuscript at Wolfenbützel.
- * 629: a fourteenth or fifteenth century manuscript in the Vatican.
- * 636: a variant reading added to a sixteenth-century manuscript at Naples.
- * 918: a sixteenth-century manuscript at the Escorial, Spain.
- * 2318: an eighteenth-century manuscript, influenced by the Clementine Vulgate, at Bucharest, Rumania.

(2) The passage is quoted by none of the Greek Fathers, who, had they known it, would most certainly have employed it in the Trinitarian controversies (Sabellian and Arian). Its first appearance in Greek is in a Greek version of the (Latin) Acts of the Lateran Council in 1215.

(3) The passage is absent from the manuscripts of all ancient versions (Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Slavonic), except the Latin; and it is not found (a) in the Old Latin in its early form (Tertullian Cyprian Augustine), or in the Vulgate (b) as issued by Jerome (codex Fuldensis and codex Amiatinus) or (c) as revised by Alcuin (first hand of codex Valliscellianus).

The earliest instance of the passage being quoted as a part of the actual text of the Epistle is in a fourth century Latin treatise entitled Liber Apologeticus (chap. 4), attributed either to the Spanish heretic Priscillian (died about 385) or to his follower Bishop Instantius. Apparently the gloss arose when the original passage was understood to symbolize the Trinity (through the mention of three witnesses: the Spirit, the water, and the blood), an interpretation that may have been written first as a marginal note that afterwards found its way into the text. In the fifth century the gloss was quoted by Latin Fathers in North Africa and Italy as part of the text of the Epistle, and from the sixth century onwards it is found more and more frequently in manuscripts of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate. In these various witnesses the wording of the passage differs in several particulars. (For examples of other intrusions into the Latin text of 1 John, see 2.17; 4.3; 5.6, and 20.)

(B) Internal Probabilities.

(1) As regards transcriptional probability, if the passage were original, no good reason can be found to account for its omission, either accidentally or intentionally, by copyists of hundreds of Greek manuscripts, and by translators of ancient versions.

(2) As regards intrinsic probability, the passage makes an awkward break in the sense.

For the story of how the spurious words came to be included in the Textus Receptus, see any critical commentary on 1 John, or Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, pp. 101 f.; cf. also Ezra Abbot, "1 John v. 7 and Luther's German Bible," in *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel and Other Critical Essays* (Boston, 1888), pp. 458-463.

Re: Johannie Comma Part 3, on: 2006/6/13 20:35

Part 3 from the Book "Which Version is the Bible" by Floyd Nolen Jones:

CRITICAL INTERNAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTS THE "COMMA"

If 1 John 5:6-8 is removed from the Greek text, the two resulting loose ends will not join together grammatically. The Greek language has "gender" in its noun endings (as do many other languages). Neuter nouns normally require neuter articles (the word "the" as in "the blood" is the article). But the article in verse 8 of the shortened reading as found in the Greek that is the foundation of the new versions (verse 7 of the King James Greek text) is masculine. Thus the new translations read "the Spirit (neuter), the water (neuter), and the blood (neuter): and these three (masculine!! - from the Greek article "hoi") are in one." Consequently three neuter subjects are being treated as masculine (see below where the omission

d portion is italicized). If the "Comma" is rejected it is impossible to adequately explain this irregularity. In addition, without the "Comma" verse 7 has a masculine antecedent; three neuter subjects (nouns in vs.8) do not take a masculine antecedent. Viewing the complete passage it becomes apparent how this rule of grammar is violated when the words are omitted.

5:6 ... And it is the Spirit (neuter) that beareth witness (neuter), because the Spirit (neuter) is truth.

5:7 For there are three (masculine) that bear record (masculine) in heaven, the Father (masculine), the Word (masculine), and the Holy Ghost (neuter): and these three (masculine) are one (masculine).

5:8 And there are three (masculine) that bear witness (masculine) in earth, the Spirit (neuter), and the water (neuter), and the blood (neuter): and these three (masculine) agree in one.

When we inquire of the scholars an accounting for this strange situation, the reply is that the only way to account for the masculine use of the three neuters in verse 8 is that here they have been "personalized". Yet we observe that the Holy Spirit is referred to twice in verse 6 and as He is the third person of the Trinity this would amount to "personalizing" the word "Spirit" — but the neuter gender is used. Therefore — as Hills noted — since personalization did not bring about a change of gender in verse 6, it cannot fairly be pleaded as the reason for such a change in verse 8.

What then is to be done by way of explanation? The answer is that something is missing! If we retain the Johanne Comma, a reason for referring to the neuter nouns (Spirit, water, and blood) of verse 8 in the masculine gender becomes readily clear. The key is the principle of "influence" and "attraction" in Greek grammar. What influence would cause "that bear record" in verse 7 and "these three" in verse 8 to suddenly become masculine? The answer can only be: due to the influence of the nouns Father and Word in verse 7 which are masculine — it is the inclusion of the Father and the Word, to which the beginning and ending of the passage are attracted, a principle well known in Greek syntax. In effect then, the only way the spirit, the water and the blood can be "personalized" is by retaining the reading of the 1611 King James and the Greek text upon which it is based where all three words are direct references to the Trinity (vs.7). Where is the "Person"? "The Person" is in verse 7 of the Authorized Version of 1611.

The reader will note that the underlined phrase, "that bear witness", occurring three times in the preceding passage is a participle which is a type of verbal adjective. As adjectives, they modify nouns and must agree in gender. Thus if a text critic wishes to remove this passage with integrity, he should be able to answer the following:

1. Why after using a neuter participle in line one is a masculine participle suddenly used in line three?
2. How can the masculine numeral, article (Greek), and participle (the three masculine adjectives) of line three be allowed to directly modify the three neuter nouns of line seven?
3. What phenomena in Greek syntax (the part of grammar dealing with the manner in which words are assembled to form phrases, clauses or sentences in an orderly system or arrangement) would cause the neuter nouns of line seven to be treated as masculine by the "these three" in line eight?

There is no satisfactory answer! Leading Greek scholars as Metzger, Vincent, Alford, Vine, Wuest, Bruce, Plummer etc., make no mention whatever of the problem when dealing with the passage in any of their works to date. The International Critical Commentary devotes twelve pages to the passage but is IGNORANTLY OF DISHONESTLY SILENT regarding the mismatched genders.

Finally, with regard to internal evidence, if the words were omitted, the concluding words at the end of verse 8 contain an unintelligible reference. The Greek words "kai hoi treis eis to hen eisin" (kaiV oiJ trei" eij" toV e{n eijsin) mean precisely — "and these three agree to that (aforementioned) One." If the 7th verse is omitted, "that One" does not appear. It is inconceivable how "that One" (Grk = to hen = toV e{n) can be reconciled with the taking away of the preceding words, that is — by taking out the "Comma". As Gaussen has remarked: "Remove it, and the grammar becomes incoherent."

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

This is the end of the 3rd part in a 5 part series.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re: Johannie Comma, Part 4, on: 2006/6/13 20:41

Part 4 of 5 parts on the "Johannie Comma" from the Book "Which Version is the Bible", pages 177-182.

A FEASIBLE EXPLANATION FOR THE OMISSION OF THE "COMMA"

We take our long overdue departure from this much disputed verse by offering the following as a plausible explanation for the omission of I John 5:7 which is taken from the late (1981) Christian text critic, Dr. Edward Freer Hills:

"... during the second and third centuries (between 220 and 270, according to Harnack) the heresy which orthodox Christians were called upon to combat was not Arianism (since this error had not yet arisen), but Sabellianism (... after Sabellius, one of its principal promoters), according to which the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit were one in the sense that they were identical. Those that advocated this heretical view were called Patripassians (Father-suffers), because they believed that God the Father, being identical with Christ, suffered and died upon the cross; ...

"It is possible, therefore, that the Sabellian heresy brought the Johannine comma into disfavour with orthodox Christians. ... And if during the course of the controversy manuscripts were discovered which had lost this reading..., it is easy to see how the orthodox party would consider these mutilated manuscripts to represent the true text and regard the Johannine comma as a heretical addition. In the Greek-speaking East especially the comma would be unanimously rejected, for there the struggle against Sabellianism was particularly severe.

"Thus it is not impossible that during the 3rd century, amid the stress and strain of the Sabellian controversy, the Johannine comma lost its place in the Greek text but was preserved in the Latin texts of Africa and Spain, where the influence of Sabellianism was probably not so great. ... although the Greek New Testament text was the special object of God's providential care ... this care also extended, in lesser degree, to the ancient versions and to the usage not only of Greek-speaking Christians, but also of the other branches of the Christian Church.

Hence, although the traditional text found in the vast majority of the Greek manuscripts is a fully trustworthy reproduction of the divinely inspired original text, still it is possible that the text of the Latin Vulgate, which really represents the long-established usage of the Latin Church, preserves a few genuine readings not found in the Greek manuscripts. ... hence, it is possible that the Johannine comma is one of these exceptional readings which ... were included in the Textus Receptus under the direction of God's special providence."

Thus with regard to external evidence, we have seen that for the most part if I John 5:7 is received, it must be admitted mainly on the testimony of the Western or Latin Church. Admittedly, it seems unwarranted to set aside the authority of the Greek Church and accept the witness of the Latin where a question arises as to the authenticity of a passage which properly belongs to the text of the former. Still, when the doctrine contained within that passage is taken into account, reasons do exist for giving preference to the Western Church's authority over that of the Eastern.

As the quote from Dr. Hills indicates, shortly after the period in which the Sabellian heresy flourished, Arianism arose. Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria (d. 336 A.D.) and pupil of Lucian of Antioch, denied the deity and eternity of Christ Jesus. The Greek or Eastern Church was completely given over to that heresy from the reign of Constantine to that of Theodosius the Elder, a span of at least forty years (c.340-381, the convening of the fourth Council of Byzantium). Conversely, the Western Church remained uncorrupted by the Arian heresy during this period. Thus if the "Comma" problem did not develop during the Sabellian controversy as Dr. Hills proposes, it may well have so done during the time of the Arian dominion of the Greek Church as Dr. Frederick Nolan has forcefully propounded. Nolan argues that with the Arians in control of the Greek Church for the forty or so year span, Eusebius was able to suppress this passage in the edition that he revised which had the effect of removing the verse from the Greek texts. Thus the disputed verse was originally suppressed, not gradually introduced into the Latin translation.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

End of part 4, of 5 parts on the Johannie Comma

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re: Johannie Comma, Part 5 Conclusion, on: 2006/6/13 20:48

"The Johannie Comma" from the Book "Which Version is the Bible by Floyd Nolen Jones Page 177-182.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

There remains one more valid and compelling reason for the acceptance of the section under discussion as being genuine. As stated on page 30, the Textus Receptus always has been the New Testament used by the true Church! We have cited Parvis' admission of this conclusively decisive point and Aland's concession that it undoubtedly has been the N.T. of the Church from the Reformation until the mid twentieth century.

This is the most important justification why not only this passage, but all of the passages that would be deleted or altered by the destructive critics should be retained in the confines of Scripture.

Finally, it cannot be overly stressed that the successive editors of the TR could have omitted the passage from their editions. The fact that Stephens, Beza, and the Elzevirs retained the Pericope, despite the reluctance of Erasmus to include it, is not without significance.

The learned Lutheran text critic J.A. Bengel ("Gnomon", published in 1742) also convincingly defended its inclusion as did Hills in this century. The hard fact is that, by the providence of God, the Johannie comma obtained and retained a place in the Textus Receptus. We emphatically declare that the most extreme caution should be exercised in questioning its right to that place.

Moorman reminds us that the fate of this passage in the written Word indeed parallels the many times Satan sought to destroy the line through which Messiah— the Living Word would come. We are reminded, for example, of wicked Athaliah, daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, slaying all of the seed royal of the lineage of David— save for Joash!

Moreover, this author concurs with Moorman— the passage has the ring of truth. Like him, we proclaim that it is the Holy Spirit who "guides into all truth" (John 16:13) who has given it that "ring".

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

This concludes 5 parts of the Johannie Comma, from the book "Which Version is the Bible by Floyd Nolen Jones.

I have this book in zip format for free if anyone is interested. Just send me your personal email address in order for me to attach the zip file, so I can send it to you

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 20:57

Then all the noise stopped....the planes were gone, the bombs weren't exploding anymore...and slowly the huge cloud of smoke and dust started to clear...

Gasping and choking, trying to clear the dirt and smog out of his throat, one small insignificant figure walked out of the dissipating cloud...

Fact; the TR and the KJV is said to be based on the greek majority texts.

Fact: the KJV contains the Johanne Comma

Fact: the greek majority texts do NOT support the Comma.

All the arguments presented about scholars did this and that and said this and that are meaningless when the facts are looked at.

The very greek texts that the KJV is supposedly based on DO NOT SUPPORT the Johanne Comma...as every honest KJOnlyer will admit (look around, there are a LOT of good articles out there from KJOnlyers who are very learned and v

ery honest and will readily admit this fact)

the math is very easy in this issue.

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/13 20:59

This discussion is getting dryer by the minute :-(:cry:

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 21:04

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

This discussion is getting dryer by the minute :-(:cry:

It seems that stever starts saturation bombing not only threads but also peoples pm boxes when he cant deal with the facts.

STOP PMing me about this stever !

I hope this is the last time I have to ask you.

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 21:10

Dear FOC:

That's it? That is your response to the 5 posts I made on this issue, the Johannie Comma? Respond to what I posted, and refute it line by line. You can hardly be taken seriously unless you do so.

Some very GREAT MEN who wrote books on this issue DISAGREE with you in this matter by 100%.

Men like :

1. Moorman, When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text.
2. Sturz, The Byzantine Text Type And New Testament Textual Criticism.
3. Hills, The King James Version Defended
4. Nolan, An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate
5. Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones, Which Version is the Bible.

God bless,

Stever :-D

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Then all the noise stopped....the planes were gone, the bombs werent exploding anymore...and slowly the huge cloud of smoke and dust started to clear...

Gasping and choking, trying to clear the dirt and smog out of his throat, one small insignificant figure walked out of the dissipating cloud...

Fact; the TR and the KJV is said to be based on the greek majority texts.

Fact: the KJV contains the Johanne Comma

Fact: the greek majority texts do NOT support the Comma.

All the arguments presented about scholars did this and that and said this and that are meaningless when the facts are looked at.

The very greek texts that the KJV is supposedly based on DO NOT SUPPORT the Johannine Comma...as every honest KJVonlyer will admit (look around, there are a LOT of good articles out there from KJonlyers who are very learned and very honest and will readily admit this fact)

the math is very easy in this issue.

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 21:15

To FOC:

I posted to you personally the entire 5 parts in one piece because I seriously thought that you might be interested in refuting it.

Now, I see that you have no interest in doing that.

Consider it a done deal. I will NEVER post to you personally again.

Sincerely,

Steve Goltra

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

This discussion is getting dryer by the minute

It seems that stever starts saturation bombing not only threads but also peoples pm boxes when he cant deal with the facts.

STOP PMing me about this stever !

I hope this is the last time I have to ask you.

For the 'rest of the story' regarding Jesus exception clause...

<http://divorceandremarriage.bravehost.com/>

Re:, on: 2006/6/13 21:16

Unlike some, I dont like to allow myself to be distracted with what is quite probably irrelevance.

I like to stick to the facts first to bake my cake, then if necessary toss in other non-essential details as icing to fill in missing gaps *IF* any exist.

Facts first..

Fact; the TR and the KJV is said to be based on the greek majority texts.

Fact: the KJV contains the Johanne Comma

Fact: the greek majority texts do NOT support the Comma.

You see folks...the number of words a person says is quite irrelevant...all that is relevant in the end is what the facts present.

Fact; the TR and the KJV is said to be based on the greek majority texts.

Fact: the KJV contains the Johanne Comma

Fact: the greek majority texts do NOT support the Comma.

Readers, im sure you can get thru the smoke and add up the facts for yourself.

We dont need to become distracted and refute pages of irrelevance, we simply need to accept the facts in the matter...

Re: Humility - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/6/13 23:52

Quote:

-----I believe I should have the right to retract my words if I decide I dont want to get in any deeper than I am.

Other than that, I will refrain from deleting posts I make.

That is a lot of "I"s and that may be your belief, but it doesn't work here. You may feel that you are being singled out, but it is your conduct that is bringing this upon you. Just as well, to the participants that this applies to, a re-reading of the original posters (Leaf)later comments;

My own view on the more vociferous comments is that, I respect other's views and hope that in our zeal we do not fall into the judgement of our brothers and sisters. The truth needs only love and loyalty as its companions it is powerful enough of its self. Whatever our views, the truth is a sharp edged sword it does not need the blunt instruments of offensive thoughts or words to cut its way through.

There is generally only two items that will get members removed from this site;

Unruly conduct.

Bitterness feeding divisiveness leading to pride expressed in anger.

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id10431&forum13&post_id&refreshGo) SermonIndex Forum Disclaimer (MUST READ)

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id10073&forum13&post_id&refreshGo) How to make the most out of SermonIndex (SI)

Re:, on: 2006/6/14 0:18

Quote:

That is a lot of "I"s and that may be your belief, but it doesn't work here.

Not even sure what you mean here.

Quote:

----- You may feel that you are being singled out, but it is your conduct that is bringing this upon you.

bringing WHAT upon myself?

Stevens implications that I said to throw away the KJ bible?

Please explain in detail what exactly I'm bringing upon myself here because the only thing that is 'on' me at this point has been being harassed thru my pm box and having it implied that I believe we should throw away our KJ bibles...that's about it...

If that's not what you meant, then you've lost me completely as that is ALL I have complained about to you and 3 other mods I PMed to make sure there were as many eyes on this situation as possible.

If you're upset about my deleting my words in that post, it was done to avoid a bigger issue.

Nothing in that post was inflammatory and I think given the circumstances here that what I did was 'best' for this thread. Avoiding another issue that is going to get out of hand.

What I posted wasn't offensive, but given the method of comparison that some folks use for determining the accuracy of translations out there, it would surely have led to another disagreement that was better left out of the picture since it was also off topic for this thread to begin with.

I don't see the problem with a little 'self-moderation'...even if it means using the feature the site owners have provided its members...the edit button.

Quote:

-----There is generally only two items that will get members removed from this site;

Unruly conduct.

Such as falsely accusing someone of saying to throw bibles away?

"STEVE:

"So your position is that because of the comma alone, that you consider to be a "mistake", that does not offer false doctrine in any way, we should throw away the King James?"

I never said this...never even hinted at it. yet twice now I've been indirectly accused of it.

Quote:

----- Bitterness feeding divisiveness leading to pride expressed in anger.

Is lying or deceptive posting in there anywhere?

Re:, on: 2006/6/14 0:45

Just to show that I can keep this discussion at a gentlemanly level, i want to respond to this post. You can respond stever, but I do NOT want to see another insinuation that I am preaching throwing away our KJ bibles....I have said only the opposite of this. I simply do not believe it is 'perfect'...nor do I believe ANY english translatoin is or ever could be.

Ive taken enough foreign language to understand that with just the Hebrew and the fact that there are some Hebrew phrases that CANNOT be rendered "perfectly" into english and that this alone means no english bible is 'perfect' by default.

Nor do I believe in 'inspired' translation as some KJVonlyers seem to believe in.

Nor I do not believe that God destroys the original when a new text is written as the Jews did...otherwise there are a lot of issues in all of the still existing manuscripts laying around.

The KJV is probably the single most greatest literary work of all time....but it isnt a 'perfect' translation...as well it could not be by default.

Quote:

Stever wrote:

To FOC:

I posted to you personally the entire 5 parts in one piece because I seriously thought that you might be interested in refuting it.

I understand you thought this.

But your posts have become a bit dishonest in that you keep implying that I believe something I have not once stated and probably have shown just the opposite.

for the record, no, I do not wish to bury myself in irrelevance...refuting that which I do not need to refute. Refutation of what you posted does nothing for this issue.

He said, she said, they did, someone else is....all pretty much meaningless.

I adore the old scholars, i read them daily.

I enjoy reading quite a bit when i find a topic that interests me.

4 years ago I was on CF arguing that the Comma belongs as adamantly as some here....then I decided to start actually studying it out.

MY studies are what drew me to the GMTs and to trust them alone as what Gods word is.

When I found that the Comma isnt supported by the GMTs that is when I looked a bit more into it and concluded that because it ISNT supported by the very texts the TR and KJV is said to come from....along with all the shrouded mystery around the comma to begin with....that the evidence shows that the comma, while a great source for our belief in the trinity ...is probably not genuine.

At that point it was a blow to me as I had spent quite a bit of effort arguing the same types of things you and others do in its defense.

I hate to keep chanting this mantra to you, stever, but the very texts the KJV supposedly comes from DONT support the Comma as a whole.

KJVonlyers agree that the latin does, not the greek.

Im sorry, but FACT supercedes all the fancy debate in the world on this or any matter.

That is where I stand and where I will remain unless someone uncovers a few more thousand greek texts that do have the comma.

Quote:

-----Now, I see that you have no interest in doing that.

I dont have the time, energy or inclination to do so.

Quote:

Consider it a done deal. I will NEVER post to you personally again.

How about this...dont PM me again for any reason.
You and I discuss on the open forum in full view of the brethren to keep it on the up and up.

Also, NO more even hinted implications that I have ever even thought about throwing about the KJV.
I have never said or even thought such an atrocious thing..the KJV is my foundatoin that all other versions are compared to...EXCEPT where the GMTs shows the KJV errant.

wm

Re: Your Healing, on: 2006/6/14 10:33

Dear FOC:

I pray that the Lord heals your sickness, that He touches you and that the diabetes that hurts your hands and feet is take n away, and that you are restored from the top of your head to the tip of your toes, in Jesus Name, the Name of above al I Names, Amen.

God bless,

Stever

Re:, on: 2006/6/14 10:37

Quote:

Stever wrote:
Dear FOC:

I pray that the Lord heals your sickness, that He touches you and that the diabetes that hurts your hands and feet is taken away, and that you are rest ored from the top of your head to the tip of your toes, in Jesus Name, the Name of above all Names, Amen.

God bless,

Stever

thanks for the prayer, altho its not diabetes, its Acute Intermittant Porphyria, a genetic disorder.

:-)

Re:, on: 2006/6/14 20:43

Dear FOC:

What is your position to the issues raised here in regards to specific "internal" evidence that supports the comma. Do you have an analysis that differs from this? Are you able to respond to this?:

CRITICAL INTERNAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTS THE "COMMA"

If I John 5:6-8 is removed from the Greek text, the two resulting loose ends will not join together grammatically. The Greek language has "gender" in its noun endings (as do many other languages). Neuter nouns normally require neuter articles (the word "the" as in "the blood" is the article). But the article in verse 8 of the shortened reading as found in the Greek that is the foundation of the new versions (verse 7 of the King James Greek text) is masculine. Thus the new translations read "the Spirit (neuter), the water (neuter), and the blood (neuter): and these three (masculine!! - from the Greek article "hoi") are in one." Consequently three neuter subjects are being treated as masculine (see below where the omitted portion is italicized). If the "Comma" is rejected it is impossible to adequately explain this irregularity. In addition, without the "Comma" verse 7 has a masculine antecedent; three neuter subjects (nouns in vs.8) do not take a masculine antecedent. Viewing the complete passage it becomes apparent how this rule of grammar is violated when the words are omitted.

5:6 ... And it is the Spirit (neuter) that beareth witness (neuter), because the Spirit (neuter) is truth.

5:7 For there are three (masculine) that bear record (masculine) in heaven, the Father (masculine), the Word (masculine), and the Holy Ghost (neuter): and these three (masculine) are one (masculine).

5:8 And there are three (masculine) that bear witness (masculine) in earth, the Spirit (neuter), and the water (neuter), and the blood (neuter): and these three (masculine) agree in one.

When we inquire of the scholars an accounting for this strange situation, the reply is that the only way to account for the masculine use of the three neuters in verse 8 is that here they have been "personalized". Yet we observe that the Holy Spirit is referred to twice in verse 6 and as He is the third person of the Trinity this would amount to "personalizing" the word "Spirit" — but the neuter gender is used. Therefore — as Hills noted — since personalization did not bring about a change of gender in verse 6, it cannot fairly be pleaded as the reason for such a change in verse 8.

What then is to be done by way of explanation? The answer is that something is missing! If we retain the Johanne Comma, a reason for referring to the neuter nouns (Spirit, water, and blood) of verse 8 in the masculine gender becomes readily clear. The key is the principle of "influence" and "attraction" in Greek grammar. What influence would cause "that bear record" in verse 7 and "these three" in verse 8 to suddenly become masculine? The answer can only be: due to the influence of the nouns Father and Word in verse 7 which are masculine — it is the inclusion of the Father and the Word, to which the beginning and ending of the passage are attracted, a principle well known in Greek syntax. In effect then, the only way the spirit, the water and the blood can be "personalized" is by retaining the reading of the 1611 King James and the Greek text upon which it is based where all three words are direct references to the Trinity (vs.7). Where is the "Person"? "The Person" is in verse 7 of the Authorized Version of 1611.

The reader will note that the underlined phrase, "that bear witness", occurring three times in the preceding passage is a participle which is a type of verbal adjective. As adjectives, they modify nouns and must agree in gender. Thus if a text critic wishes to remove this passage with integrity, he should be able to answer the following:

1. Why after using a neuter participle in line one is a masculine participle suddenly used in line three?
2. How can the masculine numeral, article (Greek), and participle (the three masculine adjectives) of line three be allowed to directly modify the three neuter nouns of line seven?
3. What phenomena in Greek syntax (the part of grammar dealing with the manner in which words are assembled to form phrases, clauses or sentences in an orderly system or arrangement) would cause the neuter nouns of line seven to be treated as masculine by the "these three" in line eight?

There is no satisfactory answer! Leading Greek scholars as Metzger, Vincent, Alford, Vine, Wuest, Bruce, Plummer etc., make no mention whatever of the problem when dealing with the passage in any of their works to date. The International Critical Commentary devotes twelve pages to the passage but is IGNORANTLY OF DISHONESTLY SILENT regarding the mismatched genders.

Finally, with regard to internal evidence, if the words were omitted, the concluding words at the end of verse 8 contain an unintelligible reference. The Greek words "kai hoi treis eis to hen eisin" (kaiV oiJ trei" eij" toV e{n eijsin) mean precisely "and these three agree to that (aforementioned) One." If the 7th verse is omitted, "that One" does not appear. It is inconceivable how "that One" (Grk = to hen = toV e{n) can be reconciled with the taking away of the preceding words, that is "and these three agree to that One" by taking out the "Comma". As Gaussen has remarked: "Remove it, and the grammar becomes incoherent."

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/6/14 21:43

Steve,

The reasons Metzger and such mention nothing about the grammar is because THERE IS NO PROBLEM WHATSOEVER with the grammar. If you actually knew Greek, you would know this. This passage is very elementary grammar when it comes to Greek. There is nothing complicated about it whatsoever. I posted this earlier. Of course, you won't understand any of it, but for anybody who actually knows Greek, they will:

The participle in question, *maturountes*, has nothing grammatically to do with the words following after it in 7/8.

"oi *maturountes*" in 1 John 5:7 is present active participle nominative plural masculine, functioning adjectivally in the sentence (as required by the definite article). Participles agree with the words they are modifying in case, number, and gender. This word's case is nominative. It's number is plural. It's gender is masculine.

It would be IMPOSSIBLE for this word to be modifying any of the words of, "o Pater, o Logos, kai to Agion Pneuma" (the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit) in the TR variant. Likewise, it doesn't modify any of the modern renderings of 7/8 either, "to pneuma kai to udor kai to hima" (the Spirit and the water and the blood). The reason? All these words are all in the SINGULAR. And since participles modify the words that they agree with in case, number, and gender, it would be impossible for "oi *maturountes*" to modify any of these words, for "oi *maturountes*" is PLURAL.

The only word that "oi *maturountes*" can possibly modify is the word "treis" (three) which comes prior to it in verse 7, which is nominative, masculine, and PLURAL. Grammatically, both these variants are rather basic Greek, with no grammatical problems.

(Non-TR) Greek of 1 John 5:7-8:

hoti treis eistin oi *maturountes* to pneuma kai to hudor kai to hima kai oi treis eis to en eisin

My personal translation:

There are three bearing witness: the Spirit and the water and the blood and these three are in one (agreement).

Whoever you are quoting, frankly, doesn't really know Greek, though they might be pretending they do. Or frankly, they are being deliberately deceitful. I hope they are just being ignorant.

Re:, on: 2006/6/14 23:09

Stever.

Well, I lost my post...so I will simply remind you of what I have stated before.

The comma isnt backed by the GMTs, where the KJV is supposedly derived from.

If I have to choose which evidence is most convincing...'gender' or missing text...Ill go with the fact that the Comma doesnt have the necessary support in the GMTs that it should have.

This will be my last post in this thread as we are simply going round and round for no apparent reason.

also..

Quote:

Whoever you are quoting, frankly, doesn't really know Greek, though they might be pretending they do. Or frankly, they are being deliberately deceitful. I hope they are just being ignorant.

Im no greek scholar, but Id guess this is probably right seeing that *IF* there were this huge gramatical issue with this passage then ALL of the scholars of the greek would have to agree the comma belongs....

That they dont all agree was part of the 'evidence' for my original change of heart to begin with.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/6/14 23:22

Quote:

Im no greek scholar, but Id guess this is probably right seeing that *IF* there were this huge gramatical issue with this passage then ALL of the scholars of the greek would have to agree the comma belongs....

Nuhuh! It's all one big conspiracy... remember???

:-)

Re:, on: 2006/6/15 10:47

Stever replies to KingJimmy (and FOC):

I took two years of Latin in High School. Does my understanding of Latin, with all of its nuances of tense (past, present, future, pluperfect & future perfect) and verbs & gender, etc. etc. equal that of a person who studied Latin in High School, College and Graduate School, and then spent his entire life using the language that he mastered in Graduate School as part of his life's work? I don't think so.

Edward Freer Hills, who wrote "The King James Defended" had the following educational and life qualifications, and was proficient in Greek, as well as Latin:

Edward F. Hills (1912-1981) was a respected Presbyterian scholar. He was a distinguished Latin and Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Yale University. He also earned the Th.B. degree from Westminster Theological Seminary and the Th.M. degree from Columbia Theological Seminary. After doing doctoral work at the University of Chicago in New Testament textual criticism, he completed his program at Harvard, earning the Th.D. in this field. Though largely ignored by professional textual critics and translators, Hills has encouraged thousands of pastors, evangelists, missionaries, and Bible teachers by his defense of the Received Text and his exposure of the unbelief of modern textual criticism. In 1956, he published The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscripts. Key chapters include "A Short

History of Unbelief,Â” Â”A Christian View of the Biblical Text,Â” Â”The Facts of New Testament Textual Criticism,Â” Â”Dean Burgon and the Traditional New Testament Text,Â” and Â”The Textus Receptus and the King James Version.Â”

Hills devastated the Westcott-Text theories and exposed the rationalistic foundation of the entire modern version superstructure. Hills saw the issue of authority in the field of Bible texts and versions.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

When I posted the most recent post to FOC, which you responded to, I posted a quote from Hills, in his book "the King James Defended" that consisted of:

"In the third place, the omission of the Johannine comma involves a grammatical difficulty. The words spirit, water, and blood are neuter in gender, but in 1 John 5:8 they are treated as masculine. If the Johannine comma is rejected, it is hard to explain this irregularity. It is usually said that in 1 John 5:8 the spirit, the water, and the blood are personalized and that this is the reason for the adoption of the masculine gender. But it is hard to see how such personalization would involve the change from the neuter to the masculine. For in verse 6 the word Spirit plainly refers to the Holy Spirit, the Third Person of the Trinity. Surely in this verse the word Spirit is "personalized," and yet the neuter gender is used. Therefore since personalization did not bring about a change of gender in verse 6, it cannot fairly be pleaded as the reason for such a change in verse 8. If, however, the Johannine comma is retained, a reason for placing the neuter nouns spirit, water, and blood in the masculine gender becomes readily apparent. It was due to the influence of the nouns Father and Word, which are masculine. Thus the hypothesis that the Johannine comma is an interpolation is full of difficulties."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever concludes:

KingJimmy, since you have already dismissed Hills position on this matter, based upon your own understanding of Greek, I would be interested in seeing your educational and life work qualifications (Resume) posted here in order to decide if your opinion has any merit.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re:, on: 2006/6/15 11:39

Stever, it doesnt matter what you took in this regard.

I took 3 years of french and dabbled in a bit of spanish and have messed with a couple other languages myself, and what it helped me with most of all wasnt speaking to frenchmen....it helped me understand that there is no such thing as 'perfect' translation.

Beyond that the Greek Majority texts where the KJV supposedly came from do not support the Comma.

I dont know what its going to take for this crucial piece of information to finally get thru to you, nor do I care, but you are kidding only yourself when you offer up what you do and ignore the one piece of evidence that is the most overwhelming

Ive a feeling if this were ANY other issue that youd accept the facts.

If we were talking about ANY other literary work other than the KJV, something tells me youd accept the fact that the FOUNDATIONAL texts dont support a specific reading and be as willing to admit the probability of an addition to the text as many others of us are.

At this point Ive been informed of some things that I do believe have persuaded me that you arent interested in facts, but only in what you wish to believe.

As such, have at it, believe what you will and ignore every fact you need to to continue in whatever you wish to.....nuff said.

wm

Re:, on: 2006/6/15 11:48

Stever responds to FOC:

I would suggest that it is your own lack of understanding of the Greek that is responsible for your position.

Surely, if you or I needed brain surgery, we are not going to use a Surgeon that only recently started practicing brain surgery. We would choose a Doctor that has been doing this procedure over and over and over, with great success.

Since you have taken a position on this issue, without any understanding of the Greek and in what Hills and Moorman have said in regards to the issue of the Greek gender, etc., how can your position be sure?

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re:, on: 2006/6/15 11:50

Fact; the TR and the KJV is said to be based on the greek majority texts.

Fact: the KJV contains the Johanne Comma

Fact: the greek majority texts do NOT support the Comma.

all the scholarly discussion in the world isnt going to change the facts...

Re:, on: 2006/6/15 11:54

Dear FOC:

Your response sounds like the mantra of the heathen, or the prayers of the Catholic that repeats words and prayers over and over and over.

Specifically:

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Fact; the TR and the KJV is said to be based on the greek majority texts.

Fact: the KJV contains the Johanne Comma

Fact: the greek majority texts do NOT support the Comma.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever concludes:

Surely, you have more to offer than that, especially with the work of Hills and Moorman, that has NOT been refuted by their peers.

God bless,

Stever

Re:, on: 2006/6/15 12:02

Quote:

Stever wrote:

Dear FOC:

Your response sounds like that of the heathen, or even the Catholic that repeats words and prayers over and over and over.

Stever

Sticks and stones.....

It sounds like you simply wave your wand of condemnation toward anyone that opposes your errant views.

Sorry, but I'm not concerned in the least about your proclamation here, stever, that I'm now a heathen.

(tho I wonder if crsschk is going to be as quick to admonish you as he was me.....lets see if he is)

The facts are the facts...deal with them.

Fact; the TR and the KJV is said to be based on the greek majority texts.

Fact: the KJV contains the Johanne Comma

Fact: the greek majority texts do NOT support the Comma.

I'm not interested in your maze of refuting irrelevance and seemingly that is distressing to you.
I'm interested in the FACTS that matter.

Fact; the TR and the KJV is said to be based on the greek majority texts.

Fact: the KJV contains the Johanne Comma

Fact: the greek majority texts do NOT support the Comma.

Here are some of the bible versions I use;

American standard version 1901

Bible in Basic english

Contemporary english version

Darby 1889

Douay-Rheims 1899

English Majority Text version(based on the actual GMTs, not the TR)

Geneva bible 1599

Good News bible

Gods Word
Hebrew Names Version
International Standard Version
King James Version (also with apocrypha)
Jay P Greens Literal Version
Modern King James version (Jay P Green)
The Message
Websters 1833
Youngs Literal translation
etc.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/15 14:06

Thomas Newberry 'Englishman's Greek New Testament' has an introduction to different editors of the Greek Text and their different philosophies in constructing a Greek Text. Of Christopher Wordsworth, he writes

Quote:
-----"The text of the present edition," says this editor, "is not a reprint of that hitherto received in any impression of the New Testament. The editor (Wordsworth) has endeavoured to avail himself of the collations of manuscripts which have been supplied by others, and to offer to the reader the result at which he has arrived after an examination of those collations... He feels it his duty to state, that he has not deviated so far from the text commonly received, as has been done in some recent editions. Indeed he cannot disguise his belief that a superintending Providence has ever been watching over the text of the New Testament, and guiding the Church of Christ, as the guardian and keeper of Holy Writ, in the discharge of her duty"

In short, Wordsworth has a confidence in the Greek textform usually referred to as the 'Received Text'. Wordsworth has a massive two volume commentary on the Greek text of the New Testament which has been my study companion for many years. Whenever possible Wordsworth will choose the 'TR' against other textforms. His comments on 1 John 5:7 are significant as the writings of a strong TR supporter.

He writes:

Quote:
-----Elzivir has this addition... "in heaven the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one, and there are three who are bearing witness on earth." But this addition is not found in Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, B, G, K, or in the cursive manuscripts of the Epistle - with the exception of three manuscripts of comparatively recent date - nor in the Lectionaries, nor in the best editions of the Ancient Versions, nor in the Greek Fathers of the first Four Centuries, nor in the Latin Fathers of those centuries, with the exception of a single passage in S. Cyprian de Unit. Eccl. c.5, the tenor of which is doubtful.

The earliest Author by whom these words are clearly cited is Vigilius Thapsensis at the close of the Fifth Century. See the statement of the evidence on this subject in the editions of Welstein, Griesbach, Scholz and Tischendorf.

The words in question are not received by Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf. Nor need any one be disturbed by their non-appearance in the text. It is certain, as has been observed by Bentley (Correspondence, vol.ii. p530) that the Ante-Nicene and Nicene Fathers confuted Arianism without the aid of this passage, to which they never refer, because it was not in their copies of this Epistle;

The passage therefore according to the best authorities stands thus, "Because three (treis, masculine, not tria, neuter) are those who are bearing witness, the Spirit, and the Water, and the Blood, and these three (treis, masculine, not tria neuter) are (joined) into the one (to hen, the one Substance, neuter; not masculine hena).

I don't if this has been raised previously but the fact that the verse was not used during the Arian controversies is surely inexplicable if it had been known at that time?

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2006/6/15 14:11

Glad to see you back philologos
Dom

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/6/15 14:56

Quote:
-----I don't if this has been raised previously but the fact that the verse was not used during the Arian controversies is surely inexplicable if it had been known at that time?

It is relatively certain that they would have left no stone unturned in the quest to prove their points. If it did exist, then it was handled as those who dispute those doctrines handle it today.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/6/15 21:57

Quote:

I took two years of Latin in High School. Does my understanding of Latin, with all of its nuances of tense (past, present, future, pluperfect & future perfect) and verbs & gender, etc. etc. equal that of a person who studied Latin in High School, College and Graduate School, and then spent his entire life using the language that he mastered in Graduate School as part of his life's work? I don't think so.

Of course not. However, if somebody with such a background came out and said that adjectives don't modify nouns, or some other basic part of grammar, such wouldn't make them right just because they had such a background. It would be like somebody with a PhD in Mathematical application saying $2+2=5$! You'd look at them and think they were nuts, and know they are wrong.

However, if something was in dispute, and somebody asserts something I'm not quite sure about, I have enough knowledge of Greek to be able to go to other scholarly resources and check them with myself, and against the claims of others.

Quote:

"In the third place, the omission of the Johannine comma involves a grammatical difficulty. The words spirit, water, and blood are neuter in gender, but in 1 John 5:8 they are treated as masculine.

And this is probably why Hill was never taken seriously in the world of scholarship, because it doesn't even appear he can parse basic Greek grammar. In 1 John 5:8 the words water, spirit, and blood are all in NEUTER. And just to check myself, I verified this in a Bible program (e-sword) that already has every Greek word parsed for you.

Quote:

KingJimmy, since you have already dismissed Hills position on this matter, based upon your own understanding of Greek, I would be interested in seeing your educational and life work qualifications (Resume) posted here in order to decide if your opinion has any merit.

My knowledge of Greek comes from 1 year of seminary study at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary (perhaps the top conservative evangelical seminary in the country), where I was taught by a professor who has been teaching Greek for over 30 years. I had a B avg in the class. I admit, I'm far from an expert on Greek. However, I have at my fingertips further tools which can aid my study, to check myself and others against.

And based on my understanding of Greek and tapping these resources, I am forced to conclude Hills either doesn't know what he's talking about, or he is lying, or I've totally misunderstood what he's said altogether. Such is my honest conclusion.

You might still choose to stand behind Hills, but if you do such, you do such without really knowing for yourself which of us is right in our assertion.

I recommend you pickup a copy of William Mounce's "Basics of Greek" (www.teknia.com), buy his grammar, workbook, flashcards, and since you don't have a professor around, his audio lectures. Spend about the next 6-12 months working through the Greek yourself (which you could probably quickly pickup with your latin background), and you'll then be equipped with the tools necessary to examine these things for yourself.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/6/15 23:57

Stever, FOC have you both had enough of the digs at each other yet?

FOC, this is not a place to be dictating conversation of what is your interest or not. Take note of where you are, this is not a private conversation you are having here...

What is going on in the heart of you brothers?
Humble yourselves for the Lords sake.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/16 3:49

Just another snippet...

Erasmus produced 4 editions of his Greek Text; 1516, 1519, 1522, ?
Editions 1 and 2 did not have the "Johanine Comma". Luther translated his German Bible from Erasmus Edition 2. Erasmus came under strong ecclesiastical pressure to add them to his third edition. The record seems to be that he promised to do so if he found the words in a single Greek Manuscript. They were found in the Cod Monfort and he kept his promise by inserting them into his 3rd Edition. Tyndale translated from Erasmus 3rd Edition, although in Tyndale's 1526 Edition he has the phrase in brackets.

Perhaps a German-speaker can check on Luther's translation and see if the words are there or not. What does Eberfeld say?

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/16 4:01

I know very, very little german, but i checked 1 John 5:7 in E-sword, Here it is:

Verse 7:

"Denn drei sind, die da zeugen: der **Geist** und das **Wasser** und das **Blut**;"

Google english translation:

"Because three are, which witness there: the **spirit** and the **water** and the **blood**;"

Verse 8:

"und die drei sind beisammen. "

Google english translation:

"and the three are together."

The comma is not here.

Now here is KJV, v7-8

"7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.
8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."

Also notice how different verse 8 is between the German Luther Bible and the KJV.

Adam :-P

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/16 4:20

Ron,

I'd be interested in proof and quotations from erasmus and his contemporaries showing that he indeed was pressured to add the comma. From what I've seen, this is a myth started by some guy by the name of metzinger (which he later on re voked and admitted he was wrong). Stever can tell you all about it. ;-)

Edit:

Here we go, two bruce metger quotes taken from stevers post earlier:

Here we have metger making up the story:

“Erasmus promised that he would insert the Comma Johanneum, as it is called, in future editions if a single Greek man uscript could be found that contained the passage. At length such a copy was found--or made to order” (Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, 1st and 2nd editions).

Here we have metger revising his own words in his 3rd edition:

“What is said on p. 101 above about Erasmus’ promise to include the Comma Johanneum if one Greek manuscript w ere found that contained it, and his subsequent suspicion that MS 61 was written expressly to force him to do so, needs to be corrected in the light of the research of H. J. DeJonge, a specialist in Erasmian studies who finds no explicit eviden ce that supports this frequently made assertion” (Metzger, The Text of The New Testament, 3rd edition, p. 291, footnot e 2).

For more information, contact Stever.

This by no means proves 1 John 5:7 is authentic, as FOC will quickly assert-- but it is important.

Therefore, I see no reason to believe Erasmus was pressured to add the comma into his text, unless you can find a sour ce other than bruce metger.

Re:, on: 2006/6/16 10:21

Quote:

philologos wrote:
Just another snippet...

Erasmus produced 4 editions of his Greek Text; 1516, 1519, 1522,?

Editions 1 and 2 did not have the "Johanine Comma". Luther translated his German Bible from Erasmus Edition 2. Erasmus came under strong eccle siastical pressure to add them to his third edition. The record seems to be that he promised to do so if he found the words in a single Greek Manuscrip t. They were found in the Cod Monfort and he kept his promise by inserting them into his 3rd Edition. Tyndale translated from Erasmus 3rd Edition, alt hough in Tyndale's 1526 Edition he has the phrase in brackets.

Perhaps a German-speaker can check on Luther's translation and see if the words are there or not. What does Eberfeld say?

Heres a funny thing about this point.

Some have reduced this to an arguement that Erasmus "promise" is/was a hoax to try to prove the Comma (how this is s upposed to prove anything is beyond me).

But going back to FACTS that we CAN prove...we see that the Comma was indeed left out of the first couple versions. F or what reason?

Was the man ignorant of the strongest piece of evidence FOR the trinity in the NT?

This was no new bible student, the man would have known if that major a piece of scripture was "missing" from the text.

Its almost enough to cause one to wonder if the 'promise' wasnt real...not that I do, nor do I care to even ponder it, but " why" was such a huge doctrinal passage simply omitted ?

and *IF* Erasmus had believed it belonged from day one, there's not a man alive here or elsewhere that can convince me that Erasmus would have just casually left it out for two entire editions.

So the arguments about his promise in my opinion are not irrelevant if true, but entirely unnecessary to prove that at least Erasmus had to have some serious doubts about the Comma to simply leave it out as he did.

Re:, on: 2006/6/16 10:25

Quote:

crsschk wrote:

Stever, FOC have you both had enough of the digs at each other yet?

quite.

I've decided not to respond personally to Stever anymore but only to repeat the facts I have listed.

This way I can keep myself from getting into trouble.

If Stever wishes to keep making his personal attacks, so be it.

And how moderation handles such attacks is between them and our impartial God.

Re:, on: 2006/6/16 10:27

That's very interesting info Chuck.

I wonder if Esword has Luther's Bible or not ;) (runs to check)

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

I know very, very little German, but I checked 1 John 5:7 in E-sword, Here it is:

Verse 7:

"Denn drei sind, die da zeugen: der **Geist** und das **Wasser** und das **Blut**;"

Google English translation:

"Because three are, which witness there: the **spirit** and the **water** and the **blood**;"

Verse 8:

"und die drei sind beisammen. "

Google English translation:

"and the three are together."

The comma is not here.

Now here is KJV, v7-8

"7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."

Also notice how different verse 8 is between the German Luther Bible and the KJV.

Adam :-P

Re:, on: 2006/6/16 10:43

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Thats very interesting info chuck.
I wonder if Esword has luthers bible or not ;) (runs to check)

cool, they did have it..

1Jo 5:7 Denn drei sind, die da zeugen: der Geist und das Wasser und das Blut;
1Jo 5:8 und die drei sind beisammen.
(1Jo 5:7-8 GLB)

Can anyone read German ? :D

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/16 18:08

Dude, the verses I quoted from were from the E-sword GLB.

Re:, on: 2006/6/16 23:13

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

Dude, the verses I quoted from were from the E-sword GLB.

ah...reading posts to fast...just saw that you did include esword in your previous post.
I need more sleep ;-)

Re: Dr. Thomas Holland, on: 2006/6/17 1:43

This relates:

The following is an excerpt from Dr. Thomas Holland's Crowned With Glory, Â©2000, used with permission.

1 John 5:7 (Johannine Comma)
"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."

The passage is called the Johannine Comma and is not found in the majority of Greek manuscripts. However, the verse is a wonderful testimony to the Heavenly Trinity and should be maintained in our English versions, not only because of its doctrinal significance but because of the external and internal evidence that testify to its authenticity.

The External Support: Although not found in most Greek manuscripts, the Johannine Comma is found in several. It is contained in 629 (fourteenth century), 61 (sixteenth century), 918 (sixteenth century), 2473 (seventeenth century), and 2318 (eighteenth century). It is also in the margins of 221 (tenth century), 635 (eleventh century), 88 (twelfth century), 429 (fourteenth century), and 636 (fifteenth century). There are about five hundred existing manuscripts of 1 John chapter five that do not contain the Comma.

It is clear that the reading found in the Textus Receptus is the minority reading with later textual support from the Greek witnesses. Nevertheless, being a minority reading does not eliminate it as genuine. The Critical Text considers the reading *lesou* (of Jesus) to be the genuine reading instead of *lesou Christou* (of Jesus Christ) in 1 John 1:7. Yet *lesou* is the minority reading with only twenty-four manuscripts supporting it, while four hundred seventy-seven manuscripts support the reading *lesou Christou* found in the Textus Receptus.

Likewise, in 1 John 2:20 the minority reading *pantes* (all) has only twelve manuscripts supporting it, while the majority re

ading is panta (all things) has four hundred ninety-one manuscripts. Still, the Critical Text favors the minority reading over the majority in that passage. This is common place throughout the First Epistle of John, and the New Testament as a whole. Therefore, simply because a reading is in the minority does not eliminate it as being considered original.

While the Greek textual evidence is weak, the Latin textual evidence for the Comma is extremely strong. It is in the vast majority of the Old Latin manuscripts, which outnumber the Greek manuscripts. Although some doubt if the Comma was a part of Jerome's original Vulgate, the evidence suggests that it was. Jerome states:
In that place particularly where we read about the unity of the Trinity which is placed in the First Epistle of John, in which also the names of three, i.e. of water, of blood, and of spirit, do they place in their edition and omitting the testimony of the Father; and the Word, and the Spirit in which the catholic faith is especially confirmed and the single substance of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is confirmed.

Other church fathers are also known to have quoted the Comma. Although some have questioned if Cyprian (258 AD) knew of the Comma, his citation certainly suggests that he did. He writes: "The Lord says, 'I and the Father are one' and likewise it is written of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, 'And these three are one'."

Also, there is no doubt that Priscillian (385 AD) cites the Comma:

As John says "and there are three which give testimony on earth, the water, the flesh, the blood, and these three are in one, and there are three which give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one in Christ Jesus."

Likewise, the anti-Arian work compiled by an unknown writer, the Varimadum (380 AD) states: "And John the Evangelist says, . . . 'And there are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one'."

Additionally, Cassian (435 AD), Cassiodorus (580 AD), and a host of other African and Western bishops in subsequent centuries have cited the Comma. Therefore, we see that the reading has massive and ancient textual support apart from the Greek witnesses.

Internal Evidence: The structure of the Comma is certainly Johannine in style. John is noted for referring to Christ as "the Word." If 1 John 5:7 were an interpretation of verse eight, as some have suggested, then we would expect the verse to use "Son" instead of "Word." However, the verse uses the Greek word logos, which is uniquely in the style of John and provides evidence of its genuineness. Also, we find John drawing parallels between the Trinity and what they testify (1 John 4:13-14). Therefore, it comes as no surprise to find a parallel of witnesses containing groups of three, one heavenly and one earthly.

The strongest evidence, however, is found in the Greek text itself. Looking at 1 John 5:8, there are three nouns which, in Greek, stand in the neuter (Spirit, water, and blood). However, they are followed by a participle that is masculine.

The Greek phrase here is oi marturountes (who bare witness). Those who know the Greek language understand this to be poor grammar if left to stand on its own. Even more noticeably, verse six has the same participle but stands in the neuter (Gk.: to marturoun). Why are three neuter nouns supported with a masculine participle? The answer is found if we include verse seven. There we have two masculine nouns (Father and Son) followed by a neuter noun (Spirit). The verse also has the Greek masculine participle oi marturountes. With this clause introducing verse eight, it is very proper for the participle in verse eight to be masculine, because of the masculine nouns in verse seven. But if verse seven were not there it would become improper Greek grammar.

Even though Gregory of Nazianzus (390 AD) does not testify to the authenticity of the Comma, he makes mention of the flawed grammar resulting from its absence. In his Theological Orientations he writes referring to John: . . . (he has not been consistent) in the way he has happened upon his terms; for after using Three in the masculine gender he adds three words which are neuter, contrary to the definitions and laws which you and your grammarians have laid down. For what is the difference between putting a masculine Three first, and then adding One and One and One in the neuter, or after a masculine One and One and One to use the Three not in the masculine but in the neuter, which you yourselves disclaim in the case of Deity?

It is clear that Gregory recognized the inconsistency with Greek grammar if all we have are verses six and eight without verse seven. Other scholars have recognized the same thing. This was the argument of Robert Dabney of Union Theological Seminary in his book, The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek (1891). Bishop Middleton in his book, Doctrine of the Greek Article, argues that verse seven must be a part of the text according to the Greek structure of the passage. Even in the famous commentary by Matthew Henry, there is a note stating that we must have verse seven if we are to have proper Greek in verse eight.

While the external evidence makes the originality of the Comma possible, the internal evidence makes it very probable. When we consider the providential hand of God and His use of the Traditional Text in the Reformation it is clear that the Comma is authentic.

The first and second editions of Erasmus' Greek text did not contain the Comma. It is generally reported that Erasmus promised to include the Comma in his third edition if a single manuscript containing the Comma could be produced. A Franciscan friar named Froy (or Roy) forged a Greek text containing it by translating the Comma from the Latin into Greek. Erasmus was then presented with this falsified manuscript and, being faithful to his word, reluctantly included the Comma in the 1522 edition. However, as has now been admitted by Dr. Bruce Metzger, this story is apocryphal (The Text Of The New Testament, 291). Metzger notes that H. J. de Jonge, a respected specialist on Erasmus, has established that there is no evidence of such events occurring. Therefore, opponents of the Comma in light of the historical facts should no longer affirm this report.

Kurt Aland, in connection with Annette Benduhn-Mertz and Gerd Mink, Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments: I. Die Katholischen Briefe Band 1: Das Material (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1987), 163-166.

Prologue To The Canonical Epistles. The Latin text reads, "si ab interpretibus fideliter in latinum eloquium verterentur nec ambiguitatem legentibus facerent nec trinitatis unitate in prima joannis epistola positum legimus, in qua etiam, trium tantummodo vocabula hoc est aquae, sanguinis et spiritus in ipsa sua editione ponentes et patris verbique ac aspiritus testimonium omittentes, in quo maxime et fides catholica roboratur, et patris et filii et spiritus sancti una divinitatis substantia comprobatur."

Treatises 1 5:423.

Liber Apologeticus.

Varimadum 90:20-21.

Some other sources include the Speculum (or m of 450 AD), Victor of Vita (489 AD), Victor Vitensis (485 AD), Codex Frisingensis (of 500 AD), Fulgentius (533 AD), Isidore of Seville (636 AD), Codex Pal. Legionensis (650 AD), and Jacob of Edessa (700 AD). Interestingly, it is also found in the edition of the Apostle's Creed used by the Waldensés and Albigensians of the twelfth century.

Fifth Orientation the Holy Spirit.

Actually the 1 John commentary is the work of "Mr. John Reynolds of Shrewsbury," one of the ministers who completed Matthew Henry's commentary, which was left incomplete at Henry's death in 1714.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Stever

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/17 2:10

Stever:

Which do you believe is "the perfect Bible":

The Earliest+Majority Byzantine Textform
OR
Erasmus 3rd edition Greek New Testament

And why?

Re:, on: 2006/6/17 3:31

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:
Stever:

Which do you believe is "the perfect Bible":

The Earliest+Majority Byzantine Textform
OR
Erasmus 3rd edition Greek New Testament

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever :

Erasmus 3rd edition Greek New Testament

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

And why?

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever responds again:

Several reasons lead me to that conclusion

1. The quote that I have provided, by three separate sources about the gender, etc. of the Johannie Comma HAS NEVER BEEN REFUTED by another Greek Scholar. We have heard several posters on this thread, with one or two years of Greek under their belt throw stones at it, but I have never seen any of the great champions from the left--those that support the NIV and the Newer versions specifically attack this and blow it out of the water. None of them go there. Why not, if it is bogus as KingJimmy and others have posted here?

Specifically, I have never heard one of the "big guns" from the left address this specific issue:

INTERNAL EVIDENCE::

The structure of the Comma is certainly Johannine in style. John is noted for referring to Christ as "the Word." If 1 John 5:7 were an interpretation of verse eight, as some have suggested, then we would expect the verse to use "Son" instead of "Word." However, the verse uses the Greek word logos, which is uniquely in the style of John and provides evidence of its genuineness. Also, we find John drawing parallels between the Trinity and what they testify (1 John 4:13-14). Therefore, it comes as no surprise to find a parallel of witnesses containing groups of three, one heavenly and one earthly.

The strongest evidence, however, is found in the Greek text itself. Looking at 1 John 5:8, there are three nouns which, in Greek, stand in the neuter (Spirit, water, and blood). However, they are followed by a participle that is masculine. The Greek phrase here is *oi marturomentes* (who bare witness). Those who know the Greek language understand this to be poor grammar if left to stand on its own. Even more noticeably, verse six has the same participle but stands in the neuter (*Gk.: to marturomen*). Why are three neuter nouns supported with a masculine participle? The answer is found if we include verse seven. There we have two masculine nouns (Father and Son) followed by a neuter noun (Spirit). The verse also has the Greek masculine participle *oi marturomentes*. With this clause introducing verse eight, it is very proper for the participle in verse eight to be masculine, because of the masculine nouns in verse seven. But if verse seven were not there it would become improper Greek grammar.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Metzger (a liberal) has tried to discredit the Johannie Comma as follows:

Metzger writes:

"The first and second editions of Erasmus' Greek text did not contain the Comma. It is generally reported that Erasmus promised to include the Comma in his third edition if a single manuscript containing the Comma could be produced. A Franciscan friar named Froy (or Roy) forged a Greek text containing it by translating the Comma from the Latin into Greek. Erasmus was then presented with this falsified manuscript and, being faithful to his word, reluctantly included the Comma in the 1522 edition."

However, as has now been admitted by Dr. Bruce Metzger, this story is a lie (apocryphal) (The Text Of The New Testament, 291), and he had to remove it from all future publications of his book. Metzger also had to note that H. J. de Jonge, a respected specialist on Erasmus, has ESTABLISHED THAT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE OF SUCH EVENTS OCCURRING. Therefore, opponents of the Comma in light of the historical facts should no longer affirm this report--it was NEVER THE TRUTH.

HOWEVER, METZGER never addressed the issue with the neuter, and the masculine, etc. shown above in red. No one from the LEFT has done that, that I am aware of.

Until they (the left and others) address this issue, and stake their credibility on it, and attack it head on, then it continues to be another nail in the coffin of the work of Westcott and Hort, and all of the "newer" versions (NIV, NASB, etc. etc. etc.) that work 24/7 to do anything they can to discredit the King James Version (the Protestant Bible)

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/17 4:16

But Stever,

Metzger aside-- KingJimmy, FOC, and Philologos have plenty of other good points... As much as I want the comma to be Scripture.....

Why is it not in the earliest and majority of the byzantine text form! why!>!?!? **WHY?!?!?** The very "preserved" form that we so adamantly defend! Why not?! How can this be???

Is not the byzantine textform the very text we claim has been sovereignly preserved throughout the centuries? If yes, then why would God not preserve the comma within?

This just doesn't make any sense.

Why did the people debating with the arians never use the comma as a defense for the holy Trinity??

Not only this, but why was it not in erasmus's 1st and 2nd editions? And luthers Bible?

It just doesn't add up, Stever, it really doesn't.

I no longer can believe 1John 5:7 is inspired unless we find it in an ancient manuscript.

Could this be traditionalism seeping in? As great as the KJV is, this "comma" is not in the highly esteemed byzantine greek textform. It is from the minority text, remember... "the corrupted text" :-o

Re:, on: 2006/6/17 4:55

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:
But Stever,

Could this be traditionalism seeping in? As great as the KJV is, this "comma" is not in the highly esteemed byzantine greek textform. It is from the minority text, remember... "the corrupted text" :-o

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever responds:

Not all of the early "minority texts" in Latin were corrupt. They all became truly corrupt after Origen.

Erasmus was quite certain that it was there, and the writings that I posted earlier (the Patristic writings of the early Church Fathers) proves that it was in the letters they wrote to each other.

What other awful thing can you find in the King James? Don't you think that the left would find all kinds of road blocks to throw at it? I think it was KingJimmy who criticized the work of Edward F. Hills (The King James Version Defended) in this thread. He said that his work was of no value because no one took it seriously. The only ones who didn't take it seriously and threw stones at it was the LEFT- THE LIBERALS, that still to this day support the NIV and the newer versions, men like Metzger and others.

If you feel comfortable in reading the byzantine Greek Texts, then please go ahead. There is no basic difference between them and the King James. The same cannot be said about the difference between the Byzantine Greek Texts, and the NIV, NASB, and the "newer versions". There you find nothing but error in all of the newer versions.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/17 5:02

Stever, you didn't answer my main question though,

Quote:
-----Is not the byzantine textform the very text we claim has been sovereignly preserved throughout the centuries? If yes, then why would God not preserve the comma within?

Re:, on: 2006/6/17 5:12

How many times have I answered this? It is a complex issue, with many facets of information, posted over 12 pages on this site. It is not black and white.

1. The writings of the early Church fathers, in the year 250, back-up the johannie comma, as well as the writings of other early church fathers.

"Evidence for the early existence of the Johannine comma is found in the Latin versions and in the writings of the Latin Church Fathers. For example, it seems to have been quoted at Carthage by Cyprian (c. 250) who writes as follows: "And again concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit it is written: and the Three are One." (29) It is true that Facundus, a 6th-century African bishop, interpreted Cyprian as referring to the following verse, (30) but, as Scrivener (1833) remarks, it is "surely safer and more candid" to admit that Cyprian read the Johannine comma in his New Testament manuscript "than to resort to the explanation of Facundus." (31)

The first undisputed citations of the Johannine comma occur in the writing of two 4th-century Spanish bishops, Priscillian, (32) who in 385 was beheaded by the Emperor Maximus on the charge of sorcery and heresy, and Idacius Clarus, (33) Priscillian's principal adversary and accuser. In the 5th century the Johannine comma was quoted by several orthodox African writers to defend the doctrine of the Trinity against the gainsaying of the Vandals, who ruled North Africa from 489 to 534 and were fanatically attached to the Arian heresy. (34) And about the same time it was cited by Cassiodorus (480-570), in Italy. (35) The comma is also found in an Old Latin manuscript of the 5th or 6th century, and in the Speculum, a treatise which contains an Old Latin text. It was not included in Jerome's original edition of the Latin Vulgate but around the year 800 it was taken into the text of the Vulgate from the Old Latin manuscripts. It was found in the great mass of the later Vulgate manuscripts and in the Clementine edition of the Vulgate, the official Bible of the Roman Catholic Church."

The Roman Catholic Church did not start out corrupt, it became corrupt. Erasmus was aware of that, and we should be as well (aware of it). God's Word has been preserved- it can be found in the King James Bible. God preserved His Word through the texts, as well as the writings of the early Church Fathers (Patristics). We have one book, with His inspired Word in it. You won't find it anywhere else. Other's (Luther, Stephens, etc) were not as focused on the Patristics, although Stephens put the comma in, and Luther did not.

God bless,

Steve :-D

Quote:

Combat_Chuck wrote:

Steve, you didn't answer my question though,

Quote:

-----Is not the byzantine textform the very text we claim has been sovereignly preserved throughout the centuries? If yes, then why would God not preserve the comma within?

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/6/17 5:37

But I thought it was your belief that God sovereignly preserved His Word in the Majority Byzantine Textform?

Why is the comma not in the byzantine textform?

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/6/17 8:53

Quote:

The Greek phrase here is oi marturountes (who bare witness). Those who know the Greek language understand this to be poor grammar if left to stand on its own. Even more noticeably, verse six has the same participle but stands in the neuter (Gk.: to marturoun). Why are three neuter nouns supported with a masculine participle? The answer is found if we include verse seven. There we have two masculine nouns (Father and Son) followed by a neuter noun (Spirit). The verse also has the Greek masculine participle oi marturountes. With this clause introducing verse eight, it is very proper for the participle in verse eight to be masculine, because of the masculine nouns in verse seven. But if verse seven were not there it would become improper Greek grammar.

Stever,

How many more times do you have to quote such nonsense? Your quoting these individuals to me only proves they do not understand what they are talking about regarding Greek (not to mention yourself). The participle in this verse cannot in anyway modify anything that comes after it, for it modifies that which precedes it. Participles must agree with all the words they modify in case, number, and gender. Even with the comma insert, the only word that the participle in question could possibly modify in either variant is the word preceding it, "three." For "three" is the subject of the participle "bearing witness," and cannot in anyway be any of the words: water, blood, Spirit, Father, word, etc. Why? Because none of these words agree with the participle in case, number and gender.

I don't know why we keep going through this stuff over and over. Just because you quote the same arguments over and over doesn't make it any more right, and you are only making your case worse by quoting such things, as it plainly appears to me the so-called doctors you keep quoting either have no clue what they are talking about, or are liars attempting to corrupt the word of God.

The more you quote them, the more I am inclined to believe they are deliberately lying. But I'll give them the benefit of the doubt, and assume they just don't know what they are talking about. This is very basic Greek grammar we are talking about.

It's obvious you already have your mind made up on these subject matters. As your conclusion is that if it appears in the text the KJV used to translate from, then it must be genuine, as you believe the TR is the perfectly preserved word of God. Therefore, your conclusions are made up already before you even examine the internal and external evidence, no matter how overwhelming the evidence might be.

Quote:

Until they (the left and others) address this issue, and stake their credibility on it, and attack it head on, then it continues to be another nail in the coffin of the work of Westcott and Hort, and all of the "newer" versions (NIV, NASB, etc. etc. etc.) that work 24/7 to do anything they can to discredit the King James Version (the Protestant Bible)

The problem Steve is that it's not just about Westcott and Hort, Metzger and the like. You can make it about them all you want, and spin all sorts of conspiracy theories and slanderous accusations. But in reality, textual criticism has nothing to do about them.

The great thing about the critical editions of the Greek NT (NA27 & UBS4) is that each scholar can make decisions for themselves based on the internal and external evidences if they agree or not with any variant that they come across. In some textual critical issues I have personally undertaken, I sometimes am in full agreement with the NA27/UBS4 editions. At times though, I disagree with their choices.

It's not simply a matter of saying "Alexandrian vs Byzantine" or "TR vs. NA27." It's about looking at each piece of evidence, and painfully and carefully weighing each bit of evidence. Sometimes simply sorting through any one variant can take a couple hours. Not to mention consulting commentaries and other books that address various textual issues.

I know for a textual issue I had to address in my Interp. of NT class, it took me several hours of being in a library to come to just examine the evidence of an entirely insignificant variant in Mark 11:19. And then only after I chewed on it for a couple days, and actually sat down to write my conclusion did I actually have the issue settled in my mind, in which I decided I preferred one of the variants over what the UBS4 had as its text.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/6/17 9:05

Quote:

I think it was KingJimmy who criticized the work of Edward F. Hills (The King James Version Defended) in this thread. He said that his work was of no value because no one took it seriously. The only ones who didn't take it seriously and threw stones at it was the LEFT- THE LIBERALS, that still to this day support the NIV and the newer versions, men like Metzger and others.

I did not say such Steve. I said the reason nobody probably took his work seriously is because imo, he seemed to be displaying absolutely poor scholarship, not being able to talk about even the most basic issues of grammar. I mean, when you can't tell the difference between a word that is clearly neuter, and say it's a masculine instead, one has some serious issues.

If one displays such ignorance, no wonder scholars don't even mention Hill, as they might as well be quoting you and your internet posts. I know if I came across a so-called scholar who couldn't even seem to talk about the most basic issues of Greek grammar, I know I would probably ignore whatever he said, and write him off as having nothing of any value to contribute to scholarship.

Stop demonizing everybody who ignores your scholars as far left liberals. Such is the furthest from the truth. I have plenty of conservative books on textual criticism on my bookshelf, and none of them seem to ever mention in their indexes any of the guys you quote from. There is probably a good reason for this, and it's no conspiracy, as a lot of these books are simply survey level books, looking to introduce readers to a very wide spectrum of scholarship, ultra conservative, ultra liberal, and everything in between.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/6/17 11:37

What a pathetic display this has become. An endless debate without charity, without consideration, without any conclusion or resolution in mind ...

And all over what amounts to the most secondary of matters ...

It is being locked.

If it needs any other reason why, take Ravenhill's words to heart...

"because you stink with pride that's why"