

Comparing Some Disputed Verses in the Ancient *English Versions of the New Testament*

Namely,

John 1:14, 1:18, Acts 20:28, I Tim. 3:16 and I John 5:7

I have not used translations *only* from the Textus Receptus, but also the Latin Vulgate of Jerome, and Wycliffe's mixed Latin text. *Please note the distinctions between the Jerome of 435 and the Wycliffe Translation many incorrectly say came from Jerome's Vulgate. Wycliffe did not use the 435 edition of Jerome.* He did use a *corrected or mixed translation* perhaps from Jerome or perhaps not. We can note this by comparing some of these translations. Many times the historic dissenters would adopt Jerome and then correct it by the Old Latin. That is what I mean when I say a mixed text. Others mean a text that contained part of the N T from the Old Latin and part from Jerome's Vulgate with no corrections in the texts. I find it very interesting to compare Jerome and Wycliffe.

The Ancient Latin of Wycliffe

By comparing Jerome's Vulgate with Wycliffe's Translation you will note that John Wycliffe and his followers used the true and proper Latin text in most cases while Jerome did not in 435. This brings an interesting question: *from where did Wycliffe and his friends secure their Latin Text?* It had the true and proper verses in it that agree in Christology and theology mostly with the Textus Receptus while the Jerome of 435 agreed mostly with Origen and Eusebius' corrupted Gnostic texts.

In my opinion the Wycliffe Latin came from the older and pure Italic texts that Priscillian, Patrick and the Monks of Bangor used. It cost them all their lives to deny the corrupted Gnostic-Origen, Constantine-Eusebius bibles.

My sources for these translations is this site:

<http://www.geocities.com/onlinebibletranslations/>

John 1:14

The Geneva Bible (1587) TR

And that Word was made flesh, and dwelt among vs, (and we sawe the glorie thereof, as the glorie of the onely begotten Sonne of the Father) full of grace and trueth.

Tyndale New Testament (1526) TR

And the worde was made flesshe and dwelt amonge vs and we sawe the glory of it as the glory of the only begotten sonne of ye father which worde was full of grace and verite.

The Wycliffe Bible (1395) Old Latin or Mixed

And the word was maad man, and dwellyde among vs, and we han seyn the glorie of hym, as the glorie of the `oon bigetun sone of the fadir, ful of grace and of treuthe.

The Latin Vulgate (425) Corrupted Texts of Origen-Eusebius

et Verbum caro factum est et habitavit in nobis et vidimus gloriam eius gloriam quasi unigeniti a Patre plenum gratiae et veritatis (Please note that Jerome did say only begotten son, but only begotten. See his translation on John 1:18, where he did include the term Filius, son. This is just one reason why our forefathers often rejected these corrupted Latin texts that Jerome used, REP)

The Bishop's Bible (1568) TR

And the same word became fleshe, and dwelt among vs (and we sawe the glory of it, as the glory of the only begotten sonne of the father) full of grace and trueth.

Miles Coverdale Bible (1535) TR

And the worde became flesh, and dwelt amonge vs: and we sawe his glory, a glory as of the onely begotte sonne of the father, full of grace and trueth.

King James Version (1611) TR

And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among vs (& we beheld his glory, the glory as of the onely begotten of the Father) full of grace and trueth.

John 1:18

The Geneva Bible (1587)

No man hath seene God at any time: that onely begotten Sonne, which is in the bosome of the Father, he hath declared him.

Tyndale New Testament (1526)

No man hath sene God at any tyme. The only begotte sonne which is in ye bosome of ye father he hath declared him.

The Wycliffe Bible (1395)

No man sai euer God, no but the `oon bigetun sone, that is in the bosum of the fadir, he hath teld out.

The Latin Vulgate (425)

Deum nemo vidit umquam unigenitus Filius qui est in sinu Patris ipse enarravit **(It is strange here that Jerome *did not* follow Origen's corruptions, but used the word SON or Filius REP)**

The Bishop's Bible (1568)

No man hath seene God at any tyme: The onely begotten sonne which is in the bosome of the father, he hath declared hym.

Miles Coverdale Bible (1535)

No man hath sene God at any tyme. The onely begotte sonne which is in the bosome of the father, he hath declared the same vnto vs.

King James Version (1611)

No man hath seene God at any time: the onely begotten Sonne, which is in the bosome of the Father, he hath declared him.

1 Timothy 3:16

The Geneva Bible (1587)

And without controuersie, great is the mysterie of godlinesse, which is, God is manifested in the flesh, iustified in the Spirit, seene of Angels, preached vnto the Gentiles, beleued on in the world, and receiued vp in glorie.

Tyndale New Testament (1526)

And with out naye great is that mistery of godlines: God was shewed in the flesshe was iustified in the sprete was sene of angels was preached vnto the gentylys was beleued on in erth and receaved vp in glory.

The Wycliffe Bible (1395)

And opynli it is a greet sacrament of pitee, that thing that was schewid in fleisch, it is iustified in spirit, it apperid to aungels, it is prechid to hethene men, it is bileuyd in the world, it is takun vp in glorie. (Here Wycliffe is disappointing, REP)

The Latin Vulgate (425)

et manifeste magnum est pietatis sacramentum quod manifestatum est in carne iustificatum est in spiritu apparuit angelis praedicatum est gentibus creditum est in mundo adsumptum est in gloria (Once again Jerome shows his corrupted original text, he left out the word Deus, God, again a reason why many of our forefathers rejected Jerome, REP)

The Bishop's Bible (1568)

And without doubt, great is that misterie of godlynesse: God was shewed in the flesshe, was iustified in the spirite, was seene among the angels, was preached vnto the gentiles, was beleued on in the worlde, and was receaued vp in glorie.

Miles Coverdale Bible (1535)

and without naye, greate is that mystery of godlynes. God was shewed in the flesh: was iustified in the sprete: was sene of angels: was preached vnto the Heythen: was beleued on in the worlde: was receaued vp in glory.

King James Version (1611)

And without controuersie, great is the misterie of godlinessse: God was manifest in the flesh, iustified in the Spirit, seene of Angels, preached vnto the Gentiles, beleued on in the world, receiued vp into glory.

1 John 5:7 (Please note that 1 John 5:7 is a Trinitarian issue and not a Christology issue, though we have included it here. REP)

The Geneva Bible (1587)

For there are three, which beare recorde in heauen, the Father, the Worde, and the holy Ghost: and these three are one.

Tyndale New Testament (1526)

(For ther are thre which beare recorde in heuen the father the worde and the wholly goost. And these thre are one)

The Wycliffe Bible (1395)

For thre ben, that yyuen witnessing in heuene, the Fadir, the Sone, and the Hooli Goost; and these thre ben oon.

The Latin Vulgate (425)

quia tres sunt qui testimonium dant (Jerome's omission is striking here, another reason why many of our forefathers rejected Jerome, REP)

The Bishop's Bible (1568)

For there are three which beare recorde in heauen, the father, the worde, and the holy ghost, and these three are one.

Miles Coverdale Bible (1535)

(For there are thre which beare recorde in heauen: the father, the worde, and the holy goost, & these thre are one.)

King James Version (1611)

For there are three that beare record in heauen, the Father, the Word, and the holy Ghost: and these three are one.

I find it interesting that Wycliffe agreed with the old Latin Bible of the dissenters, against Jerome and the Origen-Eusebius corruptions *in all but one instance* I Tim. 3:16. Perhaps I am missing something with Wycliffe's translation of I Tim. 3:16, but don't think so.

The Authorized Version of 1611 followed the earlier English Versions from the Byzantine Texts or the TR, through the Latin. Wycliffe nearly did always, but Jerome hardly ever did. Jerome and Wycliffe agree in I Tim. 3:16 but not in the other places.

Let me also point out that Jerome *refused to use* the Lucian-Antiochian-Byzantine texts because he said they added too much to the original Greek Manuscripts. Now we can see why!