

# The Christology of the King James Version

*In*

Distinction

From the Christology of the  
So-Called Better Manuscripts of Westcott  
and Hort

*Being a Comparative Investigation into the Textus  
Receptus and its Christology in Distinction from the  
Westcott-Hort Polluted Texts and Their Downgrader  
Mythological Christology*

*Displaying some Reasons for Rejecting the  
Constantine-Eusebius Family of Polluted Texts and their  
Nicenian Downgrader Mythological Christology*

He (Tischendorf REP) received the primary sources, *containing the complete New Testament* as well as two apocryphal books. Neither Codex Vaticanus, nor Codex Alexandrinus had the full text of the New Testament. Moreover, *the manuscript turned out to be older than the two codices known before!* The discovery contained the majority of the Old Testament books and also The Epistle.

Tischendorf was congratulated on his success by European monarchs *and the Pope himself*. He was granted hereditary nobility in Russia.

*by*

*More than One*

Isa 59:21 *As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the LORD; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the LORD, from henceforth and for ever.*

18 No man hath seen God at any time; *the only begotten Son*, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*. King James Version from the Greek Textus Receptus

18 θεον ουδεις εωρακεν πωποτε μονογενης θεος ο ων εις τον κολπον του πατρος εκεινος εξηγησατο Westcott-Hort Corruption, *only begotten God*;

18 אלהא לא חזא אנש ממתום יחידיא אלהא הו דאיתוהי בעובא דאבוהי הו אשתעי 18 Peshitta, Syrian, Based upon the corrupted Constantine-Eusebius text, *only Begotten Elohem (God)*;

18 θεον ουδεις εωρακεν πωποτε ο μονογενης υιος ο ων εις τον κολπον του πατρος εκεινος εξηγησατο; Greek Textus Receptus; the only Begotten Son

18 Deum nemo vidit umquam *unigenitus Filius* qui est in sinu Patris illi exposuit. Bezae Latin Received Text; only begotten son.

#### Section IV.

119 No man hath seen God at any time; the only *Son*, God,<sup>23</sup> which is in the bosom of his Father, he hath told of *him*.

The Diatessaron of Tatian, about A.D. 170.

<http://www.gnosis.org/library/fragh.htm>

Fragment 3, on John 1:18 The words, "No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known." (John 1:18), were spoken, not by the Baptist, but by the disciple.

Here is an enlarged quote from this commentary on John by the Gnostic writer, Heracleon, a disciple of Valentius formerly of Rome.

#### Fragments from a Commentary on the Gospel of John by Heracleon

*Fragments preserved in Origen's Commentary on John:*

Fragment 1, on John 1:3 (In John 1:3, "All things were made through him, and without him nothing was made.") The sentence: "All things were made through him" means the world and what is in it. It excludes what is better than the world. The Aeon (i.e. the Fullness), and the things in it, were not made by the Word; they came into existence before the Word. . . "Without him, nothing was made" of what is in the world and the creation. . . "All things were made through Him," means that it was the Word who caused the Craftsman (*Demiurge*) to make the world, that is it was not the Word "from whom" or "by whom," but the one "through whom (all things were made)". . . It was not the Word who made all things, as if he were energized by another, for "through whom" means that another made them and the Word provided the energy.

Fragment 2, on John 1:4 In the saying, "What was made in him was Life" (John 1:4), 'in him' means 'for spiritual people.' For he (the Word) provided them with their first form at their birth, in that what had been sown by another he brought to form, illumination and into an outline of its own, and set it forth.

Fragment 3, on John 1:18 The words, "No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known." (John 1:18), were spoken, not by the Baptist, but by the disciple. Fragment 4, on John 1:21 (In John 1:21, "And they asked him, 'What then? Are you Elijah?' He said, 'I am not.' 'Are you the prophet?' And he answered, 'No.')

<http://www.gnosis.org/library/fragh.htm>

Here is an enlarged quote from this commentary on John by the Gnostic writer, Heracleon, a disciple of Valentius formerly of Rome.

### Fragments from a Commentary on the Gospel of John by Heracleon

*Fragments preserved in Origen's Commentary on John:*

Fragment 1, on John 1:3 (In John 1:3, "All things were made through him, and without him nothing was made.") The sentence: "All things were made through him" means the world and what is in it. It excludes what is better than the world. The Aeon (i.e. the Fullness), and the things in it, were not made by the Word; they came into existence before the Word. . . "Without him, nothing was made" of what is in the world and the creation. . . "All things were made through Him," means that it was the Word who caused the Craftsman (*Demiurge*) to make the world, that is it was not the Word "from whom" or "by whom," but the one "through whom (all things were made)." . . It was not the Word who made all things, as if he were energized by another, for "through whom" means that another made them and the Word provided the energy.

Fragment 2, on John 1:4 In the saying, "What was made in him was Life" (John 1:4), 'in him' means 'for spiritual people.' For he (the Word) provided them with their first form at their birth, in that what had been sown by another he brought to form, illumination and into an outline of its own, and set it forth.

Fragment 3, on John 1:18 The words, "No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known." (John 1:18), were spoken, not by the Baptist, but by the disciple. Fragment 4, on John 1:21 (In John 1:21, "And they asked him, 'What then? Are you Elijah?' He said, 'I am not.' 'Are you the prophet?' And he answered, 'No.')

The first known Gospel commentary was a commentary on the Gospel of John written around 170 AD. It was authored by a prominent Gnostic Christian and disciple of Valentinus, Heracleon. Heracleon was one of the most important Biblical exegetes of his day. His writings were carefully read by orthodox theologians such as Origen and Clement of Alexandria. (From the same Gnostic source site as I have already given. REP)

Note how that both Origen, originally of Alexandria then Caesarea, and then Clement of Alexandria, preserved these ancient Gnostic writings. These men had strong Gnostic roots, while the Gnostics received much from Justin Martyr who was the first Christian writer I have found who taught the *Begotten God* concept. However, the Gnostics did not use the *Only Begotten God* text, and Origen used both and his later disciple, Eusebius of

Caesarea, the historian and developer of Constantine's new Bibles, made *the Begotten God* concept into official law in the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles for the Holy Roman Empire.

Strange is the background of the Westcott-Hort text. See the work entitled *New Age Bible Versions*.

Also surf the www and find the site dealing with the Ghostly Guild (?).

# **Table of Contents**

**Some Very Interesting Statements**

**Introduction A- The Historical Succession of the Ancient Texts unto the Present**

**Introduction B- The Theological Introduction**

**Introduction C- The So-Called Disputed Passages and the Major Disputed Passage, John 1:18**

**The General Introduction**

**Chapter 1 Stating the Issue**

**Chapter 2 Origin of the Begotten God Concept**

**Chapter 3 Old Syriac**

**Chapter 4 Old Italic**

**Chapter 5 Codex Sinaiticus**

**Chapter 6 Codex Vaticanus**

**Chapter 7 Codex Alexandrinus**

**Chapter 8 Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus**

**Chapter 9 Origin of the “Holy Catholic Church”**

**Chapter 10 Constantine-Eusebius Bibles**

**Chapter 11 Priscilianists**

**Chapter 12 Southern France**

**Chapter 13 John 1:18 in the King James Version of the Bible**

**Chapter 14 The Nature of Christ’s Deity**

**Chapter 15 Exposing the Mythology of the Westcott- Hort Bibles**

**Chapter 16 Exposing the Tractarianism Movement**

**Chapter 17 Exposing the Oxford Movement During the Downgrader Era**

**Chapter 18 Standing Firm on the King James Christology**

**Conclusion The Biblical Trinity and Christology with Supporting Texts**

## Some Very Interesting Statements

Concerning the Sinaiticus;

He (Tischendorf REP) received the primary sources, *containing the complete New Testament* as well as two apocryphal books. Neither Codex Vaticanus, nor Codex Alexandrinus had the full text of the New Testament. Moreover, *the manuscript turned out to be older than the two codices known before!* The discovery contained the majority of the Old Testament books and also The Epistle.

Tischendorf was congratulated on his success by European monarchs *and the Pope himself.* He was granted hereditary nobility in Russia.

The most important contribution of the scientist is the comparison of four manuscripts: Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Peresianus and Codex Vaticanus. By doing so Tischendorf *proved that the New Testament of the modern Bible reached present time in its true value.* However, *the Ecumenical Council at Nicea had already approved the Canonical Gospels by that time.* That is why it did not lead to any disturbance of the apologists of Christianity. [http://www.aramaicpeshitta.com/old\\_syriac.htm](http://www.aramaicpeshitta.com/old_syriac.htm)

Question 1, since no one has the first Greek texts how did Tischendorf prove this? Hum, I wonder?

Question 2, since there are no original Greek New Testament Greek Texts how did the Nicea Council know which Canonical Gospels to approve?

Is not such an unfounded statement the result of *egotistical assumption* rather than *scientific evaluation*? Should we not conclude that men like Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and even Constantine and Eusebius, tried to assume Pope like power in giving us their idea of the Original Greek New Testament?

It would seem that if we are going to say that the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles represented the entire Greek New Testament in its original form, then we should have a role model by which to measure all Text Canons? *No original role model exists. The issue is a faith issue, not a scientific issue. What Think Ye of Christ? Is He a Begotten God, or a Self-Existent Divine Being?*

Do we believe in the *Divine Inspiration* of the Original Words of God, and if we do, do we also believe in the *Divine Preservation* of the Original Words of God? The answer to both of these questions should be **YES!** Will you be shocked to realize that the majority of those who promote the Constantine-Eusebius or Westcott-Hort Bibles really do not believe in the *Inspiration of the Original Words of God and their Divine Preservation?*

Isa 59:21 **As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the LORD; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the LORD, from henceforth and for ever.**

Mt 24:35 **Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.**

## Historical Introduction

As we enter into the maze of issues surrounding the *Which Bible* controversy, we encounter many different and strange people with very unusual opinions. Perhaps the strangest are those who follow the Oxford movement's Westcott-Hort texts. They tell us *strange, odd and curious things* like we should reject the historic Textus Receptus and the wonderful King James Version because their Bible is from better and is a more reliable text. They tell us that their texts more closely resemble the original Greek manuscripts. We find this strange because there are no ancient and original Greek Manuscripts so how do they know they have superior and better texts that more closely resemble the originals?

### Are the WH Texts Better and More Reliable

Do the Westcott-Hort Textual families provide better and more reliable manuscripts? *I do not believe so.* In fact, I consider them among the worst of all the Greek texts used in the *Which Bible* controversy. How do I arrive at that conclusion? I have come to this conclusion not by comparing some large data banks with or against each other. But, rather, by noting the texts *that more glorify Jesus Christ in the fullness of His complex person*, His Divine and Manly natures.

2Jo 1:9 *Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.*

2Jo 1:10 *If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed:*

When we evaluate the Which Bible controversy by the texts that best glorify Jesus Christ, there is no doubt which Bible we should be using, the Textus Receptus and the old reliable King James Version. I am not a King James onlyist, but I am a Textus Receptus onlyist, in both the ancient old Italic and the Greek textual families.

### Consulting the Disputed Texts

As we consult the so-called disputed passages, those contained in the TR and those omitted in the W-H textual family, most of the time we really do not get the entire overview of the question *because the most disputed text in earliest times is not even involved in the discussions.* This is John 1:18. Very few textual historians and critics in our generation even know that the W-H texts render John 1:18 incorrectly. The W-H texts teach that Jesus is *a begotten god* in His deity. The King James Version teaches that He is a *begotten son*. Compare John 1:18 and then ask yourself this question: Is Jesus a begotten God, and therefore not self-existent and equal with the Father, or His He a Begotten Son? It is that simple.

### Position of this Treatise

This treatise investigates this simple question by looking at it from many different sources. *In His Divine Nature, as God the Word, our Lord Jesus Christ is a self-existent Divine Being and Immutable.* However, this is not the Christology presented in the Westcott-Hort Textual families. They have the *begotten god* verse in their textual families *for a reason.* Their text contains this to validate the Nicene Creed.

This small treatise explains why this has been done. As late as the final decade of the 1800s Bible scholars were well aware of the disputes and history of the controversy over John 1:18. But due to several reasons this is not true in our age. To give a very good overview of this question please consult Dean Burgon's classic work, *The Causes of the*

*Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, and read carefully his treatment of John 1:18 in its historical overview.

## Greek Mythology

The begotten god concept comes from Greek mythology. In brief I here will give an historical account of how and why the *begotten god* concept is in the W-H textual families. The deciding factor in the Which Bible issue is simply this, as is true of all other issues and questions, **WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?**

## The Existence of Several Problems

I freely and openly grant and admit that there are several problems no matter which side of the controversy we take. The reasons for this are complex, but we can sort them out and come to some basic conclusions. In these next few pages of this historical introduction, I shall attempt to do that.

## Not About the Trinity Controversy

Before doing that let me note that this treatise is not about the Trinity, or the well beloved proper text of the *Three Heavenly Witness in I John 5:7*, found in the King James and Textus Receptus manuscripts, both Greek and old Latin, but rather it deals with Christology. Properly speaking very few of the early writers whom the Catholics have allowed to pass through to us, were what we would call *Biblical Trinitarians*. They have been a mixture of Bini-tarians, Nicenists, Sabellians or Semi-Arians. In most colleges and seminaries Sabellianism or Modalism is the standard definition for the Trinity. I am not going to deal with this issue, but suggest interested students secure Brother Michael Maynard's matchless and exhaustive treatment of this issue in his accurate work entitled *The Debate Over I John 5:7-8*.

## A Brief Overview

I will now present a brief overview of how the *Begotten God text* has become so popular in our modern, but corrupted Bibles of Christianity. This is a brief plea for the true and proper usage of *the historic Latin or Old Italic text* and its influence upon our blessed King James Version of the Bible.

## Epic Events

There are several important epic events in the history of our Bibles and these have all influenced the controversy over John 1:18. I will now give some of these.

*The Destruction of Jerusalem* played a very important part in the overview of textual history. As the Romans surrounded Jerusalem ready to overtake it, Christians fled to many places taking their prized Sacred Manuscripts with them. Various Jewish groups fled to the Mountains taking their various Sacred Texts with them. Many Christians went to Antioch and formed the Gentile Church there. The Gentile Church at Antioch became a center for Christian learning and proper Biblical translations.

## Antiochian Translations

*Translations from Antioch* are important factors in the *Which Bible* controversy. Yes, as always, there are questions dealing with this, but no more than any other part of the history of Biblical manuscripts. Contemporary evidence is pointing to the importance of the Antioch Church in translating the two oldest Biblical textual families that we yet know about, *the old Syrian and the old Italic*. The Gentiles Christians, most probably from Antioch, completed these translations by about 150 AD. I deal with this largely in each respective chapter.

## The Old Syrian

Before long the Old Syrian text became corrupted and passed from our question. What we have today are old Syrian Texts that have been *made to conform* to the Bibles of Constantine-Eusebius. This is all that we need to say about the Old Syrian texts. It matters not if we deal with the Old Syrian or the Peshitta texts. The result is still the same.

## The Old Italic

The Old Italic texts *did not* meet with the same end as the old Syrian Texts. As the Old Italic texts passed from Antioch into Northern Africa and then into the Western parts of the Roman Empire, they soon reached Rome and gradually replaced the Greek Texts even used at Rome.

## Attempted Corruptions

In the process of time both the so-called Orthodox and the so-called heretics tried to corrupt these old manuscripts. The hotbeds for this corruption were Alexandria, Egypt and Palestine. In its earliest stages the old Latin escaped these corruptions and we have proof in the Ante-Fathers citing of the old texts that the Latin Fathers, as they were called, used the same textual family as many of the Greek Fathers did. This shows the early passing of the original Greek into the Old Italic Texts. By using the Ante-Nicene Fathers we can almost produce the entire texts of the Old Greek and Latin Bibles of that era. God has preserved His Inspired Words by this means.

## Justin Martyr

When Justin Martyr debated with the Jew, Trypho, he used a Greek text *that we do not have today*, except in these early writings. In this debate Justin used many passages from the Psalms that are only known to us by the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers.

## Tertullian and Cyprian

However, this same Greek text went into Latin and when men such as Tertullian and Cyprian, Latin writers, *debated their views of the Trinity*, they cited the Latin version of this mother Greek text that Justin used. We can note this by comparing these writings from Justin, Tertullian and Cyprian.

## Pagan Persecutions

*Roman Pagan Persecutions* also played a very important part in the destruction of the early Greek manuscripts. By reading early Church Historians such as Eusebius we can see how that the Romans murdered early Christians and burned down their meeting houses. Often the Romans placed as many Biblical texts as they could find in these fires. Church houses burned with their precious Bible texts in the same fires. This produces a severe shortage of the Greek Manuscripts. This shortage was overcome different ways. One was to use the old Latin texts to reproduce the Greek texts. Another was to bring secret texts out of hiding and copy them. In this process errors occurred. The early writers such as Origin and others often complained about the errors and careless manner of the copyists. Yet, the process went on.

## In the Western World

In the Western world faithful Christians secured the Old Italic texts and guarded them with their very lives. They trusted faithful men and women to copy and circulate these old texts. In the process of time another epic occurred. I will now deal with it in brief.

## Jerome-Lucian

The Roman Catholic Bishop at Rome commissioned Jerome to produce a uniform Latin Text. This is much like Constantine and Eusebius and the Greek Texts nearly a century before. *Jerome complained about this and tried to be a good martyr and did what he considered his best.* He had *an agenda* and sought to discredit the Greek texts from Antioch under the leadership of the pre-Arian scholar, Lucian. According to Jerome these Antiochian texts were too polluted to be used in any way. This widened the gap between the Antiochian and the Alexandrian-Palestine texts that Jerome would use to help in his formation of the best and most favorable Latin text *he wanted to produce.* But in this process he encountered the ire of yet another scholar in Northern Africa, Augustine.

## Augustine-Jerome

Augustine used the Antiochian texts. These two men fought back and forth over the texts they used. They each accused the other of using corrupted texts. Jerome won out and his Latin Bible soon became the official text of Constantine's new church in the Western World. Augustine would not use the Jerome Bible.

## Jerome's Followers and Forced Biblical Conformity

This produced the following result, after Jerome died, his devoted followers went everywhere trying to find all the old Italic texts they could find and then forced them to conform to Jerome's new Bible. This process went before in Syrian and then again in the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles. This would mean that the old Syrian, the old Greek and the Old Latin texts would receive *special forced support* by evil men with evil agendas as their motives. They would try to make the existing older texts conform to the newer Bibles of their teachers.

## The Dissenters

Another epic in this conflict is the *attitude of the Dissenters.* Christ Jesus preserved His older texts and His pure word mainly *among the Dissenters and their Old Italic Texts.* These Dissenters *would not use* the corrupted texts of Rome, but used their older texts. The only times that both texts united was when the newer version of Jerome did not contradict with the older Italic texts. An example of this is the older Albigensian Bibles in southern France. I show this in the proper chapter.

## Dissenters and their Nonconformity

Dissenting Christians not did believe in the Nicene Creed, they did not conform to the Catholic Church and they rejected the Bibles of Constantine-Eusebius. This even cost many their lives, but they did not waver in their faith and allegiance to Jesus Christ and the old texts. Many of the establish Imperialists often *lied* about the dissenters and tried to *distort* them and their views, and make them into the worst heretics and most evil men and women that that they could.

## Priscillian

Priscillian is an example of this. Let me briefly note that He used an old Italic version that contained many, if not all of the disputed texts. He *refused to conform* to Constantine's *new church, his new creed or use his new Bibles.* Please remember these are the same Bibles that Westcott and Hort reproduced. He became the first Christian that Constantine's new church murdered. Of course, the Imperial ministers *lied about him* and tried to *represent him as the worst heretic they could.* However, the Lord God preserved many of his works and they show that he was not what the Imperials made him out to be. He used

the old Italic Text that contained the true and proper I John 5:7, and other disputed passages. This occurred near 385 AD in Spain. I have a chapter covering these events.

### Southern France

Dissenting believers maintained the old Italic texts. Southern France became a seed ground for the free distribution of the old Italic. Many used the ancient old Italic Text and went into others parts of Europe, even reaching England and Wales, carrying the true gospel and the true old texts with them. Often times when Jerome's Bible agreed with the Old Italic, it was joined with the Old Italic to form one united Text.

### Other Usages of the Old Italic

The old Italic surfaced in the TEPL CODEX. The Old Italic was the foundational text for the pre-Luther German Bible and was used to help produce the old French and the old Waldensian Bibles and many others. Perhaps even Peter Waldo used this text as he and his friends produced countless translations for the common people as far east as the Baltic States.

### The Protestant Reformation

The Protestant Reformation became the next major epic event favorable to the Bible of the Dissenters. Many freedom loving dissenters continued to use the Old Italic. Interest in the ancient Greek language and texts arose. These old texts had almost vanished from the Western world under the stranglehold of the papacy and the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles. During the Protestant Reformation several men refused to use the Papal Bible. They wanted a more Christ honoring text. They produced the Textus Receptus in several different forms. This is no different from the other textual families. They all have variants and different textual forms.

### Producing the Textus Receptus

Some dissenting scholars started gathering many of the old Greek texts and comparing them with the old Italic. The result was the *Greek Textus Receptus*. I readily admit there are many problems in the Textus Receptus just as in other textual families. There are many variants, even many thousands. The enemies of the TR have well supplied the various data banks with TR variants and apparent contradictions. *However, these variants do not affect the theology and Christology of the Textus Receptus.* The W-H texts try to present, alter, and change the teaching about the very nature of Christ in His deity. They try to present Christ as a *Begotten God*. All the variants and problems in the TR do not present Christ in a downgrader manner in any way. In fact such places as John 1:18, Acts 20:28, and I Tim. 3:15-16, are upgrading to Jesus Christ and His deity and manhood in the TR. *This cannot be said about the W-H texts.* They *downgrade Jesus Christ* and seek to present Him in a much different light than the old Italic texts and the Greek T R textual families do.

### The Early English Translations

The early English Translations from the Textus Receptus maintained a true testimony to Jesus Christ, His deity, His Sonship and His Blood. These are the Tyndale Bible, the Bishops Bible, the Geneva Bible and of course the King James Bible. These translators studied and used several older and historic textual families, including the old Italic, to produce their respective versions. *They produced Christ honoring versions that respect Christ's true Deity, His Sonship and His blood.*

### Are they Really Better Texts?

So, are the W-H texts really better texts? How can they be when they down grade Jesus Christ and seek to *represent Him as a Begotten God*? They try to deny that His very blood is the *Blood of God* and keep us from reading that *He is God manifested in the flesh*. This is all done by *pretending* that they are better texts. I think not.

#### Conclusion to this Chapter

I conclude by saying when we measure the differing textual families by their Christology, the TR, and the King James Version are by far the superior texts. Jesus Christ is *not a begotten God* and He certainly *was and is God manifested in the flesh* and His *very blood, by union with God the self-existent Word*, is the very *blood of God*. We cannot submit to anything less.

***Finish to this Introduction***

## Theological Introduction

In the area of textual criticism we can never decide which Bible to use by human reasoning. We must be taught of God as to which is the true and proper Inspired Word of God. This teaching comes concerning our Lord Jesus Christ and His glories.

1Jo 2:20 But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.

Matt. 16:16 And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

17 And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed *it* unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.

I Cor. 2:7 But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, *even* the hidden *wisdom*, which God ordained before the world unto our glory:

8 Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known *it*, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

9 But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.

10 But God hath revealed *them* unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.

11 For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.

12 Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

13 Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

14 But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned.

15 But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man.

I am not suggesting that persons are reprobates who do not hold to the TR and KJV, but I do suggest that when a person is presented the truth about the glories of Jesus Christ and His essential Being, and then rejects these glories and truths ***IN A FINAL AND TOTAL MANNER***, this is not a sign of a true follower of Jesus Christ. By their fruits ye shall know them.

Matt. 7:21 Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.

22 Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?

23 And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

### Divine Equality

We must understand some basic theological and Christological fundamentals in our studies in order to arrive at a proper conclusion in the ***Which Bible*** controversy. Let me go over some of these and then I shall make some important deductions.

First, Jesus taught us about His Divine Equality with the Father. He said:

John 5:22 For the Father judges no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:

23 That all *men* should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honors not the Son honors not the Father which hath sent him.

One result of the Father's bestowing the Mediatorial Judgeship unto Jesus Christ is to *manifest* Divine Equality between the Father and the Son. Yes, I know about the Father's monarchical superiority over the Son, but this is not in His *Divine essence* but only in His office works in the Covenant of Redemption. The Father is superior or greater to Christ and is Christ's Head, *only in Christ's sacred Manhood in relationship to His office and work as the God-Man Mediator*. In the *Divine essence* the Father is not greater, because they Three are One in the same essential divine essence. *Therefore no Divine Being is greater than any other Divine Being*.

### Honoring the Son as We Honor the Father in the Divine Essence

Christ taught the doctrine of Equality between the Father and the Son. This did not pertain to His manhood, *but to His divine essence as the God-Man Mediator*.

Phil. 2:5 Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus:

6 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:

Let me ask some questions:

1. Is the Father *self-existent and immutable* or did He have a *Divine Origin* from the mind of the eternal Divine Essence?
2. Is the Father of Himself, *ingenerate and uncreated*?

Since we believe in the *Divine Equality of the One Divine Essence*, how can we affirm the above two axioms to the Father alone and not God the Eternal Word, and to God the Holy Spirit? *We cannot*. The Three are One in the Divine Essence or Godhead.

### The Equal and Common Divine Attributes

The One Divine Essence contains the *same* Divine Attributes *equally* in the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit. The Son has these *same equal Divine Attributes because of His Personal Union with God the Eternal Word*. He has them in His *essential Deity*, not in His *essential manhood*. As God the Eternal Word He possesses the same attributes of *self-existence and immutability* as the Father and Holy Spirit do. *The fullness of the Godhead abides in Christ Jesus*, not just a part of it.

Col 2:9 For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

### Self Existent and Immutable Attributes

Since the Father is both *self-existent and immutable* so is the Son in His essential Divine Being as God the Word. Since the Father is of Himself, *ingenerate*, so is the Son in His essential Divine Being. As the Father is *uncreated* even so is God the Son in His essential Divine Being. Whatever we say about God the Father *in His Attributes we must also say about the Son in His essential Deity as God the Word, and about God the Holy Spirit*. If this is not so, then the Divine Beings in the Trinity Each *do not possess the same Divine Essence*. We distinguish between the Beings in the Trinity, NOT BY THEIR LACKING OF ANY DIVINE ATTRIBUTES, BUT BY THEIR RELATIVE PROPERTIES.

## Does the Father Alone Possess all the Divine Attributes?

If we distinguish the Beings in the Trinity by their attributes and not by their relative properties it would mean that the Father alone possesses the fullness of the Divine *attributes* of the One Divine Essence. *Therefore the Holy Trinity is not a Trinity in equality at all*, but is really a *Unitarian* existence with two lesser Divine Beings. This is what Nicenism is founded upon and then proceeds into the successive gods dogma. If *they are not a Trinity in Equality* then they are not a Trinity in Oneness. These lesser Divine Beings are *not of themselves*, they *are not self-existent* and *they are not immutable, so we are being told*. Nicenism teaches that these two lesser Beings, the Divine Word or Son in hypostatic Union, and the Holy Spirit, have fewer Divine Attributes than the Father. According to *Nicenism They are not self-existent and immutable*. Who wants to affirm the above except a Monotheist? Only a true Unitarian would affirm such a position openly.

### No Monotheism

Please note I said *openly*. Others, by default, do affirm Monotheism without being aware of it. Some are aware of it and try to conceal it, but in the end, it is the same, *they do not honor the Son as they honor the Father*. Is it not becoming more clear as to why some Bibles leave out the true and proper I John 5:7 and 8? But, the same also may be said for the true and proper John 1:18, Acts 20:28, and I Tim. 3:16.

### Concealed Arianism

What I am saying is this, that in the final analysis the Nicenian Creed is nothing more than *concealed Arianism*. This will be my next point. Please understand the distinction between what is professed in Arianism and what is professed in Nicenism. Arians say that Christ is *not a generated God but a created God*. Nicenists say that Christ is *not a created God but a generated God*. Nicenists then produced their own version of John 1:18 to try to prove that Christ is the *only begotten God*.

### Constantine and the Arian-Nicenist Controversy

Sometime near the beginning of the fourth century, Constantine had a *questionable converting vision*. He then proceeded to unite the Pagan Roman Empire with his version of professed Christianity. He grew tired of the Arian Conflict and ordered his Imperial Bishops to come to a proper conclusion. In time, they did so. They produced the Nicenian Creed of Begotten and Proceeding Divine Beings, *the Begotten God position*. Being happy with this conclusion, Constantine then had a new church and a new Creed. Next, he commissioned Eusebius, his most powerful and favorite admirer, to produce 50 new bibles to be used in the new Holy Roman Empire that he had created. Eusebius did this and received many great honors he would not have had otherwise. *The Westcott-Hort Bibles are essentially the same as the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles*.

### Returning to the Arian-Nicene Conflict

In the final analysis there is little difference between the Arians and the Nicenists. Both have *distorted views about Jesus Christ in His essential deity* and downgrade Him by making Him less than the Father by denying that He is *self-existent and immutable*. The Nicenist will not openly admit this, *and tries to deny this with theological double-talk*, but we are capable of knowing that words have certain meanings and produce certain conclusions. Both argued from the one same Greek word. Here are some further notes from my work, *The Eternal Sonship of Christ*, Vol. 2:

Taking our leave from the English Scriptures, we now go into the original Greek language, γεννω occurs in about 70 verses. Look well at Matthew 1:16, *Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was BORN Jesus*. This is a regular term and it is used in such places as John 3:6 and 7. In Biblical theology, *the term generation can also mean born*.

Here is *Liddell and Scott* on γεννω: “*To produce from one’s self, to create.*” Page 254, unabridged Greek Lexicon.

Now we ask, did the Father *generate* the Eternal Word from Himself as the Nicenists teach, or did He *create* the Eternal Word as the radical Arians teach? We answer *no* to both. However, the Father did produce from Himself the *Man* Christ Jesus.

### Relying upon the Same Greek Term

When we consider the Nicenian-Arian controversy, we realize that both sides relied strongly upon the same Greek term, γεννω. This same Greek term means *either to generate or to create*. Therefore, when we take away the Nicenian double talk, we arrive at a *downgraded Jesus Christ in His essential Deity*. This is why Eusebius had so much uncertainty in his own mind and waited until he could determine which side had the most power and then sided with the Nicenists who then were the dominate group.

### The Impossibility of the Begotten God Concept

There are some things God *cannot* do. He cannot sin, He cannot die, and He cannot will Himself to become a devil, to name a few. However, there is one just as important, He cannot *reproduce another God with the same Divine Nature that He has*. This is a total contradiction. If God produced the Divine Being of God the Word, then the Divine Word is *not self-existent*. This is simple, but it should be obvious. If *only* the Father is self-existent, or *of Himself*, as the Nicenist say, whatever that means, then the Divine Nature in the Divine Word is *not self-existent* and therefore not of Himself. This is not the same Divine nature that is in the Father. *It would be missing the Divine attribute of Self-Existence*. A begotten being certainly *cannot be a self-existent being*. This is not all. If God the Father did reproduce another God, as the Nicenists and their Bibles teach, then Christ in His essential Divine nature is not *immutable*. *He became what He was not by the process of eternal generation*.

If the Nicenist is correct, then God the Divine Word began as a thought in the Father’s mind, and by the process of eternal generation, became a Divine Being. This is Platonism in a Christian setting.

### Platonic and Neo-Platonic Christology

Many leading Nicenists actually teach that the Divine Word began in the Father’s mind *as an idea*. *This is purely Platonic*. They proceed further and say that the Father brought forth His thought or idea and made Him into a Divine Person by the process of *Eternal Generation*. This is more *Platonic* philosophy. Thomas Goodwin, one of the Westminster Divines, is a prime example of such teachings. Please note his section dealing with Christ Jesus as the *Logos*. I have exposed his position. Also note this site for a contemporary treatment of this subject: <http://www.xanga.com/vis3o> Please note these interesting statements from that site:

“Although Modalism had been thoroughly discredited among theologians, a clearer definition of the persons in the Trinity was desired. *Philosophy had become the “handmaiden” of the church, and was determined to help it understand itself better.*

Justin Martyr was one who had such a high opinion of philosophy that it helped shape his view of God. He said: *‘Philosophy is the greatest possession and most honorable before God to whom it alone leads and unites us.’* <sup>4</sup>

Plato and other philosophers had taught that God was transcendent, beyond knowledge, and not capable of being contained in a body. Hence, any revelation of him had to be through a lesser, mediating agent. To Justin the “logos” was clearly that agent. Not only did he defend the deity of “logos”, but he stressed his difference from the Father as well:

So the Logos, having been put forth as an offspring from the Father, was with him before all creatures...He is adorable. He is God; and we adore and love, next to God, the Logos derived from the increate and ineffable God, seeing that for our sakes he became man. <sup>5</sup>

Tatian, a disciple of Justin, believed in a two-stage theory of “logos”. He taught that the “word” first existed in the mind of the Father as his rationality. Then, by an act of will, he was generated and issued forth, becoming another person with whom the Father took counsel. For him “logos” and Spirit were one and the same. He speaks of: *“The heavenly Word, born as Spirit from the Father and as Word out of his rational power”.* <sup>6</sup>

Influenced by *Stoic* terminology, the Apologist Theophilus spoke of the Word as being immanent, or inherent, in God the Father. The Word and Wisdom of God were emitted from him before the universe was created. His was also a two-stage theory.

Another who believed the Word to be God’s intelligence or rationality in the beginning was the Apologist Athenagorus. He described the Son as the Fathers’ intelligence, Word, and Wisdom. He taught that the Father and Son formed a unity, but were nonetheless distinct from one another.

Other church Fathers, not necessarily Apologists, were influenced by philosophy too. The great Augustine studied the philosopher Plotinus. In the philosophy of Plotinus there was an all encompassing One. This One was above and beyond all things. From the One there sprang a Nous, or Intellect, which was responsible for all order in the universe. Thirdly, there was Soul, or the principle of reality and life, which permeated all things. After reading his works, Augustine saw in this philosopher, the Christian God. He wrote:

Who is the “One”, if not God the Father, the first person of the Christian Trinity? And who is the “Nous”, or Intellect, if not the second person of the Christian Trinity? <sup>8</sup>

Another church leader influenced by his view of Greek thought was Clement of Alexandria. As we have already intimated, in the case of Philo, philosophy was diligently pursued in that city. Clement tried to harmonize it with Christian doctrine. He was anxious to alleviate fears Christians had of it. Philosophy, he taught, had been a schoolmaster to bring the Greeks to Christ. As the law had prepared the Jews, so had it prepared them.

He followed Justin and others in declaring the transcendence of God, and the need for a mediator. For him Christ was that mediator. The highest One of religion and philosophy, however, remained inaccessible. Only through the lesser “logos” was God accessible, and knowable to man. While carefully defending the deity of Christ, he made him a lesser manifestation of God, and another person.

Origen, also from Alexandria, studied under Clement. By the age of eighteen he had proven to be a brilliant religious thinker, and came to be one of the most respected teachers in the history of the Church.

With respect to the Godhead, Origen believed in the One who was transcendent. He also believed in Christ, the lesser expression of God. He believed the Son was eternal; otherwise, there would have been a time when God was not Father. In his view this could not be. As any Son, the "logos" was subordinate to his Father, yet he was God in every other sense of the word."

Justin's teachings about Eternal Generation came from Platonic philosophy. He was the first Christian writer that we have found who taught eternal generation openly. Here are some of his comments:

### Justin on Eternal Generation

p. 438

#### CHAPTER 61 of the Ante-Nicene Fathers

#### WISDOM IS BEGOTTEN OF THE FATHER,

#### *AS FIRE FROM FIRE*

"I shall give you another testimony, my friends," said I, "*from the Scriptures, that God begat before all creatures a Beginning, [who was] a certain rational power [proceeding] from Himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, now the Son, again Wisdom, again an Angel, then God, and then Lord and Logos;* and on another occasion He calls Himself Captain, when He appeared in human form to Joshua the son of Nave (Nun). *For He can be called by all those names, since He ministers to the Father's will, and since He was begotten of the Father by an act of will;* just as we see happening among ourselves: for when we give out some word, we beget the word; yet not by abscission, so as to lessen the word [which remains] in us, when we give it out: and just as we see also happening in the case of a fire, which is not lessened when it has kindled [another], but remains the same; and that which has been kindled by it likewise appears to exist by itself, not diminishing that from which it was kindled. *The Word of Wisdom, who is Himself this God begotten of the Father of all things, and Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and the Glory of the Begetter, will bear evidence to me, when He speaks by Solomon the following: 'If I shall declare to you what happens daily, I shall call to mind events from everlasting, and review them. The Lord made me the beginning of His ways for His works. From everlasting He established me in the beginning, before He had made the earth, and before He had made the deeps, before the springs of the waters had issued forth, before the mountains had been established. Before all the hills He begets me. God made the country, and the desert, and the highest inhabited places under the sky. When He made ready the heavens, I was along with Him, and when He set up His throne on the winds: when He made the high clouds strong, and the springs of the deep safe, when He made the foundations of the earth, I was with Him arranging. I was that in which He rejoiced; daily*

438

*and at all times I delighted in His countenance, because He delighted in the finishing of the habitable world, and delighted in the sons of men. Now, therefore, O son, hear me. Blessed is the man who shall listen to me, and the mortal who shall keep my ways, watching daily at my doors, observing the posts of my in goings. For my outgoings are the outgoings of life, and [my] will has*

*been prepared by the Lord. But they who sin against me, trespass against their own souls; and they who hate me love death.*

Justin's treatment of Old Testament Christology is outstanding, but his mixture of Platonic philosophy with Christology is terrible and must be rejected.

The Nicenist Creed, in its Christology, *is clearly Platonic*. Thomas Goodwin, Westminster Assembly divine, in his treatment of Christ, under the name of Logos, is clearly Platonic. Goodwin, in discussing this very issue in his section on Christology, stated:

Lastly, Whereas it may be said, that the philosophers having used that phrase afore John, in this or the like sense, that therefore John taking up of choice the same title, and giving it to Christ, that therefore he should use it in their sense and intention. Answer is,

(1.) That John originally used this word from the Old Testament itself. For the Jews expressed their Messiah, or Christ to come, under this notion, ' the Word,' and ' the Word of God,' as appears by the Chaldee paraphrasts (who are at least as ancient as Christ) (*Note here that the learned Dr. has already told us that Christ, as Christ, existed before creation now he says that these uninspired Chaldee paraphrases are as ancient as Christ- strange words, REP*) often, when God the Son is mentioned and spoken of, they translate it 'the Word.' So Hosea i. 7, 'I will save them by the Lord their God;' they render it, 'I will redeem them by the Word of the Lord their God.' So Ps. ex. 1, \* The Lord said to my Lord;' the paraphrasts expound it, \* The Lord said to the Word.' And so Isa. xlv. 17, 'Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation ;' they read it, \* by the Word of the Lord,' namely Christ. And this phrase not the Jews only, but the Scriptures themselves, do use, as 2 Sam. vii. 21, 'For thy Word's sake,' says David, that is, for thy Christ's sake. For 1 Chron. xvii. 19, it is rendered, \* For thy servant's sake;' and is all one with that, Dan. ix., 'For the Lord's sake.' Philo (a Jew never turned Christian, and not long after Christ's time) in his writings calls him *λογος* as before did Plato and those heathens who stole their knowledge from the Jews, and vended it as their own. Taken from THE WORKS OF THOMAS GOODWIN VOLUME FOUR, p. 418.

I therefore conclude this chapter by noting three points:

1. Concerning the Father, the Nicenist Creed and the C-E Bibles teach Zeus mythology;
2. Concerning the Logos, they are a mixture of Philo and Plato;
3. Concerning the substance or *homoousias* of the Begotten Deity of Christ, they were a mixture of Constantine and Aristotle.

*Constantine, himself, insisted on the inclusion of a word which created uncertainty homoousias". The word means that the Son partook of the same substance as the Father. It was a philosophic term borrowed from Aristotle, and referred to the underlying nature shared by any group of things. In this instance, it referred to the Godhood shared by each member of the Trinity.*

I have no confidence in an eclectic Creed founded upon such a mixture. Nor do I have any confidence in any of the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles that support it. I can never approve of the C-E Bibles under their new name, the Westcott-Hort textual family. I much prefer the TR and King James. Christ is the *Only Begotten Son*. He is not a *begotten God*, and *His blood*, by union with the Divine Word, *is the very blood of God*, and He certainly *was and is God manifest in the flesh*.

***Finish this Chapter***

## Introduction C

### The So-Called Disputed Passages and the Major Disputed Passage,

#### John 1:18

In treating of textual distinctions, there is no end to the variants that may be found between the different texts, even among the different Textus Receptus texts. This is because most of these texts, with others, were compiled long before the age of printing and the human factor must always be taken into consideration. Writers like Mills have sought to discredit the TR because of these variants. What no one wants to consider is that with all these variants, *still the Christology and Theology within the T R families is not altered or downgraded in any way.*

The variants between the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles and the TR show a very strong downgrading of Jesus Christ and as a result the entire Trinity. These main variants deal with the very nature of the Godhead from John 1:18, the Economy and Unity of the Trinity from I John 5:7 and 8, the Manifestation of God in the Flesh, and the Value and Dignity of Christ's Blood and the entire scope of vicarious, substitutionary blood redemption by the very *blood of God*. There are many sites on the www that show the distinctions between the TR, King James, and the W-H texts concerning the blood of Jesus.

I have not chosen to enter much into these other texts because to do so would swell these pages well beyond my original intent. Brother Michael Maynard has investigated I John 5:7 and published his researches and conclusions in a convincing manner. I have not yet found many enlarged studies on Acts 20:28, or I Tim. 3:15. Both of these texts are vital in our Christology beliefs and studies. However, I cannot do now a complete and exhaustive study on each of these as I have done on John 1:18. Perhaps someday I can. I have done only a limited study on each and I will briefly share my findings in this short chapter.

#### Concerning the Blood of God

Here are some statements from the early Christian writers on the expression, *The Blood of God*.

#### The Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol.1 THE EPISTLE OF IGNATIUS (AD 30-107) CHAPTER 1

##### PRAISE OF THE EPHESIANS

##### [SHORTER]

I have become acquainted with your name, much-beloved in God, which ye have acquired by the habit of righteousness, according to the faith and love in Jesus Christ our Savior. Being the followers of God, and stirring up yourselves by *the blood of God*, ye have perfectly accomplished the work which was beseeming to you. Page 99.

#### THE SECOND EPISTLE OF IGNATIUS TO THE EPHESIANS;

##### CHAPTER 1

INASMUCH as your name. which is greatly beloved, is acceptable to me in God, [your name] which ye have acquired by nature, through a right and just will, and also by the faith and love of Jesus Christ our Savior, and ye are imitators of God, and are fervent in *the blood of God*, and have speedily completed a work congenial to you [for] when ye heard that I was bound, so as to be able to do nothing for the sake of the common name and hope (and I hope, through your prayers, that I may be devoured by beasts at Rome, so that by means of this of which I have been accounted worthy, I may be endowed with strength to be a disciple of God), ye were diligent to come and see me. Page 197.

### CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, (A.D. 153-217)

34. This visible appearance cheats death and the devil; for the wealth within, the beauty, is unseen by them. And they rave about the carcass, which they despise as weak, being blind to the wealth within; knowing not what a "treasure in an earthen vessel" we bear, protected as it is by the power of God the Father, *and the blood of God the Son*, and the dew of the Holy Spirit. But be not deceived, thou who hast tasted of the truth, and been reckoned worthy of the great redemption. Page 1217.

I can find no mention of the Blood of God in volume 3.

### Tertullian, 160 – 220 AD

So far as I know, "*we are not our own, but bought with a price;*" and what kind of price? *The blood of God*. In hurting this flesh of ours, therefore, we hurt Him directly. Page 91. Vol. 4.

I need not to continue these quotations as they show that the early Christian writers used the terms *The Blood of God* rather than the terms the *Blood of the Lord*, The correct text is *The Blood of God*.

I do not find the expression, *The Blood of God*, used anywhere in the entire Bible. The usage is a reference to Acts 20:28, and while not a direct quote, they are the same as and show that the W-H textual family once again is defective and downgrading to Jesus Christ.

There are valuable works comparing the many instances in the New Testament where the Sacred Scriptures mention the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in a redemptive way that the W-H textual family has omitted on purpose. I recommend that concerned readers surf the WWW for any number of the excellent studies.

## Negative Comments

<http://messiahism.bravehost.com/GodNoBleed.htm>

[Back to The Messiahism Homepage](#)

[Acts 20:28](#) Keep watch over yourselves and over all the flock, of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the church of god that he obtained with the blood of his own Son. New Revised Standard Version

### [Acts 20:28](#)

προσεχετε εαυτοις και παντι τω ποιμνω εν ω υμας το πνευμα το αγιον εθετο επισκοπους ποιμνιν εν την εκκλησιαν του θεου ην περιεποιησατο δια του αιματος του ιδιου. Westcott-Hort text from 1881

*Αιματος* is just a different usage of blood; *ιδιου* is "of his own" while *αιματων* is the plural genitive "of blood."

So, “the blood” possessed by “his own” but ἰδίου is in the genitive, there is no object in the Westcott-Hort text.

Genitive: it’s the case generally of possession.

Example: *ARXH KTISEWS*, Creation’s beginning; it’s the beginning possessed by the group of creation. Basically, think of it like an English ‘s.

So, *hAIMA* is “blood” while *hAIMATOS* is “of blood”

Chester Beatti, dates 2nd Century. [Acts 20:28](#) “...To shepherd the ekklesia of the master and of god, which he acquired through his own blood.”

Byzantine Majority [Acts 20:28](#)

[προσεχετε ουν εαυτοις και παντι τω ποιμνιω εν ω υμας το πνευμα το αγιον εθετο επισκοπους ποιμαινειν την εκκλησιαν του κυριου και θεου ην περιεποιησατο δια του ιδιου αιματος](#)

World English Bible [Acts 20:28](#) Take heed, therefore, to yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the assembly of the Lord and God which he purchased with his own blood.

Therefore, the true God does not bleed, but rather it is the master/lord (referring to the Messiah) who bled on the cross/stake.

Bart D. Ehrman chairs the Department of Religious Studies at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He is an authority on the history of the New Testament, the early church, and the life of Jesus. And I will be quoting from his book ‘Misquoting Jesus’ concerning [Acts 20:28](#), pages 113-114 (I have a recommendation of a few of his books on my Homepage):

And it happens in a passage in [Acts 20:28](#), which in many manuscripts speaks of “the Church of God, which he obtained by his own blood.” Here again, Jesus appears to be spoken of as God. But in Codex Alexandrinus and some other manuscripts, the text instead speaks of “the Church of the Lord, which he obtained by his own blood.” Now Jesus is called the Lord, but he is not explicitly identified as God. Alerted to such difficulties, Wettstein began thinking seriously about his own theological convictions, and became attuned to the problem that the New Testament rarely, if ever, actually calls Jesus God. And he began to be annoyed with his fellow pastors and teachers in his home city of Basel, who would sometimes confuse the language about God and Christ—for example, when talking about the Son of God as if he were the Father, or addressing God the Father in prayer and speaking of “your sacred wounds.” Wettstein thought that more precision was needed when speaking about the Father and the Son, since they were not the same. Wettstein’s emphasis on such matters started raising suspicions among his colleagues, suspicions that were confirmed for them when, in 1730, Wettstein published a discussion of the problems of the Greek New Testament in anticipation of a new edition that he was preparing. Included among the specimen passages in his discussion were some of these disputed texts that had been used by theologians to establish the biblical basis for the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. For Wettstein, these texts in fact had been altered precisely in order to incorporate that perspective: the original texts could not be used in support of it.

Thanks Bart D. Ehrman, for the nice explanation of the corruption of [Acts 20:28](#) among many, many other passages. If you, the reader, want to know what these other passages are, buy his book.

According to this site it is a corruption to speak of the *Blood of God*. I have given this brief statement to show some of the problems with the other disputed texts. Please note well the *pretended supposition* that the New Testament does not speak often of Jesus as God.

Concerning I Tim. 3:16

From the following site:

<http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/CriticalTexts/dbs2695.htm> / note:

#### **IV. ARTICLE III--WESTCOTT & HORT'S NEW TEXTUAL THEORY-- Refuted by Dean Burgon (pages 233-366)**

**A. The Importance of Dean Burgon's ARTICLE III Which Refuted Westcott and Hort's NEW TEXTUAL THEORY.** In 1881, Westcott and Hort and the other members of the translation committee of the English Revised Version (ERV) published their very inferior work. At about the same time Westcott and Hort published an Introduction to the Greek New Testament. This amazingly misleading book has been answered fully by Dean Burgon in his ARTICLE III. The BIBLE FOR TODAY has re-printed this Introduction for those who wish to see their false theory for themselves. It is BFT #1303 (540 pp.) which is available for a gift of \$25.00. This false THEORY behind the false Revised Greek text is as important as the Greek text itself. Not only is the same basic false Greek text in use today by the various versions and perversions, but also the same basic false THEORY supporting this text is in use today by the same versions and perversions!!

**B. Important Quotations from Dean Burgon's ARTICLE III: WESTCOTT AND HORT'S NEW TEXTUAL THEORY (pages 233-366).**

**1. Dean Burgon's Massive Evidence in Favor of the Reading "GOD Was Manifest in the Flesh" in 1 Timothy 3:16.** Dean Burgon shows strong and irrefutable proof for the correctness of "GOD WAS MANIFEST IN THE FLESH."

Evidence for THEOS ("God") N.T. Greek Manuscripts  
(Lectionaries & Copies) = 289  
Ancient N.T. Versions = 3  
Greek Church Fathers = c. 20

There is an abundance of evidence for this reading as contained in the King James Bible. Theos or "God" is without any doubt the original and proper reading.

Evidence for HO ("which") N.T. Greek Manuscripts = 1  
Ancient N.T. Versions = 5  
Greek Church Fathers = 2

This evidence for ho, or "which," is extremely scanty. It has no opportunity to succeed as the original and proper reading.

Evidence for HOS ("who") N.T. Greek Manuscripts = 6  
Ancient N.T. Versions = 1  
Greek Church Fathers = 0

[Dean John W. Burgon, Revision Revised, pp. 486-496].

Again, this is not sufficient evidence to favor hos, or "who." It is unreasonable to have the modern versions favoring it, yet they do.

"GOD was manifest in the flesh" is the correct reading in the King James Bible. Though it is entirely in error, HOS is what is used in the new versions and perversions of our day. Here are a few of them:

"HE WHO was manifested in the flesh"--the American Standard Version.  
"HE was manifested in the flesh"--the Revised Standard Version.  
"HE WHO was revealed in the flesh"--New American Standard Version.  
"HE appeared in a body"--the New International Version.  
"HE was shown to us in a human body"--the New Century Version.  
"HE was revealed in flesh"--the New Revised Standard Version.

2. The Error of "Alternative Readings." Dean Burgon wrote: "What are found in the margin are therefore `alternative readings'--in the opinion of these self-constituted representatives of the Church and of the Sects. It becomes evident that by this ill-advised proceeding, our Revisionists would convert every Englishman's copy of the New Testament into a one-sided Introduction to the Critical difficulties of the Greek Text; a labyrinth, out of which they have not been at the pains to supply him with a single hint as to how he may find his way. . . . What else must be the result of all this but general uncertainty, confusion, distress? A hazy mistrust of all Scripture has been insinuated into the hearts and minds of countless millions, who in this way have been forced to become doubters,--yea, doubters in the Truth of Revelation itself." [Dean John W. Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. 236-237]. Dean Burgon is opposed to alternative readings. These are what abound in the footnotes of the study edition of the New King James Version. The reader doesn't know which to believe, the words of the text or the words of the footnotes! *This results in a "hazy mistrust of all Scripture"!*

### In Conclusion

I deal with the disputations surrounding John 1:18 in a different chapter. So in conclusion to this chapter let me note that there are several very important texts that the King James Versions followed the Textus Receptus on and these glorify our Lord Jesus Christ in a high and honorable manner just as the Scriptures teach us. Anything less is downgrading and dishonorable to the God-Man Redeemer.

Let us remember the Arians tried to present our Lord, in His Deity, as a *Created God*. The Nicenists said no, He began as an idea in the Father's mind and by the process of eternal generation He has become a *begotten God*. Both are wrong.

*Finish to this Chapter*

## General Introduction

I do not purpose to produce another work trying to validate the disputed texts of I John 5:7, I Tim. 3:16, Acts 20:28 John 8:1- and Mark 16: ultra. These are very important and I shall deal with the theological issues of some of these in my conclusion. I purpose to discuss the most overlooked and ignored disputed text in Textual Criticism, John 1:18. The *implications* involved in holding to this true and proper text or denying it, are far reaching and involve the very nature of the complex Person of Jesus Christ and His Mediatorial Office and work as the God-Man. *They even touch the very God-Head and the essential Essence and Attributes of the One Divine Essence.* Do we believe in Gods originating by succession or do we believe in the *self-existence* of each Divine Being in the Trinity?

### The Essential Deity of the God-Man Redeemer

Quite simply this is the issue, is Jesus Christ, *in His essential Deity*, a Begotten God or a self-existent and immutable God in *both His Divine Nature and His Divine Being*? Or to ask this question in another way, did Jesus Christ emanate from the Father in His *essential Deity by the process of eternal generation?* I *am not* dealing with the *sacred manhood* of Christ, but *only His deity*.

### The True Text

Which is the true text:

*the Only Begotten Son* from the Textus Receptus, and the King James Version or

*the only begotten God* from the Constantine-Eusebius texts through Westcott and Hort?

I understand that some pretend this text should read, the *only unique God*, but this understanding is without foundation. Let such pretenders tell us what a unique God is?

This concerns the *nature* of the very *Deity of Jesus Christ* in His essential Divine Being as God the Divine, *self-existent Word*. While every Word of God is pure and essential, yet there must be a foundation established that Believers can manifest their hopes upon. This is the *essential Deity* of our Lord Jesus Christ. Is He a *Self-Existent Divine Being*, and therefore *Immutable*, or is He a Begotten Deity, therefore *not self-existent and not immutable?*

While the ancient Constantine-Eusebius Bibles did not *introduce* the *Begotten God* concept into Christianity, so far as my investigations have shown *after nearly forty years*, Justin Martyr did, yet these corrupted C-E Bibles forced this concept upon *unsuspecting* Christians throughout the so-called Holy Roman Empire and elsewhere. It is even so now in the entire English speaking world. The whole world seems to follow the beast system of Constantine, using his creed and his bible.

### Reviving the Corrupted Text

In our day and age the efforts of Westcott and Hort and their disciples, have *revived this corrupted Imperial text of a Begotten God*. During the times of the Downgrader Movement

in England and elsewhere in the late 1800s, these men and their co-workers brought the *Begotten God* text back from the Papacy and placed it into the hands of the unsuspecting public. Since then countless multitudes have tried to make it the received text of *modernized* Christians. *But is this a valid text?* It is no more valid than *Zeus* is, and no more than the several versions of the *Nicene Creed* are. Only because the *Tractarian Movement* dignified the betrayal of John Wycliffe's Oxford into the hands of the Papists and Jesuits in England during the 1800s, could men like Westcott and Hort re-produce such a Papal text and influence its official adoption among scores of none-Papal followers in the English world. Is Christ a begotten God? *Certainly He is not! Christ is no more a Begotten God than the Wafer is Divine in the Papal Mass.*

### The Only Legal Text

Not only did the C-E Bibles *establish, not introduce*, the Begotten God text as the *official text in professed, imperial Christianity*, but quickly it became the *only legal text* to possess and even cost many dissenters their lives for rejecting it in favor of the Begotten Son texts contained in the Textus Receptus in the ancient Greek and old Italic Scriptures.

The Priscilianists are an example of the intolerance of the C-E Bible followers. They were Spanish dissenters in the later 300s who rejected the Nicene Creed and the new C-E Bibles in favor of the older Latin texts that taught the proper *Only Begotten Son* Christology. For their efforts many of them were murdered by the new Holy Catholic Church Constantine established just a few years before. They rejected the Constantine- Eusebius Bibles.

### The Early Existence of Two Texts

Yes, we can find the Begotten Son Texts in the time of Justin, well before Origin. These predate the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles by many years. We can find these two texts side by side before some of the early Christian writers. What textual families did the *Only Begotten Son* texts come from? *I would conclude that it was from the same Greek Manuscripts that contained the other disputed passages.* The Gentile Church at Antioch gathered and translated the true and proper texts into the Old Italic and sent them into the Western World years before the corruptions Eusebius Bibles became the official Bible of the new Holy Catholic Church.

### Ignatius and Irenaeus

Let me cite one of my other works, *Studies on the Only Begotten God Texts in the Apostolic Fathers*:

Here is an example:

**Ignatius**, writing around 175 A D, stated:

THE EPISTLE OF IGNATIUS TO HERO, A DEACON OF ANTIOCH (p.224) Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 1.

saith [the Scripture], "is one Lord." And again, "Hath not one God created us? Have we not all one Father? And there is also one Son, God the Word. For *"the only-begotten Son,"* saith [the Scripture], *"who is in the bosom of the Father."*

Another example:

4) (Page 583) 6. For “no man,” he says, “*hath seen God at any time,*” unless “*the only-begotten Son of God, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared [Him].*” For He, the Son who is in His bosom, declares to all the Father who is invisible.

And again:

[God] is invisible and indescribable to all things which have been made by Him, but He is by no means unknown: for all things learn through His Word that there is one God the Father, who contains all things, and who grants existence to all, as is written in the Gospel: “*No man hath seen God at any time, except the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father; He has declared [Him.]*” (Pages 976, 977) The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol.1.

I then researched out the early usage of the Only Begotten God citations, here are my results:

In Conclusion to the Apostolic Father’s Usage of *Only Begotten God* from John 1:18

These two statements contain the Apostolic Father’s citing of John 1:18 were Jesus is an *Only Begotten God*. These two, *Ignatius and Irenaeus* are the only ones who cited what we now call the Westcott-Hort Text. I call it the Egyptian-Palestine Text. This is very noteworthy, only two men cited John 1:18 from the E-P Text. They only did it once each. *What if they also cited the true and proper text? Did they, and how many times? This would seem to prove that these old Fathers had before them two texts and cited them both.*

These early Christian writers, Irenaeus and Ignatius, both did cite both texts, the Egyptian-Palestine Texts, the *Only Begotten God*, and the Antiochian Text, the *Only Begotten Son*, showing that *both texts did exist well before the close of the second century of the Christian era, near 175 AD*. Origen also cited both texts during the mid 200s.

### The Usage of Both Texts

Before the Nicenist Creed, around 315 AD, and the Arian controversy, the early Christian writers used both texts, but the C-E Bibles made the E-P text, the *corrupted text* the *official text* of Constantine’s new church, the Holy Catholic Church. The Westcott-Hort Bibles have made this the *unofficial*, official text of apostate Christianity.

### The Early Translation of the Greek into old Latin and Syrian

The Gentile Church at Antioch translated the original Greek Textual Canon into both the Old Syrian and the Old Italic by at least 150 AD. We do not know which came first. Many claim the old Syrian came first. I deal with it in chapter 3. There you will see that the original old Syrian text has been lost and we have no knowledge of its contents. What we do have today under the old Syrian *are translations made to conform to the corrupted Bibles of Constantine and Eusebius*. This is explained in chapter 3.

### The Value of the Old Italic

This means that the Old Italic *may be the only real historic witness to the accuracy of the several disputed texts*. These texts, including John 1:18, may not be found in every old Italic text, but they will all be found in some of the old Italic Texts. These predate the corrupted Jerome Latin Vulgate texts and the corrupted Constantine-Eusebius Bibles of the Holy Catholic Church.

## Tertullian

Tertullian, the supposed father of Latin writers, did not use the terms, *Only Begotten God*, but did use the terms Only Begotten Son from John 1:18 in the following:

*“And we have seen His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father;”* that is, of course, (the glory) of the Son, even Him who was visible, and was glorified by the invisible Father. And therefore, inasmuch as he had said that the Word of God was God, in order that he might give no help to the presumption of the adversary, (which pretended) that he had seen the Father Himself *and* in order to draw a distinction between the invisible Father and the visible Son, he makes the additional assertion, *ex abundantia* as it were: *“No man hath seen God at any time.”* What God does he mean? The Word? But he has already said: *“Him we have seen and heard, and our hands have handled the Word of life.”* Well, (I must again ask,) what God does he mean? It is of course the Father, with whom was the Word, *the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, and has Himself declared Him.* He was both heard and seen and, that He might not be supposed to be a phantom, was actually handled. Him, too, did Paul behold; but yet he saw not the Father. *“Have I not,”* he says, *“seen Jesus Christ our Lord?”* Moreover, he expressly called Christ God, saying: *“Of whom are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever.”* He shows us also that the Son of God, which is the Word of God, is visible, because He who became flesh was called Christ. Of the Father, however, he says to Timothy: *“Whom none among men hath seen, nor indeed can see;”* and he accumulates the description in still ampler terms: *“Who only hath immortality, and dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto.”* The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 3; (page 1109)

## Origen

Origen, around 250 AD, stated in Volume 4 of the Ante-Nicene Fathers:

### CHAPTER 71

Jesus taught us who it was that sent Him, in the words, *“None knoweth the Father but the Son;”* and in these, *“No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.”* 897

## Conclusion to this Chapter

We come to this conclusion; The Westcott-Hort texts are nothing more than the ancient texts of Constantine and Eusebius. These texts support the Nicene Creed, the official Creed of Constantine’s new Holy Catholic Church. This Creed has been adopted in various forms not only by the Roman and Greek Catholics, but most Protestants and Calvinized Baptists as well.

The Westcott-Hort texts are nothing more than representations of the four most ancient C-E Bibles that we know about. *There is nothing sacred or original about them.* As early as Justin’s times both texts existed and were cited by various Christian writers. Not only is this true of the so-called Orthodox writers, but of the heretics as well. Theology determined which text the early writers used. Tertullian is regarded as a Trinitarian writer, he used the Only Begotten Son text. Origen used both. Eusebius knew about both, and said it made no real difference, and made his Bible the official Bible of the Holy Catholic Church. In our modern times most of the Christian world wonders unknowingly after the Beast System of Constantine and have adopted the C-E Bibles. But why? *Is Jesus a Begotten God or a Begotten Son?*

## Chapter 1

### Stating the Issue

#### Is Jesus a Begotten God or a Begotten Son?

Since we are faced with the question of Which Bible, the King James based on the historic Greek and Latin Textus Receptus texts, or other Translations how can we answer? We must measure this question and answer it by our Lord Jesus Christ, *what think ye of Christ?*

#### The Issue of Divine Revelation and Unction

The issue here is *not* one of natural science and historical inquiry, but of **Divine Revelation and Unction**. What has God the Father taught us about Jesus Christ and His essential Deity and Being? Is He equal to the Father in His essential Being and Nature or is He a produce of the Father's mind brought into being as a Divine Person by eternal generation as the Nicenists and their various Creeds and Bibles teach?

John 17:1 These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee:

2 As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.

3 And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

I John 2:18 Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.

19 They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would *no doubt* have continued with us: but *they went out*, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.

20 But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.

26 These *things* have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you.

27 But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.

For an open and accurate account of how the Nicenists, whether Papal, Protestant or Baptist, consider Christ to be a *divine person* by the process of *eternal generation*, consider Thomas Goodwin's remarks in his section on Christology dealing with the Logos. Goodwin was a leading member of the famed Westminster Assembly that produced the *Westminster Confession of Faith*.

#### Not King James Onlyism

Let me quickly note that we do not believe in any form of King James onlyism. We value the King James translation because of the *foundational texts* used to produce it. This is also true of the Bishop's Bible, the Geneva Bible, the Tyndall Bible and others that come from the ancient Greek and Latin Textus Receptus. We could say the same for the ancient German Bible or the ancient French Bible. The same is true of many translations of today

that are based on the same ancient Greek and Latin TR texts. *We are not King James onlyists, but we are Textus Receptus onlyists* in both Greek and Old Latin.

Constantine established a new church in the early fourth century. He was tired of the fighting between the so called Orthodox Christians and the Arians. He called for a empire wide council to settle the issue and produce a standard Creed for his new church. This is called the Nicenian Council and they produced what is called the Nicenian Creed. In order to valid this new Creed, Constantine commissioned one of his favorite admirers and supporters, Eusebius, to produce fifty uniform Bibles to validate the New Creed and become the Official Bibles of the Holy Catholic Church.

### Satan's Unholy Trinity

By the middle of the fourth century, professed Christianity had a *new church* with a *new creed* and *new bibles*. Satan's new unholy trinity has become the standard by which all professing Christians are to judge their Bibles and their Christology. *We dissent*.

So once again we ask, *what think ye of Christ*, is He the only Begotten God or in His Deity and Being is He *self-existent and immutable*, and is therefore the *only Begotten Son*?

The Arians taught different concepts about the Deity and Being of Jesus Christ. The *moderate Arians* denied eternal generation. The *extreme Arians* denied the equal deity of Christ with His Father's deity and *claimed Christ was a created God*. The Nicenists denied both and taught Justin's concept of eternal generation and declared that Jesus Christ was not a *created* God, but a *generated* God. Neither is true, *He is a self-existent Divine Being*, and not a *generated* or *created* God.

### Concerning the Only Begotten Word

Our Lord Jesus Christ is the Father's Only Begotten Son, but nowhere does the Sacred Scripture present Him as the Father's *Only Begotten Word*. In the Egyptian-Palestinian textual family, John 1:18 incorrectly reads *the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, has declared Him*. They do this in order to justify the early theology of the Begotten God and unbegotten God that Justin Martyr helped to introduce into the rapidly apostatizing churches.

This theology is nothing more than a redoing of the Zeus theology of Greek Mythology. Some of the early Christian (?) writers did refer to Him in this manner both before and after the first Nicene Council. In the Arian controversy Christ is often spoken about as the Father's *Only Begotten Word*. This is totally foreign to the Scriptures.

### Is He Both A Begotten Deity or Word or the Only Begotten Son?

In the writings and theology of those who developed the Egyptian-Palestinian Textual Manuscripts, and later the Nicene Creed, there is no distinction. They repeatedly affirmed that Christ is both a Begotten Deity or Word and a Begotten Son. Because of their failure to make a clear distinction between the two, they later began to affirm that Christ received His manly being and substance from Mary and not from the Father.

The failure of the early Fathers to note correctly the distinction between *the unbegotten Word*, Christ in His Deity, and the *Begotten Son*, Christ in His manhood, began the concept that Christ in His Deity came from the Father and Christ as the Son, in His manhood came, from Mary. This, of course, also is borrowed from the early Mythology of

the Mother-Son worship of the ancient Nations and has a very important place in early Greek Mythology. In Constantine's church it is known as Mariology.

### **Early Greek Mythology and the Father and His Queen**

The early Greek, Babylonian, Egyptian, and other early Mythologies placed a very close relationship between the Unbegotten Father and His Spouse, the Heavenly Queen or Goddess. As time progressed and many Greeks became converted, more or less, to Christianity, some of them became known as the Greel Fathers. Because of their backgrounds they placed a strong emphasis between the unbegotten Father and His Divine Offspring Whom He either *begat or created* to serve Him perfectly as an example for all others to follow.

In the earliest stages these writers did not strongly develop the Goddess or Mariology. However, in the process of time what some of the early Fathers introduced and the Egyptian-Palestinian Textual family helped to make official, grew into the worship of the Divine Mother and her Divine Child within Constantine's Church. In this way, the ancient Mythological Trinity would be included in various forms in the apostate Holy Catholic Church, or Mystical Babylon.

### **The Influence of Simon the Magician and the Copyists at Alexandria**

Due to the strong influence of Simon the Magician and his many followers and later Justin Martyr and the corrupted textual manuscripts the Simonites produced, together with the altered manuscripts gathered and further altered by the Copyists at Alexandria, both the Theology and Textual supports for the Begotten God became fixed in apostate and corrupted Christianity that later would evolve into the Holy Catholic Church. As I said before, the inclusion of the Mother would soon come as the Father became further unknown.

### **Old Mythology and the Egyptian Textual Family**

The Egyptian Textual family is the perfect setting for the Unknown, Unbegotten Father, the Begotten God-Son, and later the Divine Mother, of ancient mythology. This Text became the official Bible of Constantine's Church. Why did they adopt this text and why did they outlaw later all the texts based upon the older Greek and Old Italic Texts? *Simply because Eusebius considered it as the best text.*

### **In Conclusion to this Chapter**

Why not also seriously ponder why the modern Christian world almost universally adopts and uses the Egyptian Textual family of Constantine and Eusebius or its several offspring? Why do most modern Baptists hold to the first official Bible of the Papal Church produced by the apostate copyists of Alexandria and others?

## Chapter 2

### The Origin of the Begotten God Concept

There are three basic way of presenting John 1:18 and they are:

1. The Antiochian Textual family: the *Only Begotten Son*;
2. The Constantine-Eusebius or Palestinian-Alexandrian textual family: *God only Begotten*;
3. The modern Westcott-Hort textual family, the *Only Begotten God*.

I have been investigating these and other related issues since the early 1960s. It is possible that I have overlooked some evidences and made some mistakes. If I am incorrect, I shall be happy to be corrected.

1. **Justin Martyr**, [A.D. 110-165.] was the earliest Christian writer that I have found who taught the *Begotten God* or *eternal generation* concept. He taught such in his debate with Trypho the Jew, Here are some of his comments:

*“I shall give you another testimony, my friends,” said I, “from the Scriptures, that God begat before all creatures a Beginning, [who was] a certain rational power [proceeding] from Himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, now the Son, again Wisdom, again an Angel, then God, and then Lord and Logos; and on another occasion He calls Himself Captain, when He appeared in human form to Joshua the son of Nave (Nun). For He can be called by all those names, since He ministers to the Father’s will, and since He was begotten of the Father by an act of will; just as we see happening among ourselves: for when we give out some word, we beget the word; yet not by abscission, so as to lessen the word [which remains] in us, when we give it out: and just as we see also happening in the case of a fire, which is not lessened when it has kindled [another], but remains the same; and that which has been kindled by it likewise appears to exist by itself, not diminishing that from which it was kindled.*

*The Word of Wisdom, who is Himself this God begotten of the Father of all things, and Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and the Glory of the Begetter, will bear evidence to me, when He speaks by Solomon the following: ‘If I shall declare to you what happens daily, I shall call to mind events from everlasting, and review them. The Lord made me the beginning of His ways for His works. From everlasting He established me in the beginning, before He had made the earth, and before He had made the deeps, before the springs of the waters had issued forth, before the mountains had been established. Before all the hills He begets me. God made the country, and the desert, and the highest inhabited places under the sky. When He made ready the heavens, I was along with Him, and when He set up His throne on the winds: when He made the high clouds strong, and the springs of the deep safe, when He made the foundations of the earth, I was with Him arranging. I was that in which He rejoiced; daily and at all times I delighted in His countenance, because He delighted in the finishing of the habitable world, and delighted in the sons of men. Now, therefore, O son, hear me. Blessed is the man who shall listen to me, and the mortal who shall keep my ways, watching daily at my doors, observing the posts of my in goings. For my outgoings are the outgoings of life, and [my] will has been prepared by the Lord. But they who sin against me, trespass against their own souls; and they who hate me love death.*

Vol. 1, CHAPTER 61 of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, WISDOM IS BEGOTTEN OF THE FATHER, *AS FIRE FROM FIRE*, p. 437, 438.

Please note that Justin understood the expression *a beginning* to refer *to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God*. This is a very important fact as you will see later. Justin said:

*“from the Scriptures, that God begat before all creatures a Beginning, [who was] a certain rational power [proceeding] from Himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, now the Son, again Wisdom, again an Angel, then God, and then Lord and Logos;”*

In Justin’s mind Christ Jesus, or the Divine Word, in His first and original state was *a beginning*. In a different chapter we shall see that the Gnostics followed Justin on this and the Imperial ministers called them heretics. I wonder why the same Imperialists did not call Justin a heretic?

### From Justin Martyr to Arianism

Shortly you will see that Dean Burgon deals with John 1:18 and shows that the Valentinians (Gnostic sect-REP) also understood this in the same way. However, Burgon failed to account for Justin’s usage of this expression. He merely observed that the Valentinians used the *only begotten God* concept and tied it to *In the Beginning*. In this manner they taught that Jesus Christ *was the Beginning*, in His essential deity as God the Word, or Logos. They merely followed Justin. They *did not* originate this interpretation, but merely used what Justin Martyr already said. I wonder why no one has accused Justin of being a heretic or the forerunner of Arianism? In one regard he was. He was the first Christian I have found who taught the *begotten God concept*. Take away the term *begotten* and use *created* and you have full *Arianism*. In fact, Arius and other Arians, used the terms *begotten and created interchangeably*.

The *Begotten God* concept did not originate in Arianism, or from the Valentinians, but from Justin’s usage. It went from him into the various Gnostic writings, and then from them to the Arians. In this regard Justin’s novel introduction of the begotten god helped pave the way for the Gnostics and later the Arians. Westcott and Hort adopted the Gnostic and Arian understanding of John 1:18. We must reject this and raise our voices loudly in descent.

### From Justin to Eusebius

Justin was a converted Greek who used ancient Greek Philosophy and Mythology to a great advantage. The *begotten God concept* comes from ancient Greek mythology. It is adopted from Zeus, who, in ancient Greek mythology, is the father of all gods and men. Justin also used Plato’s concepts very well. In Alexandria, Egypt there would soon arise another person who would follow in Justin’s concepts, Origin.

Origin used Texts that taught both the Only Begotten Son and the Only Begotten God. Due to some serious difficulties Origin was forced to leave Egypt and he relocated in the Caesarea area in Palestine. There he established another academy and set up a large library. A few years later another bright light in the Church would locate in that area, Eusebius.

Eusebius would follow in the methods of Origin and Justin. He also would later collect all the known Bible Manuscripts He could and produce the fifty Constantine - Eusebius Bibles. In these official Bibles of the Holy Catholic Church, Eusebius followed Origin and Justin and taught the *only begotten God* concept. Eusebius learned this because he was

under strong Arian influence. Many have concluded that he was at one time an Arian. This may be true.

## Eusebius, Arius and the Great Uncials

From Eusebius we now come to the *Great Uncial Manuscripts* of the Bible. They all teach the *Begotten God* concept. They all are the product of Eusebius, from Origin, then Justin Martyr. Eusebius taught a *form of Arianism* when he taught the *begotten god* position, for Arius and many other Arians did the same.

Dr. Shedd:

The following statements are from Shedd's *introduction to Augustine on the Trinity, The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, First Series Volume 3; Page 15,*

*“The Father knoweth the Son,” from all eternity (Matthew 11:27); and “loveth the Son,” from all eternity (John in. 35); and “glorifieth the Son,” from all eternity (John17:5). Prior to creation, the Eternal Wisdom “was by Him as one brought up with Him, and was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him”(Proverbs 8:30); and the Eternal Word “was in the beginning with God”(John 1:2); and “the Only Begotten Son (or God Only Begotten, as the uncials read) was eternally in the bosom of the Father” (John 1:18).*

The words *“or God Only Begotten, as the uncials read,”* came from Dr. Shedd, and are not a part of Augustine’s original statement. It is noteworthy that Augustine himself did not use the statement, *God Only Begotten,* in his work on the Trinity.

Now we can turn to Burgon and his short history of the controversy over John 1:18.

## Burgon’s Account of John 1:18

Burgen states that Arius and the Arians used the same method of interpretation and taught the Begotten God doctrine, meaning the Created God doctrine. From Dean Burgon we note the following interesting account:

We now reach a most remarkable instance. It will be remembered that St. John in his grand preface does not rise to the full height of his sublime argument until he reaches the eighteenth verse. He had said (ver. 14) that 'the Word was made flesh,' &c.; a statement which Valentinus was willing to admit. But, as we have seen, the heresiarch and his followers denied that 'the Word' is also 'the Son' of God. As if in order to bar the door against this pretence, St. John announces (ver. 18) that *'the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him'*: thus establishing the identity of the Word and the Only begotten Son.

What else could the Valentinians do with so plain a statement, but seek to deprave it? Accordingly, the very first time St. John i. 18 is quoted by any of the ancients, it is accompanied by the statement that the Valentinians, in order to prove that the 'only begotten' is 'the Beginning,' and is 'God,' appeal to the words,--*'the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father* [513], ' &c. Inasmuch, said they, as the Father willed to become known to the worlds, the Spirit of Gnosis produced the 'only begotten' 'Gnosis,' and therefore gave birth to 'Gnosis,' that is to 'the Son': in order that by 'the Son' 'the Father' might be made known. While then that 'only begotten Son' abode 'in the bosom of the Father,' He caused that here upon earth should be seen, alluding to ver. 14, one 'as the only begotten Son.' In which, by the way, the reader is requested to note that the author of the Excerpta Theodoti (a production of the second century) reads St. John i. 18 as we do.

I have gone into all these strange details,--derived, let it be remembered, from documents which carry us back to the former half of the second century,--because in no other way is the singular phenomenon which attends

the text of St. John i. 18 to be explained and accounted for. Sufficiently plain and easy of transmission as it is, this verse of Scripture is observed to exhibit perturbations which are even extraordinary.

**Irenaeus** once writes [Greek: ho] [?] [Greek: monogenês uios]: once, [Greek: ho] [?] [Greek: monogenês uios Theos]: once, [Greek: ho monogenês uios Theou] [514]:

**Clemens Alex.**, [Greek: ho monogenês uios Theos monos][515]; which must be very nearly the reading of the Codex from which the text of the Vercelli Copy of the Old Latin was derived[516].

**Eusebius** four times writes [Greek: ho monogenês uios] [517]: twice, [Greek: monogenês Theos] [518]: and on one occasion gives his reader the choice of either expression, explaining why both may stand[519].

**Gregory Nyss.**[520] and **Basil**[521], though they recognize the usual reading of the place, are evidently vastly more familiar with the reading [Greek: ho monogenês Theos][522]: for Basil adopts the expression thrice[523], and Gregory nearly thirty-three times as often[524].

This was also the reading of **Cyril Alex.**[525], whose usual phrase however is [Greek: ho monogenês tou Theou logos][526].

**Didymus** has only [? cp. context] [Greek: ho monogenês Theos],--for which he once writes [Greek: ho monogenês Theos logos][527].

**Cyril of Jer.** seems to have read [Greek: ho monogenês monos][528].

[I have retained this valuable and suggestive passage in the form in which the Dean left it. It evidently has not the perfection that attends some of his papers, and would have been amplified and improved if his life had been spared. More passages than he noticed, though limited to the ante-Chrysostom period, are referred to in the companion volume[529]. The portentous number of mentions by Gregory of Nyssa escaped me, though I knew that there were several. Such repetitions of a phrase could only be admitted into my calculation in a restricted and representative number. Indeed, I often quoted at least on our side less than the real number of such reiterations occurring in one passage, because in course of repetition they came to assume for such a purpose a parrot-like value.

But the most important part of the Dean's paper is found in his account of the origin of the expression. This inference is strongly confirmed by the employment of it in the Arian controversy.

**Arius** reads [Greek: Theos] (\_ap\_ Epiph. 73--Tischendorf), whilst his opponents read [Greek: Huios].

So **Faustinus** seven times (I noted him only thrice), and

**Victorinus Afer** six (10) times in reply to the Arian Candidus[530].

Also **Athanasius and Hilary of Poitiers** four times each, and

**Ambrose** eight (add Epp. i. xxii. 5).

It is curious that with this history *admirers of B and [Symbol: Aleph] should extol their reading over the Traditional reading on the score of orthodoxy*. Heresy had and still retains associations which cannot be ignored: in this instance some of the orthodox weakly played into the hands of heretics[531]. None may read Holy Scripture just as the idea strikes them.]

I have taken the above from *The Causes of the Corruption of the Greek New Testament*, section dealing with John 1:18. This concludes Dean Burgon's account.

**The Begotten God Concept is Concealed Arianism**

The three key persons in the transfer of Greek Mythology into Imperial and Apostate Christianity are Justin Martyr, Origen and then Eusebius. The Two Main epics in delivering professed Christianity into this form of Greek Mythology have been: The Arian Controversy that resulted in the Nicenian Council and Creed, with the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles; then the Tractarian Movement, Puseyism, in England, and its influence upon Oxford and Cambridge and the Revisionism associated with Westcott and Hort and their efforts.

The Arians taught that Jesus was a *created* God. They used the terms created and begotten interchangeably. The Nicenists taught that Jesus was and is a *begotten* God. Neither are true. In His deity, Jesus is self-existent and immutable, neither generated nor created.

### In Conclusion to this chapter

In conclusion to this chapter here are some interesting statements about the Alexandrian School and the theology that the *Father is the Source of the Godhead*:

### The Father as the Root and Source of the Godhead

#### ELUCIDATIONS

THAT the theology of the great school of Alexandria had a character of its own, is most apparent; I should be the last to deny it. As its succession of teachers was like that of hereditary descent in a family, a family likeness is naturally to be found in this school, from the great Clement to the great Athanasius. It is a school that hands on the traditions in which Apollon had been reared; it not less reflects the Greek influences always dominant in the capital of the Macedonian hero; but it is a school in which the Gospel of Christ as the Light of the world was always made predominant: and, while a most liberal view of human knowledge was inculcated in it, yet the faith was always exalted as the mother and mistress of the true gnosis and of all science. The wise men of this world were summoned with an imperial voice, from this eldest seat and center of Christian learning, to cast their crowns and their treasures at the feet of Jesus. *With a generous patronage Clement conceded all he could to the philosophy of the Greeks*, and yet sublimely rose above it to a sphere it never discovered, and looked down upon all merely human intellect and its achievements like Uriel in the sun.

It was the special though *unconscious mission of this school to prepare the way, and to shape the thought of Christendom*, for the great epoch of the (nominal) conversion of the empire, and for the all-important synodical period, its logical consequence. *It was in this school that the technical formulas of the Church were naturally wrought out*. The process was like that of the artist who has first to make his own tools. He does many things, and resorts to many contrivances, never afterwards necessary when once the tools are complete and his laboratory furnished with all he wants for his work. To my mind, therefore, it is but a pastime of no practical worth to contrast the idiosyncrasies of Clement with those of Origen, and to set up distinctions *between the Logos* of this doctor and that. The differences to be described belong to the personal peculiarities of great minds not yet guided to unity of diction by a scientific theology. The marvel is their harmony of thought. Their ends and their antagonisms are the same. The outcome of their mental efforts and their pious faith is seen in the result. Alexander was their product, and Athanasius (bringing all their sheaves to the Church's garner, winnowed and harvested) is the perpetual gnomon of the Alexandrian school. Its testimony, its prescription, its harmony and unity, are all summed up in him. It is extraordinary that many truly evangelical critics seem to see, in the subordination taught by Origen, something not reconcilable with the Nicene orthodoxy. Even Bishop Bull is a subordinationist, and so are all the great orthodox divines. *When Origen maintains the μοναρχι (the Father as the root and source of the Godhead, as do all the Greeks)*, and also a subordination of the Son in the divine ουφσι, he is surely consistent with the Athanasian doctrine; and, if he is led to affirm a diversity of essence in connection with this subordination, he does it with such limitations as should convince us that he, too, would have subscribed the οθμοου, in which Alexandrians no

whit inferior to him finally formulated the *convictions and testimonies of their predecessors*. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 6; Pages 555, 556.

## Chapter 3

### Old Syriac

As we enter into this chapter, please note that both the Old Syrian and the Old Latin textual families existed sometime near 150 AD. It is highly probable that the Gentile Church at Antioch produced these two early translations. They originated from one textual source, the original Greek Text. That source no longer exists. However, the Lord has kept His words alive and continuing on because we can almost reconstruct this one textual source from the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. What we can not construct from them, we can from the old Italic Manuscript family.

Note the following points presented in the following statements:

1. One original textual family is the source used to produce the Old Syrian and the Old Italic;
2. The Original Syrian no longer exists;
3. The present Syrian is a text made to Conform to the Constantine-Eusebius Texts;
4. It then follows that since the new texts are altered, changed and made to conform to the C-E texts, *then the original did not*.

Here is from the Diatessaron of Tatian, about AD 170:

#### Section IV.

119 No man hath seen God at any time; the only Son, God,<sup>23</sup> which is in the bosom of his Father, he hath told of *him*.

#### Syrian Bibles Made to Conform to the C-E Bibles

Please note this very well: the Syrian Bibles have been made to conform to the Constantine-Eusebius Greek Textual family. The Old Italic did not undergo such a *corruption* and *they do not conform to the C-E Texts*. This is why the earlier Latin writers did not follow the corrupted text that reads *Only Begotten God*. By the process of conforming the Syrian texts to the C-E Greek texts, the *Only Begotten Son* text was omitted and the Arian-Nicenist text of the *Only Begotten God* was inserted. The present Syrian Texts do not represent the original Syrian Textual family, but only the corrupted, conformed textual revisions.

Almost as quickly as the original translations came forth, heretics attacked them and started to distort them. Various copies were made and the two families went their separate ways. This concludes the original unity of the Syrian Text and the original Italic Text.

#### Distinguishing Between the Old Syrian and the Present Syrian Texts

The *present Syrian text is not the old Syrian*, but a version *made to conform* to what we now call the Constantine-Eusebius or W-H textual families. The widely respected Peshitto is also a *conformed* version.

I glean from Kenyon's *The Story of our Bible*.

### The Three Earliest Translations

The three earliest, and therefore the most important for our purpose, were in the principal languages of the adjoining peoples - Syrian, Latin and Coptic (the language of the natives of Egypt). *It is only lately that we have learnt much about the first versions in these tongues; for in each case the early version was eventually superseded by another, which became the accepted Bible of that people, and of the earlier translations relatively few manuscripts have survived, and most of these are only fragments.* But it now seems certain that the books of the New Testament were translated into all these languages before the end of the third century, while the Syriac and Latin almost certainly go back to the second. The original translators must have used Greek manuscripts then existing; so that, so far as we can ascertain the original form of these various versions (itself not an easy task), we have the evidence of Greek manuscripts earlier than any which have come down to us. Further, these translations show us what kind of text was in use in the countries in which they were produced. (Page 14, my edition REP)

Syria was a very definite province of the Christian Church, and might very naturally develop a local form of text; and so we find in the Old Syriac a text including many unquestionably early readings, some of which occur also in the Western group and others in the Neutral (or, as we prefer to call it, Alexandrian). It is a valuable witness, all the more because it incorporates elements of different types. Later, when Bishop Rabbula in the early fifth century undertook a revision of the texts then circulating in his diocese, he brought them more into conformity with the Byzantine type, then acquiring dominance in the Church, and so produced the Peshitta, which became the generally 'received text' of Syrian Christianity.

Kenyon continues:

#### Chapter VIII:

#### THE ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

WE have now completed the survey of the primary sources of our knowledge of the text of the Greek New Testament. We go out into a wider territory. Not Greek alone, but all the tongues of Pentecost the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and the parts of Libya about Cyrene, sojourners in Rome, and Arabians - are now laid under contribution.

We go to Syrian, and Egyptian, and Roman, and ask them when the sacred Scriptures were translated into their language, and what information they can give us as to the character and exact words of the Greek text from which their translations were originally made. And the answer is that the Word of God was delivered to the dwellers in some at least of these lands before the date at which the oldest of our Greek manuscripts were written.

The Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts carry us back, as we have just seen, to about the middle of the fourth century - say, to AD 350 - and the papyri a century or more earlier.

But the New Testament was translated into Syriac and into Latin by about AD150, and into Egyptian somewhere about AD 200; and the copies which we now possess of these versions are lineal descendants of the original translations made at these dates.

The stream of textual tradition was tapped at these points, higher in its course than the highest point at which we have access to the original Greek. If we can ascertain with certainty what were the original words of the Syriac or Latin translations, we can generally know what was the Greek text which the translator had before him; we know, that is, what words were found in a Greek manuscript which was extant in the first half of the second century, and which cannot have been written very far from AD100.

### Early Evidences of Two Textual Families

Taking leave from Dr. Kenyon, let me note that we can establish from the writings of the early "Fathers" Irenaeus and Ignatius, then that two different textual versions of John 1:18 did exist. Origen had both before him and used them both. When Kenyon suggests that a common textual family existed and the later Greek manuscripts came from that one common family, *he is incorrect*. Beyond doubt the original Gospel of John contained the *Only Begotten Son* text, heretics and copyists began to alter the ancient Gospel nearly as soon as it began to circulate. Some scribes did so unintentionally and others did so intentionally. From the very earliest two distinct textual families started to exist. These two textual versions or families existed during the second century. Perhaps the Chester Beatty Papyri also shows that these same two different textual families existed.

Followers of the Westcott, Hort, and Kenyon school *maintain that we can go back to one textual family and this is the original Greek Textual family*. Of course, this is their approved textual family. However, we have and will continue to demonstrate *that two distinguishing Greek textual families did exist in the second century*. The two well known textual families, *the Only Begotten Son-Antiochian and the Only Begotten God-Alexandrian-Palestinian, were clearly defined and in usage*. To make matters worse the so called heretics produced many texts adding to the confusion and distortion already in existence.

I now quote from another source:

<http://sor.cua.edu/Bible/OldSyriac.html>

The Old Syriac is known in Syriac as Evangelion Dampharshe meaning 'Gospel of the Separated [Evangelists]', in order to distinguish it from the Diatessaron, 'Gospel of the Mixed'. This translation was made at some point between the late second century and the early fourth century by a number of translators. Rather a literal translation, this was a rather free translation from the Greek. *A series of revisions took place over a long period of time which brought the Old Syriac into closer line with the Greek. The original translation of the Old Syriac is lost, but we are fortunate to have two lacunous manuscripts which represent two different stages of the revisions: the Sinaiticus palimpsest and the Curetonianus manuscript.*

Unlike the Diatessaron, the Old Syriac version was unknown to scholarship, not to mention the Syriac Church itself, until the discovery of two manuscripts. The Curetonianus manuscript was acquired, among others, by the British Museum and reached its new home on the first day of March 1843. Some further pages arrived in England and Berlin in the form of fly-leaves to strengthen the bindings of other manuscripts. The original home of the manuscript is Deir as-Surian, 'Monastery of the Syrians,' in Egypt. William Cureton, then assistant keeper of the manuscripts at the British Museum, discovered that the volume contains pre-Peshitto readings and concluded that he had discovered "the identical terms and expressions which the Apostle himself

employed,"—an exaggeration. The most interesting characteristic of the Curetonianus manuscript is the unusual order of the Gospels: Matthew, Mark, John and Luke, with Luke following John on the same page.

*The Sinaiticus manuscript is a palimpsest*; that is, a later scribe rubbed off the original writing of the Gospels and wrote a new text on top of it, a popular activity in antiquity when parchment was rare and expensive. The manuscript is preserved at the ancient library of St. Catherine Monastery in Sinai which contains many ancient Syriac manuscripts. This particular manuscript was discovered in 1892 by Agnes Lewis and her twin sister Margaret Gibson, two Scottish widows. They took 400 photographs of the manuscript and sent them to Cambridge, England, where they were deciphered by two English scholars, Bensly and Burkitt, who concluded its affinity with the Curetonianus manuscript. It took many visits to the home of the manuscript in Sinai until the text was deciphered. A chemical reagent was used to help in reading the text, which, alas, contributed to the destruction of the manuscript. Recently, new photographs have been taken by Bruce Zuckermann (University of Southern California) and James Charlesworth (Princeton Theological Seminary) using the latest photographic techniques. Whether new readings will emerge from this endeavor remains to be seen. - George Kiraz, Ph.D, Feb 25, 2001.

### Dr. Kiraz commented about the Peshitto:

In the early fifth century, the long process of revising the [Old Syriac](#) came to a halt, culminating in the Peshitto version. Hence, the Peshitto is not a new translation, but rather a revision of the Old Syriac Gospels. However, the Peshitto also contains the rest of the books of the New Testament except for the Minor Catholic Epistles (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John and Jude) and Revelation. To this day, readings from these books are not read in Syriac Churches. In the Peshitto manuscripts, the Catholic Epistles are placed between the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles.

The word Peshitto in Syriac means 'simple' or 'clear'. It was given this epithet in order to distinguish it from later versions, especially the [Harklean](#) which was a literal translation of the Greek resulting in obscure Syriac.

The Peshitto was able to triumph over all its rivals and became the authorized text of all the Syriac Churches to this day: Syrian Orthodox, Assyrian Church of the East, Maronite, Chaldaean, etc. Consequently, hundreds of Peshitto manuscripts survive with little variation between them. This, however, did not prevent Syriac churchmen from producing two further revisions: The [Philoxenian](#) and [Harklean](#).

## Syriac Sinaiticus

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

(Redirected from [Sinaitic Palimpsest](#))

The Syriac Sinaitic (syr<sup>sin</sup>), known also as *Sinaitic Palimpsest* of [Saint Catherine's Monastery, Mount Sinai](#) is a late 4th century [manuscript](#) of 358 pages, containing a translation of the four canonical [gospels](#) of the [New Testament](#) into [Syriac](#), *which have been overwritten by a vita of female [saints](#) and [martyrs](#) with a date corresponding to AD 778. This [palimpsest](#) is the oldest copy of the gospels in [Syriac](#), one of two surviving manuscripts that predate the [Peshitta](#), the standard Syriac translation of the Bible.* The other Syriac manuscript of the pre-Peshitta Syriac Bible, found in Egypt in 1842, is called the [Cureton Manuscript](#) after the [orientalist William Cureton](#), who first identified and edited it in 1858.

*Both manuscripts contain similar version of the Syriac gospels, which have been "conformed" to the four Greek gospels. In this sense of the word, the text has been corrected and re-edited to be made to conform to the Greek New Testament. Even so, the Sinaitic Palimpsest retains some*

readings from even earlier lost Syriac gospels and from the 2nd century Greek manuscripts, which brought the four gospels into harmony with one another through selective readings and emendations.

The importance of such early, least conforming texts is emphasized by the revision of the *Peshitta* that was made about 508, ordered by bishop [Philoxenus of Mabbog](#). *His revision, it is said, skillfully moved the Peshitta nearer to the Greek text*: "it is very remarkable that his own frequent gospel quotations preserved in his writings show that he used an Old Syriac set of the four gospels".<sup>[1]</sup>

The palimpsest was identified in the library at St. Catherine's in February 1892 by the intrepid Dr. [Agnes Smith Lewis](#) and her sister [Margaret Dunlop Gibson](#), who returned with a team of scholars that included [J. Rendel Harris](#), to photograph and transcribe the work in its entirety.<sup>[2]</sup>

The German theologian [Adalbert Merx](#) devoted much of his later research to the elucidation of the *Sinaitic Palimpsest*, the results being embodied in *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien nach dem ältesten bekannten Texte* (1897-1905).

The *Sinaitic Palimpsest* immediately became a central document in tracing the history of the New Testament. *The palimpsest's importance lies especially in making the Greek New Testament manuscripts understandable to Aramaic speaking communities during that period.* (see [Aramaic primacy](#)).

A palimpsest is a [manuscript](#) page, whether from [scroll](#) or [book](#) that has been written on, scraped off, and used again. The word "palimpsest" comes through [Latin](#) from [Greek](#)  $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu + \psi\alpha\omega =$  ("again" + "I scrape"), and meant "scraped (clean and used) again." [Romans](#) wrote on [wax-coated tablets](#) that could be smoothed and reused, and a passing use of the rather bookish term "palimpsest" by [Cicero](#) seems to refer to this practice.

### In Conclusion to this Chapter

With a bit of sadness we say farewell to the old Syrian Bibles. The present Syrian Bible conforms to the Constantine-Eusebius Texts. Its Christology is downgraded to teach the *Begotten God* concept. There is an original Greek Text in addition to the Constantine-Eusebius textual family and their images, the Syrian texts. Therefore, the Syrian serves no practical purpose in tracing the succession of the Words from the Father to His Only Begotten Son, and His Son's Words to His Spiritual Seed, and the Gospel Seed after them.

God has clearly preserved His Sacred Words. The original Greek Texts are not contained in the present Syrian Texts. However, this is not true of the Old Italic or Latin Texts. The Lord God did preserve His Word to the Seed of Christ and their Gospel Seed. We shall now turn to the old Italic and its early history and usage.