



Part 2

2.1 Review of Part 1

- Original NT Autographs, all completed by 90 AD were written in Greek
- Originals wore out and copies had to be made by hand
- Changes, many 'cut outs' in the Alexandrian copies versus the Antioch copies
- Alexandria was the seat of Intellectualism and Greek Philosophy with the worlds greatest library
- Alexandria was the home of two very significant heresies: Gnosticism and Arianism
- Gnosticism denies Jesus humanity, Arianism denies His deity
- Gnosticism bred more than 'Jesus was not in a human body', it created a mind set of Superior Scholarship trumps Spirituality
- Alexandrian copies are 5% smaller due to cut outs plus many words are changed: total differences versus Antioch copies approaches 5600
- The 'cuts outs' had to do with Jesus, the supernatural, eternal punishment. Not all but enough to still be a Christian bible, but enough to ask: *has God said?*
- After all Satan does want inside the church helpers, his angels of light, to still be call Christian Scholars & Pastors
- There are, as Jesus said, tares among the wheat, leaven in the meal offering, evil birds lodging in the branches of the church
- That mindset has carried over into the 1800s on up to today in so called Textual Criticism
- Criticism from so called Christian men who have no supernatural conversion like Paul's or yours or mine
- The Bible spoke of the Corruption of God's Word even in Paul's day
- But God promises to preserve His Word until Heaven & Earth pass away
- Satan's Devices are to get us to answer **no** to the question to Eve and to us: *Has God said?*
- Would God choose men with no supernatural testimony of conversion to write or preserve His word?
- Does spiritual character matter with those who handle the translation of God's Word? Of course it does.
- Does the phrase Holy men of God were moved by the Holy Spirit in 2 Peter 1:21 mean anything?

2.2 Why would God keep the true N.T. hidden to the broader church for 1400 years?

In review of our Tale of two texts we find this:

- The Lineage of the Alexandrian texts up to the 1800s involves 45 Greek manuscripts some whole, some fragments
- The Lineage of the Textus Receptus aka the Majority Text involves over 5200 Greek manuscripts some whole some fragments and these from all over the former Roman Empire.
- Though Alexandrian texts are older than any Textus Receptus or Majority Texts outside of Alexandria and the Catholic church
- they are little known, little referred to, quoted or used until Westcott and Hort and their cohorts of the 1800's.
- Two copies Codex A and Codex B are dated as the oldest and range from 430-480 AD.
- These copies reflect the 'cut outs' and changes made in Alexandria of these texts about 5% less than the copies that came out Antioch
- After Jerome's New Latin Vulgate which was translated from the Alexandrian texts into Latin we hear no more of the Alexandrian texts until the 1800s.
- Would God hide His true NT for 1400 years from the church at large?
- On the other hand** we have over 5200 Manuscripts from Antioch sources in active use thruout the ages until this day, thruout the world.
- BUT the oldest is from about +600 AD, thus not as old as the Alexandrian texts: Aleph and B
- But actively used outside of the Catholic church in Antioch, parts of Africa, the Eastern Greek church, Italy, mainland Europe, Scotland and Ireland
- So much more so that we have 5210 copies versus 45 from Alexandria.

2.3 The Seed of the 'Scholars of Alexandria' *the Gnostics* Resurface in the Revision Committee of the 1850s.

- Secretly led by Westcott and Hort and others
- Westcott and Hort's many letters give us detailed insight, in their own words, into their spiritual depravity hidden away and covered by their scholarship their 'Gnostic Scholastic Superiority'

2.4 Dr. Henry Morris

a founding father of the Institute for Creation Research, made these telling comments concerning modern translators.

Catch Dr. Morris's point of emphasis: The Creation

- The men most responsible for alterations in the New Testament text were B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, whose Greek New Testament was largely updated by Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland.*
- All of these men were evolutionists.*

-Furthermore, Westcott and Hort denied Biblical inerrancy and promoted Spiritism and racism.

-Nestle and Aland, were German theological skeptics.

-Westcott and Hort were also the most influential members of the English revision committee which produced the English Revised Version of the Bible.

-The corresponding American revision committee which developed the American Standard Version of 1901 was headed by another liberal evolutionist, Philip Schaff.

-Most new versions since that time have adopted the same presuppositions as those of the 19th century revisers...

-So one of the serious problems with most modern English translations is that they rely heavily on Greek manuscripts of the Bible developed by liberals, rationalists and evolutionists, none of whom believed in the verbal inspiration of the Bible.

-Is this how God would preserve His word? Would he not have used devout scholars who believed in the absolute inerrancy and authority of the Bible?...

End quote from Dr. Morris

2.5 The Nestle/Aland Greek text of today is essentially the same as Westcott and Hort's

-in 1990, Dr. Kirk D. Di Vetro, a Baptist Pastor, wrote to Dr. Bruce Metzger (a modern day Textual Critic, who died in 2007) about how he and the other members of the Nestle-Aland and United Bible Societies Committee began their work on their New Testament Greek Texts.

-Dr. Metzger replied to him as follows:

"We took as our base at the beginning from the text of Westcott and Hort (1881)...."

2.6 The Theory of Westcott and Hort has two basic parts

1st-Oldest is Best.

2nd-The Recension Theory: That Editor(s) added to the shorter original autograph copies over time prior to the shorter copies we know as Codex A & B

-Recension basically means: The manuscripts were deliberately revised, 'added to' at the hands of an editor or editors not a copying scribe.

2.7 Oldest and therefore the Best?

-Bible students are often told that Codex A or Siniaticus and B Vaticanus are older and thus better than other manuscripts.

-the implication being that they must, therefore, be more accurate.

-They are older, but older than what?

-They are older than other Greek manuscripts of the New Testament.

-But they are not older than the earliest versions or translations of the NT into other languages: the Peshitta, Italic, Waldensian and the Old Latin Vulgate: versions which agree with the Majority text or Textus Receptus & are older than A & B

-These ancient versions are some 200 years older than A and B.

-Yes A and B are older than other Greek manuscripts, but for anyone to suggest that they are more accurate is absurd.

-It is like someone saying 'You will find the greatest TRUTH being preached in the oldest and most beautiful cathedrals of the world,' **just because they are older**

-In his masterful book 'Revision Revised' Burgon wrote, over a hundred years ago, concerning the ages of Codices Vaticanus (B) and Siniaticus (Aleph) and their internal corruption:

"Lastly, -We suspect that these two Manuscripts are indebted for their preservation, solely to their ascertained evil character, which has occasioned that one Vaticanus eventually found its way, four centuries ago, to a forgotten shelf in the Vatican library; while the other, after exercising the ingenuity of several

generations of critical corrections, eventually (in A.D. 1844) got deposited in the waste-paper basket of the Convent at the foot of mount Sinai.

-Had A and B been copies of average purity, they must long since have shared the inevitable fate of books which are freely used and highly prized; namely, they would have fallen into decadence and disappeared from sight due to much handling and use and need to replace with newer copies." End quote

2.8 Burgon gives us seven examples of corruption in Codex A and B

With Regards to Codex A, Siniaticus

1-'On many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped out through carelessness of the copyists

2-Letters, words or even whole sentences are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately cancelled, lined thru

3-a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in this New Testament.

4-On nearly every page of the manuscript there are corrections and revisions, done by 10 different people.

5-Some of these corrections were made about the same time that it was copied, but most of them were made in the 6th and 7th century.

With Regards to Codex B, Vaticanus.....

6-In the Gospels alone, Codex B (Vatican) leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 1,491 times.

7-Vaticanus and Siniaticus disagree with each other over 3000 times in the gospels alone...

2.9 Older Ancient Versions

John Burgon on the reliability of a version over any single manuscript.

I suppose it may be laid down that an ancient Version outweighs any single Codex, ancient or modern, which be named: the reason being, that it is scarcely credible that a Version - the Peshito, for example, an Egyptian or Gothic - can have been executed from a single revised copy. *Translations from different parts of the world could not have been translated from the same single text, from a single editor even though their contents agree with each other.*

-A second reason for the value of ancient versions is in their ability to exhibit a text which pre-dates the older Greek manuscripts.

-Readings which are challenged in the Authorized Version for their non-existence in the 'two most ancient authorities' (Codex A; and Codex B, fourth century) are frequently discovered in the Syrian and Latin translations of the second century."

Some of these translations are:

The Peshito or Peshitta Version (AD 150)

The Old Latin Vulgate (AD 157)

The Italic Bible (AD 157) One of the first of these Latin Bibles was for the Waldenses in northern Italy, translated not later than 157 AD and was known as the Italic Version.

2.10 Testimony of Older Early Church Fathers

- Textus Receptus agrees with the vast majority of the 86,000+ citations from scripture by the early church fathers, dated 325AD and earlier.
- Much earlier than the Alexandrian copies A & B which are 430-480 AD

2.11 Part two of the Westcott and Hort Theory

The False So-Called "Syrian Text Recension" of 250 and 350 A.D. Refuted.

Westcott and Hort wrote: "The Syrian Text [our Textus Receptus] must in fact be the result of a 'Recension (deliberately revised, added to thru the direction of an editor),' ... performed deliberately by Editors, and not merely copied by Scribes."

- No one has found any proof of this from any writings
- The older than A & B Translations from all over the world could not have come from one revised text they are too far apart, yet these translations agree with each other
- this is very similar to the synoptic gospels writing much later in the first century and drawing from a singular harmonized mystical text called 'Q'.
- 'Q' has never been found, nor have any ancient fathers written of it except modern textual critiques.
- So with the Recension or revised theory that would explain the larger, fuller texts of Antioch.
- But there is no evidence of a 'Recension'

2.12 How did the Revision committee respond to these challenges to the Westcott and Hort Text?

-The Chairman of the Revision Committee, Bishop Ellicott, that accepted the Westcott and Hort Text and used it as the text from which the Revised Standard version N.T. came.....

-.....Responded to the criticisms of the New Greek New Testament by Burgon, Scrivener and others

A year after the RSV and The New Greek New testament was released in 1881.

-He did so in a short paper and followed it up with a book in 1901.

-He basically stuck to and defended their core principle: '**Ancient Witnesses only**'.

-He did not address anything about their corruption or the witnesses of older translations or the writings of the older fathers

2.13 Looking at some key 'cut out' passages

-When is the last time you heard a sermon on the Trinity from **1John 5:7-8?**

-Even Calvary pastors are hesitant to expound this verse due to the footnotes. Doubt creeps in, we better avoid this verse!

-Who wins here?

1 John 5:7-8 'The Johannine Comma'

it reads: **7 For there are three that bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness on earth: the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree as one.**

The Summary

- 1) Antiquity: We have the testimony of the Old Latin Version as early as AD 157, Tertullian around AD 200, Cyprian around AD 250,
- on the Greek side Codex Wizanburgensis from the 8th century, and Manuscript #88 from the twelfth century. The Comma passes this test.
- 2) Consent of Witnesses: There is consent of Latin witness (old and new) throughout history, as well as several Greek witnesses.

- 3) Variety of Evidence: There are various witnesses (versions, Fathers, lectionaries.) from a variety of locations (N. Africa, Italy, Asia) which qualifies the Comma.
- 4) Respectability of Witnesses, or Weight: Tertullian, the Waldenses, Cyprian, and the orthodox African writers are all credible.
- 5) Continuity, or Unbroken Tradition: The reading appears consistently throughout history from AD 150 to 1500. Pass.
- 6) Credibility of Opposing Evidence: The manuscripts, circumstances and many of the people of the opposing side are suspicious or not credible altogether. 1 John 5:7 passes again.
- 7) Internal Considerations, or Reasonableness: The elementary Greek grammar is deficient without 1 John 5:7, and fundamental Bible doctrines suffer without it. The so called Comma passes again!

The Details Behind the Summary:

GREEK MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE: (most of this evidence was found post Erasmus' Textus Receptus)

There are at least 10 confirmed Greek MSS that contain the Comma.

- 1) 61 (late 15th century) (Aland's Text, 3rd edition, p. 824)
- 2) 629 (14th century) (Aland's, 3rd ed., p. 824)
- 3) 918 (Aland's; 3rd ed., p. 824)
- 4) 221 (Listed by Dr. D.A. Waite; Aland's, 3rd ed., p. 824)
- 5) 2318 (Listed by Dr. D.A. Waite; Aland's, 3rd ed., p. 824)
- 6) 634 (Listed as confirmed by Dr. D.A. Waite)
- 7) 636, margin (Aland's, 3rd ed., p. 824)
- 8) 88, margin, Codex Ravianus, 12th century (Aland's, 3rd ed., p. 824)
- 9) 429, margin (Aland's, 3rd ed., p. 824)
- 10) Omega 110 (Listed as confirmed by Dr. D.A. Waite)
- 11) 635, margin (Holland)
- 12) Codex Wizanburgensis (8th century) (Cloud)
- 13) Dr. Waite lists 10 other Greek MSS that are unconfirmed as yet.

GREEK LECIONARIES (These contained extracts of the New Testament):

(Lectionary: a book containing readings appointed to be read at divine services)

Two Lectionaries that contain the Johannine Comma

- 1) Lectionary 60
- 2) Lectionary 173

OLD VERSIONS

- 1) Old Syriac Version (G.A. Riplinger, p. 381) AD 170
- 2) Included in the 2nd century Old Latin Bible.
- 3) Old Latin MS r has the verse (AD 550).
- 5) Old Latin MS L has the verse.
- 6) Latin Vulgate from AD 800 on.

WRITINGS AND CITATIONS BY CHURCH FATHERS AND OTHERS:

12 writings of the early church fathers contain the comma. 8 of them older than Codex A & B

- 1) AD 200 - Tertullian quotes the verse (Gill, "An exposition of the NT", Vol 2, pp. 907-8)
- 2) AD 250 - Cyprian, who writes, "And again concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit it is written: 'and the Three are One'" (Vienna, vol. iii, p. 215)
- 3) AD 385 - Priscillian cites the verse (Vienna, vol. xviii, p. 6)
- 4) AD 350 - Idacius Clarus cites the verse (MPL, vol. 62, col. 359)
- 5) AD 350 - Athanasius cites the verse (Gill)

- 6) AD 380 - Varimadum
- 7) AD 435 - Cassian
- 8) AD 427 - The Speculum, MS m, a treatise containing an Old Latin texts arranged by topic.
- 9) Sixth century - Ps-Athanasius
- 10) Eighth century - Ansbert
- 11) AD 750 - Wianburgensis cites the verse
- 12) 1200-1400 - Waldensian Bibles have the verse

Greek Grammatical Evidence

This is summarized by saying: The elementary Greek grammar is deficient without 1 John 5:7, and fundamental Bible doctrines suffer without it. The so called Comma passes again!

there are certain grammatical difficulties which result in the Greek.

The nouns spirit, water and blood in v. 8 are in the masculine gender when they are normally neuter; but if v. 7 is present the terms Father and Word which are masculine would influence the structure of v. 8 and explain this anomaly. (Traditional Text Society)

Dr. Frederick Nolan is quick to point out that the verse as preserved in the Latin manuscripts is consistent and full whereas the Greek is internally defective grammatically (Nolan, An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, pp. 259-261, 294) Now let us listen to a few scholars that know the Greek grammatical problem well.

Textus Receptus reading of 1 John 5:7-8 (KJV). The omitted words are capitalized:

"For there are three that bear witness IN HEAVEN, THE FATHER, THE WORD, AND THE HOLY SPIRIT: AND THESE THREE ARE ONE. AND THERE ARE THREE THAT BEAR WITNESS IN EARTH, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."

1) EDWARD HILLS: "[T]he omission of the Johannine comma involves a grammatical difficulty.

-The words spirit, water, and blood are neuter in gender, but in 1 John 5:8 they are treated as masculine.

-If the Johannine comma is rejected, it is hard to explain this irregularity.

-The usual explanation is that in 1 John 5:8 the spirit, the water, and the blood are personalized and that this is the reason for the adoption of the masculine gender.

-But it is hard to see how such personalization would involve the change from the neuter to the masculine.

-For in verse 6 the word Spirit plainly refers to the Holy Spirit, the Third Person of the Trinity. Surely in this verse the word Spirit is "personalized," and yet the neuter gender is used.

-Therefore since personalization did not bring about a change of gender in verse 6, it cannot fairly be pleaded as the reason for such a change in verse 8.

-If, however, the Johannine comma is retained, a reason for placing the neuter nouns spirit, water, and blood in the masculine gender becomes readily apparent.

-It was due to the influence of the nouns Father and Word, which are masculine.

-Thus the hypothesis that the Johannine comma is an interpolation is full of difficulties.

2) FLOYD JONES: The Greek language has "gender" in its noun endings (as do many other languages). Neuter nouns normally require neuter articles (the word "the" as in "the blood" is the article). But the article in verse 8 of the shortened reading as found in the Greek that is the foundation of the new versions...is masculine.

-Thus the new translations read "the Spirit (neuter), the water (neuter), and the blood (neuter): and these 'three' (masculine!! - from the Greek article "hoi") are in one."

Consequently three neuter subjects are being treated as masculine.

-If the "Comma" is rejected it is impossible to adequately explain this irregularity.

-In addition, without the "Comma" verse 7 has a masculine antecedent; three neuter subjects (nouns in vs.8) do not take a masculine antecedent.

Viewing the complete passage it becomes apparent how this rule of grammar is violated when the words are omitted. I John 5:6-8:

"... And it is the Spirit (Neuter) that beareth witness (Neuter), because the Spirit (Neuter) is truth. For there are three (Masculine) that bear record (Masculine) IN HEAVEN, THE FATHER (Masculine), THE WORD (Masculine), AND THE HOLY SPIRIT (Neuter): AND THESE THREE (Masculine) ARE ONE (Masculine). AND THERE ARE THREE (Masculine) THAT BEAR WITNESS IN EARTH, the Spirit (Neuter), and the water (Neuter), and the blood (Neuter): and these three (Masculine) agree in one.

How about Mark 16:9-20?

-When is the last time you heard a great commission sermon from **Mark 16:9-20?**

-How many of you have heard that the great commission starts with making disciples of all men from Matthew 28?

-Mark 16:15 says: **15 And He said to them, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.**

-How many of you have heard this verse given before making disciples they must believe the gospel first.

-How many of you have heard that Jesus never spoke about Tongues? Mark 16:17 says: **17 And these signs will follow those who believe: In My name they will cast out demons; they will speak with new tongues;**

-How many of you have heard a good explanation for why the NIV Mark 16 ends with v. 8 and the words 'for they were afraid':

-Does that sound like the way Good News or a Gospel should end?

9 Now when He rose early on the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom He had cast seven demons. 10 She went and told those who had been with Him, as they mourned and wept. 11 And when they heard that He was alive and had been seen by her, they did not believe. 12 After that, He appeared in another form to two of them as they walked and went into the country. 13 And they went and told it to the rest, but they did not believe them either. 14 Later He appeared to the eleven as they sat at the table; and He rebuked their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they did not believe those who had seen Him after He had risen. 15 And He said to them, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. 16 He who believes and is baptized will be saved; but he who does not believe will be condemned. 17 And these signs will follow those who believe: In My name they will cast out demons; they will speak with new tongues; 18 they will take up serpents; and if they drink anything deadly, it will by no means hurt them; they will lay hands on the sick, and they will recover." 19 So then, after the Lord had spoken to them, He was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God. 20 And they went out and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them and confirming the word through the accompanying signs. Amen.

Mark 16:9-20 Is not in the Oldest Greek Manuscript Copies: Codex B 430 AD and Codex A 480 AD

-Leaves about 400 years where we have no Greek Manuscript copies since Mark wrote his Gospel

-If Mark did not write verses 9-20 then there would be no witnesses older than Codex A & B that would include verses 9-20.

-Specifically there would be no translations into other languages from the Greek text that would include 16:9-20 and there would be no quotations from early church fathers from verses 9-20 if Mark ended his gospel at v. 8

Is that the case? Perish the thought.....

Three Primary Witnesses Since we do not have the Original Autograph of Mark

#1-Greek Manuscript Copies

But the overwhelming majority of Greek manuscripts younger than A & B have verses 9-20

#2-Translations into other languages that are older than A & B

1-Syriac Peshito from the 2nd Century contains 9-20

2-Jerome's Latin Vulgate, prox. 382 a.d. has 9-20 (Jerome claims to have consulted many texts)

3-Gothic translation from Ulphilas, 350 a.d. has 9-20

4-From fourth century (to which codex A & B are ascribed) five Greek writers, one Syriac, and two Latin fathers besides the Vulgate, Gothic and Memphitic (Egyptian) versions (eleven authorities in all) testify to familiar acquaintance with this portion of Mark's Gospel.

#3-The Writings of the Early Church Fathers

-**Chrysostom** wrote around 400 AD and he quotes the last 2 verses of Mark 16 and states that this is the end of Mark's Gospel.

-**Ambrose**, Archbishop of Milan (AD 374-397) freely quotes from this portion of Mark. Citing v.15 four times, vs.16-17 and 18 three times and v. 20 once.

-**Jerome** lived 331-420 AD He was a professed editor of the NT and as such had vast resources and facilities at his disposal. Besides giving the last 12 verses a place in the New Latin Vulgate, the Latin translation of the NT, he also quotes Mark 16:14 as well as v. 9 in his writings

-**Nestorius** quotes v. 20, **Cyril of Alexander** accepts his quote adding a few more verses himself. They both wrote prior to AD 430.

To quote a few.

Conclusion based on the Witnesses: So based on witnesses older than Codex A & B we can safely say that the Textus Receptus, the text of the KJV and the NKJV is correct and accurately represents what Mark wrote.

Acts 8:37 ~~Then Philip said, "If you believe with all your heart, you may." And he answered and said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."~~

All of this verse is deleted by Westcott & Hort. Your footnote says so!

-why is this significant?

1-What you believe is very important. Whom you believe in is very important. *Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*

2-This is the only place in Acts where the complete name, title, and the divine eternal generation of Jesus as the son is listed all at once!

-This is only one of 5 verses where this complete description is used in the New Testament.

-The same older proof sources apply here as well

Romans 1:16 ~~For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God to salvation for everyone who believes, for the Jew first and also for the Greek.~~

-'Of Christ' has been deleted. Westcott and Hort Reads: 'Gospel'.

- The phrase 'Gospel of Christ' is used 10 times in the New Testament
- What Gospel of Christ unique in this verse out of the 10 usages of this phrase is that this is the only verse where the exact phrase "Gospel of Christ" is linked to being the power of God to save all who believe to the Jew first and also to the Greek
- How may here think that is significant?
- The same older proof sources apply here as well

Hebrews 1:3 who (son of v.2) being the brightness of *His* glory and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had **by Himself** purged our sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high,

two words were deleted in the W & H text: 'By Himself'. He had by Himself purged our sins.

-**By Himself**. How many of you think 'by Himself' is significant.

-I think is very important.

-There was no other sacrifice.

There is no other sacrifice to come

There were and are no co-redeemers

-only **by Himself**. Alone. Only Him

-The same older proof sources apply here as well

Last week we gave you 6 other examples out of hundreds....

2.14 Summary and Conclusions thru Questions

-Does God, would God, have two Greek New testaments? **No**

-Would Satan who desires to be like the most high and desires his Scholars to be called 'Christian' though they are not, have two Greek New Testaments? **Yes**

-In face of conflicting footnotes in our Bibles lead us perhaps to ask what Satan asked Eve in the garden:
Has God Said? **Yes**

-What is Satan's end goal in creating doubt about the Word of God?

-That we deny the inerrancy of the Bible just like most of His Christian Seminary Scholars do today and like most of the mainline denominations do today.

-Does Spirituality over Scholarship matter? **Yes**

-Does knowing the super natural testimony of our Bible College Professors matter? **Yes**

-It was important for Paul and the Holy Spirit that his super natural testimony was known to the world.

-If you are involved with teaching the Word of God here would your testimony matter? **Yes**

-So what do we do with our non Textus Receptus English Translation Bibles?

Trust as your final authority the Textus Receptus based English Translations. NKJV/KJV

Note: And the 1898 Edition of the YLT is based on the Textus Receptus. You would use this side by side with you NKJV or KJV.

-It is a transliteration so it can be difficult to follow versus our everyday way of speaking

- Use your other translations as references or for hearing how a verse is translated a little differently for personal clarity
- BUT do not listen to the footnotes about Best manuscripts...etc.

Amen!

Some Books that dig into this further:

All Edited by David Otis Fuller, D.D.

'Which Bible?'

'True or False?'

'Counterfeit or Genuine Mark 16? John 8?'

By Dean William Burgoon

'The Revision Revised'

Also...

By John Henry

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

By Paul Duperron

'Two Parallel Streams of Bibles'

By David B. Loughran

'Textus Receptus versus Westcott & Hort'

Audio

By Chuck Smith

'The Foundations of the Word', parts 1 & 2