

CHAPTER XVI

THE OLD LATIN & GOTHIC VERSIONS

OLD LATIN VERSIONS

In their various books and articles, King James-Only leaders confer legitimacy not only on heretical sects but also translations of Scripture based on corrupt manuscripts. We can be sure that the Cathars, Albigenses, Bogomils, etc – medieval heretics who denied the divinity of Jesus Christ and substituted the “divinity of man” in their creed – used versions of the Scriptures that supported the Gnostic heresy. Their bibles were comparable to the “modern versions” of our day, which omit words and verses which testify that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh.

Versions such as the Syriac Peshitta and Old Latin are misrepresented by KJV-Only advocates as being the earliest bibles “based on the Traditional text.” These bibles, however, were not “pure texts” but hybrid texts, that is, a blend of Traditional and Alexandrian manuscripts. The term “Old Latin Bible” is a misnomer for there was never a complete Latin translation in common use before the Latin Vulgate translated by Jerome. Of the Old Latin, there were “a multiplicity of translations differing from one another, and there was none possessed of commanding authority to which appeal might be made in case of necessity.” (ISBE) The Translators of the 1611 King James Version attested to the corruption of these manifold Latin translations:

“There were also within a few hundred years after CHRIST, translations many into the Latin tongue: for this tongue also was very fit to convey the Law and the Gospel by, because in those times very many Countries of the West, yea of the South, East and North, spake or understood Latin, being made Provinces to the Romans. But now the Latin Translations were too many to be all good, for they were infinite (Latini Interprets nullo modo numerari possunt, saith S. Augustine.) [S. Augustin. de doctr. Christ. lib 2 cap II]. Again they were not out of the Hebrew fountain (we speak of the Latin Translations of the Old Testament) but out of the Greek stream, therefore the Greek being not altogether clear, the Latin derived from it must needs be muddy. This moved S. Jerome a most learned father, and the best linguist without controversy, of his age, or of any that went before him, to undertake the translating of the Old Testament, out of the very fountain with that evidence of great learning, judgment, industry, and faithfulness, that he had forever bound the Church unto him, in a debt of special remembrance and thankfulness.” (Preface, 1611 KJV)

The King James Translators considered the Roman Catholic monk, St. Jerome, “a most learned father, and the best linguist without controversy, of his age.” They also regarded his Latin Vulgate to be a better translation than the “muddy” Old Latin translations. One reason for the superiority of the Vulgate was that the multitude of Old Latin bibles had been translated by laymen who “revised and modified” the text instead of translating in a scholarly manner.

“The term Old Latin denotes the Latin versions of the Bible predating the revisions and new translations by Jerome and others. Not only is there no complete OT text of the Old Latin versions, but its very transmission is spotty and fragmentary...

“The oldest evidence for the existence of the Old Latin version is in the authors from South Africa... The testimony...establishes the existence of the Old Latin version before A.D. 180...Available evidence suggests that at about the time of the first translation in North Africa, translation was beginning independently at several other places...

“... We have evidence that in the 3rd cent. several Old Latin versions circulated in Italy, in Gaul, and in Spain... The text was not yet regarded as official and unalterable, and countless hands were at work on the MSS, whether improving the popular Latin or bringing the texts closer to other forms, thus creating hybrid types and contributing to even wider diversification. Augustine (5th cent.) complained about the ‘infinite variety’ of the Latin translations: ‘In the early days of the faith, every man who happened to gain possession of a Greek manuscript and who imagined that he had any faculty in both languages – however slight that may be – dared to make a translation.’ By ‘translation’ he meant revisions and modifications in the text.” (ISBE, Vol. IV, pp. 969-970)

The Verbum Project to produce an edition of the Old Latin versions of the Gospel of John confirms that the “Vetus Latina” or Old Latin translations were not formal equivalence translations produced by meticulous scholarship. Instead they were comparable to the dynamic equivalence versions or paraphrases that have become popular today:

“The first translations were made by individual Christians for use within their own community. These are known as the *Old Latin* or *Vetus Latina*...

“The Latin translations of John were neither translated nor diffused in a cultural vacuum. The relative importance of local communities, regional metropoleis, and larger centres, in particular, Rome, within Western Christianity, have been widely debated in earlier scholarship. The circulation of Scriptural translations is one index of how different centres and communities interacted with each other; as is the degree of freedom local scholars felt to adapt the texts they had received.”

The ISBE confirms the Translators’ criticism that the Old Latin translations were “muddy,” the reason for this being that they were translated from the Greek Septuagint (LXX):

“... The Old Latin version is not written in the polished literary language of that time but in the didactic, vernacular idiom of the cult, often reflecting the dialect of the common people. This colloquial flavor is colored also by the Greek idiom, seen in its translation of Greek terms and occasionally even in syntax. This Greek influence indicates that the translation was based not on the Hebrew original but on the LXX, prevalent in Christian communities where the Greek idiom had first been used in the cult and where the LXX text was orally translated into Latin for those who could not understand Greek... The textual picture is equally colorful. The evidence in the historical and prophetic books manifests the Lucianic rescension of the LXX. Thus some have even concluded that the version originated in Syria. Since Lucian’s text is later than the Old Latin version, the inference is that both have preserved the pre-Origenic renderings of the LXX.” (ISBE, Vol. IV, p. 970)

The Septuagint was a Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament produced in the 3rd century B.C. by 70 Jewish rabbis who lived in Alexandria, Egypt. The Translators’ Preface noted that these “Seventy Interpreters” took great liberties with the Hebrew text that was originally inspired by God:

“It is certain, that that Translation was not so sound and so perfect, but it needed in many places correction; and who had been so sufficient for this work as the Apostles or Apostolic men?... it was commended generally, yet it did not fully content the learned, no not of the Jews... Yet for all that, as the Egyptians are said of the Prophet to be men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit [Isa 31:3]; so it is evident, (and Saint Jerome affirmeth as much) [S. Jerome. de optimo genere interpret.] that the Seventy were Interpreters, they were not Prophets; they did many things well, as learned men; but yet as men they stumbled and fell, one while through oversight, another while through ignorance, yea, sometimes they may be noted to add to the Original, and sometimes to take from it; which made the

Apostles to leave them many times, when they left the Hebrew, and to deliver the sense thereof according to the truth of the word, as the spirit gave them utterance. This may suffice touching the Greek Translations of the Old Testament.” (Preface, 1611 KJV)

Jerome rejected the Septuagint and translated the Old Testament from the original Hebrew: “His real contribution lies in the translation of the OT from its original tongue. He thus inaugurated a new era in the history of the Christian Bible by dethroning the LXX; but the reaction to this decision brought him much disappointment and bitterness.” (ISBE, Vol. IV, p. 972)

As for the New Testament of the Old Latin version, it was “marked by the boldest departures from the received text” due to the fact that it was not translated from the Byzantine (Eastern) manuscripts which would become the Received Text, but from the Alexandrian (Western) text which underlay the Westcott-Hort Greek Text of 1881.

“The textual complexion of the [Old Latin] version is marked by the boldest departures from the received text. It represents the Western type and goes along with the Codex Cantabrigiensis and the Old Syriac. The deviations vary in the different groups; the African branch displays the greater divergence and the European the lesser. It has also preserved a large number of readings from the Diatesseron, some Marcionite readings, and many apocryphal elements...” (ISBE, Vol. IV, pp. 969-970)

The Old Latin New Testament was so corrupt that it resembled the New Testament of the heretic Marcion, who had been expelled from the church in Rome in 144 because of his “gnostic-tinged heretical views.” Marcion excluded the Old Testament from his translation as the “product of a God inferior to the God of Jesus (the Christian God)” and established a “hyper-Paulinistic canon” which limited the New Testament to ten Pauline epistles and portions of Luke. (ISBE, Vol. I, p.604) The numerous modifications and the “carelessness” of the language of the Old Latin N.T. are mentioned by the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia along with similarities to the hybrid Syriac versions:

“...The Old Latin version of the NT enjoys a better attestation...

“No less complicated is the relationship between Marcion’s version of the Pauline Epistles and the origin of the Old Latin version. Attention has been drawn to the Marcionite prologues that appear in certain Vulgate MSS. The Marcionite corpus as translated into Latin must have had some corrections with the Latin tradition that ended in the Vulgate version...

“The earliest Latin translations of the NT, like those of the OT, show a multitude of adaptations and modifications. The same must be said about the language used, which generally bears the stamp of carelessness. Some elements that cannot be explained on the basis of the Greek original may justly be considered astounding. The only explanation is that the Latin must have had some affinities with the Syriac versions...” (ISBE, Vol. IV, pp. 970-971)

The 1611 Translators, the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia and many other authoritative sources rebut the claims of KJV-Only advocates concerning the purity of the Old Latin. The internal evidence also proves the Old Latin to be corrupt. A few examples from the critical apparatus of the UBS Greek New Testament show that all 10 Old Latin manuscripts omitted “Jesus” in Matt. 1:18, “but after the spirit” in Romans 8:1, “adulterers” in James 4:4, “fasting and” in I Cor. 7:5, and changed “God” to “that which” in I Tim. 3:16.

The doxology was omitted from the Lord’s Prayer (Matt. 6:13) in 7 out of 11 Old Latin mss. In Luke 24:6, 7 of 11 Old Latin mss. omitted “he is not here but was raised” and 8 of 11 Old Latin mss. omitted “from the tomb” in Luke 24:8, to name just a few of the many corruptions in Old Latin versions. (Source: The Greek New Testament, UBS 3rd Ed., 1975)

So corrupt were the Old Latin versions that Jerome's Latin Vulgate was considered an improvement. The ISBE agrees with the 1611 Translators and both cite St. Augustine as evidence that the Latin translations were substandard:

“But now the Latin Translations were too many to be all good, for they were infinite (Latini Interprets nullo modo numerari possunt, saith S. Augustine.) [S. Augustin. de doctr. Christ. lib 2 cap II].” (Preface, 1611 KJV)

“It was the consideration of the chaotic condition of the existing translations, with their divergences and variations, which moved [Pope] Damascus to commission Jerome to his task and Jerome to undertake it. We learn particulars from the letter of Jerome in 383 transmitting to his patron the first installment of his revision, the Gospels...

“From Jerome's contemporary, Augustine, we obtain a similar picture. ‘Translators from Hebrew into Greek,’ he says (*De Doctrina Christiana*, ii.11), ‘can be numbered, but Latin translators by no means. For whenever, in the first ages of the faith, a Greek manuscript came into the hands of anyone who had also a little skill in both languages, he made bold to translate it forthwith.’ In the same context he mentions ‘an innumerable variety of Latin translators,’ ‘a crowd of translators.’ His advice to readers is to give a preference to the *Itala*, ‘which is more faithful in its renderings and more intelligible in its sense.’ What the *Itala* is, has been greatly discussed. Formerly it was taken to be a summary designation of all the versions before Jerome's time. But Professor Burkitt (*Texts and Studies*, IV) strongly urges the view that by this term Augustine designates Jerome's Vulgate, which he might quite well have known and preferred to any of the earlier translations. However this may be, whereas before Jerome there were those numerous translations, of which he and Augustine complain, after Jerome there is the one preeminent and commanding work, produced by him, which in course of time drove all others out of the field, the great Vulgate edition, as it came to be called, of the complete Latin Bible.” (ISBE)

In her typical hodgepodge of edited quotations – words and phrases taken out of their respective contexts and spliced together with falsehoods thrown in as facts – Gail Riplinger again forced her source, in this case the Translators' Preface, say the *opposite* of what the Translators actually stated. Regarding the pedigree of the Old Latin versions, Gail distorted the words of the Translators' to mean that Erasmus used and endorsed them! Gail Riplinger's “private interpretation” of the Translators' Preface goes like this:

“Reference works used by the final ‘general committee,’ according to Bois' notes, include the following and more:...

“The ‘old Latin versions’ were an important witness to the most ancient text. (e.g., Romans 9:6, 1 Cor. 9:5). ‘Erasmus' Translation of the New Testament, [e.g. his old Latin] is so much different from the vulgar [Catholic Latin Vulgate]...’ In the *Translators to the Readers* they write, ‘what varieties have they, and what alterations have they made...of their Latin translation.’ ‘Erasmus...found fault with their vulgar translation...we produce their enemies [Erasmus] for witnesses against them.’ (*Translators*)” (*Awe*, p. 534)

To give this string of lies some authority, the paragraph on the Old Latin versions appears in a section titled “Reference works used by the final ‘general committee,’ according to Bois' notes,” even though this is not in John Bois' notes. A glance at the Translators' Preface shows they were *not* referring to an Old Latin translation endorsed by Erasmus but to the Greek New Testament *translated* by Erasmus:

“...Erasmus...found fault with their vulgar Translation, and consequently wished the same to be mended, or a new one to be made... But what will they say to this, that Pope Leo the Tenth

allowed Erasmus' Translation of the New Testament, so much different from the vulgar, by his Apostolic Letter and Bull..." (Translators' Preface)

One more example in this fabric of KJV-Only lies and distortions – which passes for “scholarship” because it is never investigated or exposed – is Peter Ruckman’s spin on the Old Latin as cited by Jack Moorman in *Forever Settled*:

“Ruckman, quoting ISBE says, ‘The Albigenses continued to use the Old Latin long after Jerome’s Vulgate came out and their preservation of this text is attributed (according to Burkitt) to the fact that they were ‘heretics’.’” (p. 86)

What the ISBE actually states is that “only among heretics isolated from the rest of Western Christianity” would the Old Latin continue to be used after the Latin Vulgate was commonly accepted:

“The emergence of the Vulgate could not immediately displace or swiftly change the position of the Old Latin... Not until the 9th century did the Old Latin capitulate to the Vulgate, and there are good witnesses that it lingered on in certain places even longer... (ISBE, Vol. IV, p. 971)

“When Jerome’s revision took hold of the church, the Old Latin representatives for the most part dropped out of notice. Some of them, however, held their ground and continued to be copied down to the 12th and even the 13th century. Codex c is an example of this; it is a manuscript of the 12th century, but as Professor Burkitt has pointed out (*Texts and Studies*, IV, ‘Old Latin,’ 11) ‘it came from Languedoc, the country of the Albigenses. Only among heretics isolated from the rest of Western Christianity could an Old Latin text have been written at so late a period.’” (ISBE)

In other words, it was the Merovingian heretics of the Languedoc in the South of France who preserved the Old Latin text—the same heretics who are falsely identified as “fundamental Christians” by the KJV-Only defenders:

“The Old Latin Vulgate was used by the Christians in the churches of the Waldenses, Gauls, Celts, Albigenses, and other fundamental groups throughout Europe.” (Samuel Gipp, *An Understandable History of the Bible*, p. 67)

“The first Latin translation of the Bible is known as the ‘Old Latin’ and was made no later than A.D. 157 for the young churches established throughout the Italian Alps... Also referred to as the Itala Bible, this venerable witness was also closely allied with the *Textus Receptus*... true Latin-speaking believers continued to perpetuate their beloved Itala through the centuries. These readings were eventually preserved through a translation into sixteenth-century Italian by the reformer Diodati becoming the official Bible of the Albigenses and Waldensian assemblies. Satan’s wrath for this pure Alpine text was vividly confirmed by the blood which flowed through the otherwise peaceful valleys amidst repeated Catholic atrocities.” (William P. Grady, *Final Authority*, pp. 35-6)

“The ‘TRADITIONAL TEXT’ in Latin from A.D. 120 to 240 was the Old Latin of the Waldenses that matched the Syrian Greek Receptus of Antioch...”

“You see, until Martin Luther’s time, there was no European recognition of the correct Bible text. It was traveling by ‘underground railroad’ through Europe, being propagated by Lollards, Waldenses, Albigenses, Picards, Lyonists, Petrobrusians, Henricians Berengarians, Bogomiles, Paulicians, Catharis, and ‘Montanists,’ but they had the ‘dice loaded against them.’” (Peter Ruckman, *Christian Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, pp. 87, 103)

THE SYRIAC PESHITTA

There is an affinity between the Old Latin translations and the Syriac Peshitta, produced in the 5th century at Antioch of Syria, which makes it plausible that the Old Latin originated in this early center for the propagation of heresy:

“It is clear from a comparison that the Western type of text has close affinity with the Syriac witnesses originating in the eastern provinces of the empire. The close textual relation disclosed between the Latin and the Syriac versions has led some authorities to believe that, after all, the earliest Latin version may have been made in the East, and possibly at Antioch.” (ISBE, “Old Latin”)

“Syria was also the source of several Christian heresies and schismatic movements, including Nestorianism and Monophysitism.” (ISBE, Vol. III, “Syria,” p. 693)

Ruckmanites like Samuel Gipp misinform readers when they write that the Syriac Peshitta and Old Latin were “Bibles” based on the Traditional Text which were brought by Jewish Christians to preach the gospel in England and Europe.

“The Universal [Traditional] Text is that which travels north from Jerusalem to Antioch, the ‘gateway to Europe,’ heading for England. Upon arrival in England it would be ready for translation into the language through which God has chosen to spread His Gospel – English.

“From Antioch...the Universal Text was sent up into Europe. From there it spread through Syria and Europe through its translation into the Syrian Peshitto version and the Old Latin Vulgate. There are still 350 copies of the Peshitto in existence today as a testimony to this widespread usage in the years since 150 A.D.” (*An Understandable History of the Bible*, p. 67)

The original Peshitta not only contained the Apocrypha but omitted several books of the New Testament – 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. These books were only added at a later date when the official canon of Scripture was established. Even Gail Riplinger acknowledged the corrupt nature of the Syriac Peshitta in the first printing of *New Age Bible Versions*, but this admission was omitted in subsequent printings:

“...the Peshitta or the Greek Septuagint, both of which contain numerous corruptions.” (*NABV*, 1st Printing, March 1993, p.100)

(See Chapter 9)

For a more complete treatment of the heretical origins and textual corruption of the Syriac Peshitta, see “The Semitic New Testament” on this website. The following sections of the present report will cover other corrupt translations which the “KJV-Defenders” misrepresent as being “in complete agreement with the original Hebrew and Greek manuscripts.”

The Old Latin translations were not only similar to the Syriac version but also the Aramaic Targums, which were not translations but Jewish interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures: “Remarkable points of contact between the Old Latin and the Aramaic Targums raise another problem important for the study of the former’s origins...” (ISBE, Vol. IV, p. 970)

We can only conclude that high on the agenda of the KJV-Only movement is the revival, not only of the medieval heresies, but of heretical translations based on the corrupt Greek Septuagint Old Testament and the corrupt Aramaic New Testament, the Syriac Peshitta. This explains why Judaizers in the Hebrew Roots and

Sacred Name movements have been claiming that the New Testament was originally written in Aramaic rather than Greek. (See: "The Semitic New Testament")

Mrs. Riplinger opens the door a little wider for such tampering with the sacred canon of the Greek New Testament by her assertion that the book of Romans was originally written in Old Italia and the book of Hebrews in the Hebrew language. To give this falsehood authority, it is inserted as a fact right in the midst of a spurious statement attributed to John Wycliffe:

"Weighty notes, such as this one from Wycliffe, a man God entrusted to publish the scriptures, tip the scale in today's debate – 'You say it is heresy to speak of the Holy Scriptures in English... Do you know whom you blaspheme? Did not the Holy Ghost give the word of God at first in the mother-tongue of the nations to whom it was addressed? [e.g. the book of Romans first written in Old Italia; the book of Hebrews written in Hebrew, etc.]...to speak that word in all languages under heaven' (see Ch. 22)." (*Awe*, p. 36)

The authenticity of the Canon of the New Testament is now being challenged by nonbelievers and it is noteworthy that ministerial students in some seminaries are now studying Aramaic instead of Greek. A popular translation is the late George Lamsa's "Translation from the Aramaic of the Peshitta" which is promoted among Evangelical Christians in some circles. One promoter of Lamsa's translation of the Syriac Peshitta is Robert Reiland, who also teaches that God spoke in the Old Testament with a female voice! (*The Fire & The Cloud*) According to John P. Juedes writing for the Christian Research Institute Journal, George Lamsa denied the doctrine of the Trinity as well as the deity, atonement, resurrection, ascension and second coming of Jesus Christ. ("George M. Lamsa: Christian Scholar or Cultic Torchbearer?") Lamsa's student, Dr. Rocco Errico, a Near Eastern theologian and Aramaic expert, now uses his mentor's Peshitta translation to attack the Biblical doctrine of redemption. Seriously heretical statements were elicited from Dr. Errico during a CBS interview:

"Errico says he used the ancient Peshitta texts, known to be at least as old as the Greek, as well as other ancient manuscripts. But the real controversy comes in Errico's interpretations. He says Jesus was the son of man, the 'Meshihah' (Messiah), a provincial prophet on a mission to teach God's word, that he was a spiritual genius mighty in word and deed but Jesus was our savior but not our redeemer by the cross, which some say presents a real blow to western Christian belief. In other words, says Errico, Jesus never ever spoke sacrificial language 'first of all that word redemption and redeemer is incorrect, the Aramaic does not use that word.' Errico, in that refusal man crucified Jesus -- it was not God's plan. He says why would God be unwilling to sacrifice Abraham's son and then decide to sacrifice his own? Thus, Errico says the question is not who was Jesus but rather what was he about; what was his mission, "He didn't die for our sins, he died because of them...'

"Errico says that...[p]art of the problem is rooted in the fact that Jesus, after his crucifixion, was deified as Lord as a justification for his death; that Jesus didn't become Lord in a liturgical sense until about the 1st century A.D. Errico says Christians (mostly Jewish Christ followers) had to try and explain why the son of man or the son of God died in such a way. Old Hebrew tradition regularly used blood sacrifice and this would've made sense as an explanation for Jesus' death for the atonement of our sins, but that Jesus never said that. 'His message was not the cross. His message was the kingdom of God coming here and now.' Errico adds there is no heaven or hell in the Western sense of the two being specific places in the universe. Hell is an Aramaic idiom that means mental torment -- when you do something wrong you suffer for it...

"So the question becomes: how does one suffer for it? What then, is the great reward of being saved? Errico says: 'The reward is here not when you die. God doesn't reward, God doesn't punish. He (Jesus) did save us, but he saved us by his teachings and if we don't follow his teachings you're not saved at all.'" ("Aramaic-English Bible Translation Draws Criticism")

The 1968 edition of George M. Lamsa's Translation from the Aramaic of the Peshitta contains the following corrupt readings which undermine the doctrine of redemption:

COLOSSIANS 1:14

SYRIAC PESHITTA: "By whom we have obtained **salvation** and forgiveness of sins."

KJV: "In whom we have **redemption through his blood**, *even* the forgiveness of sins."

GREEK TEXTUS RECEPTUS: εν <1722> {IN} ω <3739> {WHOM} εχομεν <2192> (5719)
την <3588> {WE HAVE} απολυτρωσιν <629> {REDEMPTION} δια <1223> του <3588>
{THROUGH} αιματος <129> {BLOOD,} αυτου <846> {HIS} την <3588> {THE} αφεσιν <859>
των <3588> {REMISSION} αμαρτιων <266> {OF SINS;}

TITUS 2:14

SYRIAC PESHITTA: "Who gave himself for us, that he might **save** us from all iniquity, and might purify us to be his own."

KJV: "Who gave himself for us, that he might **redeem** us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

GREEK TEXTUS RECEPTUS: {WHO} εδωκεν <1325> (5656) {GAVE} εαυτον <1438>
{HIMSELF} υπερ <5228> {FOR} ημων <2257> {US,} ινα <2443> {THAT} λυτρωσεται <3084>
(5672) {HE MIGHT REDEEM} ημας <2248> {US} απο <575> {FROM} πασης <3956> {ALL}
ανομιας <458> {LAWLESSNESS,} και <2532> {AND} καθαριση <2511> (5661) {MIGHT
PURIFY} εαυτω <1438> {TO HIMSELF} λαον <2992> {A PEOPLE} περιουσιον <4041>
{PECULIAR,} ζηλωτην <2207> {ZEALOUS} καλων <2570> {OF GOOD} εργαων <2041>
{WORKS.}

A YouTube video takes full advantage of Dr. Errico's CBS interview to justify the false claims of Astrotheology, which equates the Son of God, Jesus Christ, as presented in the Greek New Testament and the KJV, with the Greek Sun god, Helios. (See also Chapter 2 for Astrotheologists' claim that "Jehovah" in the KJV is the Sun god.)

We must keep in mind that the endgame of the conspiracy is the total eradication of the Textus Receptus and all of its translations. To facilitate the transition from the Textus Receptus and its translations to corrupted manuscripts and versions, the conspirators are creating associations in the minds of Christians between the Old Latin, Syriac Peshitta, etc. and the Received Greek Text (Textus Receptus). These associations are opening the door ever so stealthily for the next phase of the deception, which will sneak these corrupt translations into the

Fundamentalist community. When the Textus Receptus and its translations are ultimately banned, the masses will freely accept hybrid versions that are essentially no better than modern versions.

A broadside attack on the KJV and the Textus Receptus is, in fact, already underway. David Bay of Cutting Edge Ministries has launched a campaign of discrediting the King James Version as a “Rosicrucian masterpiece edited by the Rosicrucian/Freemason Francis Bacon and his band of intellectuals known as the ‘Order of the Helmet’.” Using their “Secret Mysteries of America” video series, Cutting Edge appears to also be heading in the direction of introducing some “proof” that Francis Bacon was the illegitimate son and legal heir of Queen Elizabeth of England, which would render King James I an illegal occupant of the British throne. This prospect was suggested by Peter Dawkins, a main speaker in the first “Secret Mysteries” video, who stated that the surname of Elizabeth I “Tudor” was an Anglicized word for “Tribe of Judah.” (See audio series: Cutting Edge Ministries’ Plot to Destroy the English Bible)

A three-pronged attack has been mounted against the Textus Receptus using three factions – proponents of modern versions, King James-Only defenders who promote hybrid texts, and Messianic Jews who promote Aramaic translations of the New Testament. Ultimately, the KJV and all Bibles based on the Textus Receptus will be banned as “Fundamentalist” hate propaganda (See: The House of God on Trial). When this sad state of affairs comes to pass, KJV-Onlyism’s heavy promotion of the Wycliffe, Old Latin versions and Syriac Peshitta will allow these corrupt translations to fill the void.

THE GOTHIC BIBLE

As previously discussed, a good portion of *In Awe of Thy Word* is devoted to the promotion of corrupt translations as “based on the original Hebrew and Greek texts.” A list of alleged “English Bibles,” each a “purification” of the previous one, is presented on page 33:

“The English Bible’s seven purifications are covered, including,

- The Gothic
- The Anglo-Saxon
- The Pre-Wycliffe
- The Wycliffe
- The Tyndale/Coverdale/Great/Geneva
- The Bishop’s
- The King James Bible

The Tyndale Bible, Coverdale Bible, Great Bible, Geneva Bible, Bishops’ Bible and the King James Bible were based on the Hebrew Masoretic Text and the Byzantine manuscripts which later became the Greek Textus Receptus. However, the Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Pre-Wycliffe and Wycliffe are quite another story. Gail takes the King James Only deception to the next level of deception with several chapters promoting ancient translations that unfamiliar to most in the KJV-Only community. For example, she maintains that the pure Word of God was preserved in the Gothic translation.

“Gothic, the great great grandfather of English, was a major world language at the time of Christ and the apostles. Gothic benefited from this gift, by which the Holy Ghost superintended over the preaching of the ‘word...in all the world’ (Col. 1:5,6) and the translation of the ‘scriptures...made known to all nations’ (Rom. 16:26). The words of English are much older than most think. The earliest English sentence to be discovered appears on an old coin dated around A.D. 450. (It says, ‘This she-wolf is a reward to my kinsmen’ (see *The Mother Tongue: English and How it Got That Way* by Bill Bryson).” (*In Awe of Thy Word*, p. 34)

“The Gothic Gospels, among the oldest of the vernacular versions, match the text of Erasmus and the King James Bible... ‘The original Greek manuscript or manuscripts, from which Ulfilas made his translation of the Gothic Gospels, belonged to the Byzantine group [KJV type]... As in the Gospels, the original Greek text in the epistles was of the Byzantine type... and differs very little from the fully developed Textus Receptus of the later period.’ (*Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 2...)” (Ibid., pp. 968-9)

In *Final Authority*, William P. Grady promotes the Gothic Bible as the first translation of the Syriac Peshitta into a European language. The following paragraph from Grady’s book is also cited by Becky Sexton of Former Catholics For Christ writing for Cutting Edge Ministries, which is Baptist but not KJV-Only:

““For the Syrian people dwelling northeast of Palestine, there were at least four major versions: the Peshitta (A.D. 145); the Old Syriac (AD. 400); the Palestinian Syriac (A.D. 450); and the Philoxenian (A.D. 508), which was revised by Thomas of Harkel in A.D. 616 and henceforth known as the Harclean Syriac. True to the meaning of its name (straight or rule), the Peshitta set the standard because of its early composition and strong agreement with the Greek text underlying the King James Bible. Because of the obvious embarrassment caused by this document bearing witness to a text some two centuries older than either X [Codex Sinaiticus] or B [Codex Vaticanus], modern Nicolaitane scholarship has conveniently assigned the Peshitta’s origin to A.D. 415. The first translation into a purely European tongue is known as the Gothic version. This work was prepared in 330 A.D. by the soul-winning missionary Ulfilas... Once again, the strength of this version is found in its age and agreement with the Textus Receptus. Edward Hills cites F.G. Kenyon’s 1912 edition on New Testament criticism that, ‘The type of text represented in it is for the most part that which is found in the majority of Greek manuscripts. Thus, Ulfilas had access to King James Version readings a full two decades before Sinaiticus or Vaticanus were copied. An excellent example of his superior manuscripts is reflected by the Gothic inclusion of the traditional ending to ‘The Lord’s Prayer’ of Matthew 6:13. The familiar words, ‘for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen’, are conspicuously absent from both of the ‘two most ancient authorities.’ There are only eight surviving manuscripts of the Gothic version.” (*Final Authority*, p. 36)

ULFILAS: “A LITTLE ARIANISM”

According to Gail Riplinger, the translator of the Gothic Bible, Ulfilas, was “‘the apostle’ to the Goths.” Selectively quoting the Encyclopedia Britannica, she writes, “Philostorgius said Ulfilas’ ‘grand-parents were Christians,’ converts of those ‘dwellers in...Cappadocia’ which received the gift of ‘other tongues’ heard in Acts 2:9.” (*Awe*, pp. 622-3)

The Encyclopedia Britannica actually states concerning Ulfilas (c. 311-383): “The Arian historian Philostorgius (*Hist. eccl. ii. 5*) says that his grand-parents were Christian captives from Sadagolthina in Cappadocia...” Moreover,

“Ulfilas may therefore have been a convert to Christianity when he reached Constantinople. But it was here probably that he came into contact with the Arian doctrines which gave the form to his later teaching... This ordination of Ulfilas by the chiefs of the semi-Arian party is at once an indication of their determination to extend their influence by active missionary enterprise, and evidence that Ulfilas was now a declared adherent of the Arian or semi-Arian party. He was now thirty years of age, and his work as ‘bishop among the Goths’ covered the remaining forty years of his life.”

The Arian heresy was introduced in the 4th century by one Arius, a priest of Alexandria, Egypt who taught that Jesus Christ was a created being, rather than the Creator. So when the “Arian historian Philostorgius” wrote that Ulfilas’ grandparents were “Christians” he would not have defined Christianity as it is presented in the (true) Scriptures or Jesus Christ as “the only begotten Son of God,” but rather in terms of the Arian heresy which demoted Jesus to a created being.

Gail is not only careful to omit mention of Philostorgius’ Arianism but also Ulfilas’ ordination by the Arians. However, it turns out that Ulfilas was not only an Arian bishop and missionary but the chief carrier of the Arian heresy throughout the Roman Empire following the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D., which gave Christendom the version of the Nicene Creed we have today. Notably, it was to the Visigoths of Western Gaul that Ulfilas brought the Arian heresy in the 4th century, specifically to the South of France where the Merovingian heresy took root.

“The Visigoths were adherents of the Arian heresy which denied the divinity of Jesus. Their descendants founded the Merovingian dynasty which ruled Gaul until the death of Dagobert II. The Merovingians were said to rule by right of their ‘royal blood’ or ‘sang real’. ‘Sangreal’ has been traditionally interpreted as the ‘holy grail’ which, according to legend, Mary Magdalene carried to the Jewish kingdom of southern Gaul (including Rennes-le-Chateau. It may have been believed by adherents of a secret tradition that Mary Magdalene was the wife of Jesus and that what she brought was not a vessel but the royal seed of David in her womb.’ - Steve Mizrach, ‘The Mysteries of Rennes-le-Chateau and the Priore du Sion’” (OrdoTempli)

The authors of *Holy Blood, Holy Grail* identify the Goths as the Merovingian Jews of the seventh century principality of Septimania, “...an autonomous principality that existed in the south of France for a century and a half,” which would explain why the Goths were receptive to an heretical version of Christianity which denied the deity of Jesus Christ:

“[There exists] support for our hypothesis – that a bloodline descended from Jesus existed in the south of France, that this bloodline intermarried with the Merovingians, and that the Merovingians, in consequence, were partly Judaic....an autonomous principality that existed in the south of France for a century and a half, a principality whose most famous ruler was Guillem de Gellone...”

“At the apex of his power Guillem de Gellone included among his domains northeastern Spain, the Pyrenees, and the region of southern France known as Septimania. This area had long contained a large Jewish population. During the sixth and seventh centuries this population enjoyed extremely cordial relations with its Visigothic overlords, who espoused Arian Christianity, so much so, in fact, that mixed marriages were common and the words ‘Goth’ and ‘Jew’ were often used interchangeably.” (*Holy Blood, Holy Grail*, pp. 389-91)

History World chronicles the Arian heresy and the work of the missionary who insured that it would not die:

Nicaea and orthodoxy: AD 325

More than 200 bishops, mainly from the eastern parts of the empire, arrive at Nicaea for the council. They meet in Constantine’s palace, and the emperor himself presides over many of the discussions. His authority is purely political; though an undoubted supporter of Christianity, he has not yet been baptized.

The alarming presence of the emperor helps the bishops to reach a conclusion more emphatic than is justified by the range of their opinions. The crack opened wide by Arius seems to be

firmly closed when it is announced at Nicaea that the Father and the Son are of the same substance (homo-ousios in Greek).

Between two councils: AD 325-381

During the lifetime of those who gather at Nicaea in AD 325 Arianism remains a controversial issue. Before the end of Constantine's reign Arius himself is brought back from exile. By mid-century, under Constantius (one of Constantine's sons), Arianism is actively favoured, with most of the influential positions in the church held by Arian bishops.

Over the years new middle ways are explored. Some suggest that the Son is 'of similar substance' (homoi-ousios) to the Father; others that he is 'like' Him (homoios). But eventually the debate runs out of steam - particularly when a pagan emperor, Julian the Apostate, concentrates the minds of the Christians by dismissing all their notions.

By AD 381, with a new generation of bishops and a new emperor, Theodosius, who is anti-Arian, the council summoned to Constantinople is in no mood for compromise. It conclusively rejects the Arian heresy and formally adopts a slightly modified version of the statement of faith promulgated at Nicaea. This AD 381 version is the text which becomes known as the Nicene creed.

And there the matter would seem, at first sight, to have ended. But it transpires that Arianism, like an irrepressible virus, has already spread elsewhere. The carrier is a remarkable man, Ulphilas, who in about 340 is appointed bishop to the barbarian Goths settled north of the Danube.

Ulphilas and his alphabet: AD c.360

Ulphilas is the first man known to have undertaken an extraordinarily difficult intellectual task - writing down, from scratch, a language which is as yet purely oral. He even devises a new alphabet to capture accurately the sounds of spoken Gothic, using a total of twenty-seven letters adapted from examples in the Greek and Roman alphabets.

God's work is Ulphilas' purpose. He needs the alphabet for his translation of the Bible from Greek into the language of the Goths. It is not known how much he completes, but large sections of the Gospels and the Epistles survive in his version - dating from several years before Jerome begins work on his Latin text."

Notwithstanding the undisputed historical fact that Ulphilas spread the Arian heresy throughout the Roman Empire, Gail Riplinger maintains that there was not a trace of Arianism in his theology or his translation of Scripture. She cites Joseph Bosworth's *The Gospels: Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Wycliffe, and Tyndale Versions* which claimed that Ulphilas' Bible was pure and uncontaminated, and presents a hodgepodge of excerpts from other sources (Cambridge History of the Bible, Friedrichsen's *The Gothic Version of the Gospels and Epistles*) to make her case that Ulphilas' bible differed a little from the Greek.

"Ulphilas drew the water of life from the pure fountain, and delivered it to his people uncontaminated. (*The Gospels: Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Wycliffe, and Tyndale Versions*, ed. Joseph Bosworth, 4th Ed., London, 1907)

"Of the influence of the [corrupt] Vulgate there is no trace whatsoever' in the Gothic Bible. 'We are certain of this, that so far as the translation of Ulphilas has been recovered, there is not a trace of Arianism to be found [the heresy that Jesus was a created being]. On the contrary, in

passages clearly unfavorable to the doctrine of Arius, Ulphilas has honestly and plainly given the literal meaning of the Greek.’ (Freiderichsen, *Gospels*, p. 162; Bosworth, p. iv).” (Awe, p. 624)

“Cambridge History of the Bible: ‘The original Greek manuscript or manuscripts, from which Ulphilas made his translation of the Gothic Gospels, belong to the Byzantine group...As in the Gospels, the original Greek text in the epistles was of the Byzantine type...This text represents the mid-fourteenth stage in the development of the Byzantine text, and differs very little from the fully developed Textus Receptus of the later period...Having established a comparatively pure Byzantine text in the New Testament we should anticipate a relatively unmixed Byzantine text in the Old...Testament.’” (Awe, p. 625)

“‘[T]he Goth is so extraordinarily faithful to the Greek.’ ‘[T]he Byzantine Greek shines through the Gothic with almost undimmed lustre.’ The Gothic Bible follows ‘The Wulfilian [Ulphilas means ‘little wolf’] tradition and its fountain-head, the *Graeca veritas* [Greek true originals]...’ ‘The Wulfilian Greek...presents the mid-fourth-century stage in the development of the a-text, and differs very little from the fully developed T.R. of the later period.’ ‘[T]his was done into Gothic from a Byzantine text of the Chrysostomian type...’ ‘[T]he basic Wulfilian Greek text is again Byzantine...and Chrysostom...a text essentially identical with the Textus Receptus as we know it’” (Freiderichsen...) (Awe, p. 625)

What Gail conveniently omitted were portions of the Cambridge History of the Bible which stated that the Goths embraced Arianism due to the influence of Ulphilas from Cappadocia. Also that Ulphilas’ Gothic translation was influenced by the (corrupt) Old Latin versions:

“The Goths living in the Balkans came into contact with the Roman Empire at an early period; and there must have been Christians among them in the third century since a bishop represented them at Nicaea. In the fourth century there were some links with the church in Cappadocia, and Wulfila was ordained bishop by Eusebius of Nicomedia. Through the influence of this contact and other factors, the Goths at length embraced the Arian interpretation of Christianity, which may have appealed to unsophisticated minds. Wulfila has traditionally the role, unchallenged by later scholars, of translating the scriptures into the language of his own people...

“All the manuscripts we have of the [Gothic] version are products of the Western Gothic kingdoms, and it is clear that the Old Latin version, which they presumably found in Africa, has influenced the text of their version, and left its mark externally in the Western order of the gospels, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark which is found in the one complete copy, the Codex Argenteus, preserved in Stockholm.” (Cambridge History of the Bible, p. 369)

“Ulphilas was a definite, if moderate, Arian, and he spread the doctrines of Arius among his converts. About the end of the fourth century, Arianism disappeared from the East but in the course of their migration the Visigoths propagated it in the West, where it almost triumphed. Thanks to the zeal of the Visigoths, Arian Christianity also reached numerous Germanic tribes.” (Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. II, p. 340)

Gail also quoted Bruce Metzger as support for the authenticity of the Gothic bible. The problem with this source should be obvious to those who know that, in 1950, Metzger served on the committee that edited the Nestle-Aland Text which was based on the Westcott-Hort New Greek Text.

“All investigators agree (e.g. Westcott and Hort, von Soden, Streitberg, Nestle, Streeter, Kenyon, Friedrichsen, et al.) that it [the Gothic Bible] is basically a Syrian Antiochian form of text... It is, therefore, the oldest extant representative of the Lucianic or Antiochian type of text... (Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, pp. 384-385)

“The Gothic ‘Codex Argenteus represents a Byzantine text’ and is the best existing exemplar of the Gothic text. Erasmus had easy access to it at the Abbey of Werden on the Ruhr River in Westphalia, just 80 miles from his back porch in Holland...Codex Carolinus would have been available to Erasmus at the Abbey of Weissenburg...” (Camb. History, Vol. 2, p. 341; Metzger, *Early Versions*, pp. 378-379)

“In the 4th and 5th centuries the Gothic language – using the term in its widest sense – must have spread over the greater part of Europe together with the north coast of Africa.’ The Gothic Bible ‘must have been the vernacular Bible of a large portion of Europe.’ ‘King Reccared of Spain, where the Visigoths had settled early in the 6th century, ordered...burned...the Gothic Bible...” (EB, s.v. Goths; Metzger, *The Early Versions*, p. 377;...) (Awe, pp. 626-7)

Gail Ripplinger argues that the Gothic bible is doctrinally correct, however, her very first example of its textual ‘purity’ promotes the Arian heresy. (p. 629) Note that, in the Gothic translation of Ephesians 3:14, God the Father is the “Lord of our Jesus Christ.”

“The following charts document the faithful preservation of the word of God. It was given to the Goths in the book of Acts and ‘endureth to all generations’ (Ps. 110:5)... The ancient Gothic Bible accurately depicts Christian beliefs, unlike new versions which frequently deny that Jesus is the Christ and Lord of the Old and New Testament... (Awe, p. 628)

“For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Eph. 3:14	
GOTHIC pre-A.D. 350	fraujins unsar Iesus Xristaus Lord of our Jesus Christ
KJV	of our Lord Jesus Christ
NIV, NASB	OMIT
NKJV note	OMIT
Jehovah Witness Version	OMIT
Catholic Version	OMIT
See errors in HCSB, ESV, NLT, NRSV, RSV, NCV, etc.	

Please note what Gail Ripplinger does in this table, which she prefaced with the remark, “The ancient Gothic Bible accurately depicts Christian beliefs, unlike new versions which frequently deny that Jesus is the Christ and Lord of the Old and New Testament.” In the table, she then presents a verse from the Gothic bible which denies that Jesus is the Lord, the “Father” being the “Lord of our Jesus Christ”!

Gail then misrepresents the New King James Version as “omitting” the phrase ‘of our Lord Jesus Christ’ but this is not true. In the NKJV, the phrase ‘of our Lord Jesus Christ’ is in the *main text* of Eph. 3:14 however a *footnote at the bottom of the page* states: “NU-Text omits *of our Lord Jesus Christ*.” Ephesians 3:14 in the NKJV reads:

For this reason I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,*
 (...)
 (...)
 *Eph. 3:14 NU-Text omits *of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

In other words, a footnote way down the page says the Nestles-UBS Text omitted the important phrase, but the actual text of the New King James carries the Textus Receptus reading just as the King James Version does. In fact, the New King James Version almost consistently follows the Textus Receptus in the text, but is always made to appear corrupt in Riplinger’s tables because she totally disregards the text of the NKJV and evaluates the NU reading in the footnotes instead. She does this repeatedly with the New King James Version, lumping it together with other modern versions that carry the NU corruptions *right in the text*. In the same tables she always conceals the textual agreement of the NKJV with the Textus Receptus and the KJV, but endorses translations with obvious textual corruptions – i.e., the Old Latin, Syriac Peshitta, Gothic, Wycliffe – as “pure” and “uncontaminated.” (See: Progression of New Testament Corruption)

Like Ulfilas, a thoroughgoing Arian whose Gothic version promotes his heresy, Gail Riplinger denied the deity of Jesus Christ when she misinterpreted “only begotten of the Father” as a reference to His Incarnation, instead of Christ’s eternal existence, having been eternally begotten of the Father.

The Only Begotten Son

“If, ‘He is antichrist...that denieth the Son,’ durely the Jehovah Witnesses and new version editors, who have discharged ‘the Son’ from John 1:18, are arch-antichrists. Recent printings of the NIV do likewise.

<i>J.W. TRANSLATION</i>	NASB	KJV
the only begotten god	the only begotten God	the only begotten Son

“Christians have held tenaciously to the doctrine that Christ is God and co-eternal with the Father. The term ‘begotten’, in reference to Christ, is introduced and interpreted in John 1:14.
 “[T]he Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and **we beheld his glory**, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father...John 1:14

“From this we gather that ‘begotten’ is used in reference to the body of ‘flesh’ ‘beheld’ by mankind. Gabriel said to Mary (Luke 1:35):

“The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.” (*New Age Bible Versions*, p. 337)

In this section, Gail stated, “The term ‘begotten’, in reference to Christ, is introduced and interpreted in John 1:14.” Not so. The verse states “and we beheld **his glory**,” NOT “the **body of ‘flesh’**”, which Gail

proceeds to say was ‘begotten’ at the Incarnation. “Christ’s glory” is interpreted in John 17:5 as eternally existing:

“And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with **the glory which I had with thee before the world was.**” (John 17:5)

The Athanasian Creed was formulated to uphold the truth of God’s Word against the Arianism brought by the Ostrogoths and Visigoths to Europe in the 5th century. The following articles of this historic confession expressed the Scriptural view of Jesus Christ’s deity and humanity:

30. For the right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man.

31. God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man of substance of His mother, born in the world.

Gail Ripplinger gets away with lies and distortions because few of her readers examine her tables, verify her sources or otherwise research her claims. Her mentor, Peter Ruckman, must acknowledge Ulfilas’ Arianism because he teaches seminary students whose studies expose them to scholarly sources which state the truth about Ulfilas. Even so, Ruckman does the usual damage control...poor Ulfilas wasn’t so much an Arian as ‘anti-Catholic.’

“Ulfilas was born in 311 and was in Constantinople in 321. He studied Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, having already known Gothic. **He picked up a little ‘Arianism,’** as the term in those days was beginning to mean ‘anti-Catholic.’ After 400, the term was applied to ALL BIBLE-BELIEVERS who resisted Roman Catholic Fascism...” (Peter Ruckman, *The Christian Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, p. 103)

Which is it, Dr. Ruckman – “a little Arianism” or Roman Catholic libel?? Ulfilas’ “little bit of Arianism” certainly went a long way in the Roman Empire, almost to the point where Arianism triumphed over the Biblical doctrine of the deity of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER XVII THE ANGLO-SAXON VERSION

CONTEND FOR THE FAITH: THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS

<http://watch-unto-prayer.org/TR-0-intro.html>

WATCH UNTO PRAYER

taho@watch-unto-prayer.org

<http://watch-unto-prayer.org>