

Intro:

We have dealt with the passages that have the longest variations in the texts. There are a number of other variations, most of them quite small, that we must consider. I want to show you that the differences we are talking about are generally insignificant and not worth fighting over.

IV. Names of Christ

A. Frequent criticism in KJV Only literature: deletion of “Lord” from name of Christ

<i>Scripture Reference</i>	<i>KJV</i>	<i>Modern Versions</i>
Matt 8:29	Jesus , thou Son of God	Son of God
Matt 16:20	Jesus the Christ	the Christ
Romans 15:8, 2 Cor 4:6, 2 Cor 5:18	Jesus Christ	Christ
Col 1:28, Phile 1:6, 1 Pet 5:10, 1 Pet 5:14	Christ Jesus	Christ
Luke 7:19, Luke 10:39, Luke 10:41	Jesus	the Lord
Acts 19:10, 1 Cor 5:5	Lord Jesus	Lord
Rom 16:18	Lord Jesus Christ	Lord Christ
1 Cor 16:22, 2 Tim 4:22	Lord Jesus Christ	Lord
Rom 1:3	Son Jesus Christ our Lord	Son

Implication: the modern versions are somehow tearing down the deity of Christ.

B. Analysis:

1. Differences of this sort are hardly an attack on Christ’s deity.
 - a. To attack deity, the scribe would have to leave out ‘Lord’ and ‘Christ’ consistently
 - b. Reality: The names describing deity are regularly included

2. Explanations

- a. Shorter readings usually correct – expanded by “expansion of piety”
 - 1) Scribe devoted to Christ
 - 2) As he works, he hears or sees “Lord Jesus” and writes “Lord Jesus Christ”

b. Or he has two varying mss. to work from: includes all terms to avoid a mistake

1) Ms. 1 “Lord Jesus” and Ms. 2 “Jesus Christ”

C. Conclusion:

1. This is particular question is “straining at gnats” – not a significant issue
2. If the ‘names of Christ’ issue were real, the perpetrator did a very bad job
 - a. He (or they) left many references to “Lord” and “Christ” in connection with Jesus.
 - b. Did someone delete a few, leave a few to “cleverly” disguise his deletions?
3. In some cases a name might have been lost accidentally, but doubtful and very difficult to be sure which reading is correct in every case.

V. Discussion of certain key passages

A. John 1.18

1. Which versions are stronger in this particular reference?
2. Difference is based on a textual variant.
3. Most ancient texts, including p^{66} and p^{75} (oldest existing copies of John) have God here, not Son
4. Some KJV Only advocates call this an example of Gnostic error.

B. Romans 9.5

1. Which versions are stronger in this particular reference?
2. Simply a translational difference, no textual variation here.

C. Philippians 2.6-7

1. Which versions are stronger in this particular reference?
2. Translational difference
3. KJV Only ignore the first phrase and seize on the difference between “did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped” and try to make it say that Jesus is not equal with God. (Same could be said of KJV rendering, taken by itself.)

D. Colossians 2.9

1. Which versions are stronger in this particular reference?
2. Translational difference
3. “The term translated ‘deity’ by the NASB and the NIV is a Greek term that is nowhere else used in the New Testament. It is a very strong affirmation of the deity of Christ. The KJV, by using a term that it uses elsewhere in translating other words that are not as strong as the term here, unintentionally obscures the meaning of the apostle.”
White, p. 204

E. 1 Timothy 3.16

1. Which versions are stronger in this particular reference?
2. Variant: KJV reading well attested here, and preferable.
3. How did variant come about?
 - a) Uncial texts sometimes abbreviated the words for God and Jesus
 - b) God abbreviated thus: ΘΣ with a line above it to indicate an abbreviation.
 - c) The word translated “He who” looks like this in uncial form: ΟΣ
 - d) The uncials were written on animal hides, which often had tiny flaws and lines in them. A scribe could well have taken the line in the middle of the Θ to be a scratch in the hide, as well as the line above the abbreviation.
2. Greek texts behind modern versions have “he who”.

F. Titus 2.13 and 2 Peter 1.1

1. Which versions are stronger in these particular references?
2. Translation difference, and in this case, is simply an error in the KJV.

Conclusion:

The point of this exercise is not to malign the KJV.

The point is to show that the modern versions in particular are not a part of a conspiracy against the doctrine of the deity of Christ.

I have stated that I do not prefer the NIV, and we will get into the reasons for my preference later on. However, the NIV is an orthodox translation.

To assert anything else would be inconsistent with the Bible's command to show honesty to all men.