

# Artikel 7

## Septuagint en ander

**AH Bogaards**

**22 Julie 2022**

### 1. Voorwoord

Ek is al baie, baie jare met die Septuagint/LXX besig, vanweë my opleiding in Hebreeus en my liefde vir die Ou Testament. Ek het die LXX ontsettend baie gebruik en nagevors. Ek het bv 'n groot studie oor Psalm 2 gedoen en my my toe baie verdiep in die LXX en die Targum op die Psalms.

Die standaard uitgawe van die LXX was altyd die van A Ralphs, wat ek al vir dekades in verskillende programme (Logos, Accordance en Bibleworks) op my rekenaar het.

Toe die 2020-vertaling verskyn het, het ek die nuutste uitgawe van die LXX gekoop, die van Göttingen. Omdat dit ontsaglik duur is, het ek net die deel oor die Psalms gekoop, omdat die Psalms my groot belangstelling is Ek wou daarom 100% op datum wees met my data.

Ek het ook die heel nuutste Engelse vertaling van die LXX, die NETS-vertaling.

Dit lyk seker nie so nie, maar agter punt 2 van hierdie studie en in die res lê jare en weke en maande se studie en soektogte.

Punt 2 is my gedagtes in kort.

Ek is nog lank nie klaar nie, maar hierdie saak is so belangrik vir julle, dat ek 'n klomp kladaantekeninge van myself neergepen het (punt 2).

Punt 3 bevat 'n baie goeie artikel teen die LXX – iets waarvan daar nie baie is nie.

Ek plak ook enkele ander baie belangrike goed en internetadresse in.

Die dringendheid van die saak lê oa in die misbruik van die LXX in die 1992- en 2020-vertaling en daarin dat verskeie Ou Testamentici is, dit ten sterkste aanbeveel en selfs verplig het.

Ek self het, soos ek reeds genoem het, self baie van die LXX gebruikgemaak en daarin gedelf. Gaandeweg het deur die Here se genade het my oë oopgegaan vir die groot gevaar van die Septuagint en die tekskritiek OT.

Ek voel dat ek deur die Here gedring en geroep word om my kennis in hierdie verband deur te gee. Die artikel is vir my nie bloot wetenskaplike gedagtes nie, maar dit is vir my geloofsake.

## 2. Kort, onvolledige, maar belangrike kladaantekeninge van dr AH Bogaards oor die LXX en die MT

1. Die Masoretiese Teks (MT) en die Septuagint (LXX) is in sekere sin op dieselfde pad as die Textus Receptus (TR).
2. Liberales vertel ons dat ons nie die oudste MT het nie.
3. Net soos in die geval van die TR glo hulle ook nie dat die MT nie net deur God geïnspireer is nie, maar ook suiwer bewaar is nie.
4. Hulle glo nie in God se bewaring van OT en NT grondtekste nie.
5. Daarom vertel hulle ons dat agter die LXX 'n ouer en daarom beter Hebreuse teks as die MT lê.
6. Daarom word die LXX en ander vertalings al meer en meer in die tekskritiese notas van die BHS gebruik.
7. Daarom word die LXX al meer en meer in vertalings en kommentare (en moenie Woordeboeke vergeet nie) gebruik om die MT te korrigeer en te verbeter.
8. Die groot OT Tekskritikus E Tov het al baie jare gelede met 'n groot terugvertaling van die LXX na die Hebreus begin (reverse ingenieurswese).
9. Hierdie omgekeerde ingenieurswese is so onwetenskaplik as moontlik. Die rede: die LXX is nie 'n eenheidsvertaling nie. Dit is bv nie deur een span vertalers met dieselfde vertalingsbeginsels gedoen nie. Die Grieks is nie orals uit dieselfde tyd nie. Stukke is beter en ander slegter vertaal. Sommige dele is beter Grieks en ander slegter. Dit alreeds maak omgekeerde ingenieurswese onnosel en onwetenskaplik.
10. Psalm 2 van die LXX is 'n treffende voorbeeld. In Psalm 2 het ons nie 'n direkte vertaling nie, maar 'n Joodse Targum of verklaring/parafrase. Vergelyk die nuwe NETS vertaling van die LXX met die KJV in Ps 2:12: NETS (Seize upon instruction) KJV (Kiss the Son). As jy in hierdie geval van Ps 2:12 byvoorbeeld omgekeerde ingenieurswese gebruik, is daar geen kans dat jy by die Hebreuse manuskrip wat daar agter lê sal uitkom nie. Dit is onmoontlik. Ek gebruik die vertaling van die Targum van die Psalms van David M Stec (Brill-uitgawe).

11. Om die LXX te gebruik om die MT te korrigeer, is om dit sagkens te sê ongelooft en ongehoorsaamheid. Hoe durf jy die geïnspireerde teks, die Woord van God, te korrigeer met 'n menslike vertaling, boonop 'n korrupte vertaling.
12. In die uitgawes van die LXX (Swete, Ralphs, Göttingen) word, net soos in die geval van die UBS/NA-tekse, gebou op en grotendeels gesteun op die Sinaiticus- en Vaticanus-manuskripte, bedenkbare manuskripte.
13. Tog redeneer die OT wetenskaplikes: die Vaticanus en die Sinaiticus met hulle LXX, wat dit bevat, is baie ouer as die MT, wat ons het. En ouer beteken beter – ten minste as jy nie glo in God se bewaring van sy eie Woord en ogv sy eie belofte nie. Met ongelooft beland jy op snaakse plekke.
14. Ongelowige teologiese wetenskap is nie wetenskap nie. Die Woord van God kan net op jou knieë en vasklemmend aan die Woord en vasgeklem in God se Hand nagevors, vertaal en geëksegetiseer word.
15. Gaan kyk na die geskiedenis van die ontstaan van die LXX: sameflansings, hier 'n stukkie, daar 'n stukkie, korreksie en redrigring aanmekaar. Oor eeue heen. Vertel my nie dat dit 'n eenheid is dat dit na een eeue oue Hebreeuse manuskrip truggaan nie.
16. Ek glo dit nie dat ons Here Jesus uit die Septuagint aangehaal het nie. Hoekom sal die Seun van God, Self die Woord, en volmaakte Kenner van sy eie Woord uit so 'n korrupte LXX aanhaal? Latere redakteurs van die LXX het eerder Hom aangehaal in hulle LXX korreksies.
17. Daar kan nog baie meer gesê word, maar dit is in baie kort van die belangrikste sake

### 3. Did the Apostles Favor the Septuagint?

#### Purely presbitirian 1646

#### [Did the Apostles Favor the Septuagint? – Purely Presbyterian](https://purelypresbyterian.com/2020/09/07/did-the-apostles-favor-the-septuagint/)

<https://purelypresbyterian.com/2020/09/07/did-the-apostles-favor-the-septuagint/>

Why did the New Testament writers quote from the Septuagint (LXX)? Did they favor the Septuagint over the original Hebrew text of the Old Testament? Is every Old Testament quotation in the New Testament taken from the Septuagint? Should our translations use the Septuagint instead of the Hebrew where the meanings diverge? These are not new questions. Theologians and Bible scholars have been discussing this for centuries. Richard Muller writes:

“Many of the late sixteenth and seventeenth century Protestant writers devoted considerable space to the refutation of claims made by Roman theologians and

polemicists concerning the inspiration of the Septuagint, given both its widespread use in the ancient world and by the writers of the New Testament and its congruence with the text and canon of the Vulgate.” [1]

Even to this day the Eastern Orthodox churches continue to consider the Septuagint (LXX) authentic and inspired, rather than the Hebrew Masoretic Text (MT). [2] A recent scholarly work by Mogens Müller describes the authority and authenticity of the text of the LXX as “*fully on a par with the Hebrew Bible*” and further argues that “*the Septuagint is extensively used in the New Testament writings, whereby it—and not the Hebrew Bible (the Masoretic text)—is the most obvious candidate for the title of the first Bible of the Church.*” [3] On another front, closer to home for Western Evangelicals, some recent English translations depart from the Masoretic Text in a number of places in favor of the LXX reading [4] (e.g. Gen. 47:21, 49:10; Deut. 32:43; Judges 14:15, 16:13-14; 1 Sam. 1:24, 14:41; 2 Sam. 7:16; etc.).

A common assumption underlying these views is that the OT text developed or changed over time, and that since the LXX was translated from an early edition of the Hebrew OT, it is more accurate than the later Masoretic Text. [5] Another primary reason given for the superiority of the LXX over the MT is that “*some of the citations taken from the Old Testament and found in the New mainly use the Septuagint text.*” [6]

#### ADVERTISEMENT

[REPORT THIS AD](#)

However, these traditions run counter to the Reformed doctrine of Scripture, summarized by the Westminster Confession of Faith:

“The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; so as in all controversies of religion the Church is finally to appeal unto them...” (WCF 1:8).

Thus the Old Testament in Hebrew, together with the New Testament in Greek, and those only, are immediately inspired and authoritative.

### 3.1 Statement of the Question.

Historical-critical arguments and implications regarding the Septuagint may seem overwhelming with all of the scholarly work being done regarding it. However, laymen can be assured that the original Hebrew Old Testament, that is reflected in their English translation of the Masoretic Text, has indeed been kept pure and entire by the **singular care and providence** of God and is “*profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works*” (2 Tim. 3:16-17).

There are many complex aspects to an historical, critical, and theological understanding of the LXX and many potential implications and challenges it may pose to the authenticity of the Masoretic Text, but this essay will only focus on one of them. We will not discuss the Apocryphal books of the LXX vs. the Hebrew canon of the MT, nor specific textual

variants within the OT. Our focus will be a general overview on how Christians should understand the use of the Septuagint in the New Testament. Why should the Hebrew Masoretic Text be the final appeal in all controversies when the inspired and infallible writers quoted from the LXX more than they did from the Hebrew text, sometimes despite the meaningful differences between them? Does this mean that the LXX is more authoritative than, or equally authoritative with, the MT? Or does it imply the authority of the church to identify or declare a normative text of Scripture?

Before addressing the use of the LXX by the NT writers, we must first consider the origins and reliability of the LXX, and whether what we call the LXX today is the same that existed in the time of the Apostles.

### 3.2 The Origins & Reliability of the LXX.

The Pentateuch was translated by 70 (or 72) scholars around the mid 3rd century BC, while the remaining books were translated, edited, and revised by various people over the next three centuries. History leaves few details about this latter part of the development of what we now know as “the Septuagint.” [7] This means that the LXX is not “*a single, cohesive work*,” and “*failure to comprehend the plurality of the translations that make up the LXX can result in misleading conclusions.*” [8] The quality and style varies significantly between portions of the LXX. Some parts appear to be more literal while others are more paraphrastic of the original Hebrew. The Encyclopaedia Judaica concludes that “*what we term the Septuagint is in fact an almost accidental gathering together of texts from diverse sources.*” [9]

Although there are extant older fragments of the OT in Greek, the Encyclopedia continues, “*For the most part, our earliest texts for this Greek material derive from codices from the third and fourth centuries [A.D.]; in particular, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus, and Codex Sinaiticus.*” These may or may not be good exemplars of the OT Greek translations of that time period. But even so, being contemporaneous with Jerome (347-420), his testimony about the unreliability of the LXX at that time suggests the improbability of reconstructing the LXX today (such that it precisely matches any of the Greek translations available in the first century when the New Testament was written). We will examine Jerome’s thought on this subject below. By then, the Greek versions may have been edited in some parts to match the Greek New Testament where the latter was intending to paraphrase the Hebrew and apply it in a renewed way. [10] Moreover, as Edward Leigh (1602-1671) observed, God has not guaranteed to preserve anything but the authentic original language text of Scripture:

“That ancient and true translation of the Septuagint is corrupted and violated, which (as Jerome saith [*Letter 112*]) was agreeable to the Hebrew, but so is not the Greek copy now extant, which is full of corruptions, and seemeth to be a mixt and confused translation of many.

“If the Seventy, as well as the Hebrew, had been authentical, the Lord would have been careful to have kept it pure and uncorrupt unto our days, as well as he hath done the Hebrew. There is indeed a Greek edition extant, which goeth under the name of the Seventy; but **Whitaker** saith that the true Seventy is lost, and that this which we now have is mixt and miserably corrupted.” [11]

Lutheran Scholastic theologian **Johann Gerhard** (1582-1637), likewise observed, “we cannot attribute authentic authority, however, to that Greek translation nor equate it with the Hebrew text...because first, it is a translation and, therefore, is not authentic nor does it have the same authority as the Hebrew text.” [12] Again, in his 7th argument against the authentic authority of the LXX:

“Origen, Lucian, Hesychius, and Jerome already began to correct the Septuagint translation. How, then, was it free of errors? And who would believe that, though it contracted corruption in its first three hundred years, it remained uncorrupted for the other thirteen hundred years? Justin Martyr: ‘Your teachers have removed many complete passages of those Scriptures in their entirety from the translation of the elders who were with Ptolemy. Those passages show clearly that He who was crucified is both God and man and that His crucifixion and death were foretold’ (*Dialogus cum Tryphone*, ch. 71)—a fact that he proves in the same book with several examples.” [13]

Prominent Reformed Scholastic, **Bernardinus De Moor** (1709-1780), writing in the period of Late Orthodoxy, also noted that,

“the super-abounding errors of this version [LXX] are evident, in its less suitable expression of the sense, addition, subtraction, mutation, through an incorrect reading of the letters, through incorrect punctuation, signification of the words, inverted construction of the words, *etc.*, just as Bellarmine himself acknowledges, [14] and demonstrates that this Version is now corrupted in a variety of ways, and that it is no longer extant in its integrity; so that it is not now safe to emend the Hebrew or Latin texts out of the Greek codices. But a consideration of those errors, which defile this Version, teaches that a great part of those is to be ascribed to the Interpreters themselves; to which, nevertheless, far more were able to be added thereafter by injury of time, blindness and sleepiness of scribes, *etc.*” [15]

From these observations it is clear that although the LXX which the Apostles used may have been an accurate translation, it was not preserved, but was subjected to substantial corruption over time. We therefore cannot say the LXX as it exists today is the same LXX the Apostles used. Much less can we claim the current LXX is authoritative based on the Apostles’ usage of it. Having briefly considered the origins and reliability of the LXX, we now turn to the use of the LXX by the NT writers.

### 3.3 Apostolic Use of the Septuagint in the New Testament.

For a long time scholars have attempted to quantify the New Testament quotations of the Old, and to what degree they conform to the locution of either the LXX, the MT, or are paraphrased from either or both by the NT writer. Yet this is a notoriously difficult task. How many times the NT authors quote the OT depends on what constitutes a quotation. [16] It is not always obvious whether something is an intentional quotation, allusion, or reference. What constitutes an allusion? What constitutes a quotation? Exegetes may give different answers. Are semantic differences, which are not contrary to the sense, to be counted as true differences? “It is difficult to give an accurate figure since the variation in use ranges all the way from a distant allusion to a definite quotation introduced by an explicit formula stating the citation’s source.” [17] Typically what follows the phrase “it is written” is some form of quotation, but all references are not necessarily preceded by



such an explicit formula. Moreover, when it comes to quotations of the OT in the NT, we are not simply considering copying practices, but rather citation practices—and that from one language to another. The divine author of Scripture, through the human penman, may alter the OT terminology in the act of quoting it in the NT without contradiction or inconsistency.

De Moor conceded that *“the citations of the Old Testament in the New Testament quite frequently agree with the Septuagint, even in passages where the Greek Version appears to turn from the Hebrew verity.”* Yet he assures us that this is not consistently the case, since the Apostles *“sometimes recede somewhat both from the Hebrew text and from the Septuagint Version: often also, with the Septuagint abandoned, they adhere closely to the Hebrew text.”* After giving examples of each, he continues:

“When the Writers of the New Testament follow the Septuagint, they do not do it so that they might procure authenticity for this Version; but so that in the same sense, and with the substance adduced more than the words, or words not fit for the scope, they might accommodate themselves unto the common usage and tongue: and so that they might turn from the minds of their hearers that suspicion that they either impose upon the cited oracles, and twist them unto their own opinion; or that the Version is not anywhere correct and is to be altogether rejected, of which Version they had been making use to that time, and from which alone they had drawn the mysteries of religion.” [18]

**Frederic Spanheim** (1600-1649) likewise observed,

“It is to be noted that the Evangelists followed the Septuagint Version in a great many things, which was both of the greatest authority among the Hellenists, and at the disposal of many, when it was able to be done with the substance of the Prophetic words unharmed, both so that they might show their liberty, and so that they might not in a matter trivial and indifferent furnish any occasion of scandal to the weak, and of cavils to the wicked.” [19]

The Apostles and Evangelists were very cognizant of the status and challenges the young fledgling Church would face. They deliberately avoided undermining a trusted and useful translation where it did not substantially affect exegesis and application of biblical truth. Further, while the Jews were committed with the oracles of God (Rom. 3:2) regarding **the formal preservation of the Hebrew text**, they remained in unbelief, *“their minds were blinded,”* and a veil remained upon their hearts in the interpretation and understanding of the Old Testament (2 Cor. 3:14-16). Therefore, it is likely that the Apostles were also careful of putting Gentile converts in a position of over-reliance on unbelieving Jewish scholars (who were also their persecutors), as Dr. Edward F. Hills wrote:

“Such an emphasis on the Hebrew would have been harmful to the Gentile churches which had just been formed. It would have brought these Gentile Christians into a position of dependence upon the unbelieving Jewish rabbis, on whose learning they would have been obliged to rely for an understanding of the Hebrew Old Testament.” [20]

The Apostles referenced the LXX because it was widely used at the time, not because they believed it was infallible. Even where it is a highly dynamic paraphrase, the NT writers quoted it when the meaning aligned with the Hebrew text. However, there are also many

places where they quoted from the Hebrew text, giving their own translation instead (compare Mat. 2:15 with Hos. 11:1; John 19:37 with Zech. 12:10; Mat. 2:18 with Jer. 31:15; 1 Cor. 15:54 with Isa. 25:8; Mark 15:34 with Psalm 22:1). [21] In many places the LXX is not a formal translation of the original Hebrew text, but rather an interpretation or paraphrase (sometimes of obscure Hebrew idioms). [22] Through the Holy Spirit, the Apostles infallibly discerned when these non-literal renderings were none-the-less accurately purveying the original intent. Also, in many places, the NT penmen used the OT Greek translation to draw out a meaning from the text that was initially latent in the original Hebrew. [23] *“The New Testament contains the Holy Spirit’s commentary on the message and teaching of the Old Testament.”* [24]

### Jerome’s Preference for the Hebrew.

Augustine (354-430) and Jerome (347-420) **exchanged letters** wherein they debated the authority and reliability of the LXX. While Augustine affirmed that the extant Hebrew was the pure Word of God, he also held that the LXX was likewise inspired, even in its differences with the Hebrew, and that in so doing, the Spirit provided a more Messianic interpretation in preparation for Christ’s coming (City of God 18.43-45). Due to this, as well as the apostolic use and wide circulation of the LXX, he believed it was to be preferred above the Hebrew text for translation into Latin (Letter 71).

Jerome responded that the original form of the LXX had been revised and edited such that by his time, *“you will scarcely find more than one manuscript here and there which has not these interpolations”* (Letter 112). In his **Prologue of Job**, he clarified that his motive of translating from Hebrew *“was not to censure the ancient translation, but that those passages in it which are obscure, or those which have been omitted, or at all events, through the fault of copyists have been corrupted, might have light thrown upon them by our translation.”* (NPNF2, 6:491). In his *Apology Against Rufinus*, Jerome defended the primacy of the Hebrew by enumerating several examples where the Hebrew text of the Old Testament was quoted by the Apostles in the New Testament, rather than the LXX. He continued:

*“I do not say this in order to aim a blow at the seventy translators; but I assert that the Apostles of Christ have an authority superior to theirs. Wherever the Seventy agree with the Hebrew, the Apostles took their quotations from that translation; but, where they disagree, they set down in Greek what they had found in the Hebrew.”* [25]

In a letter to *“a lady of Gaul named Algasia”* in answer to *“eleven questions which she had submitted to him,”* Jerome laid down the general rule:

*“Whenever the prophets and Apostles quote testimonies from the Old Testament, one must note quite carefully that they did not follow the words but the sense. Wherever the Septuagint translators differ from the Hebrew, one must note that they have expressed the Hebrew sense in their own words.”* [26]

### The Reformation.

Drawing from Jerome, Francis Turretin (1623-1687) summarized the Reformed Orthodox view of the apostolic use of the Septuagint:



“The Apostles used this version [the LXX] not because they believed it to be authentic and divine, but because it was then the most used and most universally received and because (where a regard for the sense and truth was preserved) they were unwilling either rashly to dispute or to create a doubt in the minds of the more weak, but by a holy prudence left unchanged what when changed would give offense, especially when it would answer their purpose. However, they did this in such a manner that sometimes when it seemed necessary, when the version of the Septuagint seemed to be not only unsuitable but untrue, they preferred the source (as Jerome says). This can easily be gathered from a comparison of Mat. 2:15 with Hos. 11:1; John 19:37 with Zech. 12:10; Jer. 31:15 with Mat. 2:18; Isa. 25:8 with 1 Cor. 15:54.

“The quotations in the New Testament from the Septuagint are not authentic *per se* (or because they were translated by the seventy from Hebrew into Greek), but *per accidens* inasmuch as they were drawn into the sacred context by the evangelists under the influence of the Holy Spirit.” [27]

The use of the LXX by the NT does not mean that the version as a whole is more authoritative than the MT. Just as Paul’s citation of pagan philosophers (*e.g.* Acts 17) does not mean that those authors were inspired, so Paul’s use of a translation does not *de facto* make it authentic and inspired.

Throughout his commentary, John Owen gives detailed attention to the use of the LXX in the book of Hebrews, which he summarizes in three points:

“1) That the penmen of the New Testament do not oblige themselves unto that translation [the LXX], but in many places do precisely render the words of the original text, where the translation differs from it.

“2) That they do oftentimes express the sense of the testimony which they quote in words of their own, neither agreeing with that translation nor exactly answering the original Hebrew.

“3) That sundry passages have been unquestioningly taken out of the New Testament, and inserted into that translation; which I have elsewhere proved by undeniable instances.” [28]

**Thomas Cartwright** (1535-1603) assures us:

“We are able to justify every place cited out of the 70 by the Apostles and Evangelists to be agreeable with the Hebrew, and (in some diversity of words) to have the same sense; at the least to have no sense repugnant to that in the Hebrew: which is manifest by this, that where the 70 differed in sense, there they leaving the 70, whom they so desirously followed (for support of the Gentiles acquainted therewith) follow the Hebrew text. And as this is manifest by experience, so it is observed expressly of Jerome.” [29]

Johann Gerhard, likewise drawing on Jerome, stated:

“The evangelists and Apostles in the New Testament follow the Septuagint translation in quoting statements from the Old Testament ‘because at that time that translation had

*been published among the nations,' as Jerome points out in his commentary on Genesis 47. Jerome, however, sets down this rule: 'Whenever the prophets and Apostles quote testimonies from the Old Testament, one must note quite carefully that they did not follow the words but the sense. Wherever the Septuagint translators differ from the Hebrew, one must note that they have expressed the Hebrew sense in their own words' (Epistle 121 ad Algasiam)." [30]*

In response to **Cardinal Belarmine**'s argument that the Apostle Paul's quotation of the LXX of Psalm 19:4 in Romans 10:18 indicates the Hebrew Masoretic is corrupt and impure, Gerhard writes:

"Not only here [Ps. 19:4] but also in many other places in the New Testament, Christ and the Apostles quote statements from the Old Testament not according to the wording of the Hebrew text but according to the Septuagint translation, as Jerome teaches (*Quaest. super Genes.*, c. 46). From this, however, one cannot and should not infer that the Hebrew text is not authentic nor that we must go back from the streams to the sources. After all, first, who are we when compared with Christ, the master of Scripture, and with the Apostles, who were moved by the immediate inbreathing of the Holy Spirit?

"Second, though they do not always follow the actual words, nevertheless they do retain the purest sense and intention. *cf.* Jerome, Epistle 121 *ad Algasiam*...

"Furthermore, it is one thing to translate Scripture, but it is another to cite a passage from Scripture. Even the teachers of our Church in their disputations draw statements of Scripture from the Latin Vulgate version, yet they do not thereby claim that it is authentic; rather, as necessity demands, they appeal to the Hebrew sources.

"In addition, the nature of the Greek version today is different from what it formerly was, because that Greek version of the Old Testament that exists today either is not the version of the Septuagint translators or has been corrupted and vitiated in many ways.

"Finally, they did not quote statements of Scripture from the Greek version for the purpose of claiming that the Hebrew sources were contaminated and muddied, but because the Greek version was at that time the most used and the most widely accepted. Jerome, *Quaest. super Genesin*: '*Observe this in general, that whenever the holy Apostles or apostolic men speak to the people, they often use those testimonies that then were widely published among the Gentiles, namely, through the Septuagint translation.*'" [31]

### 3.4 May the LXX be used to correct the Hebrew?

The **Formula Consensus Helvetica** (1675) affirms in canon I, that due to God's "*singular grace and goodness*" the Church "*has, and will have to the end of the world (2 Pet 1:19), a 'sure word of prophecy' and 'Holy Scriptures' (2 Tim 3:15), from which, though heaven and earth pass away, 'the smallest letter or the least stroke of a pen will not disappear by any means' (Matt 5:18).*" Then the Formula applies this specifically to the extant Hebrew apographa (*i.e.* the Masoretic Text) in canon II:

"But, in particular, The Hebrew original of the OT which we have received and to this day do retain as handed down by the Hebrew Church, '*who had been given the oracles of God*'

(Rom 3:2), is, not only in its consonants, but in its vowels—either the vowel points themselves, or at least the power of the points—not only in its matter, but in its words, inspired by God. It thus forms, together with the Original of the NT the sole and complete rule of our faith and practice; and to its standard, as to a Lydian stone, all extant versions, eastern or western, ought to be applied, and wherever they differ, be conformed.”

Then, in canon III, the Formula rebukes those who, contrary to the aforementioned doctrine, would advocate for amending the extant Hebrew text “*from the versions of the LXX and other Greek versions, the Samaritan Pentateuch, by the Chaldaic Targums, or even from other sources.*” Canon III continues:

“They go even to the point of following the corrections that their own rational powers dictate from the various readings of the Hebrew Original itself—which, they maintain, has been corrupted in various ways; and finally, they affirm that besides the Hebrew edition of the present time, there are in the versions of the ancient interpreters which differ from our Hebrew text, other Hebrew Originals. Since these versions are also indicative of ancient Hebrew Originals differing from each other, they thus bring the foundation of our faith and its sacred authority into perilous danger.” [32]

Lutheran bibliology is entirely compatible with the Reformed on this point, as Gerhard wrote, this would be to judge “*the source from the streams*” and to determine “*the norm and rule from the square that the norm and rule have drawn.*” [33] This is backwards. We do not determine if a ruler is straight by comparing it with a hand-drawn line, but the other way around. The Hebrew OT is the rule whereby all translations, including the LXX, are to be judged. Whatever utility the LXX may have, we utterly deny that it may be used to correct the original Hebrew, which was **dictated** by the Holy Ghost, and kept pure in all ages by his **singular care and providence**.

### 3.5 The Value of the Septuagint.

Despite the ways in which the LXX can be misused, we must not fail to note where it remains valuable. De Moor writes how important it was for preparing Hellenistic Jews and God-fearing Gentiles for understanding the Old Testament and its fulfillment in Christ, as preached by the Apostles:

“Although it is disgracefully stained with errors and polluted with fables, to the present day it is not without its manifold uses...it paved the way for the preaching of the Apostles, and in this Version the Gentiles, in a tongue known to them, were able to read those things that were preached by the Apostles, that were formerly preached by the Prophets: while many that had already previously read the Books of Moses and of the Prophets, having in a certain measure been prepared in this manner, were more easily receiving what was announced by the Apostles.” [34]

Second, the LXX is very important as a source of lexical information for the meaning of Greek terms. The New Testament may use certain Greek words a limited number of times. But upon consultation with the use of those words in the LXX, their meaning is made more clear. At the same time, it is a tool which may help exegetes determine the possible meaning of difficult Hebrew words and idioms. Understanding how the LXX and other

ancient versions translated the Hebrew can shed light on the meaning of the original Hebrew. [35]

[1] Richard Muller, *Post Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 2, p. 432.

[2] By “original” we mean what the Reformed Orthodox meant (not the revisionist, Warfieldian meaning), that is, as Turretin stated: “*we do not mean the autographs written by the hand of Moses, of the Prophets, and of the Apostles, which certainly do not now exist. We mean their apographs [copies] which are so called because they set forth to us the word of God in the very words of those who wrote under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit.*” *cf.* our article on [The Preservation of Scripture](#) & Dr. Theodore Letis, [The Protestant Dogmaticians and the Late Princeton School on the Status of the Sacred Apographa](#).

[3] Mogens Müller, [The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint](#). Engaging with this work, Emanuel Tov notes that arguments for the extant LXX being “*closer to the text used by the early Christians*” are unpersuasive, in part because “*the quotations from the Septuagint in the New Testament often differ from the known manuscripts of the Septuagint.*” ([The Status of the Masoretic Text in Modern Text Editions of the Hebrew Bible](#) in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders, p. 240, fn. 31).

[4] The English Standard Version (ESV) [Preface](#) admits: “*In exceptional, difficult cases, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Syriac Peshitta, the Latin Vulgate, and other sources were consulted to shed possible light on the text, or, if necessary, to support a divergence from the Masoretic text.*”

[5] Evangelical scholar Dr. [Edward Glenny](#), in the Gospel Coalition’s journal *Themelios*, writes:

“Textual scholars are convinced that although the LXX is primarily a translation and, in some of its forms, a revision of the original Greek text, in some of the instances where the LXX disagrees with the MT it preserves an earlier form of the Hebrew than the MT.”

Yet in the footnote, candidly admits:

“Determining such things involves retroversion of the LXX to attempt to reconstruct its Hebrew [Vorlage](#) in order to compare it with other Hebrew texts. The process is complex, and it is often difficult to determine if differences between the MT and LXX are the result of a different *Vorlage* or result from some other factor, such as the technique of the translator.” ([The Septuagint and Biblical Theology](#), *Themelios*, v. 41, i. 2).

On the other hand, it is evident how a robust and confessional doctrine of Scripture would lead Christian scholars and churchmen to approach this issue very differently.

[6] **Hilarion Alfeyev**, *Orthodox Christianity, Volume II: Doctrine and Teaching of the Orthodox Church*, (New York: St. Vladimir Seminary Press, 2012) p. 34. Cited from **The Septuagint vs. the Masoretic Text** by Fr. John Whiteford.

[7] Travis Bohlinger, **The Origin of the LXX**, Logos Academic Blog. “[*The Septuagint*] was translated from Hebrew over several centuries, and the translations began to be revised shortly after they were completed.” (Edward Glenn, **The Septuagint and Biblical Theology**, Themelios, v. 41, i. 2, fn. 15). See also “**On the Invention and Problem of the term Septuagint**” by Dr. Peter Williams at the Evangelical Theological Society gathering in 2016. Also “**Why I Don’t Believe In The Septuagint**” by Dr. Peter Williams.

[8] Travis Bohlinger, **The Influence of the LXX**, Logos Academic Blog. Similarly, Dr. Melvin Peters observes that there is often “*more than one form of the text in a single book.*” (**Translating the Old Greek Bible (The Septuagint): An Inconvenient Witness to Biblical History**, 16:20)

[9] Sarna, Nahum; Snaith, Norman; Greenspoon, Leonard; Harkins, Franklin; Harkins, Angela; Grossfeld, Bernard; Huehnergard, John; Weidmann, Frederick; Stone, Michael; Sasson, Ilana; Markon, Isaak; Cassuto, Umberto; Loewe, Raphael; Simonsen, David; Fox, Everett; Zimels, Abraham; Grossman, Avraham; Altmann, Alexander; Avishur, Isaac; Hummel, Horace; Cogan, Mordechai; Sperling, S.; Berlinblau, Jacques; Wacholder, Ben; Rabinowitz, Louis; Enslin, Morton; Hirschberg, Ha. “*Bible.*” *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. **Greek: The Septuagint**.

[10] This theory is frequently advanced by John Owen in his Commentary on Hebrews. *cf.* Owen on Heb. 1:6; 1:8-9; 2:13a; 3:7-11; 3:15; 4:7; & 10:5-7. While not limited to the book of Hebrews, more research in light of modern evidence (and confessional presuppositions) needs to be done on this topic.

[11] **Edward Leigh**, *Body of Divinity*, p. 75. *cf.* William Whitaker, *Disputations on Holy Scripture*, Q. 2, ch. 3, *Of the Greek Version by the Seventy Translators of the Hebrew Books*.

[12] Johann Gerhard, *Theological Commonplaces vol. 2*, **On the Nature of Theology and Scripture**, Kindle position 1324.

[13] Gerhard, *ibid.*, Kindle position 1327.

[14] Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621), book II *de Verbo Dei*, chapter VI, *Controversiis*, tome I, columns 102-105. In his study of Franciscus Junius’ hermeneutics, Douglas Judisch correctly observes: “*Junius distinguishes between the version supposedly executed by the legendary seventy translators of the Old Testament and the Septuagint as it existed in his own day (which sometimes, he felt, represented the work of the original translators and sometimes did not).*” **A translation and edition of the Sacrorum Parallelorum Liber Primus of Franciscus Junius: a study in sixteenth century hermeneutics** (1979), vol. 2, p. 341.

[15] Bernardinus De Moor, *Didactico-Elenctic Theology*, vol. 2, ch. 2, sect. 11, p. 211.

[16] Alexander Sperber notes:



“It may at once be said that every part of the N.T. affords evidence of a knowledge of the LXX., and that a great majority of the passages cited from the O.T. are in general agreement with the Greek version. It is calculated by one writer on the subject that, while the N.T. differs from the Masoretic text in 212 citations, it departs from the LXX. in 185; and by another that ‘*not more than fifty*’ of the citations ‘*materially differ from the LXX.*’ On either estimate the LXX. is the principal source from which the writers of the N.T. derived their O.T. quotations.” (**New Testament and Septuagint**. Journal of Biblical Literature. Vol. 59, No. 2 (June 1940), pp. 193-293).

Some sources documenting these differences will count examples in favor of the LXX when they really should not. For example, Gal. 3:13 quotation of Deut. 21:23. The LXX explicitly adds “*on a tree*” in v. 23 but the MT does not repeat that the hanging is being done on a tree after previously specifying “*tree*” twice in vv. 22-23. So the Apostle quoting the LXX here is not contrary to the sense or the grammar of the MT at all. Or Heb. 2:12 citing Ps. 22:22—alleging a difference between LXX and MT here is unwarranted; “*will I sing praise to thee*” (LXX) and “*will I praise thee*” (MT) are not divergent in meaning.

In our judgment, Archer & Chirichigno give a balanced and fair analysis of this topic. They divide the OT quotations in the NT into 6 categories (A through F), noting that some NT verses may be assigned to more than one category due to the complexity of determining what constitutes a quotation and that some NT texts may appear to quote more than one OT text at once (p. xi). Summarizing their analysis:

- **64.4% (268)** of the OT quotes in the NT are “*reasonably or completely accurate*” between the MT and LXX and are thus unquestionably immaterial to the statement of the question.
- **7% (33)** “*adhere more closely to the MT than the LXX does, indicating that the apostolic author may have consulted his Hebrew Bible directly in the preparation of his own account or letter.*”
- **11.2% (50)** of the OT quotes in the NT “*quite closely adhere to the wording of the LXX, even where the LXX deviates somewhat (though not so seriously as to distort the real meaning of the Old Testament passage as given in the MT) from the received text in the Hebrew Bible.*”
- **3% (13)** do not precisely match either the MT or the LXX and “*give the impression that unwarranted liberties were taken with the Old Testament text in the light of its context,*” yet “*far from wresting or perverting the original verse, the inspired servant of Jesus brings out in a profound and meaningful way its implications and connotations.*”
- **8% (32)** are not explicitly adduced by the New Testament writers as quotations, yet closely resemble an OT source.
- **6% (22)** “*adhere quite closely to the LXX rendering, even when it deviates somewhat from the MT.*”

Thus, regarding our statement of the question, only these last 22 citations, 6% of the whole, are seemingly problematic. For a good example of how orthodox exegetes have resolved issues in this class of citations cf. **Owen on Heb. 11:21**.



[17] Roger Nicole, **Revelation and the Bible: Contemporary Evangelical Thought**, ed. Carl F.H. Henry, p. 137.

[18] De Moor, *ibid.*, pp. 215-216.

[19] *Dubiis Euangelicis*, Part III, Doubt XIX, § 3, on Matthew 3:3, pp. 48-49, cited from De Moor, *ibid.*, p. 216.

[20] Edward F. Hills, *Text and Time: A Reformed Approach to New Testament Textual Criticism*, p. 94.

[21] Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* II.xiv.vii, vol. 1, p. 129. Archer & Chirichigno explicitly cite 33 citations of this type (Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey, p. xxvi, Category C).

[22] e.g. **“They pierced my hands and my feet” or “Like a lion my hands and my feet” in Psalm 22:16?**

[23] *“Owen’s argument resolved the textual question in a direction favorable to his theological concerns: the original language text of the epistle had been preserved, and the Old Testament citations in the epistle were either translations of the inspired Hebrew original or inspired apostolic paraphrases.”* (Muller, *ibid.*, p. 434).

[24] Gleason L. Archer & Gregory Chirichigno, *“Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey”* (2005), p. xxviii.

[25] *Apology Against Rufinus*, **Book 2**, Section 34, (NPNF2, 3:517).

[26] Jerome, Letter 121, To Algasia, (NPNF2, 6.224). Cited from Gerhard, *ibid.*, Kindle position 857.

[27] Turretin, *ibid.*, p. 129.

[28] John Owen, *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, on **Heb. 10:5**. cf. Owen on Heb. 1:6; 1:8-9; 2:13a; 3:7-11; 3:15; 4:7; & 10:5-7.

[29] Thomas Cartwright, *Confutation of the Rhemists’ Translation, Glosses, and Annotations on the New Testament*, Preface, ans. 50.

[30] Gerhard, *ibid.*, Kindle position 1328. *“The Lord’s Penmen in the New Testament do so far yield to the Seventy Interpreters as their difference from the Hebrew is in words and not in sense.”* (Cartwright, *Confutation...*, p. 642, on Heb. 11:21).

[31] Gerhard, *ibid.*, Kindle position 857.

[32] James Ussher (1581-1656) likewise warned:

*“But if in it [Capellus’ Critica Sacra] you had taught ‘Out of the Samaritan and the Greek LXX variant readings of the Hebrew text can be collected no less than from what you gather from our modern Hebrew Bible’, I could not but say that by far the most dangerous path is*

opened up by that method of reasoning for the perversion of the true meaning of the Holy Spirit in a thousand passages of Scripture...and he who first tried to block this path would have been likely to receive great favour from a not ungrateful posterity.” (Whole Works, vol. 16, p. 222, letter 294. Cited from G.H. Milne, [Has the Bible Been Kept Pure?](#), p. 259).

[33] Gerhard, *ibid.*, Kindle position 846.

[34] De Moor, *ibid.*, pp. 226-227.

[35] Owen and other exegetes frequently use it this way in their commentaries. It is likewise made use of in this way by Greek lexicons such as Thayer’s.

## 4. Die belangrike nuwe boek van Jeffrey Riddle

### Editorial Introduction

#### Jeffrey T. Riddle & Christian M. McShaffrey

From the beginning, the devil has sought to destroy the souls of men by enticing them to doubt God’s Word. Our first father Adam received God’s Word through direct revelation in the Garden of Eden. The Lord commanded, “Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die” (Genesis 2:16-17). Sadly, on the very next page of Scripture, we witness the devil’s first attempt to deceive mankind, when he asked, “Yea, hath God said...?” (Genesis 3:1).

It is a dangerous thing to challenge the integrity and authority of God’s Word. It appears that our first mother succumbed to this danger. She tried to answer the enemy of her soul, but made no less than three mistakes in the attempt: Eve modified, added to, and deleted from God’s Word.

Eve’s modification of Scripture consisted in replacing a singular pronoun with a plural pronoun. She answered the serpent, saying, “Ye shall not eat of it...” (Genesis 3:3) when God had actually said “thou shalt not eat of it” (Genesis 2:17). This was not a major modification. Some might even argue that it was good for her to apply God’s direct Word to Adam to herself, but her words, in fact, altered what God had said. She should have responded, as our Savior did when he was tempted in the wilderness, with a direct quotation (cf. Matthew 4:4, 7, 10). Eve proceeded to add to Scripture when she spoke of the forbidden fruit, saying, “neither shall ye touch it...” (Genesis 3:3). God had said no such thing. Perhaps she said it innocently enough

(i.e., simply emphasizing how off-limits the fruit was), but this was an addition to what God had said. She should not have responded with her own speculation and emendation. Finally, Eve deleted part of Scripture, saying, “lest ye die” (Genesis 3:3). God had, in fact, said more than that. He spoke with more dreadful severity, saying, “thou shalt surely die” (Genesis 2:17). Eve’s omission served to soften the intensity of the divine threat.

Why focus on this single event that occurred thousands of years ago? It proves two things. First, it exposes Satan’s subtle strategy for the destruction of souls. He seeks to destroy our faith by casting doubt over God’s Word. Second, it demonstrates how susceptible we are to Satan’s wiles.

God has raised up men in every generation since the fall and given them the courage needed to rebuke the devil and his servants. There was, in fact, none braver than the Lord Jesus Christ himself, who rebuked the devil with the words, “Get thee behind me, Satan!” (Luke 4:8). Strangely enough, even that saying, found in the Received Text, no longer appears in many modern translations of this verse in the Gospel of Luke, such as the NIV and ESV. This is only one of many examples of places where the modern critics have assumed textual corruption, and then arrogated to themselves the role of being “correctors” of holy writ. Even those who might initially profess to believe the scriptures were originally inspired by God, too often then proceed to deny that God has also preserved that same inspired Word in its transmission.

Modern academic textual criticism rejects divine preservation, and therefore proceeds to pursue reconstruction of the text based on human reasoning. This view of the text of Scripture stands in stark contrast to the Bibliology of the men of the Reformation and post-Reformation (Protestant orthodox) eras. Those godly men maintained that the Lord had not only immediately inspired the Scriptures in the original Hebrew and Greek, but that he had also kept them pure in all ages (cf. WCF and LBCF, 1.8, the most cited confessional passage in this anthology!). This led them to affirm the classic Protestant printed editions of the Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Old Testament and the Textus Receptus of the Greek New Testament as the standard text of the Christian Bible. This traditional or Received Text of Scripture provided a faithful touchstone for Protestant, Bible-believing scholars, ministers, churchmen, and congregations as they conducted their ministries. This text was the basis for scholarly study, preaching, and translation of the Bible amongst the Protestant churches.

In the nineteenth century an especially concerted effort was made to undermine the authority of the traditional text and to replace it with the modern critical text. This effort extended into

the twentieth century and included the replacement of classic Protestant translations of the Bible in various languages with new translations based on the modern critical text. Admittedly, this movement has been quite successful even among many conservative, evangelical, and Reformed men.

Not all, however, have jumped on the modern critical text bandwagon. Some have raised questions about the faithfulness and the wisdom of abandoning the Protestant touchstone of the traditional biblical text in favor of an ever-shifting modern critical text. They have maintained that we should hold fast to the old text and to the classic Protestant translations based upon it. This anthology provides a sampling of the reasoning which has led such men to this conviction.

We are thankful to the twenty-five men who contributed essays to this work. In seeking contributors to this project, we invited men who were actively serving as officers in local churches. We wanted men who were gladly laboring in the trenches of local church ministry. The authors include Pastors, Teachers, Elders, and one Deacon, coming from Reformed, Presbyterian, and Baptist traditions. These men hail from places across the English-speaking world, including Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Some of the writers have served for decades in pastoral ministry, while others are young men just beginning their service.

We gave each contributor the same topic to consider, "Why I Preach from the Received Text." In reading these essays it will become clear that all the contributors have high respect for the Authorized or King James Version of the Bible in English, as many make mention of this venerable translation in their respective essays. The reader should not, however, be confused about this book's primary focus. Critics of the traditional text, in fact, often confuse our position, whether intentionally or unintentionally, with "King James Version-Onlyism," a position which is inconsistent with WCF and LBCF 1.8. We did not ask our authors to address, "Why I Preach from the King James Version," but "Why I Preach from the Received Text." The primary purpose of this book is a defense of the traditional original Hebrew and Greek text of the Bible.

As editors, we are pleased with the diversity and strength of these contributions. Some of the essays are personal and autobiographical, while others are more historical and doctrinal, but all reflect the conviction contained in our Protestant Reformed Confessions: God has kept his Word pure in all ages. These essays, offered in alphabetical order by the names of the authors, are written in a popular and easily accessible style. Rather than footnotes, simple and

abbreviated references to any works cited appear within the text itself. We hope this will aid the reader who wants to seek out any such references. Since most of the authors are regularly engaged in preaching, many of the essays are written in a homiletical style. Spelling and punctuation have been conformed to the general standards of American English. At the end of the book there is an Appendix titled “Steps Toward Change in Your Church” offering pastoral advice on addressing text in a local congregation. Finally, there is a select annotated bibliography providing resources for the further study of the traditional text.

It is our hope that each reader’s confidence in the integrity of Scripture will be increased as he moves through the pages of this book. We particularly desire that those ministers and their congregations who have stood fast in their use of the traditional text, even when it seemed they had few allies and many adversaries, will be encouraged by this work, knowing that they do not stand alone and that this position is neither unreasonable nor obscurantist. It is also our hope that a new generation of young believers and young men called to ministry might be prompted by this work to give careful consideration regarding the text of the Bible they choose to embrace.

We close this introduction with an anecdote from the Puritan author Henry Scougal (1650-1678). In his collected works one finds a series of personal reflections drawn from his private diary (cf. *The Works of Henry Scougal*, 256-257). First, there is a note recorded on November 1, 1668 titled, “On the Sad Report of the Death of a Pious and Learned Friend.” As the title indicates, Scougal’s note expressed his grief on receiving the news that a dear friend had expired. Scougal movingly wrote: “The purest crystal is soon cracked, while courser metal can endure a stroke. The brittle cage was much too narrow and long to enclose a bird whose soaring wing required a larger volary.”

The next note, however, was recorded over a week later and had this title, “On the Sight of the Foresaid Person Whom I Had Concluded to be Dead, November 10, When I Had Occasion to Visit Him at His House.” Scougal began this note, “Oh, happy disappointment, to see him yet alive, whom some days ago I had buried in my apprehensions!”

This anecdote calls to mind the quip attributed to Mark Twain, “Reports of my death have been greatly exaggerated.” This collection of essays similarly declares that reports of the death of the traditional text of Holy Scripture in the use of faithful churches and among their ministers has been greatly exaggerated. Though it may appear to some that the traditional text has suffered the fate of the traveler on the road to Jericho who “fell among thieves” and was left

“half dead” (Luke 10:30), it is, in fact, very much alive. As Gamaliel said of the ministry of the Apostles, “But if it be of God, ye cannot over-throw it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God” (Acts 5:39). May the Lord use this book as an instrument to stimulate, revive, confirm, and defend intelligent and effective usage of the traditional text of the Word of God.

Jeffrey T. Riddle

Christian M. McShaffre

## Contents

Title Page

Abbreviations

Editorial Introduction (Jeffrey T. Riddle & Christian M. McShaffrey)

1. Infallible Truth, Not Probability (Archibald Allison)
2. Is There Such a Thing as an Authentic Text? (Jonathan D. Arnold)
3. God’s Word as Creation - A Reason I Preach from the TR (Doug Barger)
4. From Atheism to the Authorized Version (Gavin Beers)
5. The Text of the Church (Poul de Gier)
6. Promise and Faith (Tanner Dikin)
7. John Owen’s Defense of the Received Text (William O. Einwechter)
8. Preaching in the Name of the Amen (Brent C. Evans)
9. Should We Use Those Proof Texts? (Philip Gardiner)
10. The Reformed Christian’s Text (Dane Johannsson)
11. Perspectives from the Pew (Howie W. Owen Jones)
12. Why I Read and Preach from the TR and AV (Trevor Kirkland)
13. Hank, James, and Me: My Journey to the Received Text (Brett Mahlen)
14. Scripture Identified Scripture (Robert McCurley)
15. From Certainty, to Doubt, and Back Again (Christian M. McShaffrey)



16. Why? It's the Word of God! (D. Scott Meadows)
  17. The Christian Bible Can Be Trusted (Pooyan Mehrshahi)
  18. My Journey to the Received Text (Mark L. R. Mullins)
  19. The Invincible Word (Christopher Myers)
  20. Train Up a Child (Jeffrey T. Riddle)
  21. God's Honor, Christ's Glory, and the Church's Good (Christopher Sheffield)
  22. The Absurdity of Modern Textual Criticism (John Thackway)
  23. The Received Text is the Canonical Text (Robert Truelove)
  24. The Approach, Attack, and Animosity of Modern Textual Criticism (J. D. "Doc" Watson)
  25. Why Advocate for the Received Text? (Joshua White)
- Appendix: Steps Toward Change in Your Church
- A Select Annotated Bibliography
- About TGH

## 5. 'n Paar belangrike skakels

Ek het heelwat kontak met Riddle. Sy blog Stylos is by <http://www.jeffriddle.net/>

Net so insiggewend is hierdie:

Far Eastern Bible College | Articles in Defence of VPP Van Jeffrey Khoo:

[https://www.febc.edu.sg/v15/articles\\_in\\_defence\\_of\\_vpp](https://www.febc.edu.sg/v15/articles_in_defence_of_vpp)

<https://purelypresbyterian.com/category/scripture/>

<https://confessionalbibliology.com/author/paul-barth/>

## 6. Later belangrike invoeging ivm die Septuagint en Tekskritiek OT

Daar is niks nuuts onder die son nie. Lees maar hier:

In the Helvetic Consensus Formula, one of the issues they sought to counter was the influence of a textual critic named Cappellus who taught that both the vowel points and consonants of the Old Testament were corrupted (see Bowman, "A Forgotten Controversy," *Evangelical Quarterly*, 54; Muller, *After Calvin*, 151). In its third canon, this confession states: Therefore, we are not able to approve of the opinion of those who believe that the text which the Hebrew Original exhibits was determined by man's will alone, and do not hesitate at all to remodel a Hebrew reading which they consider unsuitable, and amend it from the versions of the LXX and other Greek versions, the Samaritan Pentateuch, by the Chaldaic Targums, or even from other sources. They go even to the point of following the corrections that their own rational powers dictate from the various readings of the Hebrew Original itself which, they maintain, has been corrupted in various ways; and finally, they affirm that besides the Hebrew edition of the present time, there are in the versions of the ancient interpreters which differ from our Hebrew text, other Hebrew Originals. Since these versions are also indicative of ancient Hebrew Originals differing from each other, they thus bring the foundation of our faith and its sacred authority into perilous danger.