

# False Citations in NA/UBS

## 1 Timothy 3:16 Examined

by  
Scott Jones

The critical apparatuses of NA/UBS are *SATURATED* with false citations. For example, there are no less than *SIX FALSE CITATIONS* by NA/UBS in 1 Timothy 3:16 alone. Five uncials are falsely cited in support of *OS* instead of *THEOS* in 1 Timothy 3:16. These uncials are Aleph A C F G.

Four of these uncials read *THEOS* in the original hand, whereas ultraviolet technology demonstrated that most of the corrections of Aleph, *ESPECIALLY* those with doctrinal significance, were made before Aleph ever left the scriptorium. Tischendorf stated arbitrarily and without foundation that Aleph's corrector operated on this passage in the 12th century. The technological evidence produced by Milne & Skeat in the mid-twentieth century refuted Tischendorf. In fact, the first scribe of Aleph simply copied from his exemplars without deviation. Then, before Aleph ever left the scriptorium, the same scribe or a fellow scribe came back and went over the manuscript, correcting as many obvious errors as he determined to exist. In other words, it is most probable that Aleph's reading of *THEOS* is a correction contemporary with the original hand of the manuscript itself, and a correction contemporary with the original hand of the manuscript is more accurate than the original hand. Either way, the assertion that the corrector was a 12th century hand is dubious, at best.

A very brief explanation of how the Greek is displayed in the manuscripts is as follows:

Sacred names, known generally by their Latin terminology as *NOMINA SACRA*, were abbreviated in manuscripts to conserve space, or as tokens of respect. When a sacred name was abbreviated, a light horizontal stroke was placed above the letters to signify the abbreviation. Thus, the term for God - ΘΕΟΣ - was shortened by omitting the two inner letters and by affixing a horizontal line above the two remaining letters. The abbreviation would thus appear in the manuscripts as Θ̄Σ (technically, the final sigma looked very much like our capital C, but I will forego that nomenclature here to avoid confusion).

Well, it just so happens that by removing the horizontal line *ABOVE* the abbreviation and by removing the small horizontal line *WITHIN* the *Theta* (the first letter of the word) another legitimate Greek word that looks like this - ΟΣ - is produced.

This word by itself - ΟΣ (without the horizontal lines above and within), is the masculine relative pronoun for "who" in the Greek language. In other words, if the horizontal lines are present, every reader would recognize that the word was a *NOMINA SACRA* signifying the word "Theos," which means "God." If the two horizontal lines are absent, every reader would understand that the word simply meant "who."

This, then, is the whole crux of the matter concerning 1 Timothy 3:16, for a scant handful of manuscripts are missing the horizontal lines, thus *APPEARING* to form the word "who" instead of "Theos." (This scant handful of manuscripts missing the horizontal lines are in opposition to *WELL OVER THREE HUNDRED MANUSCRIPTS THAT CONTAIN* the horizontal lines, and which therefore testify unmistakably to *Theos*, or "God"). Furthermore, the scant few manuscripts missing the horizontal lines creates a *SEVERE* grammatical problem, for the Greek word ΟΣ (without the horizontal lines, which means "who") is a masculine relative pronoun that ends up modifying a *NEUTER* noun - in this case the noun "mystery." Significantly, this is not only *HORRIBLE GREEK GRAMMAR*, but the resulting clause ends up containing *A PREDICATE WITHOUT A SUBJECT* -- I say, the *RESULTING CLAUSE ENDS UP CONTAINING A PREDICATE WITHOUT A SUBJECT* -- which is of course *ABSURD*. And yet, most modern bibles have followed this preposterous error in 1 Timothy 3:16 by rendering the word as *WHO* instead of *GOD*. The resulting *GRAMMATICAL ABSURDITY* forced these modern bibles to either fabricate the word "HE" out of thin air, or change the syntax around entirely in order to compensate for the utter *ABSURDITY*.

In other words, *MODERN BIBLES HAVE GONE OUT OF THEIR WAY TO OBLITERATE THE STRONGEST STATEMENT IN THE SCRIPTURES TESTIFYING TO THE DEITY OF JESUS CHRIST*, in spite of *CONCLUSIVE* testimony against them, as the following discourse reveals. Make no mistake about it -- modern bibles, and the *TRANSLATORS WHO CRAFTED THEM*, have *WILLFULLY OBLITERATED THE VERY STRONGEST WORD IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AFFIRMING THE DEITY OF JESUS CHRIST*, and it is *NOT POSSIBLE* that such men were indwelt by the Holy Ghost when they did so. I say, *IT IS NOT POSSIBLE THAT REGENERATE TRANSLATORS -- GENUINELY BORN AGAIN TRANSLATORS* -- would have omitted *THEOS* in this passage. It is *IMPOSSIBLE* for a *GENUINELY BORN AGAIN* Christian

to deny *THEOS* in this passage. There are *NO* exceptions, for the Holy Ghost *BEARS UNMISTAKABLE WITNESS* to *THEOS* -- *GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH* -- in this passage, for *GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH* is the *SOURCE OF ALL REVELATION*. There is *NO GENUINE REVELATION* apart from *GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH*. None whatsoever.

**W**itness just *ONE* example out of *A HORDE OF EXAMPLES* of the *WILLFUL DECEIT* of modern biblical scholarship --

**T**he original custodians of Codex A all testified that the lines in and above the Theta were visible from the year 1626 (when Codex A was given to the British by Cyril of Lucar) even up until the time of Scrivener, as Scrivener stated that he examined the manuscript 20 times in as many years and that he always maintained the original hand was *THEOS*, but that the lines had all but disappeared. Of course, the lines in and above the Theta in Codex A are *habitually* written so faintly that they are barely discernible to begin with, as testified by those who have actually examined Codex A, which is further proof of *THEOS* in 1 Timothy 3:16. As it stands now, 1 Tim 3:16 in Codex A has been thumbed so many times that it is completely worn and thus any type of examination today would be worthless.

**H**owever, we have overwhelming historical evidence to prove that Codex A read *THEOS* in the original hand. Patrick Young, the first custodian of Codex A after the British were given possession, maintained that the reading was clearly *THEOS* in the original hand. Huish, who collated Codex A, asserted that *THEOS* was *CLEARLY* the reading in 1 Tim 3:16 in the original hand, and he communicated this to Brian Walton prior to Walton's fifth edition of his Polyglot in 1657. Bishop Pearson examined Codex A in the same time period and testified that *THEOS* was unmistakable. Bishop Fell in 1675 also maintained that *THEOS* in the original hand was the unmistakable reading as well.

**M**ill, who was at work on the Text of the NT from 1677 to 1707, expressly declares that he saw the remains of *THEOS* in 1 Tim 3:16 in Codex A. Bentley, who had himself in 1716 collated the MS with the utmost accuracy, knew nothing of any other reading. In 1718 Wotton stated, "There can be no doubt that this manuscript always exhibited *THEOS*." In the early to mid 18th century both Wetstein and Berriman expressly maintained that Codex A read *THEOS* in 1 Tim 3:16 in the original hand. Berriman went so far as to note that the lines were light and fading, and that if at any time in the future they should be worn away completely, that everyone should know that they were nevertheless original. Berriman also noted that someone had recently attempted to darken

the lines by tracing over them, but that the retrace did not fully extend to the full length of the original line, so that the original line could still be seen.

**B**engel testified in 1734 that the reading of 1 Tim 3:16 in Codex A in the original hand was *THEOS*. Woide declared in 1765 that he examined A and the reading was undoubtedly *THEOS* in the original hand, and furthermore, that the very same lines 20 years later had almost disappeared.

**T**o quote Burgon:

"The fact remains for all that, that the original reading of A is attested so amply, that no sincere lover of Truth can ever hereafter pretend to doubt it... it is too late by 150 years to contend on the negative side of the question... The plain fact concerning Cod. A is this - That at 1 Tim. iii. 16, two delicate horizontal strokes in *THEOS* which were thoroughly patent in 1628, which could be seen plainly down to 1737, and which were discernible by an expert (Dr. Woide) so late as A.D. 1765, have for the last hundred years entirely disappeared, which is precisely what Berriman in 1741 predicted would be the case." Revision Revised, 432-436

**O**nly recently has Codex A been claimed as blanket support for *OS*. The early testimony from men who actually *EXAMINED* Codex A personally with their own hands, and who viewed Codex A many times up close with their *OWN EYES* - not just one or two men, but a whole *HORDE* of men over a period of two hundred years - cited Codex A as *DEFINITELY* reading *THEOS* in the original hand. Modern scholars who attempt to overturn such conclusive testimony, especially since there is no possible way to determine the true reading of Codex A today, are being disingenuous, at best.

**I**n fact, these modern scholars are being *WILLFULLY DECEITFUL*, for these vipers who perpetrated this *PROPAGANDA* know better.

**T**his is *ONE* example of a *LEGION* of examples of false citations in NA/UBS.

**A** similarly conclusive case can be made for C F G. See Burgon, Revision Revised, same section as above, where the evidence for each of these manuscripts is likewise discussed in detail. For example, notice this prescient statement by George Sayles Bishop regarding Codex C --

"Soon after 1885 I went to Europe where I spent nearly three weeks in studying this text, 1 Tim. iii:16 on the great uncials "C" and "A". Through the kindness of Mr. Albert Le Faivre, Minister Plenipotentiary from France to the United States, I had the Codex "C" for one week under my hands to study the membrane with lenses and under full sunshine. The

parchment was also held up by an attendant in front of the great window so that the light could fall through the palimpsest page. I have compared the THEOS of line 14 on folio 119, the one in dispute, with every other THEOS on the page and, out of the five, I find it the plainest one there. All five are written with two letters - OY, OY, OC, OY, OW Two of the five only have the line, the mark of contraction, above. Only one of the two, the plainest, is the only one they deny. Three of the five only have the hair mark in the Theta - one of these three is the one they deny. To put it more plainly - the question is, Is it OC "who" or is it OC with a line over the two letters and a mark in the O, God? *It is beyond question the latter. My eyes are as good as any man's.*" *Sheol, The Principle and Tendency*

**A** great deal *MORE* evidence on Codex C could be presented, which you will find, as before noted, in Burgon's thorough handling of this matter, as well as *REAMS* more information about the other *FALSE CITATIONS* in the remaining manuscripts as well.

**T**he fact is, when the actual *EVIDENCE* is adhered to, the external testimony comes down to *ONLY* 4 cursives that can accurately be cited for *OS* in 1 Tim 3:16, and I'm not confident about the testimony of the 4 cursives, for I have not personally collated these four cursives, and it is the epitome of foolhardiness to take the word of NA27 or UBS4, as they are literally *INUNDATED* with *INACCURATE* citations.

**O**f course, the grammatical absurdity that occurs when *OS* is deployed in 1 Tim 3:16 in the critical text is also fatal in and of itself, which we'll get to in a moment. Not to mention the Patristic testimony which resoundingly testifies to *THEOS* in this passage.

**T**he NA/UBS also falsely cites Epiphanius as support for *OS*, when in fact Epiphanius quotes *THEOS*.

**D**ionysius (265 AD) quotes this passage in Greek *WORD FOR WORD*, inserting only the copula "gar." (Concilia i. 858a). So much for the naked assertions that the testimony for this passage is late.

**H**ippolytus (170 - 236 AD) in *Against Noetus* paraphrases this passage at least three times. For example, "For our God sojourned with us in the flesh." And again, "Thus, too, they preached the advent of God in the flesh to the world." And again, "He now, coming forth into the world, *WAS MANIFESTED AS GOD IN A BODY.*"

**C**hrysostom (350 AD) quotes the passage *WORD FOR WORD* in the Greek several times throughout his discourses and homilies.

**G**regory of Nyssa (370 AD) quotes this passage in Greek at least 22 times, all as the Textus Receptus/Authorised Version has it.

**I**gnatius (100 AD) makes clear allusion to this passage several times. In fact, Ignatius' quote is quite interesting. In his letter to the Ephesians he states, "There is one physician, both fleshly and spiritual; made and not made; *GOD IN THE FLESH*," and then a few paragraphs later adds, "*GOD HIMSELF BEING MADE MANIFEST* in the form of a man." In these two sentences, Ignatius employs the exact same Greek words as found in the Textus Receptus.

**I**n all, there are upwards of *TWENTY* church fathers who quote or strongly allude to this passage as found in the TR/AV. These citations are *EARLY* and geographically diverse.

**F**urther still, *THEOS* matches the grammar perfectly whereas with the reading of *OS* as found in NA/UBS, you not only have a gross grammatical solecism whereby a *MASCULINE* relative pronoun ends up modifying a *NEUTER* noun, but you also wind up with a sentence that has a predicate but *NO SUBJECT*. That's why modern bibles had to fabricate the word "HE" out of thin air.

**I**n short, it is both ludicrous and blasphemous to suppose that Paul made even a single grammatical error, particularly since he was writing under the unction of the Holy Ghost - especially a *BALD* grammatical error in the very verse in which he was describing the loftiest truth in the history of the world! An error that is so juvenile, we might add, that not even a fledgling Greek schoolboy would commit it.

**I**n order to try to explain away this grammatical *ABSURDITY*, the Anglo-Sanhedrin of our day attempts to pawn this passage off as an "early Christian hymn." There is not a *SHRED* of evidence that 1 Tim 3:16 was a hymn. As far as I can discover it was Griesbach who first invented this *THEORY* - and *THEORY* is *ALL* it is - no doubt in an effort to try to justify the grammatical absurdity since Griesbach was one of those miserable men who contrived to falsify God's word whenever the text inconveniently witnessed to the Godhead of Jesus Christ. Unfortunately, mainstream Anglo-scholarship continues to

maintain the “hymn” *THEORY* without a *SHRED* of evidence. They do this by asserting that the passage appears to be made up of “strophes.” I guess they haven’t read the Sermon on the Mount, for the Sermon on the Mount has more “strophes” than any passage in the NT. Was the Sermon on the Mount a “hymn?”

**A**ccordingly, the hymn *THEORY* proponents attempt to compare this passage to Colossians 1 and Philippians 2 in a very deceitful attempt to justify the bald grammatical error in 1 Timothy 3:16. Only thing is, they always seem to *FORGET* to mention the fact that neither Colossians 1 nor Philippians 2 contain a *SINGLE* grammatical error - *NOT A SINGLE GRAMMATICAL ERROR* - and that *OS* in *BOTH* passages *MODIFIES ITS ANTECEDENT PERFECTLY*, unlike the grammatical *ABORTION* in 1 Timothy 3:16 in the Critical Text. In other words, they tell you that *OS* occurs in Colossians 1 and Philippians 2, but they *DON’T* tell you that *OS* matches the grammar *PERFECTLY* in these two passages, *UNLIKE* 1 Tim 3:16. This type of deceit and concealment of evidence is the rule rather than the exception with the Anglo-Sanhedrin of our day.

**B**ut let’s mollify the critics for a moment. Let’s say Colossians 1 and Philippians 2 and 1 Timothy 3 *WERE* hymns, just for the sake of argument. Fine. Accordingly, Paul managed to plug this “hymn” into Colossians 1 without making a single grammatical error. Paul also managed to plug this “hymn” into Philippians 2 without making a single grammatical error.

**H**ow then, we ask, did Paul fail so *MISERABLY* in 1 Timothy 3:16? Why could Paul plug these “hymns” into Colossians and Philippians without even the whisper of a grammatical blunder, but then suddenly in 1 Timothy 3:16 he falls completely apart and commits one of the most egregious grammatical blunders in the history of Greek literature?

**L**et the “hymn” *THEORISTS* explain that one.

**C**onclusion: That *GOD WAS MANIFEST IN THE FLESH* is beyond any doubt what Paul wrote in 1 Timothy 3:16, as the Holy Ghost Himself testifies to the truly born again believer -- I say, as the *HOLY GHOST HIMSELF UNMISTAKABLY BEARS WITNESS TO IN THE SPIRIT OF THE GENUINELY BORN AGAIN BELIEVER* -- there are *NO* exceptions -- and it was no hymn. Rather, it was the word of the Eternal God sent down from Heaven, sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and sealed by the blood of the Living Word to proclaim the loftiest truth in the history of the world.