

## ***“Christ is come in the flesh,” Heavenly and Earthly Witnesses, Summary Notes***

### ***Introduction***

The expression ***“Christ is come in the flesh”*** 1 John 4:3 and the testimonies of the heavenly and earthly witnesses, 1 John 5:7-8, as in the 1611 Holy Bible have consistent testimony as ***“The words of the LORD”*** Psalm 12:6 and impinge on major doctrine. However, modern bible versions cut out or dispute those testimonies. This summary will show that the 1611 Holy Bible is correct in 1 John 4:3, 5:7-8 and should not be doubted or impugned in any way with respect to 1 John 4:3, 5:7-8.

Note that the different formats in the notes that follow arise because extracts have been taken from other works and retained in the format of those works. Brief insertions have been made using the current format.

Note further the list of sources for pre-1611 Bibles and post-1611 versions with the key for abbreviations for post-1611 versions:

1385, 1395 Wycliffe and 16<sup>th</sup> century Bibles; Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ [thebiblecorner.com/englishbibles/index.html](http://thebiblecorner.com/englishbibles/index.html) [2015 update]

DR = Catholic Douay-Rheims Version, Challoner’s Revision 1749-1752  
[www.e-sword.net/downloads.html](http://www.e-sword.net/downloads.html) [2015 update]

RV = English Revised Version, 1885  
[thebiblecorner.com/englishbibles/index.html](http://thebiblecorner.com/englishbibles/index.html), [www.e-sword.net/downloads.html](http://www.e-sword.net/downloads.html) [2015 update]

Ne = Nestle’s 21<sup>st</sup> Edition Greek-English Interlinear New Testament

NIV = 1984, 2011 Editions New International Version  
[www.e-sword.net/downloads.html](http://www.e-sword.net/downloads.html) N.B. A modest fee is required, payable online. E-Sword has both the 1984 and 2011 NIVs.

Alternatively, use [www.biblegateway.com/versions/New-International-Version-NIV-Bible/](http://www.biblegateway.com/versions/New-International-Version-NIV-Bible/) for the 2011 NIV and [biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/](http://biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/) for changes from the 1984 NIV.

NKJV f.n. = New King James Version footnote  
[www.biblegateway.com/versions/New-King-James-Version-NKJV-Bible/](http://www.biblegateway.com/versions/New-King-James-Version-NKJV-Bible/)

JB, NJB = Catholic Jerusalem, New Jerusalem Bibles, respectively  
[www.unz.org/Pub/Bible-1966](http://www.unz.org/Pub/Bible-1966)  
[www.catholic.org/bible/](http://www.catholic.org/bible/)

NWT = Jehovah’s Witness Watchtower 1984, 2013 New World Translation  
[www.jw.org/en/publications/bible/](http://www.jw.org/en/publications/bible/)

Berry = George Ricker Berry’s Interlinear Edition of Stephanus’ 1550 Edition of the Received Greek New Testament Text

See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) ‘O Biblios’ – *The Book* p 63.

### **1 John 4:3**

2012 updates in blue

**“Christ is come in the flesh”** has been omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Dr J. A. Moorman [*Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version*] cites A, B, Psi and some copies of the Old Latin as the main sources of this omission. Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611.

**The** pre-1611 Bibles; Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ all contain ***“Christ is come in the flesh”*** in 1 John 4:3. Dr Moorman *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version* p 147

notes that the omission of ***“Christ is come in the flesh”*** from 1 John 4:3 stems from an early heresy that claimed that the Lord Jesus Christ was merely a man named Jesus who only became Christ at his baptism. This heresy denies the coming of the Messiah according to Isaiah’s prophecy and Matthew and John’s record.

***“Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel”*** Isaiah 7:14.

Note that the 1385, 1395 Wycliffe, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Bishops’ Bibles have *“a virgin”* or the equivalent *“a mayde (maid)”* 1385 Wycliffe in Isaiah 7:14. The 1599 Geneva Bible has *“the virgine.”* Note therefore the following exchange between Gail Riplinger, authoress of the highly acclaimed *New Age Bible Versions* and myself with respect to Isaiah 7:14.

*Dear Gail*

*I was going over New Age Versions Chapter 7 Mystery Babylon the Great, noting your citations concerning THE Virgin. You will have observed that some modern versions, NIVs, NKJV, ESV [English Standard Version], HCSB [Holman Christian Standard Bible], NLT [New Living Translation], read “the virgin” in Isaiah 7:14, not “a virgin” as in the 1611 Holy Bible. This reading is a fairly modern change in that even the DRB, RV, ASV, NASVs read a virgin and almost all the historic versions from Wycliffe onward read “a virgin” with the 1611 Holy Bible, as Bro. Kinney’s article shows [brandplucked.webs.com/avirginorthevirgin.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/avirginorthevirgin.htm). Bro. Kinney shows that the 1587 Geneva Bible reads “a virgin” but the reading was changed to “the virgin” for the 1599 Edition. Just as well that the 1611 Holy Bible came out 12 years later.*

*It appears to me that the modern reading in Isaiah 7:14 is yet another satanic New Age change, aimed at glorifying the demonic queen of heaven Jeremiah 7:18, 44:17, 18, 19, 25 and substituting antichrist for the Lord Jesus Christ, in the same manner as you showed for Isaiah 14:12 with the devil trying to put the Lord Jesus Christ there in place of himself.*

This is Sister Riplinger’s reply.

*Dear Brother,*

*When I was a Catholic as a child, I recall Mary being called, The Blessed Virgin. So when I saw the Virgin, I immediately recognized it [as] a Catholic intrusion. I like your idea about it. It is very good.*

*Gail*

***“Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us”*** Matthew 1:23.

Observe that the 1385, 1395 Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, 1587, 1599 Geneva, Bishops’ Bibles all have *“a virgin”* or the equivalent *“a mayd(e) (maid)”* Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew Bibles in Matthew 1:23.

That is, ***“a virgin”*** not ***“the virgin”*** is correct in Isaiah 7:14. When the scripture needs to use ***“the”*** with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ it does so:

***“He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ”*** John 1:41.

That is, the Lord Jesus Christ is ***“the Messiah the Prince”*** Daniel 9:25. ***“The”*** is correct in Daniel 9:25, John 1:41 just as ***“a virgin”*** is correct in Isaiah 7:14 because ***“thy word is truth”*** John 17:17.

The contemporary application of the omission or disputation of ***“Christ is come in the flesh”*** in 1 John 4:3 by the modern versions is to cater for New Age doctrine whereby all religions are brought together under the final antichrist, Revelation 13, including those such as Judaism and Moham-

medanism, each of which “**confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh**” but will “*acknowledge Jesus.*” Although it is more subtle, Catholicism also “**confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh**” in that although a Catholic *will* confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, a Catholic also wants to confess that Jesus Christ is come in the *wafer* at the Catholic Mass. The expression “**confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh**” disallows that false *added* Catholic confession, just as it disallows Jewish and Mohammedan denial “**that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.**”


See [www.chick.com/catalog/books/0187.asp](http://www.chick.com/catalog/books/0187.asp) *Babylon Religion* by David W. Daniels pp 39-43, 177-178, 187, 213-214, 218 with respect to *Queen of All* by Jim Tetlow, Roger Oakland, Brad Meyers. David Daniels rightly says of *Queen of All* that “*This book is an amazing exposé of Satan’s plan for the Roman Catholic “Mary” as the all-compassing “goddess” who will unite all religions in the End of Time.*”

See further Gail Riplinger’s observation. See:

[www.avpublications.com/avnew/content/Critiqued/james4.html](http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/content/Critiqued/james4.html).

Scanning I John 4:2, 3 in a new version will show how their wording fits precisely into the New Age One World Religion.

NIV	KJV
This is how you can <b>recognize</b> the Spirit of God: Every spirit that <b>acknowledges</b> that Jesus Christ <b>has</b> come in the flesh is from God, <b>but</b> every spirit <b>that does not acknowledge Jesus</b> is not <b>from</b> God. This is the spirit of antichrist...	Hereby <b>know</b> ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that <b>confesseth</b> that Jesus Christ <b>is</b> come in the flesh is of God: <b>And</b> every spirit that <b>confesseth</b> not that Jesus <b>Christ is come in the flesh</b> is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist...
	I John 4:2-3



The MAIN tenet of the New World Religion is TOLERANCE for the religious beliefs of others. Therefore Christians *may* still believe that “Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” as stated in verse 2 above. BUT the broad way forbids that we say that one who “confesseth **not** that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is **not** of God.” Therefore, I John 4:2 can stand with little alteration. BUT, I John 4:3 MUST change to conform to the unjudgmental broad way. “Christ is come in the **flesh**” must be removed. All New World Religion advocates will “acknowledge Jesus.”

See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) ‘O Biblios’ – *The Book* pp 63-64 on 1 John 5:7-8. Note that 1 John 5:7-8 in the AV1611 is found in the 1385, 1395 Wycliffe Bibles and the Bibles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century English Protestant Reformation; Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Matthew, Bishops’, Geneva.

### 1 John 5:7, 8

2012 updates in blue

“in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth...in one” is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

This passage, known as the ‘Johannine Comma,’ is lacking from most of the 500-600 extant Greek manuscripts which contain 1 John, although Dr Gill stated in the 18<sup>th</sup> century that “*out of sixteen ancient copies of Robert Stephens’, nine of them had (the passage)*” [*The Providential Preservation of the Greek Text of the New Testament* Rev W. Maclean M.A.] p 25.

Citing Nestle’s 26<sup>th</sup> Edition as the source, Dr J. A. Moorman [*When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text*] lists nine Greek manuscripts in his work which contain the Comma, four in the text and five in the margin.

The former include Codex 61 of the 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> century, kept in Dublin and known as the Montfort manuscript, Codex Ravianus and Codex 629 (Wizanburgensis). The latter include Codex 88 [*True or False? 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* David Otis Fuller, D.D.], [*Problem Texts*], [*Articles and Reprints from The Quarterly Record* The Trinitarian Bible Society, London, 1 John 5:7], [*1 John 5:7* Dr Peter S. Ruckman]. Dr J. A. Moorman [*When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text*] designates Codex 629 as a 14<sup>th</sup> century manuscript, citing Metzger, although Dr Ruckman locates it in the 8<sup>th</sup> century [*1 John 5:7*].

The main authorities for the passage are the Old Latin Text of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, including manuscript r, written in the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century and the *Speculum*, a treatise containing the Old Latin Text, written, according to Moorman, early in the 5<sup>th</sup> century and several fathers. Fuller [*Which Bible? 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*] p 213, citing Wilkinson\*<sup>2012</sup>, states that the passage was found in the Old Latin Bibles of the Waldenses, whose text pre-dated Jerome’s Vulgate.

\*<sup>2012</sup>The site [kjb.benabraham.com/html/our\\_authorized\\_bible\\_vindicated.html](http://kjb.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicated.html) *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* is an online version of the full text of Wilkinson’s book.

See also Ray [*God Only Wrote One Bible* Jasper James Ray] p 98, who states that this Italic Bible dates from 157 AD. The Old Latin text carried sufficient weight to influence the later copies of the Vulgate, most of which from 800 AD onward incorporated the passage.

The fathers who cite the passage include Tatian, Tertullian (both 2<sup>nd</sup> century), Cyprian (250 AD), Priscillian (385 AD), Idacius Clarus (385 AD), several African writers of the 5<sup>th</sup> century and Cassiodorus (480-570 AD). The combined influence of these authorities, together with grammatical difficulties which arise if the Comma is omitted, was sufficient to ensure its place in most editions of the Textus Receptus - see Berry’s text - and hence in the AV1611, where it undoubtedly belongs. For more detailed discussion see Hills [*The King James Version Defended 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*] p 209\*<sup>2019</sup>, [*Believing Bible Study 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*] p 210, the TBS *Notes on the Vindication of 1 John 5:7* (available from Bible Baptist Bookstore, Pensacola Florida.), Ruckman [*The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*] pp 128-129, [*Problem Texts*] p 334 [*1 John 5:7*]. The TBS have produced a more recent version of their notes, entitled *Why 1 John 5:7, 8 is in the Bible*. The omission of the Comma from the majority of the manuscripts most likely stems from the influence of Origen and some of his supporters, who did not accept the doctrine of the Trinity. See also Will Kinney’s detailed article [brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm) *1 John 5:7 These three are one*.

\*<sup>2019</sup>Dr Hills in *The King James Version Defended* Chapter 8, pp 209ff and *Believing Bible Study* Chapter 7, pp 210ff explains why the words of 1 John 5:7-8 were removed from the Greek manuscripts, through the influence of anti-Trinitarian heretics. See [standardbearers.net/uploads/The\\_King\\_James\\_Version\\_Defended\\_Dr\\_Edward\\_F\\_Hills.pdf](http://standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf) [www.scribd.com/document/298396396/Believing-Bible-Study-Edward-F-Hills-pdf](http://www.scribd.com/document/298396396/Believing-Bible-Study-Edward-F-Hills-pdf) and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work *Hazardous Materials* pp 750ff, together with Chapter 6 of Dr Moorman’s book *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text*.

The following material is included from ‘*O Biblios*’ – *The Book* pp 249-251 to show how “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21 “*maketh the judges fools*” Job 12:17 with respect to Bible critics with particular application to 1 John 5:7.

### 14.1 1 John 5:7

I now address the final section of our critic's document, where he seeks to justify the excision\*<sup>2012</sup> of several verses or words of scripture from the Holy Bible.

\*<sup>2012</sup>Note again from Section 7.3 that Dr Mrs Riplinger has explained in her book *Hazardous Materials* pp 746-753 why two verses that our critic attacks, 1 John 5:7 in this section and Acts 8:37 in Section 14.3, were cut out of most Greek manuscripts by Greek Orthodox priests and/or their ecclesiastical forbears. Dr Hills likewise addresses 1 John 5:7 and its omission in considerable detail, [*The King James Version Defended* 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition] Chapter 8, pp 209ff and [*Believing Bible Study*] Chapter 7, pp 210ff

[standardbearers.net/uploads/The\\_King\\_James\\_Version\\_Defended\\_Dr\\_Edward\\_F\\_Hills.pdf](http://standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf)  
[www.scribd.com/document/298396396/Believing-Bible-Study-Edward-F-Hills-pdf](http://www.scribd.com/document/298396396/Believing-Bible-Study-Edward-F-Hills-pdf).

See also Chapter 6 of Dr Moorman's book *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text*.

The first is 1 John 5:7, 8 **"in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth."** See Sections 1.2, 7.3 for a summary of the manuscript evidence in support of these verses.

Our critic states *"These words are not quoted by any of the Greek Fathers and are absent from all early versions. The oldest citation of this verse is in a 4<sup>th</sup> Century Latin treatise called Liber apologeticus...It probably began as allegorical exegesis in a marginal gloss."*

Our critic gives no evidence to prove that ONLY Greek writers are to be taken as authentic witnesses. Christian writers who cited the words in question BEFORE the 4<sup>th</sup> Century are Tatian (A.D. 180), Tertullian (A.D. 200) and Cyprian (A.D. 225) [*New Age Bible Versions* Gail Riplinger] p 381, [*1 John 5:7*] pp 7-8. Athanasius cited the words in A.D. 350. Dr J. A. Moorman [*When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text*] indicates that Priscillian, who cited the verse in 385 A.D., is the author of *Liber apologeticus*.

The early versions which cite the verse are the Old Syriac (170 A.D.) and the Old Latin (A.D. 200) [*New Age Bible Versions*] p 381, [*1 John 5:7*] p 8, despite our critic's opinion that *"This verse did not become established in the Old Latin until the fifth century."* Wilkinson [*Which Bible? 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*] p 213, citing Nolan, says of the Old Italic Bible, which existed in A.D. 157 [*Which Bible? 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*] p 208, that *"it has supplied him with the unequivocal testimony of a truly apostolical branch of the primitive church, that the celebrated text of the heavenly witnesses (1 John 5:7) was adopted in the version which prevailed in the Latin Church, previously to the introduction of the modern Vulgate."* See also [kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html](http://kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html).

Our critic then states *"It was not in Jerome's Vulgate despite the opinion of John Gill...this text was not in the Vulgate till the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> Century."* Our critic did not read Section 7.3 very carefully. I quoted from MacLean [*The Providential Preservation of the Greek Text of the New Testament*] p 25, with respect to GREEK copies in the possession of Robert Stephanus. MacLean cites Gill as saying *"As to its (1 John 5:7-8) being wanting in some Greek manuscripts...it need only be said that it is found in many others...out of sixteen ancient copies of Robert Stephens', nine of them had it."*

I made no reference to Gill's opinion of the text of the Vulgate, although Jerome cites the words in 450 A.D. *"in his epistle to Eustochium and wants to know why it was excluded from some texts"* [*The Providential Preservation of the Greek Text of the New Testament*] p 25, [*1 John 5:7*] p 7.

Our critic continues *"the words are not an integral part of the Byzantine textual tradition."* This is of no consequence because the AV1611 translators were not obliged to adhere rigidly to *"the Byzantine textual tradition"* where that *"tradition"* was defective. Their text was ECLECTIC. See Section 9.8, [*1 John 5:7*] p 8 and they had with them six Waldensian Bibles, whose Text contained 1 John 5:7-8 and which dated from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Century [*Which Bible? 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*] pp 208, 212-213.

See also [kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html](http://kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html).

Our critic then states *“The verse is found in only four very late Greek MSS...probably all post date Erasmus’ second edition. It is generally agreed that Erasmus reluctantly included the verse in his third edition under pressure from Rome. The Greek manuscript which was “found” for him was translated at the time from the Vulgate.”*

I originally stated in Section 7.3 that the words are found in only two of the 500-600 extant Greek manuscripts of 1 John and in the margins of two others [*Problem Texts*] p 334. I gave the manuscripts, respectively, as Codex 61, Codex Ravianus, 88 and 629. Dr Hills [standardbearers.net/uploads/The King James Version Defended Dr Edward F Hills.pdf](http://standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf) [www.scribd.com/document/298396396/Believing-Bible-Study-Edward-F-Hills-pdf](http://www.scribd.com/document/298396396/Believing-Bible-Study-Edward-F-Hills-pdf) *The King James Version Defended* 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition Chapter 8, p 209 and *Believing Bible Study* Chapter 7, p 210 and Dr Ruckman in a later work [*1 John 5:7*] indicate that the disputed words of 1 John 5:7, 8 are actually in the text of Codex 629.

Concerning Erasmus’ inclusion of 1 John 5:7-8 in his 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition of the TR, Dr Hills [standardbearers.net/uploads/The King James Version Defended Dr Edward F Hills.pdf](http://standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf) [www.scribd.com/document/298396396/Believing-Bible-Study-Edward-F-Hills-pdf](http://www.scribd.com/document/298396396/Believing-Bible-Study-Edward-F-Hills-pdf) *The King James Version Defended* 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition Chapter 8, p 209 and *Believing Bible Study* Chapter 7, p 210, explains that it was NOT “pressure from Rome” that influenced him but Erasmus’ promise “to restore (1 John 5:7-8) if but one Greek manuscript could be found which contained it...Many critics believe that (Codex 61) was written at Oxford for the special purpose of refuting Erasmus, and this is what Erasmus himself suggested in his notes.”

This is clearly our critic’s belief. He also assumes that Manuscript 61 came from the Vulgate. However, Dr Ruckman [*1 John 5:7*] pp 6-7, has a more searching analysis:

*“How about that Manuscript 61 at Dublin?*

*“Well, according to Professor Michaelis (cited in Prof. Armin Panning’s “New Testament Criticism”), Manuscript 61 has four chapters in Mark that possess three coincidences with Old Syriac, two of which also agree with the Old Itala: ALL READINGS DIFFER FROM EVERY GREEK MANUSCRIPT EXTANT IN ANY FAMILY. The Old Itala was written long before 200 A.D., and the Old Syriac dates from before 170 (Tatian’s Diatessaron).*

*“Manuscript 61 was supposed to have been written between 1519 and 1522; the question becomes us, “FROM WHAT?” Not from Ximenes’s Polyglot - his wasn’t out yet. Not from Erasmus, for it doesn’t match his “Greek” in many places. The literal affinities of Manuscript 61 are with the SYRIAC (Acts 11:26), and that version WAS NOT KNOWN IN EUROPE UNTIL 1552 (Moses Mardin).”*

Our critic adds **“Luther did not include the verse in his translation of the Bible.”** This is a half truth. Beale [*A Pictorial History of Our English Bible* David Beale] p 65 states *“The passage of the three witnesses (1 John 5:7b-8a) did not appear in Luther’s Bible until 1574-1575, when a Frankfort publisher inserted it for the first time...The passage does not appear in a Wittenberg edition until 1596.”*

However, since then, 1 John 5:7-8 has remained in Luther’s Bible [*God Only Wrote One Bible*] p 34. Moreover, Tyndale DID include 1 John 5:7-8 in his New Testament.

Dr Mrs Riplinger in *Hazardous Materials* p 1107 states, this author’s emphases, that *“In fact, following ‘Greek’ led Luther to error in omitting 1 John 5:7, which had been in all previous German Bibles. It was restored by the German people after Luther.”*

Our critic did not mention those facts. Again, Solomon warns **“A false balance is abomination to the LORD...”** Proverbs 11:1. See remarks on **Table 1**.

Our critic remarks that *“some defenders of the KJV are prepared to agree now that it did not form part of the original text,”* which shows that even Bible believers can give way to apostasy. Our critic observes that J. N. Darby omitted the verse from his New Testament, which I knew anyway [*God Only Wrote One Bible*] p 53. I would add that Darby’s New Testament, like Wesley’s, the RV, RSV

etc. has long since joined the ranks of versions now obsolete or nearly obsolete. In any event, Darby's New Testament had little influence outside of the exclusive Brethren.

Our critic lied again in his concluding statements on 1 John 5:7-8:

***“To imply that the doctrine of the Trinity depends on this verse and that to question it is to deny that doctrine, is absolutely unacceptable.”***

Our critic is here springing to the defence of Origen, who “*would correct the word of God (in the originals or otherwise) as quickly as (he) would take a breath of air*” [*The History of the New Testament Church Vol. 1 Dr Peter S. Ruckman*] p 82.

I did not imply ANYWHERE that the doctrine of the Trinity DEPENDS on this verse, to the extent that the doctrine cannot be proved without it, although I would never seek to do so.

However, 1 John 5:7-8 is undoubtedly the strongest verse in the Bible on the Trinity. There is no doubt that Origen rejected the doctrine of the Trinity and his infidelity to this doctrine very likely prompted him to attack the verse. See Section 1.2.

The TBS *Quarterly Record*, Jan.-Mar. 1993, No. 522, p 9, cites R. L. Dabney as follows:

*“There are strong probable grounds to conclude, that the text of Scriptures current in the East received a mischievous modification at the hands of the famous Origen. Those who are best acquainted with the history of Christian opinion know best, that Origen was the great corrupter, and the source, or at least earliest channel, of nearly all the speculative errors which plagued the church in after ages...He disbelieved the full inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures, holding that the inspired men apprehended and stated many things obscurely...He expressly denied the consubstantial unity of the Persons and the proper incarnation of the Godhead - the very propositions most clearly asserted in the doctrinal various readings we have under review.*

*“The weight of probability is greatly in favour of this theory, viz., THAT THE ANTI-TRINITARIANS, FINDING CERTAIN CODICES IN WHICH THESE DOCTRINAL READINGS HAD BEEN ALREADY LOST THROUGH THE LICENTIOUS CRITICISM OF ORIGEN AND HIS SCHOOL, INDUSTRIOUSLY DIFFUSED THEM, WHILE THEY ALSO DID WHAT THEY DARED TO ADD TO THE OMISSIONS OF SIMILAR READINGS.”*

Given our critic's offer to teach me Greek, it is instructive to quote from the TBS *Notes on the Vindication of 1 John 5:7*. See also Riplinger [*New Age Bible Versions*] p 382, Ruckman [*1 John 5:7*] pp 5-6 and the extensive article by G. W. and D. E. Anderson of the TBS *Why 1 John 5:7-8 is in the Bible*.

See [www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/site/articles/a102.pdf](http://www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/site/articles/a102.pdf).

*“The internal evidence against the omission is as follows:*

*“The masculine article, numeral and participle HOI TREIS MARTUROUTES, are made to agree directly with three neuters, an insuperable and very bald grammatical difficulty. If the disputed words are allowed to remain, they agree with two masculines and one neuter noun HO PATER, HO LOGOS, KAI TO HAGION PNEUMA and, according to the rule of syntax, the masculines among the group control the gender over a neuter connected with them. Then the occurrence of the masculines TREIS MARTUROUTES in verse 8 agreeing with the neuters PNEUMA, HUDOR, and HAIMA may be accounted for by the power of attraction, well known in Greek syntax.”* This is probably sufficient. How did our critic miss it?

When one reviews ALL the evidence, it is noteworthy that 1 John 5:7-8 satisfies at least 5, if not 6 of Burgon's 7 tests of truth, Section 6.2, [*True or False? 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*] pp 264ff. Only “*number of witnesses*” and in consequence some “*respectability of witnesses*” is lacking, through omission.

Finally, in view of our critic's high regard for the Westminster Confession, Sections 11.1, 11.3, I quote from the TBS article, No. 522, again, citing:

*“These supporters believe the passage rightly belongs in the Scriptures, as does the Society, as did the writers of the Westminster Confession of Faith (3)...*

*“Note 3. Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter II. iii. In the Scripture proofs for the statement of the Trinity, “God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost”, 1 John 5:7 is quoted.” That is more “evidence inconvenient,” which our critic ignored.*

See again Will Kinney’s detailed article [brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm) *1 John 5:7 These three are one.*

Note also Dr Ruckman’s summary of the witnesses for 1 John 5:7 from the *Bible Believers’ Bulletin* March 1996 *James White’s Seven Errors.*

*Watch God Almighty preserving His words. In spite of the negative, critical, destructive work of “godly Conservative and Evangelical scholars.” AD 170: Old Syriac and Old Latin, AD 180: Tatian and Old Syriac, AD 200:Tertullian and Old Latin, AD 250: Cyprian and Old Latin, AD 350: Priscillian and Athanasius, AD 415: Council of Carthage, AD 450: Jerome’s Vulgate, AD 510: Fulgentius, AD 750: Wianburgensis, AD 1150: Miniscule manuscript 88, AD 1200-1500: Four Waldensian Bibles, AD 1519: Greek Manuscript 61, AD 1520-1611: Erasmus TR, AD 1611: King James Authorized Version of the Holy Bible.*

*God had to work a miracle to get the truth of 1 John 5:7-8 preserved; He preserved it. You have it; but not in an RV, RSV, NRSV, CEV, ASV, NASV, or NIV.*

Observe how 1 John 5:7-8 in the 1611 Holy Bible are essential contributions to the three threefold cords of witnesses to the Lord Jesus Christ in 1 John 5:6-10. See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/bible-studies/alan-oreillys-studies.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/bible-studies/alan-oreillys-studies.php) *Assurance and the Witnesses of 1 John 5 p 9.*

### ***Three Threefold Cords of Witnesses***

As shown, 1 John 5:6-10 gives a total of nine witnesses to the Person of the Saviour as ***“God...manifest in the flesh,”*** in 3 sets of 3 or 3 triads of witnesses.

- *The Heavenly Triad “the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one” 1 John 5:7*
- *The earthly triad “the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one” 1 John 5:6, 8*
- *The testimonial triad “The witness of men,” “He that...hath the witness in himself” the witness in men, “The record that God gave of his Son” a record by men, 1 John 5:9, 10.*

These triads are a ***“threefold cord”*** of witnesses, as in Ecclesiastes 4:12.

***“And if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him; and a threefold cord is not quickly broken.”***

### ***Conclusion***

***“Christ is come in the flesh”*** 1 John 4:3 and the testimonies of the heavenly and earthly witnesses, 1 John 5:7-8, as found in the 1611 Holy Bible have been shown to be words of ***“The words of the LORD”*** Psalm 12:6, ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21 and ***“the book of the LORD”*** Isaiah 34:16.

***“Christ is come in the flesh”*** 1 John 4:3 and the testimonies of the heavenly and earthly witnesses, 1 John 5:7-8, as found in the 1611 Holy Bible are indeed major contributors to ***“sound doctrine”*** 1 Timothy 1:10, 2 Timothy 4:3, Titus 1:9, 2:1 with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ.

They should steadfastly be kept as such.

***“Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him”*** John 14:23.