

Which Bible is God's Word ?

Part 1 of 3

"Where is the Word of God?"

Surely we Christians cannot expect a Christ-rejecting world to accept our Book as its authority. We can, of course, expect rebellion. We can expect the world to make attempts to discredit the Bible's reliability. The battle of the lost theologians against the Bible has been waged since the Garden of Eden.

But the war that I am referring to is *not* the war between the lost world and born again Christians. For the last one hundred years the same kind of war has been raging within Christian ranks! Up until the late 1800's there was, generally speaking, only one Bible, the Authorized Version. There had been others, but the translation instituted by King James I in 1603 A.D. and published in 1611 A.D. had become known not just in England, but throughout the entire world as the "Authorized" Version. It is a historical fact that the King James Bible had become known as the "Authorized" Version due to its universal acceptance among Christians of the world, and not due to a proclamation from King James himself.

Hills states: "Although it is often called the 'Authorized Version,' it actually was never authorized by any official action on the part of the Church or State. On the contrary, it's [sic] universal reception by the common people of all denominations seems clearly to be another instance of the providence of God working through the God-guided usage of the Church."

Peter Ruckman points out: "As anyone knows, the A.V. 1611 had no royal backing, no royal promoting, no act of Parliament behind it, and the University Press was allowed to *print any other version of the Bible along with it.*"

McClure states concerning the King James Bible: "Its origin and history so strongly commended it, that it speedily came into general use as the standard version, by the common consent of the English people; and required no act of parliament nor royal proclamation to establish it's [sic] authority."

As well, the footnote from the above reference in McClure's book reads as follows:

Says Dr. Lee, Principal of the University of Edinburgh: "I do not find that there was any canon, proclamation, or act of parliament, to enforce the use of it. 'The present version' says Dr. Symonds, as quoted in Anderson's Annuals, 'appears to have made its way, without the interposition of any authority whatsoever; for it is not easy to discover any traces of a proclamation, canon or statute published to enforce the use of it.' It has been lately ascertained that neither the King's private purse, nor the public exchequer, contributed a farthing toward the expense of the translation or publication of the work."

Then in the mid to late 1800's a theory was initiated by two scholars of the names Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. This is the theory that the Traditional Text was a "conflate" text produced by editors and not merely by scribes. Their theory has remained over the years, as Darwin's theory of evolution has remained, **just a theory**. It has never been proven and has in fact lost support over the years. Fuller confirms this when he records Martin's statement that "the trend of scholars in more recent years has been away from the original Westcott-Hort position."

Their theory will be looked at in depth in a later chapter of this book.

The Revolution

By 1870 England was ripe for Westcott's and Hort's radical ideas, and their Greek Text was used by the Revision Committee of 1871 and by every revision and version ever since.

The battle began! Which text is closest to the "originals?" And, of course, the ultimate question: "Do we have a perfect Bible in English today?"

Today, three-quarters of the way through the Twentieth Century, Christianity is still divided over the question, "Do we have a perfect Bible in English today?" This battle will probably continue for the remainder of this century and well on into the next, if the Lord tarries His coming.

Do we have a perfect Bible in English today? This is not an amazing question at all. In fact, it is quite a natural question that comes to every Christian at one time or another. Surely a naive babe in Christ would never approach an unbelieving scholar with this question and then lay the Bible in his hands so that he may do with it as he pleases. Surely he would not lay God's book at man's mercy. If he would, he should not be surprised when the scholar's answer, flowing in terms not easily understood, comes back, "No."

Unbelieving scholarship is its own authority. It does not need any competition from a book!

Unregenerate man goes about believing a *theory* that man has evolved and was not created. Yet when this theory is examined *scientifically* and *logically*, it *cannot be proven to be true*. Does this upset the unbeliever? No. He just sets about to believe his theory, for he knows that believing it allows him to be his own final authority. He also knows that to reject the theory of evolution means he must accept creationism as true, and this he has avowed in his heart not to do. He does not want to be associated with a few fanatics!

Why is it that this type of reaction is found when dealing with Christian scholarship concerning the Bible? Ask a Christian scholar to tell you where the Word of God is, and he will tell you, "in the Bible." Yet, hand him any English Bible, and he will reply, "It's not there." How can we as Bible-believers tell people from our pulpits that the Bible is "infallible, without error, the very words of God" and then step out of the pulpit and allege to be able to find a mistake in it? This would not seem so serious if "the infallible Word of God" was not one of the doctrines that separates us from the world. We take pride in thundering forth that we are *not* as the unregenerate world, without an absolute guideline. We *have* a guideline. We have *the* guideline, *the Word of God!* Then we hold our open Bible up for all to see and shout, "This is God's Word! It's perfect, infallible, inerrant, the very words of God!" Yet in our hearts we are saying, "I believe all this about the original; this is just a mistake-filled translation."

Most Christians today vehemently reject the thought that God has preserved His words in English. We have "the Bible" they say, but it isn't in any one English version. Most Christians never truly realize the weight of their statements when they say that we have no perfect English Bible. Anyone who has studied even a little about Greek manuscripts knows that the Word of God isn't found in *any* of the Greek texts when translated literally.

What has started this controversy? From whence has this division of the brethren come?

Problem One

The first answer that comes to the mind of some Christians is that this division has been caused by a small group of fanatics who think that only the King James Bible is the Word of God, and who refuse to face the facts that the oldest and best manuscripts support the new translations flooding Christianity.

Strangely enough, history points to just the opposite being true. The text used by the Authorized Version has been used from the time of the early church until today by Christians. It is supported not only by the vast majority of manuscripts existent today but also by those of the highest quality and oldest reading. It has been used throughout history with the blessing of God among His born again believers.

Problem Two

It is only a recent occurrence that Biblical Christianity has begun to use the inferior Roman Catholic manuscripts and asserted that they are *better*. This is the mistake garnered by the errant "scholarship" of Wescott and Hort. These people are the new young sect of Christianity who will not accept the oldest and best. Usually unsuspectingly, they put their support to manuscripts which are decidedly Roman Catholic in doctrine and history. It is *we* who are sure we hold the true words of God brought down through the centuries by the blood of our martyred Christian brethren.

Ironically, those that take up the "new" versions, with their "better" Greek text, are voluntarily taking up the Bible which their early Christian brethren refused to use, a refusal that brought the Roman Catholic Church, the historic enemy of the Truth, crashing down on them. That same Roman Catholic Church is still active against the Truth today, only now many Christians are using her Bible.

I know that these are strong statements. I intend throughout this work to prove their truth, but I state now, that I do not intend to bring railing accusations on those brethren who do not agree with me. I will state that they are wrong, prove that they are wrong, and attempt to point out their position in regard to God's revealed Word. I do *not* intend however, to forget that they are my brethren (those who have trusted Jesus Christ as their own personal Savior) and will treat them as beloved.

The Shot Heard Around the World

This one hundred year war of words started back when the supporters of the Oxford Movement (apostates) realized that they must discredit the Reformers and Fundamental theologians in order to support their Roman Catholic Greek Text in place of the Received Text. Their salvo was returned by men like Burgon, Wilson, Scribener, Mauro, Hoskier, Cook, Salmon, Beckett, Malan and Wilkenson, and continues today with many of our modern day scholars.

Blind Rage

On *both* sides of the issue, men are called fanatic, heretic, cultist, Bible-rejecter, demon-possessed and more. These two sides have fought until the *facts* about which they fight are obscured by the dust of the battle. They call each other names until the student of Scripture finds reputable men on *both* sides of the controversy damaging their potential influence by using some adjectives which, indeed, are very descriptive but totally unnecessary. I am not a soft city gentleman who thinks we should all sit around and talk in quiet tones while sipping tea and eating "brunch." I am a militant Bible-believer who *hates* the devil, sin, heresy, and apostasy. Yet, I think it is time that we who claim to be "Christians" step back and look to see who our enemy *really* is!

The True Enemy

The subtle Roman Catholic Church has assumed the position of the lad who told two of his enemies, "*You and he fight ... I'll hold the coats!*" After all, is not "divide and conquer" one of the oldest military strategies known to men? The Christians have laid their coats at the feet of "Holy Mother Church" and for the past 100 years proceeded to "knock each others' block off." Is it any wonder that the Pope smiles so much? Who is our *enemy*? Let's *find* him and *fight* him. Today it seems, on *both sides*, that we are concerned more with finding fault with the *people* that we disagree with *rather than what they teach*. Let me make this statement: *If what I believe about the King James Bible can be disproved, I will gladly trade it in for the "right" Bible.*

We *have* an enemy, and I believe we should be verbal and active *against* that enemy, but I feel it is time that we realize that our enemy is *not* our brother. It is the one *holding* his coat!

The part of the Roman Catholic Church in the affair is similar to that of a soldier leaping into the foxhole of the enemy, only to find that *all of the enemy soldiers have strangled each other!*

Occasionally on either side we will be forced to face a railer, but instead of "writing him off" we will have to be charitable and look past his railing to see what his facts say. If we can disprove his facts, we need

not worry about his mouth!

"Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" Galatians 4:16.

The Test

What we must do as men of understanding is look into these statements and the questions which they naturally provoke.

"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." II Peter 1:21.

Did God inspire His Word perfectly in the original autographs?

"The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.

Thou shall keep them O LORD, thou shall preserve them from this generation for ever." Psalms 12:6, 7.

Has God *preserved* His words?

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Matthew 24:35.

Do we have Christ's words, or have they "passed away?"

The first verse, II Peter 1:21, guarantees that God was active in originating His Word in the first place. "Inspired" we call it. Inspired perfectly, without any error. God was the all-powerful agent in seeing to it that sinful man wrote down His Word flawlessly.

The second verse, Psalms 12:6, 7, claims that God is not only the agent in writing His words (verse 6) but is also the primary agent in preserving His words. Note that the subject is God's *words*, not His "thoughts."

In the third verse, Matthew 24:35, Jesus Christ, God in the flesh reinforces what Psalm 12:7 has already said. Christ said that His *words* would not pass away before heaven or earth. Heaven is still above us, and I am relatively sure that the earth is still beneath our feet, so the words of God must be here, within our grasp. *Somewhere*. If His words are only in Greek, then he has restricted their usage to an elite number of scholars. This, however, was never Jesus Christ's method when He was on this earth. He always went past the religious, scholarly minority and took His words to the *common people*. Until then, only the Pharisees had possessed God's words in the form of the completed, accepted Old Testament books, and although they were well educated and very religious, they were found to be taking advantage of the common people. Christ eliminated this problem by going directly to the common people of His day.

The Gospel is to all. God gave His Word to every person and gave the Holy Spirit as a guide to all truth (John 16:13) in spite of the Roman Catholic teachings that only the "clergy" are allowed to interpret the Scripture.

If God's words are locked up in the "Greek Text," then once again education is a prerequisite to having the Word of God and knowing what it says. This type of philosophy would have eliminated Peter and John from the ministry, for they were "unlearned and ignorant men." They were unlearned, and the Bible states that they were ignorant as though *incapable of learning*. Yet, "they had been with Jesus"! (Acts 4:12, 13). Jesus Christ made the difference, giving Peter a great understanding of Scripture! Notice his delivery in Acts 1:15-22, 2:14-36, 4:8-12. He understood, though unlearned and ignorant. Education, though beneficial, is *not* a necessity for being used of God. I am not anti-education or anti-college, but the first requirements are that a person has "been with Jesus" (Acts 4:13) and that they realize and believe that the written Word which they have in hand is "more sure" than God's spoken Word.

Now today we know that it is easy to "be with Jesus." The Bible says in Romans 10:9, "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." In John 14:20 it says, "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you."

But what about the second half? What about a written Word that we can believe is "more sure" than God speaking from heaven? A Word which the Bible claims God has exalted above all of His name? (Psalms 138:2). Can we have God's words today in our common language?

The Common Language of the People

While on the subject of a common language, let me point out that many opponents of the infallibility of the Authorized Version say that if God put a perfect Bible in English, He is also obligated to furnish such a translation in every other language. There must be a perfect Bible in German, French, Japanese and all of the other languages of the world. Unfortunately for them, this argument will not stand. There were many languages on this earth at the time that God chose to put it in Hebrew. There were hundreds of languages on this earth also, when God chose Greek for his New Testament. Matthew 13:18, Acts 13:46, 28:28, and Romans 11:11 show that God this time was going to be taking His message to the Gentiles, so He furnished it in the common language of the day -- Greek.

Question: When would the two Testaments be combined into one perfect Book?

Answer: As soon as God chose a language to become common to the entire world. Germany, Spain, France and most of Europe were soon to be overly influenced by Rome. No language there. There have been great Latin and Syrian translations, but these languages never became common to the *entire world*. God needed an island of purity, a nation not shackled by Romanism, and a language so descriptive and simple that it could best deliver His message. These needs were satisfied in England. Here was a people who threw off the bondage of Rome and a young language which was to creep into every corner of the world, from the Arctic to the Antarctic, and from England and America to Moscow and Peking. *English is the language of this world!*

English is taught to Russian pilots, because it is *universal*. It is learned by Oriental businessmen, because it is *universal*. It was the first language spoken *on the moon!* English is spoken the world over. This is the language God would use. Being a God of purity, He would want to use it in its purest form. The English of the King James Bible has been known to be the finest form of the language ever used. McClure praises the Authorized Version in this manner:

"The English language has passed through many and great changes, and had at last reached the very height of its purity and strength. The Bible has ever since been the great English classic. It is still the noblest monument of the power of the English speech. It is singularly free from what used to be called 'ink-horn terms' that is, such words as are more used in writing than in speaking, and are not well understood except by scholars."⁷

The English language was, in the 17th Century, just solidifying. It had been a fluid language, made up of elements of Danish, Old Norse, Latin, Greek, French, and many other dialects.

In about 1500, major changes in vocal pronunciation, inflection, and spelling simplified and helped solidify the language.⁸ This was all in preparation for the ultimate English work, the Authorized Version of 1611.

Many claim today that since the Authorized Version was printed in the common English of that day, that the Bible should be retranslated into the common English of today, but this is not a valid claim. It must be remembered that the English used in the Authorized Version was not only the common language, but it was also the English language in its purest form. The English language has degenerated from what it was in 1611 to what it is today. Those claiming to put the Bible in "modern English" are actually, though possibly not

intentionally, trying to force the pure words of God into the degenerated vocabulary of today! What a disgrace to God's Word! What a shame to those who propose such a thing!

An Archaic Con Job

A charge often brought against the Authorized Version is that it is full of "archaic" words. But are we to make the Bible pay the penalty of our own irresponsibility in not keeping our language pure and descriptive? Would we not be richer to learn the meaning of those nasty, old, "archaic" words and add them back into our own vocabulary? Would we not be making the Bible poorer by depriving it of its descriptive style? Are these words truly "archaic?" I have seen stores today that still advertise "sundry" items. Perhaps the store owner didn't realize that it was supposed to be archaic. Perhaps it is like the fish caught off the Atlantic Coast a few years ago which was supposed to have been extinct for over one million years. Of *course* it was extinct! It just didn't *know* it! Science said it was extinct, so it must be. (They *first* had better prove that the world was *here* one million years ago.)

Let us look at the word "conversation" in Philippians 1:27 and see how God chose the most descriptive words He could. Is not "conversation" a *much* more descriptive term than "life?" When we realize that our life *speaks* to people then we must *live* our Christianity, not *talk* it. The Authorized Version obviously gives us a *deeper* meaning.

What about words whose usage has definitely been dropped from modern English? Those words which are just not used anymore? What shall we do with them? In answer to this question, let us remember that the Bible is *The Word of God*. We "Bible people" claim to accept its authority in all matters of faith and practice. But do we? Do we accept the Biblical practice of how to deal with situations today? Would we be willing to accept the *Biblical example* of how to deal with words whose meanings have changed?

Let us look and learn and *follow* the *Bible example* of handling "archaic" words. Surely the Bible, God's Word, cannot be wrong! Let us look at I Samuel chapter 9.

1. *"Now there was a man of Benjamin, whose name was Kish, the son of Abiel, the son of Zeror, the son of Bechorath, the son of Aphiah, a Benjamite, a mighty man of power.*

2. *And he had a son, whose name was Saul, a choice young man, and a goodly: and there was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he: from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people.*

3. *And the asses of Kish Saul's father were lost. And Kish said to Saul his son, Take now one of the servants with thee, and arise, go seek the asses." (I Sam. 9:1-3)*

These verses give us the circumstances involved. After searching fruitlessly for his father's asses, Saul decided to give up, fearing that his father, Kish, may begin to worry about Saul and his servant.

6. *"And he said unto him, Behold now, there is in this city a man of God, and he is an honourable man; all that he saith cometh surely to pass: now let us go thither, peradventure he can shew us our way that we should go.*

7. *Then said Saul to his servant, But, behold, if we go, what shall we bring the man? for the bread is spent in our vessels, and there is not a present to bring to the man of God: what have we?*

8. *And the servant answered Saul again, and said, Behold, I have here at hand the fourth part of a shekel of silver: that will I give to the man of God, to tell us our way.' (I Sam. 9:6-8)*

Now let us watch very carefully, for an "archaic" word is about to make its appearance in the next verse. But before it can, God inserts a note to the reader!

9. *"(Beforetime in Israel, when a man went to enquire of God, thus he spake, Come and let us go to the seer: for he that is now called a Prophet was beforetime called a Seer.)" (I Sam. 9:9)*

God knows that the word "seer" is no longer in common usage; it is *archaic*. He defines it so that we will better understand His choice of words. Is this changing the text? No! Look at the following two verses.

10. *"Then said Saul to his servant, Well said; come, let us go. So they went unto the city where the man of God was.*

11. *And as they went up the hill to the city, they found young maidens going out to draw water, and said unto them, Is the seer here?" (I Sam. 9:10-11)*

Notice in verse 11 God leaves the "archaic" word *in the text!* He does *not* change it to "prophet." He does *not* change the text. God gives us a definition of the word which He chose to use in the text, but He does *not* give us a "modern" or "updated" edition. This is the *Biblical* example of how *God* handles an "archaic" word without rewriting the text.

God's Method of Revelation

"We Christians accept the authority of the Bible in all matters of faith and *practice*." I suggest we *practice* this method. Define what a word, whose definition has become cloudy through the changes in the English language, really means. I am not advising "running to the Greek." I am advising "running to the dictionary" and letting the text stand as it reads without the derogatory remarks about "archaic" words and "out of date usage." Let us respect God's text more than that.

God has given us every word; we do well to accept them from Him as they are and not attempt to "improve" on them. As one great preacher said, "The Bible doesn't need to be re-written, it needs to be reread." I concur. Born again Christians are intended to be "Bible people." Are we not expected to read the Book we claim so loudly to believe?

Upon receiving a lengthy letter from home, does a lonely soldier proceed to the third page to begin his reading? After page 3 does he "speed read" page 4, skip page 5, and read half of page 6? Does he attempt to understand the last page and then proceed to the first? Ridiculous isn't it? Yet it describes the Bible reading habits of many of God's people. Obviously, our soldier, so far away from the home he loves and the writer of his letter, is going to devour every *word* of this letter and upon finishing it, he will *read it again -- every word*.

God sent us, His *homesick* soldiers, a "letter from home," yet we steadily refuse to read it. He didn't give us the whole Book just so that we could read the Psalms. We are expected to read Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy as well as John, Acts, and Romans. The same author who inspired I and II Corinthians placed every bit as much inspiration into I and II Chronicles. We are to read Malachi as well as Revelation. God has given us *every word* of the Bible. We are to start at the beginning and read *every word!* Upon reaching Revelation 22:21, we are not expected to quietly lay the Bible aside as if our work has been done. We are to begin afresh at Genesis 1:1. There are only two events that should stop a Christian from reading through his Bible continuously, cover to cover: death and the rapture. All other "reasons" are really weak excuses. We are to *read the Book!*

Many exclaim, "But I can't understand it! There are portions with deep and difficult meanings." They find a difficult passage, give God approximately five minutes to deliver the answer, and then turn to a "better translation" or a Bible commentary for the answer. They are like the four-year-old child who wishes to drive a car. He sincerely wants to drive a car. His motive for wanting to drive may be pure. He believes that he can handle the job, and he wants the answer *now*. He will not only be refused permission to drive the car, but he as yet won't even be allowed on a bicycle. He cannot handle anything larger than a tricycle. As he matures, he will "graduate" to bigger and more complicated things.

This is true with our English Bible. We begin to read through it for the first time and ask God a question, the answer of which we just cannot handle until our fourth or fifth or sixth time through. We sincerely want the answer. Our motive may be pure. We believe that we can handle the answer, and we want it *now*. God will not show us on our *first* time through the Bible what He has ready for us on our tenth or eleventh time through. We must grow, and there are *no* shortcuts. A shelf full of Bible commentaries and other

translations is an attempt at a shortcut, but it will not work. I am not opposed to Bible commentaries. I am opposed to their de-emphasizing the Bible and replacing the Holy Spirit. I am in favor of intensifying our reading time in the only authority we have, the Authorized Version!

But why the Authorized Version? Who says we have to use only this particular translation? Why couldn't some other version be perfect in English instead of the Authorized Version?

To get the answers to these questions, we will have to take our hands off each other's throats long enough to examine the evidence which has come down to us through history. First, let's study where the manuscripts came from.

The Localities

A Family Feud

The Biblical manuscripts (MSS) are divided into two general groups. These two groups have been found to disagree with each other in many areas. Every English Bible in existence today will be found to proceed more or less from one of these two groups. The fact that there is *one* God plainly tells us that there can be only *one* correct reading concerning any given discrepancy between these two groups.

Obviously, prior to comparing readings, it will be beneficial to investigate the ancient centers from which our two basic groups proceed.

Earlier, we established two "ground rules." It will be relevant to our study to review those rules at this point, and to keep them in mind as we continue. Firstly, we established that the Bible is a spiritual book which God exerted supernatural force to conceive, and it is reasonable to assume that He could exert that same supernatural force to preserve it. Secondly, that Satan desires to be worshipped. He has the ability to counterfeit God's actions and definitely will be involved actively in attempting to destroy God's Word and/or our confidence in that Word, while seeking to replace it with his own "versions."

The fact that the disagreement between these two families is centered around points of deity or doctrine tells us that one of them *must* be the preserved text, as found in the original MSS, while the other is a Satanic forgery. Satan attacked Jesus Christ (Matthew 4:1-11) and will try to replace Him in the future (Revelation 13:1-8).

Are we to believe that Satan, a sworn enemy of Truth, is not going to attempt to disrupt the travel of God's Word through history? Would he dare let the only tangible item which God has left us remain unattacked? No, Satan cannot afford to allow the Holy Scriptures to be unmolested. He will obviously be heard to be its loudest textual critic and will attempt to eliminate God's *true* Word while replacing it with his own Satanic counterfeit.

With this in mind, we shall begin with the original autographs and trace the history of these two families of MSS.

In The Beginning

Jesus Christ always worked through His followers. It is only logical that He would look to His followers as instrumental in the preservation of His words.

The New Testament was a paradox. It was completely foreign to anything that the world had ever known. Until the time of Christ, the world was Biblically divided into two groups.

One was the Jews. They were known as God's "chosen people." Their religious practices were founded on the teachings of the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings (thirty-nine books which comprise our present Old Testament). They awaited their Messiah, the ruler who was expected at any time to come to earth and set up

a Jewish kingdom based in Jerusalem.

The other group spoken of in Scripture is the Gentile population of the world. The Gentiles are also referred to as a group by the term "Greeks." They were very religious, but heathenistic in practice. This is noted by the Apostle Paul. When in Athens he mentioned that the city was "wholly given to idolatry" (Acts 17:16). After seeing them carry out their religious duties, he concluded, "I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious" (Acts 17:22). The Gentile world was caught up in the fantasies of Christless education, philosophy, and religion.

Another location of pagan religious practices was Rome. In Rome were found temples built for the worship of many pagan gods and goddesses. A few of these are Jupiter, Apollo, and Minerva.

Still another pagan city known for its education and philosophy was Alexandria, Egypt. Famed for its library and school, it was a center of education during the centuries prior to the New Testament era. It was known to have received much of its philosophy from Athens about 100 B.C.

When the Christian church appeared, made up of born again believers, it was looked upon as a rather strange group of people. The Jews rejected it because its patrons claimed that Jesus Christ was the Jewish Messiah. The Gentiles rejected Christianity because of the Christians' claims that salvation was complete and that one could *know* that they had eternal life. This ran contrary to the teachings of pagan philosophy that nothing can be known for sure. It also made their heathen religious practices worthless, not to mention all of their beautiful temples.

The New Testament church needed a place to grow. It needed a location that was far away from the prejudices of the Jewish religious community centered in Jerusalem and the Gentile philosophical community. It needed a location that would be advantageous to the spreading of the gospel. Such a location was realized when, after the death of Stephen, the believers traveled to Phenice, Cyprus, and Antioch (Acts 11:19). But it was Antioch that the Holy Spirit chose for the base of Christian operations.

Antioch was founded by Seleucus I about 300 B.C. Its location was of prime importance to the gospel since it was built at the crossroads of ancient trade routes from Mesopotamia to the Mediterranean and from western Arabia to Asia Minor. It also has a seaport on the Orontes River.

In addition to the secular history of these two areas, let us examine what the *Bible* says concerning them.

The law of first mention is important, as the first mention of a subject usually sets the light in which that subject shall reside in the Bible narrative.

Egyptian Influence

Since one of the two families of MSS originated in Alexandria, Egypt, we shall first look at Egypt. Egypt is first mentioned in Genesis 12:10. "...Abram went down into Egypt to sojourn there...." but verse 12 says, "Therefore it shall come to pass, when the Egyptians shall see thee, that they shall say, This is his wife: and they will kill me, but they will save thee alive." (Genesis 12:12). Immediately we find a negative air about Egypt in the Bible. Notice that Abram's fear concerns the line of Christ, Satan's first enemy.

"And the Midianites sold him into Egypt unto Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, and captain of the guard." (Genesis 37:36). Here we find Joseph sold into slavery in Egypt. This also is negative.

"Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses." (Exodus 1:11). In this verse we see Israel, the people of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, persecuted in Egypt, a type of the world. Verses 15 and 16 show that Satan's attack was once again on the seed through which the Lord Jesus Christ would come. In Exodus 20:2, Egypt is called "the house of bondage." In Deuteronomy 4:20, God calls Egypt "the iron furnace."

God forbids Israel to carry on commercial activities with Egypt in Deuteronomy 17:16. "But he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the LORD hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way." Notice this final sentence gives the solemn warning, "Ye shall henceforth return no more that way."

In Jeremiah 46:25 we find God promising punishment on Egypt. "The LORD of hosts, the God of Israel, saith; Behold, I will punish the multitude of No, and Pharaoh, and Egypt, with their gods, and their kings; even Pharaoh, and all them that trust in him:"

Look at Ezekiel 20:7. "Then said I unto them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt: I am the LORD your God." Here we find that God commanded Israel not to be associated with Egypt's idolatry.

The last of our references compares Jerusalem in apostasy to Sodom and Egypt. "And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified." (Revelation 11:8).

This is only a small cross section of the Biblical references to Egypt, but I believe we see that God's attitude towards Egypt is *not* positive.

Now let's zero in on the city of Egypt which will concern our study, Alexandria.

Alexandria

Alexandria is first mentioned in Acts 6:9. "Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen." Here we find that Jews from Alexandria were partially responsible for the stoning of Stephen.

Also in Acts 18:24 we find Apollos was from Alexandria. Although he was later saved and became a great disciple of Christ, he was first associated with inadvertently misleading the people of Ephesus in Acts 19:1-3.

We have now looked at what *the Bible* has to say concerning Egypt in general and Alexandria in particular.

Since we accept the Bible in all matters of "faith and practice," we should take care to remember that God takes a negative approach to Egypt. Do we have any right to ignore God's displeasure and approach Egypt in a "positive" manner? Solomon was by far wiser than we are, yet he ignored God's clear warnings. For example, I Kings 3:1 says, "And Solomon made affinity with Pharaoh king of Egypt, and took Pharaoh's daughter, and brought her into the city of David, until he had made an end of building his own house, and the house of the LORD, and the wall of Jerusalem round about." Also, I Kings 10:28 says, "And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and linen yarn: the king's merchants received the linen yarn at a price." (cf. Deuteronomy 17:16). We find that ignoring God's Word led to the heart being turned away from the Lord and after other gods (I Kings 11:3, 4). This resulted in abominable acts on his part (I Kings 11:5, 8) and finally brought God's judgment in I Kings 11:9-43.

Certainly, if wise Solomon could fall by accepting Egypt in spite of God's clear condemnation, we would do well to take care before we buy any "horses out of Egypt." God may not be pleased with such actions.

Antioch

Now let us see what the Bible says about the city of Antioch.

Antioch is first mentioned in Acts 6:5 when Nicolas, a Christian from Antioch, was chosen to be one of the first deacons. So we see that the first time Antioch is mentioned, it is in a *positive* light.

Antioch is mentioned again in Acts 11:19. Here, it is a refuge for Christians from persecution. In the Scripture Antioch represents a "type" of the new life given to believers after having accepted Jesus Christ as their personal Saviour.

To fully understand the light in which the Bible presents Antioch in Acts 11, we must look at the context in which chapter 11 is written. In the preceding chapter (Acts 10) God plainly shows that He is calling out a following from among the Gentiles. In the following chapter (Acts 12) God shows that He is *not* going to use Jerusalem as the center of the New Testament church (Acts 12:1-4).

Our Antioch

Antioch, the new center, is away from the Gentile centers of Alexandria, Athens, and Rome and the Jewish center of Jerusalem. Antioch symbolizes the Christian's new life, apart from the heathenism of the Gentiles and ritualism of Judaism. II Corinthians 5:17 says, "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." When a Gentile is saved, he is to leave his heathenistic lifestyle for a new spiritual location in Christ. Likewise, when a Jew is saved, he is to leave his ritualism for a new spiritual location in Christ. In Galatians 3:28 Paul states that, "There is neither Jew nor Greek...for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." In I Corinthians 10:32 he divides mankind into three groups, "Jews...Gentiles...the Church of God." As God gives born again man a new spiritual location, He also gave His new young church a new physical location.

Please notice that after Acts chapter 12, the other apostles are left alone at Jerusalem and are mentioned only one last time in the narrative. This is in Acts 21:18 where they briefly rejoice in Paul's report and then get preoccupied with *the law!* Paul in Galatians 2:11 had to rebuke Peter of this very thing when he came to Antioch and tried to exercise the same legalistic teaching of Judaism on the New Testament church there. Obviously God was using Antioch and Antiochian Christians to forge a new practice of worshipping Him, different from the Old Testament Judaism and the Gentile mythology and heathenism.

God's Move

Acts 11:20 shows the beginning of God's settlement in Antioch. "And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spoke unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus." In Acts 11:22, Barnabas, one of the most important figures of the New Testament, moves from Jerusalem to Antioch. He is the man who is responsible for Paul being in the ministry. It was Barnabas who went to Tarsus to get Paul, then named Saul, in Acts 11:25. Upon finding him, Barnabas brought him back to Antioch, not Jerusalem (Acts 11:26). So we see that the primary figure of the New Testament church actually began his ministry in Antioch. Paul had visited Jerusalem in Acts 9:26-29 and had even preached there, but his ministry to the Gentiles really began when he departed from Antioch in Acts 13:1-3 with Barnabas.

We must also notice that it was at Antioch that the disciples were called "Christians" for the first time (Acts 11:26). In verse 27 of Acts 11 we find that the prophets from the Jerusalem church left it to settle in Antioch. In verse 29 of Acts 11, we even see that it was necessary for the Christians at Antioch to send relief down to their brethren in Jerusalem.

As we mentioned before, Paul's first missionary journey originated from Antioch in Acts 13:1-3. The Bible states in verse 2 that the Holy Ghost "called" them. It was in *Antioch* that God chose these men. Upon returning from their trip (Acts 14:26-28) they came back to *Antioch*, not Alexandria; not Jerusalem.

When some "Christian" Judaizers came up to Antioch from Jerusalem and began to teach the believers there that, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved" (Acts 15:1), Paul and Barnabas confronted them. Afterwards, Paul and Barnabas went down and spoke with the apostles concerning this. They formed a council and returned to their beloved Antioch with a written statement to the effect that Judaism had no hold over the New Testament church.

Upon returning to Antioch, Paul and Barnabas took with them chosen men of the Jerusalem church, Silas being one of them (Acts 15:22). They all returned to Jerusalem but Silas (Acts 15:33,34), and he is the only one whom we find recorded in New Testament history. After Acts chapter 11 and the move to Antioch, *God used only those who left Jerusalem and settled in Antioch!* Such is the case with Paul, Barnabas, Silas, and Mark. Paul and Barnabas reside at Antioch (Acts 15:35) and depart from there again in verse 40.

Notice that Paul sets his mind to go back to Jerusalem in Acts 20:22, knowing that it is against God's will as we find in Acts 20:23; 21:4, and again in 21:10-12. He goes to Jerusalem in spite of God's warning against it and is seized in Acts 21:30, thus beginning the end of his ministry! This plainly teaches that a Christian is not to return to his "old" life in any way, shape, or form and should stand firm in his "new location" in Christ. It also shows that if there will be any center for New Testament Christianity, it will be found in Antioch.

It may well be that many of the "originals" that we have heard so much about were written right there in Antioch!

Egypt is a type of this world. Antioch is a type of a Christian's new life in Christ. Which one do you think that God would use to preserve His Word?

God will not do anything contrary to His nature. It would not be consistent with God's nature to use Alexandria, Egypt to preserve His Word when He paints such a dismal picture of it in Scripture. In fact, there is no record of any of the New Testament Christians ever visiting there.

Antioch, on the other hand, was greatly used by God as the center of New Testament Christianity. Paul never took up residence in Jerusalem, but always returned to Antioch. Looking from the spiritual and practical aspect, Antioch would obviously be the logical location of the true Bible text.

The Witnesses

It would be extremely beneficial at this point if we could simply produce the original autographs for examination. This would greatly simplify the operation of establishing correctly the New Testament text. But this simply cannot happen. It has long been acknowledged by scholars that we no longer have the "originals." They have long since passed from the scene. This is due to the fact that scribes were known to have destroyed worn out MSS after they had copied them. Apparently the early church valued the *words* of the original more than the original itself. Therefore, the readings of the originals must be preserved with us somewhere, or else God's words have "passed away" which we surely know, from the Scriptural record, cannot happen. (Psalms 12:6, 7 and Matthew 24:35). We must review the witnesses of the Bible record which have come to us through history. We will be required to keep two things in mind:

1. There is a marked disagreement between the two basic families of readings.
2. Due to the truth above, we must remember our spiritual considerations as well as historical. Remember, the Bible is like no other book. All other books are written and then cast adrift on the sea of time; this is not the case with the Bible. We must remember that *God* had His hand in its inception and will be seen to have His hand in its journey through history to the present. It must also be remembered that just as God will be active in its preservation, *Satan* will be active in attempting to disrupt or destroy it.

The "hard" evidence at hand today available for our examination consists of three groups:

The Copies

1. *Copies* - Since there are no originals, every record of Scripture will be a copy. Copies are divided into three groups:

A. Miniscules - These are by far the most numerous of extant copies which we possess. Miniscules in Greek are like the lower case letters of our alphabet. The oldest copies of this type are papyrus MSS which were sewn together into a roll or scroll. Papyrus was an inexpensive paper somewhat like newsprint. Some were also written on vellum scrolls. Vellum is made from animal skins. This was used because of its durability although it was more expensive than papyrus.

In early copies the words were written end to end with no space in between. Words like God, Son, Father were abbreviated in this manner: God - gd, Son - sn, Father - ftr. Later MSS separated the words for ease of reading. An example is shown here: "No-man-hath-seen-gd-at-any-time-the-only-begotten-sn-which-is-in-the-bosom-of-the-ftr-he-hath-declared-him." (John 1:18).

Some miniscules were composed in book form instead of a scroll. These are known as codice (plural). Codex is the singular form. These also were written on either papyrus or vellum. In some cases, all that remains of a scroll or codex are fragments.

B. Majuscules or Uncials -- These are equivalent to the upper case letters of our alphabet. In the same verse as above, John 1: 18, letters of our alphabet would appear in this manner in an uncial MSS:

NOMANHATSEENGDATANY
TIMETHEONLYBEGOTTEN
SNWHICHISINTHEBOSOMOFTHE
FTRHEHATHDECLAREDHIM.

Majuscules MSS exist in fewer numbers than miniscules and do not appear until the 4th Century.

C. Lectionaries -- These are equivalent to the "responsive readings" found in the back of today's hymnals. Due to the shortage of copies of Scripture, lectionaries were used to put key verses into the hands of the people. In many cases their readings are very early, i.e., closer to the originals.

The Versions

2. Our second group of Biblical witnesses are the ancient *versions*. God chose to write the New Testament in Greek, but He did not choose to keep it in Greek only. The early Greek MSS were translated into other languages in order that the true Word of God could be put into the hands of people in other lands. Some versions such as the Peshitto (or Peschito), a Syrian translation, and the Old Latin Vulgate (vulgate means "vulgar," i.e., "common") are actually older than our oldest uncial MSS. The Peshitto was translated from the Greek in about 150 A.D. The Old Latin Vulgate was translated about 157 A.D.

Other well known versions are the Gothic, Sahidic, Bohairic, and Coptic.

The Church Fathers

3. Our third group is the early *church fathers*. These are the men who led the Christians in the first few centuries after the New Testament was completed. We have record of their early sermons, books, and commentaries. They will be able to provide us with much information on disputed passages.

Many may have seen the original autographs.

Here we now have our three sources of information. They are *copies*, *versions*, and *church fathers*. These three groups combined to give us in excess of 5,250 witnesses.⁹ Over 3,000 of these are Greek MSS.¹⁰ With this many extant MSS, versions, and the fathers for reference, we should have little trouble determining the Greek text of the original New Testament autographs.

Taking Sides

These surviving witnesses of the Greek New Testament text which we now possess are found to generally fall into two groups, or "texts." This is where we begin to find some major problems. We find that these two texts disagree consistently concerning the major doctrines of the Bible. They are found to disagree on readings concerning the virgin birth of Jesus Christ, the blood atonement, Christ's second coming, the deity of Christ, and many other fundamental Christian doctrines. It is for this reason that we must examine our witnesses to determine if their testimony is accurate (God's text) or if they are fraudulently misleading (Satan's text). *Remember our ground rules!*

The Good Guys

The first of these two texts which we will examine is the Majority Text. This is the text which will be found to uphold the major Christian doctrines which are so vital to our fundamental beliefs.

The Majority Text has been known throughout history by several names. It has been known as the Byzantine Text, the Imperial Text, the Traditional Text, and the Reformation Text, as well as the Majority Text. This text culminates in the Textus Receptus or "Received Text" which is the basis for the King James Bible, which we know also as the Authorized Version.

I do not desire to add one more name to the list, but in the interest of finding the most accurate term to describe this text, and due to its universal reception by orthodox Christians through history, we shall refer to this text as the "Universal Text."

Dr. Hills justifies this choice: "There is now greater reason than ever to believe that the Byzantine Text, which is found in the *vast majority* of the Greek New Testament manuscripts and which was used well-nigh *universally* throughout the Greek Church for many centuries, is a faithful reproduction of the original New Testament and is the divinely appointed standard by which all New Testament manuscripts and all divergent readings must be judged."¹¹ (Emphasis mine.)

We describe this text with the term "Universal," because it represents the majority of extant MSS which represent the original autographs. Professor Hodges of Dallas Theological Seminary explains, "The manuscript tradition of an ancient book will, under any but the most exceptional conditions, multiply in a reasonably regular fashion with the result that the copies nearest the autograph will normally have the largest number of descendants."¹²

Even Dr. Hort is forced to admit this as Professor Hodges points out in his footnote, "This truism was long ago conceded (somewhat grudgingly) by Hort. A theoretical presumption indeed remains that a majority of extant documents is more likely to represent a majority of ancestral documents at each state of transmission than vice versa."¹³

Professor Hodges concludes, "Thus the Majority text, upon which the King James Version is based, has in reality the strongest claim possible to be regarded as an authentic representation of the original text. This claim is quite independent of any shifting consensus of scholarly judgment about its readings and is based on the objective reality of its dominance in the transmissional history of the New Testament text."¹⁴

Any corruption to the New Testament text would *obviously* have to begin after the original autographs were completed, or there would be *no originals* to corrupt! If the originals and the first corruptions of those

originals multiplied at the same rate, the correct text would always be found in the majority of MSS. Add to this the fact that the orthodox Christian Church would reject the corruptions and refuse to copy them, and we would find that the correct text would be in the vast majority, universally accepted as authentic, while the corrupt text would be represented by an elite minority. These are exactly the circumstances which exist in the MS evidence available today! Fuller records, "Miller has shown that the Traditional Text predominated in the writings of the Church Fathers in every age from the very first."¹⁵

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

From Antioch (remember our study of Antioch), the Universal Text was sent up into Europe. From there it spread through Syria and Europe through its translation into the Syrian Peschito version and the Old Latin Vulgate. There are still 350 copies of the Peschito in existence today as a testimony to this widespread usage in the years since 150 A.D.

The "Original" Vulgate

The Old Latin Vulgate was used by the Christians in the churches of the Waldenses, Gauls, Celts, Albigensians, and other fundamental groups throughout Europe. This Latin version became so used and beloved by orthodox Christians and was in such common use by the common people that it assumed the term "Vulgate" as a name. Vulgate comes from "vulgar" which is the Latin word for "common." It was so esteemed for its faithfulness to the deity of Christ and its accurate reproductions of the originals, that these early Christians let Jerome's Roman Catholic translation "sit on the shelf." Jerome's translation was not used by the true Biblical Christians for almost a millennium after it was translated from corrupted manuscripts by Jerome in 380 A.D. Even then it only came into usage due to the death of Latin as a common language, and the violent, wicked persecutions waged against true believers by Pope Gregory IX during his reign from 1227 to 1242 A.D.

Crooked Tactics

The Old Latin Vulgate had come into existence no later than 157 A.D. The Latin version of Jerome, translated by order of the Roman Catholic Church, was published in about 380 A.D. It was rejected by real Christians until approximately 1280 A.D. The Roman Catholic Church chose the name "Vulgate" or "Common" for Jerome's translation in an attempt to deceive loyal Christians into thinking that it was the true common Bible of the people. This is the same tactic used by the New Scofield Reference Bible (1967) and the Common Bible (1973). The former claims to be an Authorized King James Version, when in fact it is not (check the margin). The latter's name falsely implies that it is the Bible in "common" use, when in fact the Bible in *common* use is the Authorized Version of 1611! It would seem that such deception lacks a little in Christian ethics, if not honesty.

It is plain to see that the Universal Text has not only been universally accepted by the faithful Christians down through the centuries, but it was responsible for keeping the Roman Catholic Church contained to southern Italy for years. It was not until the Roman Catholic Church successfully eliminated this Book through persecutions, torture, Bible burnings, and murder that it could capture Europe in its web of superstitious paganism.

Perhaps we should learn a lesson. Where the Universal Text of the King James Bible reigns, God blesses. Once it is eliminated for a less "clean" text, God withdraws His blessing. Oh, that America could but look at what has happened to England since the corrupt Revised Version was published! Perversion has been the father of every "revision" since, on either side of the Atlantic. Yes, the sun began to set on the British Empire in 1904, when the British Foreign Bible Society changed from the pure Textus Receptus to the *Egyptian* text collated by Eberhard Nestle.

The Bad Guys

The other text which we must investigate is the Minority Text. This is the text which is found to be untrue to the beloved doctrines of Scripture such as the virgin birth, the deity of Christ, the blood atonement, the Trinity, and others. This is also the text which is used in every translation of the Bible since the Revised Version of 1881.

Its two outstanding trademarks in history are that orthodox Christianity has *never* used it and that the Roman Catholic Church has militantly (read that "bloodily") supported it. We shall say more about this matter later.

The Minority Text is also known as the Egyptian Text, (remember our study of Egypt), the Hesychian Text, and the Alexandrian Text (remember our study of Alexandria), which was the basis for the critical Greek Text of Brooke Foss Wescott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. The Wescott and Hort Text of 1881 was collated with Weymouth's third edition and Tischendorf's eighth edition by Eberhard Nestle in 1898 to become what is known as the Nestle's Greek New Testament.¹⁸ This is the text used in all "modern" translations.

The most notable MSS in the text consist of a handful of uncial MSS of the 4th and 5th Centuries. These uncials have been found to be error ridden and untrustworthy and found even to disagree among themselves.

One of these MSS is called Sinaiticus and is represented by the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, Aleph. This MS from all outward appearances looks very beautiful. It is written in book form (codex) on vellum. It contains 147 1/2 leaves. The pages are 15" by 13 1/2" with four columns of 48 lines per page. It contains many spurious books such as the "Shepherd of Hermes," the "Epistle of Barnabas," and even the "Didache."¹⁹ This MS has survived time well, but being in good physical shape by no means makes its contents trustworthy.

The great Greek scholar, Dr. Scrivener, points this out in his historic work *A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus*. He speaks concerning correctional alterations made to the MS: "The Codex is covered with such alterations...brought in by at least ten different revisors, some of them systematically spread over every page, others occasional or limited to separated portions of the MS, many of these being contemporaneous with the first writer, but for the greater part belonging to the sixth or seventh century."

Dr. Alfred Martin echos this, "Aleph shows the works of ten different correctors down through the centuries."

The corrections are so obvious as to induce Dr. Burgon to comment therefore on Dr. Tischendorf's willingness to exalt this badly marred MS: "With the blindness proverbially ascribed to parental love, Tischendorf follows Aleph, though the carelessness that reigns over that manuscript is visible to all who examine it."

May I note here that Dr. Tischendorf was the discoverer of Codex Sinaiticus. He found it in St. Cathrine's Monestary on Mt. Sinai in February of 1859. It was, of all places, in the *wastebasket!*"

Since this MS was of the 4th Century, Tischendorf, deceived by the outmoded philosophy "older is better," immediately altered his 7th edition of the Greek New Testament in over 3,500 places. He had claimed that this 7th edition (1856-59) had been perfect and could not be superseded. His 8th edition (1865-72), based primarily on Aleph, was apparently 3,500 times more perfect!

False Witness from Rome

Another MS belonging to this family is called Vaticanus. It is often referred to by the letter "B." As its name implies, it is in the Vatican library at Rome (remember our enemy). No one knows when it was placed in the Vatican library, but its existence was first made known in 1841. This MS is also in the form of a book and written on vellum. It contains 759 pages which are 10" by 10 1/2" with three columns of 41 lines per page.

This Codex omits many portions of Scripture vital to Christian doctrine. Vaticanus omits Genesis 1:1 through Genesis 46:28; Psalms 106 through 138; Matthew 16:2, 3; Romans 16:24; the Pauline Pastoral Epistles; Revelation; and everything in Hebrews after 9:14.

It seems suspicious indeed that a MS possessed by the Roman Catholic Church omits the portion of the book of Hebrews which exposes the "mass" as totally useless. (Please read Hebrews 10:10-12). The "mass" in conjunction with the false doctrine of purgatory go hand-in-hand to form a perpetual money making machine for Rome. Without one or the other, the Roman Catholic Church would go broke! It also omits portions of Scripture telling of the creation (Genesis), the prophetic details of the crucifixion (Psalms 22), and, of course, the portion which prophesies of the destruction of Babylon (Rome), the great whore of Revelation chapter 17.

Vaticanus, though intact physically, is found to be of very poor literary quality. Dr. Martin declares, "'B' exhibits numerous places where the scribe has written the same word or phrase twice in succession."²⁵ Dr. J. Smythe states, "From one end to the other, the whole manuscript has been traveled over by the pen of some... scribe of about the tenth century."

If Vaticanus was considered a trustworthy text originally, the mass of corrections and scribal changes obviously render its testimony highly suspicious and questionable.

The corrupt and unreliable nature of these two MSS is best summed up by one who has thoroughly examined them, John W. Burgon: "The impurity of the text exhibited by these codices is not a question of opinion but fact...In the Gospels alone, Codex B (Vatican) leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 1,491 times. It bears traces of careless transcriptions on every page. Codex Sinaiticus abounds with errors of the eye and pen to an extent not indeed unparalleled, but happily rather unusual in documents of first-rate importance. On many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through very carelessness. Letters and words, even whole sentences, are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately cancelled; while that gross blunder whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament."

If we are to be thorough and discriminatory in our evaluation of the true New Testament text, then we must not - we *cannot* - overlook these facts.

How did these MSS come into being? How did it happen that they should be beautiful to the eye, yet within contain such vile and devastating corruptions? It seems that these uncial MSS along with the papyrus MSS included in this category all resulted from a revision of the true, or Universal Text. This revision was enacted in *Egypt* (remember our study of Egypt) by Egyptian scribes!

Prior to documenting this statement, it will be needful to identify several of the uncial and papyrus MSS which will be referred to in the documentation. These are uncial manuscripts A, B, C, D, and Aleph. Also included are the Chester Beatty Papyri, designated as P45, P46, P47, and the Bodmer Papyri, designated as P66 and P75.

The Local Mess

It seems that this type of text was a *local text* of Alexandria, Egypt (remember our study of Alexandria) of which Eusebius made fifty copies to fulfill a request by Emperor Constantine. Unfortunately Eusebius turned to the education center in Egypt and got a "scholarly revision" instead of turning to Antioch for the pure text which was universally accepted by the Christians.

Why would Eusebius choose Alexandria over Antioch? Primarily because he was a great admirer of Origen, an Egyptian scholar. Origen, though once exalted by modern day Christianity as a trustworthy authority, has since been found to have been a heretic who interpreted the Bible in the light of Greek philosophy (remember our study of Athens). He propagated the heresy that Jesus Christ was a "created"

God.²⁸ This is a false doctrine clung to by Jehovah's Witnesses of our day, who strangely enough get their teaching from the corrupt Alexandrian Text's rendition of John 1:1-5 and John 3:13, a corruption which Origen is responsible for when he revised the Universal Text to *read in agreement with his personal heresy!*

Origen himself said, "The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written."²⁹ Which explains Bishop Marsh's statement, "Whenever therefore grammatical interpretation produced a sense which in *Origen's opinion* was irrational or impossible, in other words was irrational or impossible according to the philosophy which Origen had learned at Alexandria, he then departs from the literal."³⁰ (Emphasis mine.) Dr. Adam Clarke claims also that Origen was the first person to teach *purgatory*.

Total Corruption

Where did this "Local Text," from which all new Bible translations since 1881 are rendered, originate? Let us see what evidence scholars have unearthed in a search to discover its source.

Kurt Aland "proposes that the text of P75 and B represent a revision of a local text of Egypt which was enforced as the dominant text in that particular ecclesiastical province."

Professor Hodges assures us, "Already scholars are willing to concede a common ancestry for P75 and B. We can postulate here that this common ancestor and P66 meet even further back in the stream of transmission...It is quite possible, then that all three manuscripts go back ultimately to a single parent manuscript in which this emendation was originally made."

Dean Burgon remarks, "As for the origin of these two curiosities, it can perforce only be divined from their contents, that they exhibit fabricated texts is demonstrable. No amount of honest copying - preserved in for any number of centuries - could by possibility have resulted in two such documents. Separated from one another in actual date by 50, perhaps by 100 years, they must needs have branched all from a common corrupt ancestor, and straightway become exposed to fresh depraving influence."

Dr. Edward Hills concludes, "The best way to explain this situation is to suppose that it represents an intentional neglect of the Traditional Text on the part of those ancient Alexandrian scribes who kept revising the text of Papyrus 75 until finally they created the B text."

He also states Aland's opinion: "Aland thinks it possible that the Chester Beatty Papyri also came from this same place."

That tedious lawyer and former Supreme Court Justice, Philip Mauro, has aptly determined, "It should be observed, before we proceed with this question, that the agreeing testimony (where they do agree) of the Vatican and Sinaiticus MSS cannot be properly regarded as having the force of two independent witnesses; for there are sufficient evidences both internal and external to warrant the conclusion that these two Codices are very closely related, that they are, in fact, copies of the same original, itself a very corrupt transcript of the New Testament."

He also states, "It is admitted on all hands that the Text used as the basis of the Authorized Version correctly represents a Text known to have been widely (if not everywhere) in use as early as the second century (for the Peschito and Old Latin Versions, corroborated by patristic quotations afford ample proof of that). On the other hand, it is now known that the two Codices we are discussing represent anything but copies of a bad original, made worse in the copying."

It also seems generally agreed that this Local Text was used for a basis of the 50 Bibles which Eusebius supplied to Constantine.

The noted Greek scholar, A.T. Roberson, states, "Constantine himself ordered fifty Greek Bibles from Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, for the Churches of Constantinople. It is quite possible that Aleph and B are two of these fifty, though the actual copying was probably done in Egypt or by Egyptian scribes."

Gregory adds, "This manuscript (Vaticanus) is supposed, as we have seen, to have come from the same place as the Sinaitic Manuscript. I have said that these two show connections with each other and that they would suit very well as a pair of the fifty manuscripts written at Caesarea for Constantine the Great."

To which Burgon and Miller testify, "Constantine applied to Eusebius for fifty handsome copies, amongst which it is not impossible that the manuscripts B and Aleph were to be actually found."

Dr. David Fuller finalizes, "Age alone cannot prove that a manuscript is correct. B and Aleph probably owe their preservation to the fact that they were written on vellum, whereas most other documents of that period were written on papyrus. Many students, including Tischendorf and Hort, have thought them to be two of the fifty copies which Eusebius had prepared under the order of Constantine for use in the churches of Constantinople. They are no doubt beautiful manuscripts, but their texts show scribal carelessness. B exhibits numerous places where the scribe has written the same word or phrases twice in succession. Aleph shows the marks of ten different correctors down through the centuries. Burgon's excoriation of Wescott and Hort's method cannot be considered too strong in the light of the facts concerning the character of these two manuscripts."⁴² Who could be responsible for the corruption of the universally accepted text of the New Testament?

Wilkenson reports, "Beginning shortly after the death of the apostle John, four names stand out in prominence whose teaching contributed both to the victorious heresy and to the final issuing of manuscripts of a corrupt New Testament. These names are: 1. Justin Martyr; 2. Tatian; 3. Clement of Alexandria; and 4. Origen."

The Local Alexandrian text fell into disuse about 500 A.D. while the original Universal Text was spreading Christianity throughout Europe.

Hoskier reports this in his statement: "Those who accept the Wescott and Hort text are basing their accusations of untruth as to the Gospellists upon an Egyptian revision current 200 to 450 A.D. and abandoned between 500 to 1881, merely revised in our day and stamped as genuine."

So we see that once a pure copy of the Universal Text had been carried down into Egypt, it was recopied. During the process of this recopying, it was revised by men who did not revere it as truly the Word of God. This text was examined by the critical eye of Greek philosophy and Egyptian morals. These men saw nothing wrong with putting the Book in subjection to their opinion instead of their opinion being in subjection to the *Book*. This process produced a text which was local to the educational center of Alexandria, Egypt. This text went no farther than southern Italy where the Roman Church found its unstable character perfect for overthrowing the true Word of God which was being used universally by the Christians.

At this point, I believe it will be helpful to study the ruthless Roman Catholic Church to more clearly understand her part in all new translations of the Bible since 1881.

The Enemy

"It is necessary to salvation that every man should submit to the Pope." (Boniface VIII Unum Sanctum, 1303.)

"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast." Ephesians 2:8, 9.

Here lie two totally contradictory statements. They cannot both be correct. The one which you believe will depend on which authority you accept.

The Roman Catholic Church has long been antagonistic to the doctrine of salvation by grace. If salvation

is by grace, who needs "mass?" If salvation is by grace, who needs to fear purgatory? If Jesus Christ is our mediator, who needs the Pope? If the Pope cannot intimidate people into obeying him, how can he force a nation to obey him?

The true Bible is the arch-enemy of the Roman Catholic Church. Rome can only rule over ignorant, fear-filled people. The true Bible turns "unlearned and ignorant" men into gospel preachers and casts out "all fear."

Rome must find a way to supplant the true gospel with "another gospel." The only way to do this is to eliminate our faith in the Word of God.

Rome received the corrupted Local Text of Alexandria, Egypt and further revised it to suit her own needs. Some scholars call this revision the "Western" text. This, of course, makes it part of the already corrupted text and, therefore, still contains the Local Text readings. This text suited the Roman Catholic Church well, since it attacked the doctrines of the Bible. Rome is wise. To attack salvation by grace directly would expose her plot to all. So instead she used subtly. The Roman Catholic Church strips Jesus Christ of His deity, separates the divine title "Lord" and "Christ" from the human name Jesus, having the thief on the cross address Him as "Jesus" instead of "Lord" (Luke 23:42). It also removes the testimony to His deity in Acts 8:37, and it eliminates the Trinity in I John 5:7.

You may ask, "Would not a weakening of the place of Jesus Christ weaken the Roman Catholic Church's reason for even existing?" The answer is "No." The Roman Catholic Church does not even claim to represent the gospel of Jesus Christ. Romanist Karl Adam admits this: "We Catholics acknowledge readily, without any shame - nay with pride - that Catholicism cannot be identified simply and wholly with primitive Christianity, nor even with the Gospel of Christ."

The vacancy left by the removal of Christ would be easily filled by Mary and other "saints" along with a chain of ritualism so rigid that no practitioner would have time to really "think" about the true gospel.

The Invasion

The true gospel was fast spreading all over Europe due to the Old Latin translation of the Universal Text into the "vulgar" or "common" language. This Bible became known as the "Vulgate" since it was used so commonly all over Europe.

Rome enlisted the help of a loyal subject by the name of Jerome. He quickly translated the corrupt Local Text into Latin. This version included the Apocryphal books, fourteen books which no Bible-believing Christian accepts as authentic. To insure its success over the Old Latin, the Roman Catholic Church gave it the name "Vulgate," meaning "common." There was one problem which the Roman Catholic Church did not anticipate, the *same* problem which the businessmen publishing new versions cannot seem to avoid. *The common people recognized the true Word of God because the Holy Spirit bears witness to it! They refuse to accept other versions!*

True, many versions have been sold in the past and are being sold now. Yet, this is primarily due to the media "blitz" by which EVERY new Bible has been introduced since 1881. This is the same tactic used by Satan in Genesis chapter 3. Notice his first recorded words. Do you believe that Satan just walked up to Eve and asked, "Yea, hath God said?" No! In Genesis 3:1 we are picking up in the *middle* of a conversation, possibly one of many. Satan paved the way for his attack on God's Word by a little "softening up" publicity. Christians today do not realize that they "need a better translation" until they are told so by the Bible salesman a few times. *Suddenly*, they "realize their need" for a translation which is "closer to the originals." (*Most of these Christians have never even read the one they have.*) The next thing they know, they have eaten the fruit, and *God's blessing is gone*. To get God's blessing back, obviously, they need the next "thoroughly reliable" translation.

This is not an overstatement. An example of the "Bible business" is revealed by Dr. Edward Hills. He speaks in reference to the committee of the American Standard Version *promising* not to publish their

translation at the same time as the English Revised Version. He points out, "They promised not to publish their own revised edition of the Bible until 14 years after the publication of the English Revised Version (R. V.), and in exchange for this concession were given the privilege of publishing in an appendix to this version a list of the readings which they favored but which the British revisers declined to adopt."⁴⁶ It was obvious to these "contenders for the faith" that *two* new Bibles hitting the market at the same time just would not be conducive to *good profits*. These men are obviously "led by the spirit" but I am not entirely sure it is "Holy." It is a sad thing when men make merchandise of the Word of God.

The name "Vulgate" on the flyleaf of Jerome's unreliable translation did little to help sales. The Old Latin Bible, or "Italic" as it is sometimes called, was held fast by all Christians who upheld the authority of the Bible over the authority of education.

Dr. Wilkenson informs us in reference to the Old Latin, "Not only were such translations in existence long before the Vulgate was adopted by the Papacy, and well established, but the people for centuries refused to supplant their old Latin Bibles by the Vulgate." He records Jacobus' words, "The old Latin versions were used longest by the western Christians who would not bow to the authority of Rome - e.g. the Donatists; the Irish in Ireland, Britain, and the Continent; the Albigenses: etc;"

Dr. Wilkenson also records the words from the "Forum" of June 1887, "The old Italic version, into rude Low Latin of the second century, held its own as long as Latin continued to be the language of the people. The critical version of Jerome never displaced it, and only replaced it when the Latin ceased to be a living language, and became the language *of the learned*. The Gothic version of Ulfilas, in the same way, held its own until the tongues in which it was written ceased to exist."

So we see that the Vulgate of Jerome was unused and unwanted by the Christians for over nine hundred years. This caused the Roman Church much grief. There was only one remedy to the situation, eliminate the "other" old, archaic Bible. If it was necessary to violently *eliminate* the people who used this faithful translation, then they *did* it.

The Plot

The Roman Catholic Church has long been known for its persecution of true New Testament Christians. Beginning in about 600 A.D., persecution hounded these Christ-honoring, Bible-loving people. Pope Gregory I went so far as to systematically destroy and alter historical records pertaining to these Christians. Concerning one group, the Waldenses (or Waldensians), Dr. Gilly reports, "It is a singular thing, that the destruction or rapine, which has been so fatal to Waldensian documents, would have pursued them even to the place of security, to which all, that remained, were consigned by Morland, in 1658, the library of the University of Cambridge. The most ancient of these relics were ticketed in seven packets, distinguished by letters of the alphabet, from A to G. The whole of these were missing when I made inquiry for them in 1823."

Gilly also enlightens us with this report of the actions of Rome: "The agents of the Papacy have done their utmost to calumniate their character, to destroy the records of their noble past and to leave no trace of the cruel persecution they underwent. They went even further - they made use of words written against ancient heresies to strike out the name of heretics and fill the blank space by inserting the name of the Waldenses. Just as if, in a book written to record the lawless deeds of some bandit, like Jesse James, his name should be stricken out and the name of Abraham Lincoln substituted. The Jesuit Gretser in a book written against the heretics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, put the name Waldenses at the point where he struck out the name of these heretics."

We find that Rome's wicked persecutions of the Waldenses culminated in a devastating massacre of their number in 1655. They were hounded as "heretics" until the mid 1800's when their persistence paid off and the vile actions against them ceased.

The Counterattack

A major blow to the authority of Rome came in 1517, when a young Catholic priest by the name of Martin Luther nailed his historic 95 theses on the church door in Wittenburg. The nail drove deep into the hearts of truly born-again Christians who had for centuries been laboring under the tyranny of the Roman Catholic Church. The people flocked to their new, brave leader. From this, Lutheranism was established, but even more important, the fires of the Reformation were kindled.

The tide of the Reformation soon came sweeping across all of Europe until it washed the very shores of England. The already weakened authority of Rome was devastated by the onslaught of truth. Two-thirds of Europe was swallowed up in what can probably be referred to as the greatest spiritual awakening of all time. The Reformation was vital to the then future translation of the King James Bible. England, too, had been shackled to the hierarchy of Rome. It was the removal of these superstitious bonds that created the spirit in England of the supremacy of the Scripture which was prevalent at the time of the translation of the King James Bible. This would not have been the case had Luther not sparked the Reformation.

The most vital and immovable weapon in Luther's arsenal came in the form of his German translation of the New Testament of 1522. This put the pure words of the Universal Text back into the hands of "Bible-starved" Christians. The Reformation ran wild across the continent, fueled by this faithful translation. Rome at this point was totally helpless to stop it. The Papacy needed something with which to fight this dreaded scourge of truth. It turned in desperation to two different sources.

In 1545 the Roman Catholic Church formed the Council of Trent. The Council of Trent systematically denied the teachings of the Reformation. The Council decreed that "tradition" was of equal authority with the Bible. It decreed also that justification was not by faith alone in the shed blood of Jesus Christ. In fact, it stated that anyone believing in this vital Bible doctrine was cursed. The Council's exact words are: "If anyone saith that justifying faith is nothing else but confidence in the divine mercy which remits sins for Christ's sake or that this confidence alone is that whereby we are justified, *let him be anathema.*"

We now see that the Roman Catholic Church is guilty of *officially* cursing Jesus Christ! Would God use *this* church to preserve His Words?

The Council of Trent was viewed by the Protestants as somewhat of a "paper tiger." It certainly did not hold any authority over them. The barn door appeared securely locked, but the horse was triumphantly roaming all over the countryside! Yet there was to be an enemy much more feared than the boisterous Council of Trent - the Jesuits!

The Diabolical Jesuits

The Society of Jesus was founded in 1534 by a Spaniard by the name of Ignatius Loyola. Loyola was born don Inigo Lopez de Rocalde, in the castle of Loyola in the province of Guipuzcoa in 1491. He was known as a youth to be treacherous, brutal and vindictive. He was referred to as an unruly and conceited soldier. Loyola was wounded at the siege of Pampeluna in 1521. Crippled by a broken leg and plagued by a limp the rest of his life, he sought "spiritual" conquests.

Loyola produced an elite force of men, extremely loyal to the Pope, who would set about to undermine Protestantism and "heresy" throughout the world. Their training would require fourteen years of testing and trials designed to leave them with no will at all. They were to learn to be obedient. Loyola taught that their only desire would be to serve the Pope.

The head of the Jesuits is called the "Black Pope" and holds the title of General, just as in the military. That they were to be unquestionably loyal to this man and their church is reflected in Loyola's own words, "Let us be convinced that all is well and right when the superior commands it," also, "...even if God gave you an animal without sense for master, you will not hesitate to obey him, as master and guide, because God ordained it to be so." He further elaborates, "We must see black as white, if the Church says so."

The Devil's Plain Clothes Men

What would be the method used by the Jesuits to achieve their goals? Would it be military might? Would it be acts of daring? Would it be a violent revolution to install a Roman sympathizer as ruler? No, these actions would all have their day of usefulness, later.

The Jesuits were to be the Vatican's "plainclothesmen." They were founded to be a secret society, a society that was to slide in behind the scenes and capture the positions of *leadership*. The Jesuits knew that to capture the leaders of any particular country or organization is to conquer the entire body.

Edmund Paris, the noted French author and leading authority on the Roman Catholic Church, has written many books exposing the *true* spirit and goals of the Vatican. He points out, "Politics are their main field of action, as all the efforts of these 'directors' concentrate on one aim: *the submission of the world to the papacy*, and to attain this the 'heads' must be conquered first."

The Jesuit priests were not required to dress in the traditional garb of the Roman Catholic priests. In fact, their dress was a major part of their disguise. They presented themselves to the world in a variety of manners. They passed themselves off in a number of ways. Paris asserts that this is still true today, "It is the same today: the 33,000 official members of the Society operate all over the world in the capacity of her personnel, officers of a truly secret army containing in its ranks heads of political parties, high ranking officials, generals, magistrates, physicians, faculty professors, etc., all of them striving to bring about, in their own sphere, 'Opus Dei,' God's work, in reality the plans of the papacy."

They have often been known to join the religious persuasion which they wish to destroy. Having done this, they would manifest all of the destructive force at their hands to weaken and tear down their sworn enemy of "Protestantism." Paris again reports just such an event which took place in Scandinavia in the late 16th Century, "In 1574 Father Nicolai and other Jesuits were brought to the recently established school of technology where they became fervent Roman proselytizers, while officially assuming Lutheranism."⁵⁸ Dr. Desanctis points out, "Despite all the persecution they (the Jesuits) have met with, they have not abandoned England, where there are a greater number of Jesuits than in Italy; there are Jesuits in all classes of society; in Parliament; among the English clergy; among the Protestant laity, even in the higher stations. I could not comprehend how a Jesuit could be a Protestant priest, or how a Protestant priest could be a Jesuit; but my Confessor silenced my scruples by telling me, *omnia munda mundis*, and that St. Paul became a Jew that he might save the Jews; it is no wonder therefore, if a Jesuit should feign himself a Protestant, for the conversion of Protestants."

Holy Murder

Murder is not above the "means" which might be necessary to reach the desired "end." The General of the Jesuits will forgive any sins which are committed by the members of this Satanic order. In reference to the Jesuit General it is stated, "He also absolves the irregularity issuing, from bigamy, injuries done to others, murder, assassination ... as long as these wicked deeds were not publicly known and this cause of a scandal."

That the Jesuit priests have such liberties as murder is reflected in the following lengthy quote from Paris' book *The Secret History of the Jesuits*.

"Amongst the most criminal Jesuitical maxims, there is one which roused public indignation to the highest point and deserves to be examined; it is: 'A monk or priest is allowed to kill those who are ready to slander him or his community.'

So the order gives itself the right to eliminate its adversaries and even those of its members who, having come out of it, are too talkative. This pearl is found in the *Theology of Father L'Amy*.

There is another case where this principle finds its application. For this same Jesuit was cynical enough to write: 'If a Father, yielding to temptation, abuses a woman and she publicizes what has

happened, and because of it, dishonors him, this same Father can kill her to avoid disgrace!"

In 1572, the Jesuits, with the help of Prince Henry III were responsible for the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre. At this infamous event, which took place on August 15, 1572, the Jesuits murdered the Huguenot (Protestant) leaders gathered in Paris for the wedding of Princess Margaret, a Roman Catholic, and Henry of Navarre, a Huguenot. The murders inspired Roman Catholics to slaughter thousands of Huguenot men, women, and children. Henry of Navarre was not killed but was forced to renounce Protestantism, although his renunciation was insincere, and he remained a Protestant until 1593. The number of victims in this Jesuit conspiracy is estimated to be at least 10,000. In 1589, when Henry III was no longer useful to the Roman Catholic Church, he was assassinated by a monk by the name of Jacques Clement. Clement was called an "angel" by the Jesuit priest, Camelet.⁶⁴ Another Jesuit priest by the name of Guigard, who was eventually hanged, taught his students that Clement did nothing wrong. In fact, he voiced his regrets that Henry III had not been murdered earlier at the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre. He instructed them with lessons such as this: "Jacques Clement has done a meritorious act inspired by the Holy Spirit. If we can make war against the king, then let us do it; if we cannot make war against him, then let us put him to death ... we made a big mistake at the St. Bartholomew; we should have bled the royal vein."

The Jesuits' murderous ways were not yet completed in the history of French Protestants! When Henry III was murdered, Henry of Navarre a Huguenot, came to power. A hope for Catholic rebellion never materialized, and Henry IV was allowed to reign. In 1592, an attempt was made to assassinate the Protestant king by a man named Barriere. Barriere admitted that he had been instructed to do so by a Father Varade, a *Jesuit* priest. In 1594, *another* attempt was made by Jean Chatel who had been *taught* by Jesuit teachers and had confessed to the Jesuits what he was about to do. It was at this time that Father Guigard, the Jesuit teacher previously mentioned, was seized and hanged for his connection with this plot.

In 1598, King Henry IV issued the Edict of Nantes, granting religious freedom to the Huguenots. They were allowed full civil rights and the right to hold public worship services in towns where they had congregations.

This was the last straw! Henry IV had to be eliminated! This time the Jesuits would allow for more careful planning. Edmund Paris details the assassination of King Henry IV:

"On the 16th of May, 1610, on the eve of his campaign against Austria, he was murdered by Ravaillac who confessed having been inspired by the writing of Fathers Mariana and Suarez. These two sanctioned the murders of heretic "tyrants" or those insufficiently devoted to the Papacy's interests. The duke of Epemon, who made the king read a letter while the assassin was lying in wait, was a notorious friend of the Jesuits, and Michelet proved that they knew of this attempt. In fact, Ravaillac had confessed to the Jesuit Father d'Aubigny just before and, when the judges interrogated the priest, he merely replied that God had given him the gift to forget immediately what he heard in the confessional."

THIS is the spirit of our enemy! THIS is the ruthlessness of the Roman Catholic Church against those who will not bow their knee to Rome! Would God use this church to preserve His Word?

Wherever there is a conspiracy against God's people or God's Word, there seems always to be the shadow of a Jesuit priest near. Often they present themselves as seemingly innocent to the proceedings around them when, in fact, they are the driving force behind such plots against God's work.

It is often said that you can tell a lot about a man by taking a close look at his enemies. If a man is disliked by Communists, then that shows that he is a non-Communist and considered dangerous to their cause. If a man is disliked by the Roman Catholic Church, then this shows that he is not useful in spreading the Roman Catholic dogma.

This same thing is true of the Bible. What did the Jesuits, the sworn enemy of truth, think of the Authorized Version?

The Gun Powder Plot

To show the hatred of the Roman Catholic Church against King James for initiating a translation which would not use the corrupt Latin Vulgate or the Jesuit Bible of 1582, we must quote from Gustavus Paine's book, *The Men Behind the King James Version*. The account recorded took place in 1605-1606.

"The story is too involved to give detail here, but on October 26, the Lord Chamberlain, Monteagle, received an unsigned letter begging him to stay away from Parliament on the day it opened. He took the letter to Robert Cecil, who on November 1 showed it to the king at a midnight meeting. The King shrewdly surmised a good deal of what it meant.

Monday, November 4, an agent of the royal party found in a cellar beneath the House of Lords a man named Guy Fawkes, disguised as a servant, beside piles of faggots, billets of wood, and masses of coal. The agent went away. Shortly Monteagle and one other came and talked, but gave no heed to Fawkes, who was still on guard until they were about to go. He told them he was a servant of Thomas Percy, a well-known papist. Still later, at midnight, soldiers found Fawkes booted and spurred and with a lantern outside the cellar door. He had taken few pains to conceal his actions. They dragged him into an alley, searched him, and found on him a tinderbox and a length of slow match. In a fury now, they moved the faggots, billets and coal and came upon barrel after barrel of powder, thirty-six barrels in all. Fawkes then confessed that he meant to blow up the House of Lords and the king.

On November 6, Percy, with others, rushed into an inn at Dunchurch, Warwickshire, with the news that the court was aware of their plan. By the 8th the whole attempt had dearly failed. When Parliament met a week after the stated day, the King, calm, gracious, and splendid told what had happened and then adjourned the meeting. At first Fawkes refused to name any except Percy who, with others, was killed in the course of a chase. In time he gave the names of all, who would have blown up the House of Lords 'at a clap.'

Guy Fawkes was baptized at St. Michael le Belfrey, York, April 16, 1570, son of Edward Fawkes, a proctor and advocate in the church courts of York. The father died and the mother married a Papist. In 1603 Guy Fawkes went to Madrid to urge that Philip III invade England. Thus he was a confirmed traitor, though egged on and used by more astute plotters.

Some of these men had been involved in the rising of the Earl of Esses. A number were former members of the Church of England. Most of them had some land and wealth. They were all highly disturbed beings, throwbacks, who meant to subvert the state and get rid of King James. Church and state, they were sure, must be at one, with fealty to the Pope.

For nearly a year, the plotters had been digging a tunnel from a distance, but had found the wall under the House of Lords nine feet thick. They had then got access to the cellar by renting a building. They had planned to kill the King, seize his children, stir up an open revolt with the aid from Spaniards in Flanders, put Princess Elizabeth on the throne, and marry her to a Papist. Though all but one, Sir Everard Digby, pleaded not guilty, the court, such as it was, condemned them all to death. That same week they were all hanged, four in St. Paul's churchyard where John Overall, the translator, could have looked on and four in the yard of the old palace.

Three months later came the trial of Henry Garnet, a Jesuit, thought to be head of the Jesuits in England. Brought up a Protestant, he knew of the plot but had shrunk in horror from it, though he left the chosen victims to their fate. The court condemned him also to die.

All this concerned the men at work on the Bible. At Garnet's hanging, May 3, in St. Paul's churchyard, John Overall, Dean of St. Paul's took time off from his translating to be present. Very gravely and Christ-ianily he and the Dean of Winchester urged upon Garnet 'a true and lively faith to God-ward,' a free and plain statement to the world of his offense; and if any further treason lay in his knowledge, he was begged to unburden his conscience and show a sorrow and destination of it. Garnet, firm in his beliefs, desired them not to trouble him. So after the men assigned to the gruesome duty had hanged, drawn, and quartered the victim Dean Overall returned to St. Paul's and his Bible task."

Thus the "Gunpowder Plot" failed. As usual, where there was treachery there was a Jesuit.

Did the failure of this plan stop the Jesuits? Of course not. Garnet had allowed this drastic plan to be carried out too soon. He had forgotten the Jesuit rule to act a little at a time "surtout, pas trop de zele" (above all, not too much zeal).

A New Plan

Let it be remembered, *Jesuits do not give up*. They would have to bide their time. They would once again resort to undercover activities as they had so many times before. Their task would be a difficult one, yet for the unfaltering Jesuits, not impossible. They would have to discredit the Reformation. They would have to dislodge the Universal Greek Text from the firm position it held in the minds and hearts of English scholarship. They would have to "wean" Protestantism back into the fold of Rome. To do this they would use the same plan as they had in similar situations: *captivate the minds of scholarship*.

Men have long been worshippers of education. If an educator makes a claim, the "common" people will follow, because they have convinced themselves that anyone with *that* much education can't be wrong.

Evolution has been accepted as a fact by the average American because *educators* claim that it is true. The fact that they can produce no evidence to substantiate their theory is incidental. *Education* says it is so!

The Jesuits' task was to entice Protestant scholarship back to Rome. They knew that they could not wean the leaders of Protestantism back into Rome as long as the stubborn "heretics" clung to the pure text of the Reformers. This Bible would have to be replaced with one which contained the pro-Roman Catholic readings of Jerome's Vulgate and the Jesuit translation of 1582. It would be necessary to "educate" the Protestant scholars to believe that their Reformation Text was unreliable and that their Authorized Version was "not scholarly." Once thus programmed, the egotistical scholars would spontaneously attack their own Bible and believe that they were helping God.

The most important objective to be realized would be to replace the Bible as the *final* authority.

The Authorized Version had become a mightier foe than Rome had anticipated as Dr. McClure points out: "The printing of the English Bible has proved to be by far the mightiest barrier ever reared to repel the advance of Popery, and to damage all the resources of the Papacy. Originally intended for the five or six millions who dwelt within the narrow limits of the British Islands, it at once formed and fixed their language, till then unsettled; and has since gone with that language to the isles and shores of every sea."

The Dreaded Happening

What the Roman Catholics had always dreaded had come to pass. The *Word of God* was translated from the true text into the clearest form of the common language, English. Protestants had long refuted and neutralized Roman Catholicism by the phrase, "The Bible says so." The Roman Catholic Church had been built on about 10% twisted Scripture and 90% superstition. Where men were ignorant, it could rule by playing on their fears. But, when the "ignorant and unlearned" people received Christ as personal Savior and

clung faithfully to the King James Bible, they were not only immovable but could easily refute *any* heresy, be it Catholic or otherwise.

Aiding The Enemy

The job of the Jesuits would be aided by the natural process of time. Every major religious persuasion follows a natural pattern which is nearly impossible to avoid. They begin in the form of a *revival*, not a week long revival meeting, but a spiritual awakening which leads its followers away from the world system and into Bible literalism. The Reformation is a good example. People drew nearer to the Bible, believed it literally, and the end result was a revival which swept Europe and drew people *out* of the Roman Catholic system.

The next step is *education*. The infant Reformation had nowhere to send its converts to learn the Bible. It certainly could not allow them to return to the Roman school of philosophy for their education. So the second step is to build your own schools and train your own preachers and teachers.

The third step is *culture*. Once a movement has established itself, it forms its own culture. This process takes from 50 to 100 years. After this period of time, the movement has proved to the world that it is not a "fly by night" outfit but is a force to be reckoned with. This was true of Lutheranism, as it is now true of Fundamentalism.

Fifty years ago, a Fundamentalist preacher was considered a backwoods "hick" with no education and was able to preach nothing more than "hell, fire, and damnation." Today, the world has awakened to the fact that Fundamentalism is a powerful force. Fundamental churches are found to be the largest and fastest growing in the country. Television and magazines are producing special stories concerning the Fundamental movement. The election of 1980 showed the amount of influence that Fundamentalism could have. Fundamentalism has proven that it is here to stay.

This acceptance produces a kind of "home-grown" arrogance. This is not a derogatory comment, but is true.

When the preachers of the Reformation graduated from basements and dungeons to the pulpits of the largest, fastest growing churches in Europe, they realized that they had fought their way to victory. As they saw their colleges grow and multiply, they prided themselves in the job they had done. But the new-found ease of life began to make a subtle change. They found themselves beginning to appreciate the "finer" things of life. A pastor who had been satisfied in the early days of the Reformation with a basement and one candle for light to preach by, twenty-five years later found himself in a fine, clean, functional building. As his congregation grew and space was needed, the church built bigger buildings, but the new buildings passed from functional simplicity to a "touch of elegance." The chandeliers became more ornate. The ceiling became higher. The pews were more comfortable. The windows saw the use of stained glass, a Roman Catholic custom. The pastor found social acceptance in the community. Each succeeding building was "bigger and better" with more elaborate masonry. The preachers and people began to find time to "appreciate" the arts and sciences. The Christians soon had a culture which was separate from but parallel to that of the world. This left the door open for the next and final step, *apostasy*.

The preachers became "clergy." Their separated lives and Biblical education led to Phariseeism. Their colleges expanded from just training ministers to covering a wider spectrum of occupations. Basic Bible courses were supplemented by a study of "the arts."

Revival is from God. Education is necessary to the training of God's ministers, but culture is a product that appeals to the *flesh*. Once the flesh is allowed to offer its preferences, *apostasy* sets in. Standards become a little more lax. College professors are hired according to their academic abilities *first* and the spiritual convictions *second*. Statements like "We must have the best" and "I want to be first-class" are used to comfort the fears of anyone who feels that the churches and schools seem a little worldly. Of course, a school administrator might find himself thinking, "The average Christian doesn't understand our minute changes. They aren't educated like we are."

There suddenly appears a Christian with an open *Bible*, who points out *Scripture* which may condemn the new found "culture" of a church or school. The school amazingly finds itself in the same position as the Roman Catholic Church, *refuted* by an *ignorant Christian* who believes the Bible. Which is to be the final authority, the school or the Bible? Time after time, education has found that it has come too far to turn back. "We are!" came the answer from Oxford, Cambridge, and Westminster in England. "We are!" came the answer from Harvard, Princeton, and Yale in America. Education has conceived culture and given birth to apostasy!

Ripe for Conquest

England in the early 1800's was ripe for apostasy. The Reformation had come a long way since Luther nailed his theses on the door of Wittenberg. It had traversed Europe with the truth, leaving in its wake churches and schools that represented the pure text of Scripture. The educational foundation had been laid, upon which culture was built. *Gone* were the attempts to blow up Parliament. *Gone* was the fear of ending up like Tyndale for believing "the Book." *Gone* was the reign of terror inflicted by "bloody" Mary. The churches built around the Authorized Version were rich and prosperous. The colleges, from their meager beginnings, had become great universities, pressing on with higher education. There were a few "common" people who still feared Rome, but the "educators" knew that their fears were "unfounded." England was ripe for a transfer of authority from the *Bible* to *education*, and *Rome was willing to supply the education. The absolute reign of the Authorized Version would soon end.*

Operation "Undermine"

The Authorized Version had withstood countless attacks, but it would now be subject to a systematic campaign to exalt *several* authorities to a position equal to it. These perverted "authorities" would then join forces to portray the Authorized Version as weak, unreliable, inaccurate, outmoded, and generally untrustworthy. Once the Authorized Version had been successfully dethroned, education would be free to exalt whatever authority it desired to. The Roman Catholic Church, of course, would be close at hand to see to it that the authority which was to be exalted would be in agreement with its own corrupt Latin Vulgate.

The authorities to be exalted as equal with the Authorized Version came from several different quarters, but all with the same intent. Replace the Universal Text of the Authorized Version with the Local Text of Alexandria, Egypt.

Science "Falsely So-Called"

One of the authorities which would be used to discredit the Authorized Version was "textual criticism."

Textual criticism is known as a "science." By being called a science, it will be accepted by the educated mind. It is a process which looks at the Bible as it would look at the uninspired writings of any secular writer. This one fact alone means that the power of God to preserve His Word is ignored in favor of the naturalistic method of evaluating the "chance" of God's Word being preserved. Textual criticism allows God to "inspire" His originals, but seeks to *replace* God as the active agent in *preserving* His Word.

Earlier we established that the Bible was a *spiritual* book, that God was active in its conception, and that it would be reasonable to assume that God could be just as active in its *preservation*.

One might ask at this point if textual criticism could not be the method which God used to preserve His Words? The answer is unequivocally, "No." Here are the reasons why:

Textual critics look at the Bible *today* through the same eyes as the Egyptian scribes did who perverted the Universal Text to construct the Local Text centuries ago. Those well-educated scribes thought that the Bible was subject to *them* instead of them being subject to the *Bible*. This outlook allowed them to eliminate the power of God from their minds and make whatever changes they deemed necessary to reach a

conclusion which seemed *logical* to them. *They* were the Holy Spirit in their minds!

Today textual critics do the same, in that, before they ever start their work, they are convinced that God cannot preserve His Word without their assistance. Scholars today believe that God inspired *words* but preserved *thoughts*.

Another reason why textual criticism could not be the method God used to preserve His Word is that it *comes from Rome*.

The Catholic Encyclopedia states, "A French priest, Richard Simon (1638-1712), was the first who subjected the general questions concerning the Bible to a treatment which was at once comprehensive in scope and scientific in method. Simon is the forerunner of modern Biblical criticism ... The use of internal evidence by which Simon arrived at it entitles him to be called the father of Biblical criticism"

The same source also mentions the Catholic scholar Jean Astruc:

"In 1753 Jean Astruc, a French Catholic physician of considerable note published a little book, *Conjectures sur les memoires originaux dont il parait que Moise s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genese*, in which he conjectured, from the alternating use of two names of God in the Hebrew Genesis, that Moses had incorporated therein two pre-existing documents, one of which employed Elohim and the other Jehovah. The idea attracted little attention till it was taken up by a German scholar, who, however, claims to have made the discovery independently. This was Johann Gottfried Eichhorn ... Eichhorn greatly developed Astruc's hypothesis."

The same source also speaks of yet another Roman Catholic infidel:

"Yet, it was a Catholic priest of Scottish origin, Alexander Geddes (1737-1802), who broached a theory of the origin of the Five Books (to which he attached Joshua) exceeding in boldness either Simon's or Eichhorn's. This was the well-known 'Fragment' hypothesis, which reduced the Pentateuch to a collection of fragmentary sections partly of Mosaic origin, but put together in the reign of Solomon. Geddes' opinion was introduced into Germany in 1805 by Vater."

Dr. Benjamin Wilkenson records how the naturalistic, unsaved Roman Catholic scholars judged in favor of the perverted Egyptian manuscripts: "Some of the earliest critics in the field of collecting variant readings of the New Testament Greek were Mill and Bengel. We have Dr. Kenrick, Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia in 1849, as authority that they and others had examined these manuscripts recently exalted as superior, such as the Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Beza, and Ephraem, and had pronounced in favor of the Vulgate, the Catholic Bible."

Stop and think! Naturalistic as opposed to spiritual. Unsaved as opposed to saved. Roman Catholic as opposed to Biblical. These men conceived and developed theories which attacked the reliability of Scripture and judged in favor of the perverted Egyptian manuscripts.

Are these men and methods worthy of fellowship? Would a perfect and righteous God use such a hodgepodge of infidelity to preserve His hallowed *Words*? Some may say that textual criticism is good if carried on by good, godly Christian men. This cannot be true. The "mass" is a *Roman Catholic* invention contrived to prevent people from knowing the *truth*. Would the mass be "good" if performed by good, Bible-believing scholars? Of course not! *Elisha* took poison and made it fit to eat, (II Kings 4:38-41). *We* cannot! Neither can we take a method instigated by the Roman Catholic Church in order to overthrow the Bible and filled with the poison of Romanism and *miraculously* make it fit to use! Textual criticism is a "science" (falsely so-called - I Timothy 6:20) whose authority we *cannot* accept in place of the Bible.

The Greek Game

Another authority by which to judge and down-grade the absolute authority of the Authorized Version is

to change the meaning of the translation and the words used in Scripture.

First the student is taught that he must not accept a word as it is in the Authorized Version. He is told to study the Greek or Hebrew words to see if there is another way the word could be translated. The student, with the purest of motives, proceeds to a lexicon or a Greek or Hebrew dictionary and discovers to His horror that the translators of the Authorized Version have translated the word *improperly!* In *truth*, the exact *opposite* has happened. The lexicon and/or dictionary has *defined* the word *improperly!* The poor, naive, well-meaning student does not know it, but he has been "headed off at the pass."

Years before this poor student ever turned the first page of his lexicon, Roman Catholics *provided the pages he would turn!* Let me explain. If the student can be taught to doubt the accuracy of the translation of any given word in the Bible, then we will turn to a lexicon or dictionary to find the "true" meaning. He does not realize it, but in doing this, he removes the *Bible* from its position as final authority and bestows that honor upon an uninspired lexicon or dictionary. All this leaves Satan to do, is to *provide that student with a lexicon or dictionary* which reads the way he (Satan) wants it to! This is a subtle and dangerous precedent. Most often, it is taught in complete, innocent sincerity.

This is much like the phrase used to explain the Communist's takeover of many countries which were once thriving with many missionaries: "The missionaries taught us to *read*, but the Communists gave us the books."

(The Communists do not argue about the proper translation of Marx.)

Many unsuspecting colleges teach their students to accept the lexicon or dictionary as an authority *above* the Bible, but the lexicons and dictionaries are provided by the infidels.

John R. Rice points out the result of such "authority switching" while discussing Isaiah 7:14 in the Revised Standard Version: "The most active opposition to the Revised Standard Version has been about changing the translation of Isaiah 7:14 from, 'Behold, a virgin shall conceive,' to 'Behold, a young woman shall conceive and bear a son.' Dr. Luther Weigle, chairman of the translators, said that in the Hebrew English lexicon the word 'alma' means simply 'young woman,' not necessarily 'virgin' and he said that the word for 'virgin' in the Hebrew is 'bethulah.'" He did not tell you, however, that the lexicon he uses was prepared by unbelieving critics.

Gensenius, the German orientalist and biblical critic, is described in the Encyclopedia Britannica in these words:

"To Gensenius, who was an exceptionally popular teacher, belongs in a large measure the credit of having freed Semitic philosophy from theological and religious prepossession, and of inaugurating the strictly scientific (and comparative) method.

His chief work, *Hebraisches u. Chaldaisches Handwörterbuch* (1810-1812), has passed through several editions (Eng. ed.: Francis Brown, S.R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, 1907).

Gensenius, a notorious liberal, specialized in changing the theological terminology of the Bible into that of liberals. Brown, Driver, and Briggs, translators of the lexicon in English were, all three of them, radical liberals, and two of them were tried in the Presbyterian church for outrageous infidelity."

Wilkenson reports that two of the infamous Roman Catholic scholars previously mentioned also entered into the practice of providing definitive works. "Simon and Eichhorn were co-authors of a Hebrew Dictionary."

Such infidel works are accepted because they are produced by "great scholars." They are then used by good, godly men who do not realize the price of bowing to unbelieving scholarship.

Griesbach

Another important step in subtly removing the authority of the Authorized Version is to exalt the unreliable MSS of the Local Text of Egypt. This will be commented on later. Let it suffice for now to reveal the man who laid the groundwork for just such a move. His name was J.J. Griesbach (1745-1812).

Griesbach divided the extant MSS into three groups. One was called the "Constantinopolitan" family which is our Universal Text. The other two were known as "Western" and "Alexandrian."

As can be expected, Griesbach was not a Bible believer. In fact, he stated, "The New Testament abounds in more glosses, additions, and interpolations purposely introduced than any other book."⁷⁸ He was also antagonistic to any verse which taught the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. Whenever possible he devised means to cast doubt on such passages. He said, "the most suspicious reading of all, is the one that yields a sense favorable to the nourishment of piety (especially monastic piety). When there are many variant readings in one place, that reading which more than the others manifestly favors the dogmas of the orthodox is deservedly regarded as suspicious."

It is strange indeed that Dr. Griesbach should expect orthodox Christians to manipulate the book which they truly believe to be from God, in order to teach Christianity more fervently. He never mentioned any apprehension that heretics might delete and alter doctrinal passages. What kind of scholarship is it that naturally suspects born-again Christians of an act bordering on sacrilege, but never doubts the integrity of infidels? Is *this* God's method?

Whatever it was that possessed Griesbach to suspect Christians of such criminal acts also possessed two of his followers. Hill explains:

"Westcott and Hort professed to 'venerate' the name of Griesbach above that of every other textual critic of the New Testament. Like Griesbach they believed that the orthodox Christian scribes had altered the New Testament manuscripts in the interest of orthodoxy. Hence like Griesbach, they ruled out in advance any possibility of the providential preservation of the New Testament text through the usage of believers. But at the same time they were very zealous to deny that heretics had made any intentional changes in the New Testament text. 'It will not be out of place,' they wrote, 'to add here a distinct expression of our belief that even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament, there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes.' The effect of this one-sided theory was to condemn the text found in the majority of the New Testament manuscripts and exonerate that of B and Aleph."

Thus the Local Text, supported by the Roman Catholic Church, became an authority equal to or higher than the Universal Text of the Authorized Version in *spite* of the many doctrinal changes. After all, Griesbach, Westcott, and Hort had already established that heretics never falsify Scripture--only Christians do!

As the infidelity of men such as this is accepted as authoritative, Christians begin to look to their Bible with more and more skepticism. What more could Satan desire?

Are these men to be blamed for their failure to accept the Bible as infallible, or have they been unsuspecting dupes of a plan much bigger and far more serious than they could have ever suspected? Let us see.

The Puppeteer

One man who became greatly responsible for the fall of England to a sympathetic acceptance of Roman

Catholic ideas was Cardinal Wiseman (1802-1865).

Wiseman was the prime mover in installing the Roman Catholic Church back on the shore of England. He was born and raised in England. He went to Rome to study under Cardinal Mai, the editor of the Vatican Manuscript.

Wiseman had a desire to see England return to the fold at Rome. One of the major obstacles to this was the supremacy which the Authorized Version held there. Where the Authorized Version prevails, Rome cannot.

The Puppets

While in Rome, he was visited by several Neo-Protestants. He was instrumental in "weaning" these men back into subjection to the Pope. One of his visitors was William Gladstone (1809-1898), who was to become prime minister of England. He was a man known for his change from being a Conservative to a Liberal.

Another visitor was Anglican Archbishop Trench, who returned to England to promote a revision of the Authorized Version and even joined the Revision Committee of 1871.

Still another was John Henry Newman. Newman was the brilliant English churchman who was a leader of Oxford University and the English clergy.

Newman was close friends with Herrell Froude. Froude, Wilkenson tells us, was the son of a High Churchman, "who loathed Protestantism, denounced the Evangelicals, and brought up his sons to do the same."

These two, Newman and Froude, joined affinity with John Keble. Keble, like Froude, was of High Church background. He was strongly anti-Protestant and anti-Evangelical.

Newman and Froude visited Wiseman in Rome in 1833. Having been taken in by the beautiful architecture of Rome's cathedrals and the solemn grandeur of the high masses, the two Oxford professors inquired of Wiseman as to what terms the Roman Catholic Church would require to accept the Church of England back into the Roman Church. Wiseman's reply was cold and clear: The Church of England must accept the Council of Trent. At this, Newman left Rome stating, "I have a work to do in England," a work indeed, in which he, Froude, Keble, and Edward Pusey joined forces to swing England back to Rome and to remove their primary adversary, the hated King James Bible.

Newman, brilliant man that he was, provided the strong intellectual leadership needed. Pusey was the moralist, and Keble spoke through the delicate words of the poet and captivated the hearts and minds of many an unsuspecting young scholar. Any who lacked a strong stand on Bible principles would be easy prey for these apostates.

Newman, in fact, was so taken in by the spell of Rome that he, in 1845, left the Church of England and formally joined the Roman Catholic Church, following a similar apostate, named Ward, who had written a book teaching the worship of Mary and "mental reservation." Mental reservation is the act, condoned by the Roman Catholic Church, of *lying* to keep from revealing your ties to Rome.

Wilkenson records Newman's betrayal:

"Public sentiment was again aroused to intensity in 1845 when Ward, an outstanding Tractarian, published His book which taught the most offensive Roman views, Mariolatry, and mental reservation in subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles. When Oxford degraded him from his university rights, he went over in September to the Church of Rome. It became very evident that Newman soon would follow. On the night of October 8 Father Dominic, of the Italian Passionists, arrived at

Newman's quarters in a downpouring rain. After being received, he was standing before the fire drying his wet garments. He turned around to see Newman prostrate at his feet, begging his blessing, and asking him to hear his confession. Thus the author of *Lead Kindly Light* passed over to Rome, and within one year 150 clergymen and eminent laymen also had joined the Catholic Church."

Where was Wiseman through all of this? He was naturally close at hand. In 1836, three years following Newman and Froude's visit, he had moved to Ireland to supervise the Oxford Movement through his paper, the "Dublin Review." Wiseman was described as, "a textual critic of the first rank, and assisted by the information seemingly passed on to him from the *Jesuits*, he was able to finish the facts well calculated to combat confidence in the *Protestant Bible*."

England had graduated from "revival" to "education," and her "education" had developed into her own unique "culture." From there, the Roman Catholic Church was willing to supply the *apostasy*.

Where We Stand Today

Today in colleges and churches across America and around the world, truly good, godly men who love the Lord Jesus and sincerely desire to serve Him, are unsuspectingly propagating the Roman Catholic method of textual criticism. The result is that Christian soldiers who go out to fight Rome, either with a perfect Bible which they have been taught to doubt, or else an unreliable translation of the Rome-supported Local Text, which is worthy of all suspicion.

Education in America has come to the place of either having to swallow its pride, admit it has been wrong, and return to the true Bible; or else make another more vehement attack on the Authorized Bible in hopes of finally silencing it and its supporters, in the hope of hiding its mistake. Christians be warned! The Revised Version did not ring the death note for the King James Bible. It rang the death note for England!

All of the translations before and after 1881 which were going to replace the Authorized Version lie silently in the "grave" right now. Those which do not, shall soon join their ranks in the halls of the "improved," "thoroughly reliable," "truly accurate," and "starters of a new tradition," dead. They have failed to start one revival. They have failed to induce Christians back to reading their Bibles, and have only succeeded in casting doubt on the true Word of God. The question is, can we repair the damage already done and proceed from here? The answer is YES!

Westcott and Hort

Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1903) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892) have been highly controversial figures in biblical history.

On one side, their supporters have heralded them as great men of God, having greatly advanced the search for the original Greek text.

On the other side, their opponents have leveled charges of heresy, infidelity, apostasy, and many others, claiming that they are guilty of wreaking great damage on the true text of Scripture.

The Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, by his son, Arthur, and *The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, written by his son.

We cannot blindly accept the finding of any scholar without investigating what his beliefs are concerning the Bible and its doctrines. Scholarship alone makes for an inadequate and dangerous authority, therefore we are forced to scrutinize these men's lives.

A Monumental Switch

Westcott and Hort were responsible for the greatest feat in textual criticism. They were responsible for

replacing the Universal Text of the Authorized Version with the Local Text of Egypt and the Roman Catholic Church. Both Wescott and Hort were known to have resented the pre-eminence given to the Authorized Version and its underlying Greek Text. They had been deceived into believing that the Roman Catholic manuscripts, Vaticanus and Aleph, were better because they were "older." This they believed, even though Hort admitted that the Antiochian or Universal Text was equal in antiquity. "The fundamental text of the late extant Greek MSS generally is beyond all question identical with the dominant Antiochian or Graeco-Syrian Text of the second half of the Fourth Century."

Vicious Prejudice

In spite of the fact that the readings of the Universal Text were found to be as old, or older, Westcott and Hort still sought to dislodge it from its place of high standing in biblical history. Hort occasionally let his emotions show, "I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of text, having read so little Greek Testament, and dragged on with the villainous Textus Receptus ... Think of the vile Textus Receptus leaning entirely on late MSS; it is a blessing there are such early ones."

Westcott and Hort built their own Greek text based primarily on a few uncial MSS of the Local Text. It has been stated earlier that these perverted MSS do not even agree among themselves. The ironic thing is that Westcott and Hort knew this when they formed their text!

Burgon exposed Dr. Hort's confession, "Even Hort had occasion to notice an instance of the Concordia discourse." Commenting on the four places in Mark's gospel (14:30, 68, 72, a, b) where the cock's crowing is mentioned said, "The confusion of attestation introduced by these several cross currents of change is so great that of the seven principal MSS, Aleph, A, B, C, D, L, no two have the same text in all four places."

A Shocking Revelation

That these men should lend their influence to a family of MSS which have a history of attacking and diluting the major doctrines of the Bible, should not come as a surprise. Oddly enough, neither man believed that the Bible should be treated any differently than the writings of the lost historians and philosophers!

Hort wrote, "For ourselves, we dare not introduce considerations which could not reasonably be applied to other ancient texts, supposing them to have documentary attestation of equal amount, variety and antiquity."

He also states, "In the New Testament, as in almost all *prose writings* which have been much copied, corruptions by interpolation are many times more numerous than corruptions by omission."

We must consider these things for a moment. How can God use men who do not believe that His Book is any different than Shakespeare, Plato, or Dickens? It is a fundamental belief that the Bible is different from *all* other writings. Why did these men not believe so?

Blatant Disbelief

Their skepticism does, in fact, go even deeper. They have both become famous for being able to deny scriptural truth and still be upheld by fundamental Christianity as biblical authorities! Both Westcott and Hort failed to accept the basic Bible doctrines which we hold so dear and vital to our fundamental faith.

Hort denies the reality of Eden: "I am inclined to think that no such state as 'Eden' (the popular notion) ever existed, and that Adam's fall in no degree differed from the fall of each of his descendants, as Coleridge justly argues."

Furthermore, he took sides with the apostate authors of "Essays and Reviews."

Hort writes to Rev. Rowland Williams, October 21, 1858, "Further I agree with them [Authors of "Essays

and Reviews"] in condemning many leading specific doctrines of the popular theology ... Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue. There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible."

We must also confront Hort's disbelief that the Bible was infallible: "If you make a decided conviction of the absolute infallibility of the N.T. practically a sine qua non for co-operation, I fear I could not join you." He also stated:

"As I was writing the last words a note came from Westcott. He too mentions having had fears, which he now pronounces 'groundless,' on the strength of our last conversation, in which he discovered that I did 'recognize' 'Providente' in biblical writings. Most strongly I recognize it; but I am not prepared to say that it necessarily involves absolute infallibility. So I still await judgment."

And further commented to a colleague:

"But I am not able to go as far as you in asserting the absolute infallibility of a canonical writing."

Strange Bedfellows

Though unimpressed with the evangelicals of his day, Hort had great admiration for Charles Darwin! To his colleague, B.F. Westcott, he wrote excitedly: "...Have you read Darwin? How I should like to talk with you about it! In spite of difficulties, I am inclined to think it unanswerable. In any case it is a treat to read such a book."

And to John Ellerton he writes: "But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with ... My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable. If so, it opens up a new period."

Dr. Hort was also an adherent to the teaching of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. His son writes: "In undergraduate days, if not before, he came under the spell of Coleridge."

Coleridge was the college drop-out whose drug addiction is an historical fact. "The opium habit, begun earlier to deaden the pain of rheumatism, grew stronger. After vainly trying in Malta and Italy to break away from opium, Coleridge came back to England in 1806."

One of Coleridge's famous works is *Aids to Reflection*. "Its chief aim is to harmonize formal Christianity with Coleridge's variety of transcendental philosophy. He also did much to introduce Immanuel Kant and other German philosophers to English readers."

This man, Coleridge, had a great influence on the two scholars from Cambridge.

Forsaking Colossians 2:8

Hort was also a lover of Greek philosophy. In writing to Mr. A. MacMillan, he stated: "You seem to make (Greek) philosophy worthless for those who have received the Christian revelation. To me, though in a hazy way, it seems full of precious truth of which I find nothing, and should be very much astonished and perplexed to find anything in revelation."

Lost in the Forest

In some cases Hort seemed to wander in the woods. In others he can only be described as utterly "lost in the forest." Take, for example, his views on fundamental Bible truths.

Hort's "Devil"

Concerning existence of a personal devil he wrote:

"The discussion which immediately precedes these four lines naturally leads to another enigma most intimately connected with that of everlasting penalties, namely that of the personality of the devil." It was Coleridge who some three years ago first raised any doubts in my mind on the subject - doubts which have never yet been at all set at rest, one way or the other. You yourself are very cautious in your language.

"Now if there be a devil, he cannot merely bear a corrupted and marred image of God; he must be wholly evil, his name evil, his every energy and act evil. Would it not be a violation of the divine attributes for the Word to be actively the support of such a nature as that?"

Hort's "Hell"

Rev. Hort also shrunk from the belief in a literal, eternal "hell."

"I think Maurice's letter to me sufficiently showed that we have no sure knowledge respecting the duration of future punishment, and that the word 'eternal' has a far higher meaning than the merely material one of excessively long duration; extinction always grates against my mind as something impossible."

"Certainly in my case it proceeds from no personal dread; when I have been living most godlessly, I have never been able to frighten myself with visions of a distant future, even while I 'held' the doctrine."

Hort's "Purgatory"

Although the idea of a literal devil and a literal hell found no place in Hort's educated mind, he was a very real believer in the fictitious Roman Catholic doctrine of "purgatory." To Rev. John Ellerton he wrote in 1854:

"I agree with you in thinking it a pity that Maurice verbally repudiates purgatory, but I fully and unwaveringly agree with him in the three cardinal points of the controversy: (1) that eternity is independent of duration; (2) that the power of repentance is not limited to this life; (3) that it is not revealed whether or not all will ultimately repent. The modern denial of the second has, I suppose, had more to do with the de-spiritualizing of theology than almost anything that could be named."

Also while advising a young student he wrote:

"The idea of purgation, of cleansing as by fire, seems to me inseparable from what the Bible teaches us of the Divine chastisements; and, though little is directly said respecting the future state, it seems to me incredible that the Divine chastisements should in this respect change their character when this visible life is ended.

"I do not hold it contradictory to the Article to think that the condemned doctrine has not been wholly injurious, inasmuch as it has kept alive some sort of belief in a great and important truth."

Thus we see that Dr. Hort's opinions were certainly not inhibited by orthodoxy. Yet his wayward ways do not end here. For, as his own writings display, Dr. Hort fell short in several other fundamental areas.

Hort's "Atonement"

There was also his rejection of Christ's atoning death for the sins of all mankind.

"The fact is, I do not see how God's justice can be satisfied without every man's suffering in his own person the full penalty for his sins."

In fact, Hort considered the teachings of Christ's atonement as *heresy!*

"Certainly nothing can be more unscriptural than the modern limiting of Christ's bearing our sins and sufferings to His death; but indeed that is only one aspect of an almost universal heresy."

The fact is, that Hort believed *Satan* more worthy of accepting Christ's payment for sins than *God*.

"I confess I have no repugnance to the primitive doctrine of a ransom paid to Satan, though neither am I prepared to give full assent to it. But I can see no other possible form in which the doctrine of a ransom is at all tenable; anything is better than the notion of a ransom paid to the Father."

Hort's "Baptism"

Dr. Hort also believed that the Roman Catholic teaching of "baptismal regeneration" was more correct than the "evangelical" teaching.

"...at the same time in language stating that we maintain 'Baptismal Regeneration' as the most important of doctrines ... the pure 'Romish' view seems to me nearer, and more likely to lead to, the truth than the Evangelical."

He also states that, "Baptism assures us that we are children of God, members of Christ and His body, and heirs of the heavenly kingdom."

In fact, Hort's heretical view of baptism probably cost his own son his eternal soul, as we find Hort assuring his eldest son, Arthur, that his infant baptism was his salvation:

"You were not only born into the world of men. You were also born of Christian parents in a Christian land. While yet an infant you were claimed for God by being made in Baptism an unconscious member of His Church, the great Divine Society which has lived on unceasingly from the Apostles' time till now. You have been surrounded by Christian influences; taught to lift up your eyes to the Father in heaven as your own Father; to feel yourself in a wonderful sense a member or part of Christ, united to Him by strange invisible bonds; to know that you have as your birthright a share in the kingdom of heaven."

Hort's Twisted Beliefs

Along with Hort's unregenerated misconceptions of basic Bible truths, there were his quirkish and sometimes quackish personal beliefs.

One such example is his hatred for democracy, as he asserts in a letter to Rev. Westcott dated April 28, 1865:

"...I dare not prophesy about America, but I cannot say that I see much as yet to soften my deep hatred of democracy in all its forms."

In fact, Hort's hope, during the years of the American Civil War, was that the South would win. This desire was fostered by the hope that such a victory would destroy *both* countries to eliminate America's threat to England's domination of the world. His own words betray this in a letter which he wrote to Rev. John Ellerton in September of 1862:

"I care more for England and for Europe than for America, how much more than for all the niggers

in the world! And I contend that the highest morality requires me to do so. Some thirty years ago Niebuhr wrote to this effect: 'Whatever people may say to the contrary, the American empire is standing menace to the whole civilization of Europe and sooner or later one or the other must perish.' Every year has, I think, brought fresh proof of the entire truth of these words. American doctrine (only too well echoed from Europe itself, though felt to be at variance with the institutions of Europe) destroys the root of everything vitally precious which man has by painful growth been learning from the earliest times till now, and tends only to reduce us to the gorilla state. The American empire seems to me mainly an embodiment of American doctrine, its leading principle being lawless force. Surely, if ever Babylon or Rome were rightly cursed it cannot be wrong to desire and pray from the bottom of one's heart that the American Union may be shivered to pieces.

"I do not for a moment forget what slavery is, or the frightful effects which Olmsted has shown it to be producing on white society in the South; but I hate it much more for its influence on the whites than on the niggers themselves. The refusal of education to them is abominable; how far they are capable of being ennobled by it is not clear. As yet everywhere (not in slavery only) they have surely shown themselves only as an immeasurably inferior race, just human and no more, their religion frothy and sensuous, their highest virtues, those of a good Newfoundland dog."

Hort also had no respect for prominent Americans, be they politician or preacher. Concerning President Abraham Lincoln he wrote: "I cannot see that he has shown any special virtues or statesmanlike capacities."

The great preacher D.L. Moody impressed him as follows:

"Think of my going with Gray yesterday afternoon to hear 'Moody and Sankey' at the Haymarket. I am very glad to have been, but should not care to go again. All was much as I expected, except that the music was inferior, and altogether Sankey did not leave a favourable impression. Moody had great sincerity, earnestness, and good sense, with some American humor which he mostly keeps under restraint, but in matter is quite conventional and commonplace. Much the most remarkable thing is the congregation or rather audience."

Hort's distaste for America may not be solely attributed to patriotism as much as to a tainting of his thinking by a touch of Communism. These facts are brought out in his continued correspondence with Rev. John Ellerton, circa 1850:

"I have pretty well made up my mind to devote my three or four years up here to the study of this subject of Communism."

"I can only say that it was through the region of pure politics that I myself approach Communism."

"To be without responsibility, to be in no degree our 'brother's keeper,' would be the heaviest curse imaginable."

"Surely every man is meant to be God's steward of every blessing and 'talent' (power, wealth, influence, station, birth, etc. etc.) which He gives him, for the benefit of his neighbors."

Also suspect is Hort's delving into the supernatural along with his good friend, Brooke Foss Westcott, and others in what was called the 'Ghostly Guild' (more on this later).

"Westcott, Gorham, C.B., Scott, Benson, Bradshaw, Luard, etc., and I have started a society for the investigation of ghosts and all supernatural appearances and effects, being all disposed to believe

that such things really exist, and ought to be discriminated from hoaxes and mere subjective delusions; we shall be happy to obtain any good accounts well authenticated with names. Westcott is drawing up a schedule of questions. Cope calls us the 'Cock and Bull Club;' our own temporary name is the 'Ghostly Guild.' "

Then again, it is possible that the learned doctor was influenced by more than mere philosophy, as we see in his description of a hotel in the Alps where he often vacationed:

"Pontresina, Hotel Krone; homely, but very clean and comfortable; ... beer excellent."

It is not an amazing thing that any one man could hold to so many unscriptural and ungodly beliefs. It is amazing that such a man could be exalted by Bible believing preachers and professors to a point of authority higher than the King James Bible! Dr. Hort was a truly great Greek scholar, yet a great intellect does not make one an authority over the Bible when they themselves do not even claim to believe it! Albert Einstein was a man of great intellect, but he rejected Scripture, and so where he speaks on the subject of Scripture he is not to be accepted as authoritative. Possessing a great mind or great ability does not guarantee being a great spiritual leader. Dr. Hort was a scholar, but his scholarship alone is no reason to accept his theories concerning Bible truth.

If fundamental pastors of today enlisted the services of an evangelist and found that this evangelist had beliefs paralleling those of Fenton John Anthony Hort, I believe that the pastor would *cancel the meeting*. Strangely through, when a pastor discovers such to be true about Dr. Hort, he excuses him as "a great Greek scholar" and presents his Authorized Version to him to be maliciously dissected and then discarded as Dr. Hort sets himself down in the seat of authority which the Bible once held. Here again I must assert that most often this is done with childlike faith on the part of the pastor, due to the education he received while in seminary. The seminary is not really guilty either, for they have simply and unsuspectingly accepted the authority of two men raised under the influence of a campaign by the Jesuits to re-Romanize England. Wilkenson reports that Hort had been influenced by these Roman Catholic forces: "Dr. Hort tell us that the writings of Simon had a large share in the movement to discredit the Textus Receptus class of MSS and Bibles."

Problems with Westcott

Unfortunately for the "new Bible" supporters, Dr. Westcott's credentials are even *more* anti-biblical. Westcott did not believe that Genesis 1-3 should be taken literally. He also thought that "Moses" and "David" were poetic characters whom Jesus Christ referred to by name only because the common people accepted them as authentic. Westcott states:

"No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history - I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did - yet they disclose to us a Gospel. So it is probably elsewhere. Are we not going through a trial in regard to the use of popular language on literary subjects like that through which we went, not without sad losses in regard to the use of popular language on physical subjects? If you feel now that it was, to speak humanly, necessary that the Lord should speak of the 'sun rising,' it was no less necessary that he would use the names 'Moses' and 'David' as His contemporaries used them. There was no critical question at issue. (Poetry is, I think, a thousand times more true than History; this is a private parenthesis for myself alone.)"

He also said "David" is not a chronological but a spiritual person.

That the first three chapter of Genesis are all allegory has been believed by liberals and modernists for years. Do today's Christians realize that those modernists' beliefs were nurtures in the heart of this Bible critic?

Westcott was also a doubter of the biblical account of miracles: "I never read an account of a miracle but I

seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover somewhat of evidence in the account of it."

If a great fundamental preacher of our day were to make this statement, he would be called apostate, but what then of Westcott?

Westcott believed that the second coming of Jesus Christ was not a physical coming but a spiritual coming: "As far as I can remember, I said very shortly what I hold to be the 'Lord's coming' in my little book on the Historic Faith. I hold very strongly that the Fall of Jerusalem was the coming which first fulfilled the Lord's words; and, as there have been other comings, I cannot doubt that He is 'coming' to us now."

Westcott's "Heaven"

Wait! This fundamental doctrine is not the last one to be denied by Bishop Westcott, for he believed Heaven to be a state and *not* a literal place. Note the following quotations from Bishop Westcott: "No doubt the language of the Rubric is unguarded, but it saves us from the error of connecting the Presence of Christ's glorified humanity with place; 'heaven is a state and not a place.'"

"Yet the unseen is the largest part of life. Heaven lies about us now in infancy alone; and by swift, silent pauses for thought, for recollection, for aspiration, we cannot only keep fresh the influence of that diviner atmosphere, but breathe it more habitually."

"We may reasonably hope, by patient, resolute, faithful, united endeavour to find heaven about us here, the glory of our earthly life."

Westcott's "Newmanism"

Dr. Westcott was also deeply devoted to John Newman, the Roman Catholic defector who took 150 Church of England clergymen with him when he made the change. Those of his disciples who did not make the physical change to Rome, made the spiritual change to Romanism, though many, like Westcott, never admitted it.

In writing to his future wife in 1852, Westcott wrote: "Today I have again taken up 'Tracts for the Times' and Dr. Newman. Don't tell me that he will do me harm. At least today he will, has done me good, and had you been here I should have asked you to read his solemn words to me. My purchase has already amply repaid me. I think I shall choose a volume for one of my Christmas companions."

This was written after Newman had defected to Rome!

Wilkenson adds, "By voice and pen, the teaching of Newman changed in the minds of many their attitude toward the Bible. Stanley shows us that the allegorizing of German theology, under whose influence Newman and the leaders of the movement were, was Origen's method of allegorizing. *Newman contended that God never intended the Bible to teach doctrines.*"

Westcott also resented criticism of the *Essays and Reviews*. Upon hearing the Bishop of Manchester deride the apostate authors of these heretical essays, Westcott wrote, "But his language about the *Essays and Reviews* roused my indignation beyond expression."

These are the convictions of a man greatly responsible for the destruction of Christian faith in the Greek Text of the Authorized Version. Place Mr. Westcott next to any present fundamental preacher or educator, and he would be judged a modernist, liberal and heretic. In spite of his outstanding ability in Greek, a man of his convictions would not be welcome on the campus of any truly Christian college in America. This is not an overstatement, nor is it malicious. The Christian colleges of today hold very high standards and simply would not settle for a man of such apostate conviction, no matter how great his ability to teach a given subject.

Surprising Defense

It is truly amazing that a man who believed things completely contrary to the convictions of today's fundamental preachers and educators could be exalted and defended by them. Of course, I believe this is done primarily because our fundamental brethren know little of what either Dr. Westcott or Dr. Hort really believed and taught.

Westcott's Socialism

This does not completely describe Brooke Foss Westcott, the man. He was a devout socialist and postmillennialist. Socialism and postmillennialism go hand in hand. Postmillennialism is the belief that we shall bring in the millennial reign of Christ ourselves, without Christ's help. Socialism is usually the means of establishing that thousand-year reign of peace.

A postmillennialist would see a spiritual "coming" of Christ at any great event which drew the world closer to his idea of peace. It is also easy to see why he would believe that a "heaven" was attainable down here, i.e., Westcott's statement: "We may reasonably hope, by patient, resolute, faithful, united endeavour, to find heaven about us here, the glory of our earthly life."

These are only two small glimmers of the socialistic light which burned in Westcott's breast. If they were *all* of the evidence available, it would make for a weak case indeed. They are not!

Dr. Westcott's "pacifist" nature shows early in his life. He was known as a "shy, nervous, thoughtful boy" while attending school. His hobbies were as follows: "He used his leisure chiefly in sketching, arranging his collections of ferns, butterflies, and moths, and in reading books of natural history or poetry."

He developed an interest in social reform early on. He was known about his school for talking about things "which very few schoolboys talk about - points of theology, problems of morality, and the ethics of politics."

His son, Arthur, describes him with these words: "As a boy my father took keen interest in the Chartist movement, and the effect then produced upon his youthful imagination by the popular presentation of the sufferings of the masses never faded. His diary shows how he deserted his meals to be present at various stirring scenes, and in particular to listen to the oratory of 'the great agitator,' presumably Feargus O'Connor himself. He would often in later years speak of these early impressions, which served in no small degree to keep alive his intense hatred of every form of injustice and oppression. He even later disapproved of his father's fishing excursions, because his sympathies were so entirely on the side of the fish. On one occasion, being then a little boy, he was carrying a fish-basket, when his father put a live fish into it, and later in life he used to declare that he would still feel the struggles of that fish against his back."

(The Chartist movement was a campaign for social reform in England from 1838-1848.)

This one paragraph reveals the temperament which could describe Westcott for the rest of his life:

He was ever in favor of any social reform, at any cost, as he himself stated in speaking of the French Revolution: "The French Revolution has been a great object of interest. I confess to a strong sympathy with the republicans. Their leaders at least have been distinguished by great zeal and sincerity. Lamartine, who I fancy you know by name, quite wins my admiration."

Westcott's Poetical Influences

Westcott was ever a lover of poetry and was deeply influenced by its message. This explains his admiration of Alphonse de Lamartine. Lamartine was a French poet whose writings helped influence the French people into revolution. Ironically, but I am sure not coincidentally, Lamartine had studied under *the Jesuits*.

He is a fool who thinks a poet's pen is not a mighty weapon!

Westcott's romantic attitude explains why he would make the statement that, "Poetry is, I think, a thousand times more true than history."

It also explains his susceptibility to the subtle Romanizing influence of the poet Keble. Westcott had a fondness for poetry and an unusual fondness for Keble's poetry. No poet is mentioned more often in his writings than Keble.

Westcott writes concerning Keble, "But I intend reading some Keble, which has been a great delight to me during the whole week, and perhaps that will now be better than filling you with all my dark, dark, dark gloominess."

It seems Keble's poetry inspired Westcott to see that the Church of England needed to make a change.

"I have been reading Keble for the day, and though I do not recollect noticing the hymn particularly before, it now seems to me one of the most beautiful and especially does it apply to those feelings which so often described to you: that general sorrow and despair which we feel when we look at the state of things around us and try to picture the results which soon must burst upon our Church and country."

Westcott found time to quote Keble to express his feelings.

"On these look long and well, Cleansing thy sight by prayer and faith, And thou shall know what secret spell Preserves them in their living death."

"That hymn of Keble's contains very, very much. You have read it again and again now, I am sure, and understand it."

Westcott's Romanism

That Keble formed in Westcott a passive attitude toward Christianity's arch-enemy, Rome, is evident by his reaction to a sermon condemning Popery: "As for Mr. Oldham's meetings, I think they are not good in their tendency, and nothing can be so bad as making them the vehicle of controversy. What an exquisitely beautiful verse is that of Keble's, 'And yearns not her parental heart,' etc. We seem now to have lost all sense of pity in bitterness and ill-feeling. Should not our arm against Rome be prayer and not speeches; the efforts of our inmost heart, and not the display of secular reason?"

It has been often stated that "*You are what you read.*" Westcott's constant exposure to pro-Roman influences set a pattern for his thinking, even though he may not have been aware of it. Westcott even refused to abandon Keble as his writings became more obviously Popish.

"Keble has lately published some sermons in which, as well as in a preface on 'the position of Churchmen,' I am afraid he will offend many. I can in some measure sympathize with him."

Remembering the hatred Westcott had for what he considered "injustice and oppression," and his submission to the programming poetry of Keble, we find him slipping farther away from a truly biblical stand after hearing another pro-Roman speaker, Maurice.

"See Maurice's new lectures, with a preface on development written apparently with marvelous candor and fairness, and free from all controversial bitterness. He makes a remark which I have often written and said, that the danger of our Church is from atheism, not Romanism. What a striking picture is that he quotes from Newman of the present aspect of the Roman Church - as despised,

rejected, persecuted in public opinion."

This constant barrage of Romanizing influences caused Westcott to incorporate many Roman Catholic practices into his thinking.

In February of 1849 he decided to investigate two favorite subjects of the Romanizers: "Inspiration and Apostolic Succession.

The result of the first study led to Westcott's believing the Bible to be absolutely true, but he refused to call it *infallible*.

"My dear Hort - I am glad to have seen both your note and Lightfoot's - glad too that we have had such an opportunity of openly speaking. For I too must disclaim setting forth infallibility in the front of my convictions. All I hold is, that the more I learn, the more I am convinced that fresh doubts come from my own ignorance, and that at present I find the presumption in favor of the absolute truth - I reject the word infallibility - of Holy Scripture overwhelming."

Our good Bishop has now lost the conviction that Scripture is "infallible." We are never told the result of his study of the Roman Catholic teaching of "Apostolic Succession."

Westcott's Iconism

Westcott also had an affinity for statues since his poetic spirit had the ability to read a great deal into that which he saw.

"Our Cathedral buildings at Peterborough are far from rich in works of sculpture, but among the works which we have there are two which have always seemed to me to be of the deepest interest. The one is a statue of a Benedictine monk, which occupies a niche in the gateway built by Godfrey of Croyland about 1308; the other is an effigy of an unknown abbot of considerably earlier date, carved upon the slab which once covered his grave, and which now lies in the south aisle of the choir. They are widely different in character and significance. The statue of the monk, which Flaxman took as an illustration of his lectures on sculpture, is one of the noblest of medieval figures. The effigy of the abbot has no artistic merit whatever. But both alike are studies from life; and together they seem to me to bring very vividly before us the vital power of early monasticism in England."

The Jesuit plan is to introduce the ways of Rome into the *minds* of Protestants and familiarize them with the "High Church" atmosphere. Then, little by little, allow these Roman ideas to intertwine themselves with the worship service. Dr. Wylie aptly describes the plan:

"Tract 90, where the doctrine of reserves is broached, bears strong marks of a Jesuit origin. Could we know all the secret instructions given to the leaders in the Puseyite movement, the mental reservations prescribed to them, we might well be astonished. 'Go gently,' we think we hear the great Roothan say to them. 'Remember the motto of our dear son, the cidevant Bishop Autun, "surtout, pas trop de zele". Bring into view, little by little, the authority of the church. If you can succeed in rendering it equal to that of the Bible, you have done much. Change the table of the Lord into an altar; elevate that altar a few inches above the level of the floor; gradually turn around to it when you read the Liturgy; place lighted tapers upon it; teach the people the virtues of stained glass, and cause them to feel the majesty of Gothic basilisques. Introduce first the dogmas, beginning with that of baptismal regeneration; next the ceremonies and sacraments, as penance and the confessional; and lastly, the images of the Virgin and the saints'."

This trend was quite apparent in the unsuspecting mind of Bishop Westcott. "I do not say that baptism is absolutely necessary, though from the words of Scripture I can see no exception, but I do not think we have no right to exclaim against the idea of the commencement of a spiritual life, conditionally from baptism, any more than we have to deny the commencement of a moral life from birth."

"Dear Mr. Perrott - I had sketched out a plan in my mind for the windows in the chancel at Somersham which I should have been glad to carry out, but now, as you know, my connection with the parish has practically ceased, and in a few weeks will formally cease. My wish was to have a figure of John the Baptist opposite that of the Virgin, to represent the Old Dispensation, and to have the work executed by Heaton and Butler, who executed the window for Mr. Mason."

Westcott's Purgatory

These Romanistic leanings eventually led Westcott into allowing the practice of "prayers for the dead." In writing to a clergyman in August of 1900 concerning this Roman Catholic practice which had found its way into an Anglican church, HE STATED, "I considered very carefully, in conference with some other bishops of large knowledge and experience, the attitude of our church with regard to prayers for the dead. We agreed unanimously that we are, as things are now, forbidden to pray for the dead apart from the whole church in *our public services*. No restriction is placed upon private devotions."

Notice that the Bishop advised against prayers for the dead in "public service," but he did not even attempt to discourage the practice in "private devotions!" Would one of today's fundamental preachers who have such high regard for the Westcott and Hort Greek Text respond in the same manner? Would we hear one of our Bible-believing brethren confront the matter with, 'Well, we don't practice prayers for the dead here in our services, but if you want to do it in your private devotions, it's okay.' NEVER! We are to hate the garment "spotted by the flesh." (Jude 23.) Dr. Westcott's garment is spotted to the point of resembling a leopard's skin! Are we to expect an unbiased rendering of the Greek Text by a man whose convictions would rival Jerome's in loyalty to Roman teaching?

But to allow prayers for the dead would be futile if there were only heaven and hell. The "dead" in heaven would need no prayers, and the "dead" in hell would be beyond hope.

Benjamin Wilkenson provides the missing link in Westcott's chain of Romanism when commenting on the Revised Version translation of John 14:2:

King James: "In my Father's house are many mansions."

Revised: "In my Father's house are many abiding places." (margin)

"In the following quotation from the Expositor, the writer points out that, by the marginal reading of the Revised, Dr. Westcott and the Committee referred, not to a final future state, but to intermediate stations in the future before the final one.

"Dr. Westcott in his Commentary of St. John's Gospel gives the following explanation of the words. 'In my Father's house are many mansions. The rendering comes from the Vulgate *mansiones*, which were *resting* places, and especially the *stations* on a great road, where travelers found refreshment. This appears to be the true meaning of the Greek word here; so that the contrasted notions of repose and progress are combined in this vision of the future.'

"For thirty years now,' said Dr. Samuel Cox, in 1886, 'I have been preaching what is called *the larger hope*, through good and ill report.

"The larger hope meant a probation after this life, such a time of purifying, by fire or otherwise, after death as would insure another opportunity of salvation to all men. Dr. Cox, like others, rejoices that the changes in the Revised Version sustain this doctrine. 'Had the new version been in our hands, I should not have felt any special gravity in the assertion,' he said. Doctors Westcott and Hort, both Revisers, believed this *larger hope*." (This Roman Catholic translation also appears in the NASV).

Considering the Romanist ideals which Dr. Westcott possessed, it is no surprise that his close friend and companion, Dr. Hort, would compare him to, of all people, the Roman Catholic defector, John Newman! "It is hard to resist a vague feeling that Westcott's going to Peterborough will be the beginning of a great movement in the church, less conspicuous but not less powerful, than that which proceeded from Newman."

It also seems not surprising that Westcott would call the Jesuit inspired Oxford Movement, "the Oxford Revival!" "The Oxford Revival in the middle of the century, quickened anew that sense of corporate life. But the evangelical movement touched only a part of human interest."

Westcott's Mariolatry

Another Roman Catholic doctrine is the adoration of Mary. Here also Dr. Westcott did not let the Roman Catholic Church down, as he reveals in a letter to his fiancée Sarah Louisa Whittard.

"After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill ... Fortunately we found the door open. It is very small, with one kneeling-place, and behind a screen was a 'Pieta' the size of life (i.e., a Virgin and dead Christ) ... Had I been alone, I could have knelt there for hours."

This condition is also indicated by his son, Arthur, in describing Westcott's reaction to the painting "The Sistine Madonna:"

"It is smaller than I expected, and the colouring is less rich, but in expression it is perfect. The face of the virgin is unspeakably beautiful. I looked till the lip seemed to tremble with intensity of feeling - of feeling simply, for it would be impossible to say whether it be awe of joy or hope - humanity shrinking before the divine, or swelling with its conscious possession. It is enough that there is deep, intensely deep, emotion such as the mother of the Lord may have had."

The intensity of Westcott's admiration for Christ's mother is best revealed by his desire to change his fiancée's name to "Mary" as Arthur explains: "My mother, whose name was Sarah Louisa Whittard, was the eldest of three sisters. She afterwards, at the time of her confirmation at my father's request, took the name of Mary in addition."

The above examples illustrate Dr. Westcott's strong Roman Catholic leanings. Again I must say that I do not believe that if a man lived today with the convictions we have just studied, that he would be welcome in a fundamental pulpit anywhere in America, be his name Bishop Westcott or Hort or Schuler or any other.

Westcott's Communal Living

Few of Bishop Westcott's Twentieth Century supporters know the true thoughts and intents of his heart. If they did, they would know that he was an advocate of communal living! Let the record speak for itself.

His son, Arthur, stated in his book, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*:

"In later years of his Harrow residence (approximately 1868) my father was very full of the idea of a 'Coenobium.' (Arthur's footnote for the word 'Coenobium' states simply, 'community life.') Every form of luxury was to him abhorrent, and he viewed with alarm the increasing tendency amongst all classes of society to encourage extravagant display and wasteful self-indulgence. His own extreme simplicity of life is well-known to all his friends. He looked to the family and not the individual for the exhibition of the simple life. His views upon this subject are accessible to all who care to study them. I only wish to put it on record that he was very much in earnest in this matter and felt that he had not done all he might have for its furtherance."

On the idea of the Coenobium, Bishop Westcott's socialism bordered very close to communism as we see

by his own description of what a Coenobium was to be.

"It would consist primarily of an *association of families*, bound together by *common principles of life, of work, of devotion*, subject during the time of voluntary co-operation to central control, and united by definite obligations. *Such a corporate life would be best realized under the conditions of collegiate union* with the hall and schools and chapel, with a *common income*, though not common property, and an *organized government*; but the sense of fellowship and the power of sympathy, though they would be largely developed by these, would yet remain vigorous whenever and in whatever form combination in the furtherance of the general ends was possible. Indeed, complete isolation from the mass of society would defeat the very objects of the institution. These objects - the conquest of luxury, the disciplining of intellectual labor, the consecration of every fragment of life by religious exercises - would be expressed in a threefold obligation; an obligation to poverty, an obligation to study, and obligation to devotion."

Little did the esteemed professor realize that the college students of a hundred years later would be more than happy to turn his dream into a reality!

Arthur viewed the establishment of the Coenobium with much fear and trembling. They were assured of its future reality quite often.

"My own recollections of the Coenobium are very vivid. Whenever we children showed signs of greediness or other selfishness, we were assured that such things would be unheard of in the Coenobium. There the greedy would have no second portions of desirable puddings. We should not there be allowed a choice of meats, but should be constrained to take which was judged to be best for us. We viewed the establishment of the Coenobium with gloomy apprehension, not quite sure whether it was within the bounds of practical politics or not. I was myself inclined to believe that it really was coming and that we, with the Bensons (maybe) and Horts and a few other families, would find ourselves living in a community life. I remember confiding to a younger brother that I had overheard some conversation which convinced me that the Coenobium was an event of the immediate future, and that a site had been selected for it in Northamptonshire; I even pointed out Peterborough on the map."

In a letter to his old college friend, Dr. E.W. Benson, dated November 24, 1868, Dr. Westcott states his regrets that the Coenobium had not yet been established, and wonders if he wouldn't have done better to have pursued the matter further.

"My dear Benson - alas! I feel most deeply that I ought not to speak one word about the Coenobium. One seems to be entangled in the affairs of life. The work must be for those who have a fresh life to give. Yet sometimes I think that I have been faithless to call which might have grown distinct if I had listened."

Two years later he was still promoting the idea through articles in a periodical entitled "Contemporary," as he explains in another letter to Benson dated, March 21, 1870:

"...the paper on the Coenobium will appear, I think, in the next number of the 'Contemporary.' It was a trial to me not to send it to you and Lightfoot and Wordsworth for criticism, but on the whole I thought it best to venture for myself, and speak simply what I feel. If anything is to come of the idea it will be handled variously, and something is gained even by incompleteness. On the true reconciliation of classes I have said a few words which are, I hope, intelligible."

Young Arthur's naive sounding prediction in 1868 of the establishing of such a Coenobium in Peterborough, two years later (1870) seemed almost prophetic. In December of 1868, Dr. Westcott became Examining Chaplain in the Diocese of Peterborough! Just prior to the move, he wrote Benson, "The Coenobium comes at least one step nearer."

Arthur's fears seemed somewhat realized.

"The move to Peterborough was a great venture of faith on my father's part. He had a large family to educate, and yet he exchanged the comparative opulence of a Harrow house master for the precarious income attached to a canonry in an impoverished Chapter. Our manner of life was already adapted to the idea of the Coenobium in its strict simplicity, so the only luxury that could be abolished was meat for breakfast, which however, was retained as a Sunday treat."

Thus we see a side of Dr. Westcott which is not too publicized by his followers, yet it was there nonetheless. In addition to his desire to see the Authorized Version replaced, a Romanized Church of England, and the establishment of college Coenobium, he had one other great driving force, the abolition of war.

Westcott's Peace-Movement

No Christians loves war. A Bible believer takes the premillennial view and realizes that war is caused by the sinful nature of mankind - James 4:1. He understands that this will all be changed at Christ's return - Philippians 3:21.

A Bible rejecter who has chosen the postmillennial viewpoint cannot allow himself to believe that mankind is bad. He must find a way to show that man is basically good. All men must be *brothers* in his eyes. "Brothers," he assumes, will just naturally work toward peace.

Westcott, a postmillennial socialist, had this to say concerning the "brotherhood" of man in regard to instituting "peace on earth."

"Christianity rests upon the central fact that the Word became flesh. This fact establishes not only a brotherhood of men, but also a brotherhood of nations; for history has shown that nations are an element in the fulfillment of the Divine counsel, by which humanity advances toward its appointed end."

What should these "brothers" do to help establish "peace on earth?" We can at once recognize the part which the Christian society is called upon to take with regard to three great measures which tend to peace - meditation, arbitration, and (ultimately) disarmament - and at least silently work for them.

"Combine action, in any ways possible, for the bringing about of a simultaneous reduction of the armaments."

Once again the Cambridge professor is ahead of his time. "Disarmament" has been the cry of liberal, pro-Communist college students for two decades. Strange it is that as the "peace" movement of the 1960's was led by a "minister" with the exact same philosophy about world peace!

Westcott wanted an "arbitration board" made up of the "Christian society" to decide international policy concerning disarmament quotas. He first envisioned England and the United States submitting to this idea, assuming then that the rest of the world would be forced to follow.

"The United States and England are already bound so closely together by their common language and common descent, that an Arbitration Treaty which shall exclude the thought of war - a civil war - between them seems to be within measurable distance. When once the general principle of arbitration has been adopted by two great nations, it cannot but be that the example will be followed, and then, at last, however remote the vision may seem, disarmament will be a natural consequence of the acceptance of a rational and legal method of settling national disputes."

Westcott even felt that world peace would be worth an "Ecumenical Movement."

"Other cognate subjects were touched upon -- the proposed Permanent Treaty of Arbitration

between the United States and Great Britain, the significance of war as extreme outcome of that spirit of selfish competition which follows from the acceptance of a material standard of well being, the desirability of seeking cooperation with the movement on the part of the Roman and Greek Churches -- but it seemed best to confine immediate action to a single point on which there was complete agreement."

He assumed that "world peace" was of the utmost importance.

"The proposal to work for the simultaneous reduction of European armament is definite, and deals with an urgent peril. Such a disarmament would secure the lasting and honorable peace which the leaders of Europe have shown lately, once and again, that they sincerely desire. We are all sensible of the difficulties by which the question of disarmament is beset, but we cannot admit that they are insuperable."

All this was to be done, of course, in the name of Christ. Westcott felt that he was simply trying to bring to pass Luke 2:14. He truly considered himself a man with whom God was "pleased," as that verse had been mistranslated in the Revised Version.

"The question of international relations has not hitherto been considered in the light of the Incarnation, and till this has been done, I do not see that we can look for the establishment of that peace which was heralded at the Nativity."

So here we have a man who doubted the miracles which Christ performed.

"I never read an account of a miracle, but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some what of evidence in the account of it."

Even though he doubted *Jesus Christ's* miracles, he didn't doubt that a Roman Catholic priest could perform them, as he explains what he saw in France at "Our Lady of La Salette" shrine.

"A written narrative can convey no notion of the effect of such a recital. The eager energy of the father, the modest thankfulness of the daughter, the quick glances of the spectators from one to the other, the calm satisfaction of the priest, the comments of look and nod, combined to form a scene which appeared hardly to belong to the nineteenth century. An age of faith was restored before our sight in its ancient guise. We talked about the cures to a young layman who had throughout showed us singular courtesy. When we remarked upon the peculiar circumstances by which they were attended, his own comment was: 'Sans croire, comment l'expliquer?' (translated: 'Without believing how can it be explained?') And in this lay the real significance and power of the place."

We have a man who could read and exalt a Jesuit-inspired poet, Keble, but when it came to reading anything that presented Rome in a negative light, such as *Fox's Book of Martyrs*, he said, "I never read any of Foxe's book."

He was a man who claimed, "I cannot myself reconcile the spirit of controversy and that of Christian faith."

Since controversy was "un-Christian," he refused to answer John Burgon's arguments concerning the Local Text of Alexandria which Westcott helped exalt. He simply said, "I cannot read Mr. Burgon yet. A glance at one or two sentences leads me to think that his violence answers himself."

It is a sad thing that Westcott's prejudice closed his mind to Burgon's comments. Burgon was harsh, but Burgon was correct. Time has since proven that. It is a dangerous spirit which ignores a man's FACTS just because of a "holier than thou" attitude which teaches that "anyone who is right, must be gentlemanly." Had more people in the late 1800's looked past Burgon's harsh comments and examined his FACTS, Christianity would be richer today.

We have in Brooke Foss Westcott a man who believed in communal living; a man who believed that the second coming of Christ was spiritual, heaven was a state of mind, prayers for the dead were permissible in private devotions, and that Christ came to bring peace through international disarmament. He believed in purgatory and admiration for Mary, and he thought the Bible was like any other book. *This* is the man who walked into the Revision Committee and sat in judgment of *our* Bible. He thought he saw room for improvement in the Authorized Version and offered a pro-Roman Greek text with which to correct it. The ironic thing is that Bible-believing Christian educators and preachers, who would never agree with his theology, have for years exalted his opinion of the Greek as nearly infallible. These facts alone should be reason enough to condemn Westcott and Hort, their Greek Text and the MSS which they used to arrive at such a text. But let us look at their actions concerning the molesting of the pure words of the King James Bible, in favor of Rome. Saddest of all, we have in Brooke Foss Westcott a man who neither believed in salvation by grace nor ever experienced it. There is no record in his "Life and Letters" that he ever accepted Christ as his personal Saviour. In a letter to his then future wife, he stated strongly his feelings concerning "baptism."

"My dearest Mary - I quite forget whether we have ever talked upon the subject alluded to in my last note - Baptismal Regeneration - but I think we have, for it is one of the few points on which I have clear views, and which is, I am sure, more misunderstood and misrepresented than any other. Do not we see that God generally employs means. I will not say exclusively, that He has appointed an outward Church as the receptacle of His promises, and outward rites for admission in to it, and thus for being placed in a relation with Him by which we may receive His further grace; for till we are so connected by admission into His outward Church, we have no right to think that he will convey to us the benefits of his spiritual Church, when we have neglected the primary means which He provides. It does not, of course, follow that the outward and spiritual churches are co-extensive, that all who have been placed in relation with God by Baptism, and so made heirs of heaven conditionally, will avail themselves of that relation to fulfill those conditions - and here lies the ambiguity: because a child is born again into the Church of God, as he has been born into the world before, people seem to conclude that he must discharge all the duties of his new station, which in temporal matters we know he does not. By birth he may, if he will, truly live here; by baptism he may if he will, truly live forever. I do not say that Baptism is absolutely necessary, though from the word of the Scripture I can see no exception, but I do think we have a right to exclaim against the idea of the commencement of a spiritual life, conditionally from Baptism, any more than we have to deny the commencement of a moral life from birth."

As has already been established, both Drs. Westcott and Hort were hostile to the true Greek text of the King James Bible. Dr. Westcott has been unconsciously influenced into a pro-Roman Catholic attitude. It must also be pointed out that earlier Dr. Hort had been a student of Dr. Westcott's, as Arthur Westcott points out: "Another of Westcott's private pupils was F.J.A. Hort."

The meticulous care with which he taught his pupils is noted by Dr. Whewell, Master of Trinity at the time, "The pains he bestows upon his pupils here (private pupils) is unparalleled, and his teaching is judicious as well as careful."

The common desire of these two Cambridge scholars was to eliminate the authority of the Universal Greek Text of the King James Bible. Scholars had long sought to do this, but were baffled by the obvious evidence testifying that the Universal Text was indeed the true text of the Bible, and in that, a preservation of the original autographs. These scholars, subtly influenced by Rome, knew that their duty was to overthrow this pure, Protestant, Christ-honoring text and replace it with the Local Text of Alexandria, Egypt, but the overwhelming evidence was always weighted in God's favor. No one, even the Roman Catholic Church, could find a way to explain why 95% of all extant MSS belonged to the Universal Text. "Textual criticism" was at a standstill until this roadblock could be circumvented.

Hort's Fiction

It was the genius of Fenton John Anthony Hort which rode to the rescue of the forlorn Roman Catholic text. This man used the same method to overthrow the authority of the Universal Text that Charles Darwin

used to overthrow the fact of creation. He used a *THEORY!*

His theory was that the "originals" agreed with the Local Text, and that this Local Text was "edited" by the Syrian church at Antioch in the Fourth Century to become what we know as the Universal Text, and then forced upon the people by the church council.

Just as was true for Darwin, common sense, all available facts, and the nature of God testified against his theory. Just as Darwin did, he collected minute scraps of evidence, then twisted and magnified his evidence, and theorized that he was right. Just as Darwin did, his theory was manufactured in his head, and INDEPENDENT of historical facts and evidence.

Just as Darwin, his theory was overwhelmingly accepted by the overeducated men of his day who were looking for a way of overthrowing God's authority. The theory of evolution was music to the ears of scientists, biologists, and college professors who resented the thought of creation. The sound of "God did it; that settles it" just naturally mustered all of the animosity and rebellion that is resident in the human flesh (Romans 7:18). When Darwin issued his theory to the world, the world was happy to believe the lie.

The same thing was true of Christian scholarship. They had long resented the thought that God could or would preserve His Word without their help. Like the lost scientists, they begrudgingly had to acknowledge that the evidence and facts of history were in favor of the Authorized Version. The issuing of Hort's theory, with the backing of Dr. Westcott, was heralded as the "liberation" of textual criticism. Dr. Alfred Martin explains the delight of liberals which existed upon learning of Hort's theory:

"Men who had long denied the infallibility of the Bible - and there are many such in the Church of England and in the independent churches - eagerly acclaimed a theory which they thought to be in harmony with their position.

"At precisely the time when liberalism was carrying the field in the English churches the theory of Westcott and Hort received wide acclaim. These are not isolated facts. Recent contributions of the subject - that is, in the present century - following mainly the Westcott-Hort principles have been made largely by men who deny the inspiration of the Bible." ¹⁷⁴

Like Darwin's theory, different viewpoints using his theory arrived at different conclusions. This, Dr. Martin records, Hort knew: "Hort freely admits this and concedes that 'in dealing with this kind of evidence equally competent as to the same variations'."

Of course, the fact of different conclusions did not hamper Hort's followers. They were not interested in *establishing a new* conclusion. They were interested in abolishing an old one, i.e., that the King James Bible is the Word and the words of God.

A textual critic is not like a man driving an automobile to a destination which only he knows. He is more like a little child standing behind the wheel who doesn't particularly care where he goes, just as long as HE is doing the driving. Dr. Martin exposed this tendency: "Their principle method, an extreme reliance upon the internal evidence of readings, is fallacious and dangerous, because it makes the mind of the critic the arbiter of the text of the Word of God."

The feeling of power, to be the judge of God's Word, coupled with the old nature which exists in the flesh of all men, even in Christian scholars, becomes overwhelming to the mind. As Paul stated in Romans 7:18, "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh), dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not." Jeremiah concluded in chapter 17, verse 9, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?" Even a saved man has bad flesh. Give this flesh the authority to change God's Word, and he will soon plant himself on God's throne. As it has been said "Put a beggar on horseback, and he will ride off at a gallop."

Scholarly Prejudice

Another similarity between Hort's theory and Darwin's theory is that it is still held in high esteem long after it has been *disproven*. Darwin's theory has long ago suffered irreparable damage by historical evidence, the Word of God, and of course common sense. Yet, scientists have doggedly upheld it as reliable. This is not done because they feel that Darwin's theory will ever lead them to the truth, but because Darwin's theory leads them away from the authority they so detest, the *Bible*.

Hort's theory has been just as ill-handled by the truth, as Dr. Kurt Aland points out:

"We still live in the world of Westcott and Hort with our conception of different recensions and text-types, although this conception has lost its *raison d'être*, or, it needs at least to be newly and convincingly demonstrated. For the increase of the documentary evidence and the entirely new areas of research which were opened to us on the discovery of the papyri, mean the end of Westcott and Hort's conception."

Dr. Jacob Geerlings, who has extensively studied the manuscript evidence of the New Testament, states concerning the Universal Text:

"Its origins as well as those of other so-called text-types probably go back to the autographs. It is now abundantly clear that the Eastern Church never officially adopted or recognized a received or authorized text and only by a long process of slow evolution did the Greek text of the New Testament undergo the various changes that we can dimly see in the few extant uncial codices identified with the Byzantine (i.e. Majority) Text."

Dr. David Otis Fuller concludes, "Thus the view popularized by Westcott and Hort before the turn-of-the-century, that the Majority Text issued from an authoritative ecclesiastical revision of the Greek text, is widely abandoned as no longer tenable."

As previously quoted, Dr. Martin has stated, "The trend of scholars in more recent years has been away from the original Westcott-Hort position."

In spite of new evidence, historical facts, and God's continued blessing of the Authorized Version, Christian scholars still exalt the theory as though it were the truth. This is not done because they feel that Hort's theory will eventually lead them to the true Word of God. Any honest, "Christian" scholar today who upholds Hort's outmoded theory will be glad to tell you that there is no perfect translation of "the Bible" in English today. They will admonish each new translation as "a step in the right direction," but even the newest translation is not without errors. This attitude is due to the fact that man's human nature resents the idea that God could preserve His words without the help of "good, godly Christians," and from the natural resistance of men to be in subjection to God. The supporters of Westcott and Hort possess a loyalty which borders on cultic, as Dr. Martin again has faithfully pointed out:

"The theory was hailed by many when it came forth as practically final, certainly definitive. It has been considered by some the acme in textual criticism of the New Testament. Some of the followers of Westcott and Hort have been almost unreasoning in their devotion to the theory; and many people, even today, who have no idea what the Westcott-Hort theory is, or at best only a vague notion, accept the labors of those two scholars without question. During the past seventy years it has often been considered textual heresy to deviate from their position or to intimate that, sincere as they undoubtedly were, they may have been mistaken."

This cultic bent was even observed by Hort's friend, Professor Armitage Robinson, in 1891 who stated that a "kind of cult" had sprung up around the venerated old scholar.

To criticize either Dr. Westcott or Dr. Hort is almost sacrilegious in their eyes. We can almost hear Dr. Westcott's own words, "I cannot myself reconcile the spirit of controversy and that of Christian faith." This

he used as a defense against the "fanatics" who think that the Bible is perfect. Once accepted, pride makes the decaying process almost irreversible. As any parent knows who has questioned their guilty son or daughter, being caught "red-handed" is not nearly as difficult for the child to take as is *admitting that they have been wrong*.

Freedom Then Slavery

Just prior to the translation of the King James Bible, England had broken free of the yoke of Rome. Shortly after the Authorized Version was published, England once again started down the road back to Rome. For a brief "parenthesis" in English history, England was free of Roman influence just long enough to translate and propagate a perfect Bible.

As we have seen, by the latter half of the Nineteenth Century, England had again, bit-by-bit, fallen to Roman influence. The Romanizing effects of the Oxford Movement, the corrupt tracts of Newman, Pusey, and other pro-Romanists, the decisions by the Privy Council in favor of the anti-scriptural position of the "Essays and Reviews" had wrought their desired effect. In 1845, Newman made a formal break with the Church of England to join the Roman Catholic Church. His decision influenced 150 Church of England clergymen to do the same. In 1850, the aggressive Roman Catholic Cardinal Wiseman who had done so much to lead Newman to Rome, and had directed the Oxford Movement via his paper, "Dublin Review," had been commissioned by the Pope to formally re-establish the Roman Catholic Church on the shores of England.

England had come from the Bible-honoring, Rome-rejecting position of the Reformation, to the ritualistic, pro-Roman attitude which mistrusts and condemns the Bible.

England was ripe for revision!

The Trap is Set

In 1870, the Convention of the Church of England commissioned a revision of the Authorized Version. A gleam of hope shone in the eye of every Roman Catholic in England and the Continent. An eager anticipation filled every Jesuit-inspired, Protestant scholar in England. Although it was meant to correct a few supposed "errors" in the Authorized Version, the textual critics of the day assured themselves that they would never again have to submit to the divine authority of the Universal Text.

In November of 1870, Westcott testified of just such a spirit in a letter to Dr. Benson, "In a few minutes I go with Lightfoot to Westminster. More will come of these meetings, I think, than simply a revised version."

The Convocation had instructed the Revision Committee NOT to deal with the underlying Greek text of the Authorized Version. They were instructed to do as follows: (1) to introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the King James Bible, and (2) to limit ... the expression of any alterations to the language of the Authorized Version.

Westcott and Hort had other plans. They had edited the corrupt Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts of the Local Text of Alexandria and produced their own Greek text. Wisely they had never published it. Thus its existence was unknown to the world, and Westcott and Hort did not have to worry about the investigative eyes of their contemporary scholars, such as Dean John Burgon. Had it been published earlier, it assuredly would have been exposed as corrupt and unfit for translation into English. Drs. Westcott and Hort were definitely "wise as serpents," but unfortunately they were equally as harmful.

Scholarly Deceit

Since the Committee had been instructed not to deal with matters of the Greek text, and the Westcott and Hort text had not been published, it was necessary for the two Cambridge Catholics to submit it little by little to the Committee. Even this was done in secret.

In order to establish their own Greek text as authoritative, they first planned the strategy prior to the first meeting of the Committee. Their old friend Bishop Lightfoot was even there to help as Westcott notes in a letter to Hort dated May 1870, "Your note came with one from Ellicott this morning ... Though I think the Convocation is not competent to initiate such a measure, yet I feel that as 'we three' are together it would be wrong not to 'make the best of it' as Lightfoot says ... There is some hope that alternative readings might find a place in the margin."

The next month he wrote to Lightfoot himself: "Ought we not to have a conference before the first meeting for revision? There are many points on which it is important that we should be agreed."

They then secretly submitted their text to the Committee members, and stayed close by their sides to see to it that their scheme was carried out. This fact, Dr. Wilkenson attests to:

"The new Greek Testament upon which Westcott and Hort had been working for twenty years was, portion by portion, secretly committed into the hand of the Revision Committee. Their Greek text was strongly radical and revolutionary. The Revisors followed the guidance of the two Cambridge editors, Westcott and Hort, who were constantly at their elbow, and whose radical Greek New Testament, deviating the furthest possible from the Received Text, is to all intents and purposes the Greek New Testament followed by the Revision Committee. This Greek text, in the main, follows the Vatican and Sinaiticus Manuscripts."

These actions reek of Jesuit underhandedness. Although Westcott and Hort were men of scholarship, they were not men of integrity.

Defending the Infidel

For the most part, Westcott and Hort found a welcome audience to their abolition of the Universal Text, for the spirit of the revision had been set when the Christ-denying, Unitarian preacher, Dr. Vance Smith, was seated on the Committee.

Dr. Hort shared his feelings concerning Smith's appointment with co-conspirator Lightfoot. "It is, I think, difficult to measure the weight of acceptance won before the hand for the Revision by the single fact of our welcoming an Unitarian."

Westcott exposed his loyalty to apostasy when he threatened to quit if the Convocation were successful in ejecting Smith from the Committee.

"I never felt more clear as to my duty. If the Company accepts the dictation of Convocation, my work must end. I see no escape from the conclusion."

Wilkenson records Smith's comments concerning Isaiah 7:14: "This change gives room to doubt the virgin birth of Christ. The meaning of the words of Isaiah may, therefore, be presented thus: 'Behold the young wife is with child.'"

Dr. Smith called the belief in Christ's second coming an error. "This idea of the Second Coming ought now to be passed by as a merely temporary incident of early Christian belief. Like many another error, it has answered its transitory purpose in the providential plan, and may well, at length, be left to rest in peace."

Dr. Westcott felt that doctrine was unimportant. He believed that he as a scholar should decide the text, then theologians could add their remarks afterwards. He stated, "I hardly feel with you on the question of discussing anything doctrinally or on doctrine. This seems to me to be wholly out of our province. We have only to determine what is written and how it can be rendered. Theologians may deal with the text and version afterwards."

What did Westcott think of Smith's theological beliefs? "Perhaps we agree in spirit but express ourselves differently. At least we agree in hope."

This last statement may very well hold more truth than Westcott intended. It may help here to point out that the Church of England defector to Rome, Dr. Newman, was asked to be on the Committee, but he refused.¹⁹³ This should reveal the true spirit which the revisors had in their attempt to "bring the Bible up-to-date."

This is not the first revision Newman was asked to sit in on. In 1847, two years after defecting, Cardinal Wiseman, the militant Roman Catholic priest, wrote him this from Rome: "The Superior of the Franciscans, Father Benigno, in the Trastevere, wishes us out of his own head to engage in an English Authorized Translation of the Bible. He is a learned man and on the Congregation of the Index. What he wished was, that we would take the Protestant translation, correct it by the Vulgate ... and get it sanctioned here."

Strangely enough, the desire of Wiseman, to "correct" the Authorized Version with Jerome's corrupt Vulgate, is exactly what Protestant scholars did in 1881, 1901, 1952, 1960, 1973, and in every "new" and "improved" translation since 1611.

Westcott and Hort were so successful at their secret task of subtly guiding the decision of the Revision Committee that many Committee members did not suspect that they had been used by the Cambridge duo to help destroy the authority of the Authorized Version and give the world yet another Roman Catholic Bible. Philip Mauro records:

"In view of all the facts it seems clear that, not until after the Committee had disbanded, and their work had come under the scrutiny of able scholars and faithful men, were they themselves aware that they had seemingly given their official sanction to the substitution of the "New Greek Text" of Westcott and Hort for the Textus Receptus. The Westcott and Hort text had not yet been published, and hence had never been subject to scrutiny and criticism; nor had the principles upon which it was constructed been investigated. Only after it was too late were the facts realized, even by the Revisors themselves."

It can be safely said that if Westcott and Hort were not two Jesuit priests acting on secret orders from the Vatican, that two Jesuit priests acting under such orders *could not have done a better job of overthrowing the authority of God's true Bible and establishing the pro-Roman Catholic text of Alexandria, Egypt!*

It is truly amazing in light of all the evidence of their apostasy, that Westcott and Hort should be so revered by modern scholarship. It is strange indeed that men who believe in the premillennial return of Christ would defend men who did not. That men who believe that salvation is by grace through faith could uphold men who not only did not believe in it, but sadly, did not experience it. It is amazing that men who believe with all their heart that the Bible is the Word of God could be so blind to the infidelity to the Word of these two men.

Revival in America is still possible, but like Jacob told his household in Genesis 35:2,3: Christian scholarship must "put away the strange gods" and "go up to Bethel."

The Authorized Version

Christian Critics

In this chapter we will be looking at some of the common misrepresentations of the Authorized Version. Many of these misrepresentations are unintentional. Most of the comments against the Authorized Version are, in fact, simply repetitions of what the commentator heard from a pulpit, read in a book, or learned in a classroom.

Most of the fervency against the Authorized Version is not so much due to a conscious hatred against

the Book, as much as it is a show of one's education. This fact, which is a conscious malice, is then coupled with the "flesh" or "natural man," which may be an unconscious malice, to form a constant antagonism toward the true Word of God. This "old nature" exists in every person, even Christians. It will not change until the rapture. This nature manifests itself in an innate desire not to submit to the authority of God.

Satan realizes this and uses it to his own advantage by giving the flesh ammunition to fight a battle which it naturally wants to fight. The sad result of this spirit of judgment is that the Word of God never really gets a fair trial.

Inspiration vs. Preservation

Today it is widely taught and accepted that God wrote the originals perfectly, but that there is no perfect translation. Yet, there is no scripture that teaches any such thing! This teaching is based on logic, man's logic. Christian educators of today say that it is absurd to believe that God could use sinful men to translate His Word perfectly. Such a supposition of a perfect translation is no more absurd than the teaching that God used sinful men to write the Bible perfectly in the originals! *Every argument for inerrant, infallible inspiration applies also for inerrant, infallible preservation.* It is the same God!

If a believer in perfect inspiration says that God overpowered the writers' ability to make a mistake, the believer in perfect preservation can also state that God overpowered the translators' ability to make a mistake. It can also very happily be pointed out that a man who claims that God preserved His Words can *at least PRODUCE* what he claims to believe in!

Put Up or Shut Up

I personally believe that God has perfectly preserved His Word in the King James or Authorized Version. I can at least produce a King James Bible to show what I believe in. Any person who claims that God inspired the original autographs perfectly, cannot produce those original manuscripts to prove it! I do not believe that the King James Bible is a new inspiration. "Inspiration" starts with a blank sheet of paper, a man of God, and God. I am saying that the Authorized Version is every word of God that was in the original autographs, preserved to this day. "Preservation" starts with God's manuscripts, a man of God, and God. The end result of both is the same: the perfect Word and words of God. It only makes sense.

Many of today's preachers and self-proclaimed scholars slam their fists down on their pulpits in simulated "righteous indignation" while holding a Bible over their heads and loudly proclaim, "This Book doesn't 'CONTAIN' the word of God, it *IS* the Word of God! Perfect! Infallible! Without admixture of error!" to the delight of the *audience*. But ask them, while *out* of their pulpit, if they believe that THE BOOK IN THEIR HAND is truly without error, and they immediately go into a song and dance routine about "just a translation *OF* the Bible" and say something about "Forever, O LORD, thy word is settled *in heaven*." Try pressing the issue, and they will question your authority to do so (Matthew 21:23), and if you persist you will be labeled a "Ruckmanite."

All for simply believing that this "godly man" really believed what he had said when he was performing behind his pulpit!

Unwilling Allies

We have studied the history of the MSS, of the New Testament, and the historical plans and attempts to overthrow God's preservation of His Word. We have seen that the vast majority of MSS and of historical evidence points to the Authorized Version as God's preserved Word. Still, there is an air of antagonism against the Authorized Version. Strange as it may seem, the only things which Roman Catholics, apostates, Protestants, and Christians can agree on is that the King James Bible should be eliminated! This striking truth in itself should be enough to shock born-again Christians into scrutinizing their position to make sure of which side of the fence they are on. When we find ourselves aligned with Satan's church against Scripture, we find ourselves in a very dangerous position. This is especially true when we consider what the result would be if these groups were successful in abolishing the King James Version. The elimination of

the Authorized Version finds us without a Bible, at which time we find Rome rushing to the rescue with her 1582 Jesuit translation, and the anti-God Local Text of Alexandria. Knowing that no fundamentalist would consciously use a Roman Catholic Bible, the Roman Church has obliged us by changing the cover to Revised Version, American Standard Version, Good News for Modern Man, the Living Bible, the Amplified Bible, the Jerusalem Bible, the Common Bible, the New International Version, the New Scofield Reference Bible, and many more. The story is true; the names have been changed to protect the guilty.

Sowers of Discord

Rome realized that there is not one of these new Roman Catholic translations which will ever replace God's Authorized Version. Her plan is to get any one of these translations to replace the Authorized Version in any group of Christians. Let the Christians use one of the Revised Standard Version's "twin sons," the New American Standard Version or the New International Version. Convince the young people that they cannot understand the "thees" and "thous" in God's Authorized Version and hand them a "Good News for Modern Man" or a "Living Bible." Promote each new translation of the Local Text of Alexandria, Egypt, as "thoroughly reliable" or "more accurate," until the Authorized Version is removed from the hearts of Christians little by little.

How many young "preacher boys" have had their faith in God's PERFECT Word trampled and destroyed while they sat in *independent, fundamental* Bible colleges where they thought that they were safe?!

How many found themselves, upon graduation three or four years later indebted to their "alma mater" for teaching them what the "originals really said" and in so doing saved them from being drawn into that group of "King James fanatics," that "lunatic fringe," that "cult"?

They found themselves leaving college with the confidence (?) that the Book under their arm was NOT perfect, and thanking God for the school that had shown them that!

The only person happier than they were was the Pope. After all, who wants someone who speaks with authority? (Mark 1:22)

Many Shall Come

It must be remembered at this time that every new Bible is introduced as being "better than the Authorized Version." It may also be noted that every false prophet is introduced as "better" than Jesus Christ. Mohammed had supposedly come to finish the work which Christ began. Charles Manson claimed that he was Jesus Christ. Sun Nyung Moon claims to have finished the job which Jesus Christ failed to finish. Jim Jones claimed to be Jesus Christ. The Beatles claimed to be more popular than Jesus Christ.

Notice that Jim Jones did not claim to be Mohammed. Notice that Moon did not claim to be the replacement for Buddha. All of the false prophets attack Jesus Christ. Notice that the Good News for Modern Man does not claim to be better than the American Standard Version, but it does claim to be better than the Authorized Version. Notice also that the New International Version does not claim to be better than the American Standard Version; it claims to be better than the Authorized Version. A false prophet can always be recognized, because he attacks the true prophet. A false Bible can be recognized, because it attacks the true Bible.

The Super Sack Philosophy

The claims of the new Bibles are strikingly similar to the claims of the famous "Super Sack" grocery bag which has swept the country. The bag producers wanted to cut production costs. The "old reliable" double bag was just about indestructible when it came to doing its job, but it was too costly to produce. The manufacturers came up with the idea of producing an inferior product but calling it "superior."

It has happened to us all. One day, on a trip with our wives to the grocery store, we picked up our groceries and noticed the bag. It wasn't a double bag! "They've made them cheaper," we thought. Then we noticed an official looking statement on the side: "This new Super Sack is made from a new high strength paper. There is *no double bagging needed.*"

"Well," we realized, "then it isn't an inferior product after all. It's new and better. That's good to know."

We "bought the pitch." In our trusting, childlike manner, we believed that the "Super Sack" was better than the "old reliable" double bag, just because someone told us that it was.

"This new Super Sack ... *no double bagging needed.*"

How many times have these words echoed through my head as I heard a horrifying, tearing sound. I watched as the cans rolled across the grocery store parking lot. I watched the flour break open in the back seat of the car. After getting the survivors into the car, we headed for home.

"This new Super Sack ... *no double bagging needed.*"

We hear that sound! We watch broken eggs as they pour their contents out into the driveway. The cereal has broken open, and now the neighbors dog picks up our last package of hamburger. We make a wild dash for the house, leaving a trail of canned goods, broken jelly jars, and spilled milk in our wake. We arrive at the back door holding nothing more than a large piece of brown paper with words on the side reading: "This Super Sack is made from a new high strength paper. There is *no double bagging needed.*"

At times like that, standing there, surveying the damage, I can hardly frame the proper words with which to thank the manufacturers for blessing me with this wonderful, new, improved "Super Sack."

This "Super Sack" philosophy has existed in the field of Bible translations for years.

Every new translation published appears first with a giant "media campaign" directed at the Christian community. This campaign is designed to tell the Christians that they "need" this new translation, because the Christians do not know it. This is not an overstatement but is proven true by the Preface to the New American Standard Version of 1963. The last paragraph in the Preface begins with this statement:

"It is enthusiastically anticipated that the general public will be grateful to learn of the availability, value and *need* of the New American Standard Version." (Emphasis mine.)

The Lockman Foundation has admitted translating a Bible that the general public doesn't know that it needs! It is intended for the general public to realize that they "need" this Bible when they read the advertisement. This is just like a laundry detergent.

The Sales Pitch

Let us look into the way in which this "Bible advertising" works.

We read a few Christian periodicals and observe that a new translation has been published. It is, of course, compared to the Authorized Version. The "mistakes" of the Authorized Version are revealed to show us the "need" for a new translation. Next, this new translation is unveiled with exclamation of "thoroughly reliable," "true to the Original Greek," and "starting a new tradition." We read but are skeptical.

We proceed to the "Bible" book store to look over this new translation. After having the "sales pitch" from the man behind the counter, we leave carrying a grocery bag (Super Sack) full of "new," "modern," "easy to read" translations in which we are assured that "all of the fundamentals can be found." On the way home, we decide to try out these "more accurate," "Christ exalting" versions.

The Let Down

We meet a Jehovah's Witness. In the following discussion we try to convince him that Jesus Christ was not a created God. He shows us John 1:18 in his "New World Translation." It reads that Christ was the "only begotten God." We snicker. "That's just your version," we say, reaching for a New International Version. To our amazement it also reads "only begotten God!"

Being fully embarrassed, we change the subject to the trinity. "I John 5:7!" we exclaim. Now we've got him! We turn to I John 5:7 in the "Good News for Modern Man." "There are three witnesses," it says.

Our Jehovah's Witness asks, "So, what does that teach?" We stammer, "Wait a minute," as we reach for a New American Standard Version. "And it is the Spirit who bears witness, because the Spirit is truth."

"So how is the trinity taught from *that* verse?" he demands.

With our face glowing red and phrases like "thoroughly reliable" and "faithful to the originals" spinning through our head, we desperately grab a New King James Version.

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one." I John 5:7.

"There it is! There it is!" We exclaim, "See there, the Trinity!"

"Read the footnote on it," he states calmly. "Out loud!"

"The words from 'in heaven' (v. 7) through 'on earth' (v. 8) are from the Latin Bible, although three Greek mss. from the 15th Century and later also contain them."

"You see," says our adversary, "it doesn't belong there."

Thankfully he hasn't got any more time to talk, and he leaves.

We tear our "Super Sack" slightly as we pick it back up and head for home, not quite understanding what has taken place. In our mind we hear the Bible store salesman saying, "But I can find the fundamentals in these new versions."

Devastating Revelations

In an attempt to boost our own morale, we try to lead a man to Christ. We tell him the simplicity of conversion. We relate to him how easy it was for the Ethiopian eunuch. We open a Revised Standard Version to show it to him. We read Acts 8:36 and then the next verse, verse 38. "Wait just a second; I seem to have skipped over a verse," we say apologetically.

We read verse 36, then carefully run our finger across the line to the next verse, verse 38! There is no verse 37! This eunuch never believed on the Lord Jesus Christ!

"Excuse me," we apologize. "I seem to have picked up the wrong Bible." We lay down the Revised Standard Version and pick up the New American Standard Version. We read again. This time we arrive at verse 37.

It says, "See footnote."

"No thank you!" we say to ourselves.

Having lost his train of thought, our lost friend walks off shaking his head and wondering why

Christians don't know their Bibles better.

Of all things, we run into an infidel before we can reach the safety of our home.

"Jesus Christ was not God in the flesh," he states.

"Oh yes He was!" we retort confidently, happy to have the opportunity to redeem ourselves for the bad showing earlier.

"Look at I Timothy 3:16."

We pick the Living Bible.

"But the answer lies in Christ, who came to earth as a man...."

"There's no 'God' in that verse," he declares.

The statement of the salesman comes to mind again. "But I can find the fundamentals in these."

"Where?" we ask ourselves returning to the Revised Standard Version.

"He was manifested in the flesh...."

"Where is God?" demands our infidel. We wonder the same thing!

"He appeared in human form," says the Good News for Modern Man.

"He who was revealed in the flesh," states the New American Standard Version.

"Where is God?" demands our infidel with finality.

"I don't know. I really don't know," we reply with our heads down in sorrow.

We drag our wounded spirits home. Words cannot describe our "gratitude" to the Lockman Foundation and all the rest of those "godly, conservative scholars" who gave us these "accurate, reliable, true to the original" translations. We hear a horrifying, tearing sound as we reach the back door.

The next morning the garbage man finds a garbage bag full of brand new, unused "Bibles" covered by a large, torn piece of brown paper with the words on the side saying: "This new Super Sack is made from a new high strength paper. There is *no double bagging needed.*"

No thank you, we will stick with our "old, reliable" King James, 1611.

The story has been an allegory, but the philosophy it describes is very true.

Common Complaints

We shall now look at some of the complaints against the Authorized Version. Remember, being able to "find the fundamentals" in a version is not enough. This was the claim of the corrupt Revised Version! As Wilkenson points out, "There are many who claim that the changes in the Revised Version did not affect any doctrine."

The problem with this statement is that even if the major doctrines can be found in these new Roman Catholic Bibles, these doctrines always appear in a watered down form.

Yes, the blood of atonement can be taught in spite of the removal of the word "blood" from Colossians 1:14. The doctrine of the blood atonement is found in other passages. The danger is this. Where the Authorized Version teaches a given doctrine in maybe thirty different places, the New American Standard Version may teach the same doctrine in only twenty. The New International Version may only teach this doctrine in fifteen passages. The next "new and improved" version may teach it only three or four, until it is reduced to only one passage. How then can we teach a new convert this "major" doctrine from only one passage?

All of the doctrines, which today's Christians claim to be able to "find" in these new translations, have been taught to these same Christians through the use of a King James Bible. How will the next generation of Christians learn pure doctrine from a watered down Bible? How can we even call something a "major" doctrine which is taught only in one or two verses?

Remember, Satan is not worried at all about what people think of Jesus if he can just keep us from being able to prove that He was virgin born, shed His blood for our sins, rose from the dead, or is coming back physically. Without scripture to prove the above, Jesus was just a man.

The new Bibles have no blood in them, no Lord, no second coming, nor other vital doctrines. In other words, the new Bibles have all of the convictions of B.F. Westcott.

"The Scholar Scam"

Many Christian educators, (especially scholars) claim that the scholarship of today is greater than that of the days of King James. How can they say such a thing? How can men who say that the Bible teaches that everything will get worse and worse with time claim that education is the exception? We see the signs of apostasy all around us. They are evident in world economic systems. They are evident in educational systems. They are evident in the apostasy of religious groups which were formerly loyal to the Bible. They are evident in the worldly learning's of many once separated Christian colleges. Are we to believe that "scholarship" has avoided the "downhill progress?" That is far from being realistic.

Scholar for scholar, the men on the King James translating committee were far greater men of God than Westcott, Hort, or any other new translator. They were not only educated in a powerful, anti-Roman atmosphere, but they looked at the MSS which they handled as the Holy Word of God. They state such in the Dedicatory to King James:

"So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish persons at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us, because we are poor instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; or if, on the other side, we shall be maligned by self-conceited brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil...."

As can be seen, they considered themselves "unworthy instruments," for these were humble men.

Compare the words of the King James translators to the pride of the anonymous Lockman Foundation:

"The producers of this translation were imbued with the conviction that interest in the American Standard Version should be renewed and increased. Perhaps the most weighty impetus for this undertaking can be attributed to a disturbing awareness that the American Standard Version of 1901 was fast disappearing from the scene. As a generation "which knew not Joseph" was born, even so a generation unacquainted with this great and important work has come into being. Recognizing a responsibility to posterity, the Lockman Foundation felt an urgency to rescue this noble achievement from an inevitable demise, to reserve it as a heritage for coming generations, and to do so in such a form as the demands of passing time dictate. It is enthusiastically anticipated that the general public will be grateful to learn of the availability, value and need of the New American Standard Bible. It is released with the strong confidence that those who seek a knowledge of the scriptures will find

herein a source of genuine satisfaction for a clear and accurate rendering of divinely-revealed truth." 196

The mysterious Lockman Foundation seems not only to believe that they have done us a great service, but seems also to feel that we "ignorant" members of the general public should be grateful to them for their "clear and accurate" translation. Of course we are grateful. We are just as grateful to the Lockman Foundation as we are to the manufacturers of the "Super Sack." Their products seem to be equal in quality.

What about all of the modern versions of the Bible? What foundation are they built upon? Princeton Theological Seminary textual critic Dr. Bruce Metzger (see picture to the right), who is behind the Greek text used in translating the modern versions of the Bible, writing to Dr. Kirt D. DiVietro testified that the text they founded their work on was that of Westcott and Hort. He wrote, "**We took as our base at the beginning the text of Westcott and Hort and introduced changes as seemed necessary on the basis of MSS evidence.**"

Modern versions are erected on the faulty foundation of doubt! Here's why I say that. Westcott and Hort **speculated**, with no evidence to support their idea, that the "pure" text of the New Testament had been lost. They said that the Antiochian text (also called the Traditional Text, Textus Receptus, etc.), the text type behind the King James New Testament, was an artificial and arbitrarily invented text, fabricated between 250 A.D. and 350 A.D. In fact, Westcott and Hort asserted that it remained lost until the 19th century when Vaticanus was rediscovered 1845 in the Vatican library, where it had lain since 1481 and Sinaiticus was discovered in a wastebasket in St. Catherine's Monastery in 1844.

Figure it out. If you believe their conjured theory, that means people were without the Word of God for 1500 years! Therefore, the question must be, **were Westcott and Hort correct?** Had the Word of God been lost for 1500 years?

Dr. F. H. A. Scrivener wrote:

"Dr. Hort's System is entirely destitute of historical foundation....We are compelled to repeat as emphatically as ever our strong conviction that the hypothesis to whose proof he has devoted so many laborious years, is destitute not only of historical foundation, but of all probability..." (Dr. F. H. A. Scrivener's Plain Introduction, 1883, pp. 537, 542).

Further, he stated;

"There is little hope for the stability of their imposing structure (speaking of Westcott & Hort), **if its foundations have been laid on the sandy ground of ingenious conjecture.** And, since barely the smallest vestige of historical evidence has ever been alleged in support of the views of these accomplished editors, their teaching must either be received as intuitively true, or dismissed from our consideration as precarious and even visionary." (Dr. F. H. A. Scrivener's Plain Introduction, 1883, p. 531).

In summary, I have chosen to use the English Bible that is built on **the solid foundation of faith**, believing that God has preserved His Words in the Masoretic Hebrew text and the Textus Receptus Greek text, and that the King James Bible "preserves" in the English language, by accurate translation that preserved Hebrew Masoretic and Textus Receptus Greek texts.

By the same token, I must say that if you hold to a modern version of the Bible, you have chosen **the sandy ground of ingenious conjecture**. The critical scholars behind the modern versions do not believe that God preserved His Words as He said He did. In fact, **they are not sure where His Words are.** They are frantically revising, adding, deleting, modifying, and changing God's Words as is right in their own eyes.

Will you choose the solid foundation of faith or the sandy foundation of doubt?

Once the foundation is laid the building begins! Those who are building on the **foundation of doubt** have a **low regard for the Scriptures** while those who are building on the **foundation of faith** have a **high regard for the Scriptures**.

A LOW REGARD FOR THE SCRIPTURES

Would you trust a preacher or a Bible scholar who said **the Bible was just a book like any other book**? I hope that not a single person listening or reading this would trust him. Yet, millions of Christians, who use the modern versions of the Bible, essentially trust the judgment of those who treat the Bible as just another book. Here's proof...

Dr. Edward Hills wrote, "Westcott (picture to the right) and Hort followed an essentially naturalistic Method. Indeed they prided themselves on **treating the text of the New Testament as they would that of any other book**, making little or nothing of inspiration and providence." (Edward F. Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, pp. 65,66).

In other words, they treated the Bible just like they would the works of Plato, Shakespeare, C. S. Lewis, J. K. Rowling or any other fallible book. In fact, neither believed in the infallibility of the Bible.

Brooke Foss Westcott stated emphatically, "No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history - I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did."

Further he wrote, "I never read of the account of a miracle but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some want of evidence in the account of it." (*Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*; page 216) Again Westcott said, "**I reject the word infallibility of Holy Scriptures overwhelmingly**." (*The Life and Letters of Brook Foss Westcott*, p.207).

Concerning Fenton John Anthony Hort (picture to the right), Dr. Wilbur Pickering writes, "**Hort did not hold to a high view of inspiration**." (*The Identity of the New Testament Text*, p.212).

Some might protest that the low regard of the Scriptures held by Westcott and Hort has nothing to do with the modern versions of today. You are wrong.

First, the new Bible versions are built on the Greek New Testament compiled by them.

Secondly, current day New Version Potentate Princeton Theological Seminary Professor Bruce Metzger has a low regard for the Scriptures as well. He doubts Moses alone authored the Pentateuch. As Co-editor of the *New Oxford Annotated Bible RSV* he wrote or approved of notes asserting that the Pentateuch is "a matrix of myth, legend, and history" that "took shape over a long period of time" and is "not to be read as history." Job is called an "ancient folktale." And the book of Isaiah was written by at least three men. Jonah is called "popular legend." Then add to that that Metzger claims that the Gospels are composed of material gathered from oral tradition. The problem is, he completely ignores the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and the testimony of the Bible itself!

Exodus 24:4 "And Moses wrote all the words of the LORD, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel."

John 7:19 Jesus said, "Did not Moses give you the law, and *yet* none of you keep the law? Why go ye about to kill me?"

Matthew 12:40 Jesus said, "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

Let me ask you a question. **How can you trust a Bible that has been tampered with by men who neither**

respect it nor hold it in any higher regard than they would the works of Shakespeare? The answer is clear, you cannot.

A HIGH REGARD FOR THE BIBLE

I have a high regard for the Scriptures. I believe it stands forever. **Isaiah 40:8** "The grass withers, the flower fades: but the word of our God shall stand for ever."

I believe that through the Word of God people are born again. **John 20:31** "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." **Romans 10:17** "So then faith *cometh* by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." **1 Peter 1:23** "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which lives and abides forever.

I will not align myself with those who profane the Scriptures. **The King James Bible is founded upon Traditional Text types collated by men who had a high regard for the Bible.** Consider for instance, the often-maligned **Desidarius Erasmus**. He wrote the following in the Preface to his Greek New Testament, which clearly shows he revered and loved the Holy Scriptures...

"These holy pages will summon up the living image of His mind. They will give you Christ Himself, talking, healing, dying, rising, the whole Christ in a word; they will give Him to you in an intimacy so close that He would be less visible to you if He stood before your eyes." (*An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*; Robertson; p. 54)

Erasmus also wrote this:

"Therefore if you will dedicate yourself wholly to the study of the Scriptures, if you will meditate on the law of the Lord day and night, you will not be afraid of the terror of the night or of the day, but you will be fortified and trained against every onslaught of the enemy." (*Advocates of Reform: From Wycliffe to Erasmus*; Matthew Spinka; p. 304: by way of Sorenson; *Touch Not The Unclean Thing*)

Further he proclaimed,

"Christ Jesus...is the true light, alone shattering the night of earthly folly, the Splendor of paternal glory, who as he was made redemption and justification for us reborn in him, so also was made Wisdom (as Paul testifies): 'We preach Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Gentiles foolishness; but to them that are called, both Jew and Greeks, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God.'" (*Advocates of Reform: From Wycliffe to Erasmus*; Matthew Spinka; p. 309: by way of Sorenson; *Touch Not The Unclean Thing*)

There are others to consider, such as Theodore Beza. Does anyone doubt the fact that Theodore Beza had a high regard for the Bible? The reason I bring this up is that the King James translators are said to have worked primarily from his 5th edition of the Received Text by Beza. If you do have any doubts about where Beza stood, I challenge you to read his book, *The Christian Faith*. He says this: "**On the subject of the Word of God, the canonical books of the Old and New Testament...proceed from the mouth of God Himself.**"

I use the King James Bible because it is built upon texts that were collated by people who had a high regard for the Word(s) of God. Further, it is the most meticulous English translation ever produced.

Next, let's consider the manuscripts that were used. The modern versions are built on...

A FEW CORRUPT MANUSCRIPTS

Bruce Metzger tells how they developed their Greek text for the modern versions. He said, "**We took as our base at the beginning the text of Westcott and Hort and introduced changes as seemed necessary on the basis of MSS evidence.**"

So, what manuscripts did Westcott and Hort use to get their Greek New Testament? They used primarily two old 4th century manuscripts for their work. Hort's partiality for Codex Vaticanus (B) was practically absolute. Intuitively (without evidence) he believed it to be a near perfect representation of the Greek New Testament. Whenever pages were missing in Vaticanus he would use Codex Sinaiticus (ALEPH) to fill in the gap. And there was plenty missing from Vaticanus. Barry Burtons writes in his book *Let's Weigh the Evidence* -- "it omits...Matthew 3, the Pauline Pastoral Epistles (1 & 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon), Hebrews 9:14 to 13:25, and all of Revelation... in the gospels alone it leaves out 237 words, 452 clauses and 748 whole sentences, which hundreds of later copies agree together as having the same words in the same places, the same clauses in the same places and the same sentences in the same places." Floyd Jones further notes that Matthew 16:2-3 and Romans 16:24 are missing.

Here is another interesting fact. "It contains the Epistle of Barnabas...which teaches that water baptism saves the soul." (Which Version is The Bible? by Floyd Jones; published by Global Evangelism of Goodyear Arizona; p. 68).

"Erasmus knew about Vaticanus B and its variant readings in 1515 AD while preparing the New Testament the New Testament Greek text. Because they read so differently from the vast majority of mss which he had seen, Erasmus considered such readings spurious." (Which Version is The Bible? by Floyd Jones; published by Global Evangelism of Goodyear Arizona; p. 68). Further, as I understand it, Vaticanus was available to the translators of the King James Bible, but they did not use it because they knew it is unreliable..." It wasn't until 1889-1890 that a complete facsimile was made. The manuscript remains in Vatican City to this day.

Here is a key fact you should know about **Codex Vaticanus (B)** -- "**The entire manuscript has had the text mutilated, every letter has been run over with a pen, making exact identification of many of the characters impossible.**" More specifically, the manuscript is faded in places; scholars think it was overwritten letter by letter in the 10th or 11th century, with accents and breathing marks added along with corrections from the 8th, 10th and 15th centuries. Those who study manuscripts say, **All this activity makes precise paleographic analysis impossible.** Missing portions were supplied in the 15th century by copying other Greek manuscripts. How can you call this manuscript "the oldest and the best."

This is a picture of the Hebrews 1 from the 4th Century Codex Vaticanus. Though hard to see in this size, notice the marginal note between the first and second column. A corrector of the text had erased a word in verse 3 and substituted another word in its place. A second corrector came along, erased the correction, reinserted the original word, and wrote a note in the margin to castigate the first corrector. The note reads, "Fool and knave, leave the old reading, don't change it!"

What about **Codex Sinaiticus (ALEPH)**? This is a Greek manuscript of the Old and New Testaments, found on Mount Sinai, in St. Catherine's Monastery, which was a Greek Orthodox Monastery, by Constantine Tischendorf. He was visiting there in 1844, under the patronage of Frederick Augustus, King of Saxony, when he discovered 34 leaves in a rubbish basket. He was permitted to take them, but did not get the remainder of the manuscript until 1859. Konstantin Von Tischendorf identified the handwriting of four different scribes in the writing of that text. But that is not the end of the scribal problems! The early corrections of the manuscript are made from Origen's corrupt source. **As many as ten scribes tampered with the codex.** Tischendorf said he "counted 14,800 alterations and corrections in Sinaiticus." Alterations, and more alterations, and more alterations were made, and in fact, most of them are believed to be made in the 6th and 7th centuries. So much for the oldest!

"**On nearly every page of the manuscript there are corrections and revisions, done by 10 different people.**" He goes on to say, "**...the New Testament...is extremely unreliable...on many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40, words are dropped...letters, words even whole sentences are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately canceled. That gross blunder, whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same word as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the New**

Testament."

Here are several examples of *di homoeotéleuton omissions*. The word *di homoeotéleuton* is Greek for "because of a similar ending." Here are some examples of the sloppy work of the scribes.

Note: In the following passages the italicized, bold words are omitted in Sinaiticus...

1 Cor. 13:1-2. Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, ***I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.*** **2** ***And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity,*** I am nothing.

Here the scribe had copied the verse up to the end of the *first* "and have not charity," but when he looked up to his example again to continue copying, his eye fell upon the *second* occurrence of the phrase, from which he continued, omitting all of those words between the two occurrences of the phrase.

Now a more complicated example:

1 Cor. 15:25-27. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. **26** The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. **27** ***For he hath put all things under his feet.***

Here it is not immediately clear what has happened. But when it is known that in some early manuscripts the order of clauses is as shown below, once again we see that the scribe's eye has jumped from the first occurrence of a phrase to the second occurrence:

For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. ***For he hath put all things under his feet.*** The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.

And in the very next verse another such omission:

1 Cor. 15:27-28. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did subject unto him all things. **28** ***And when there shall be subjected unto him all things,*** then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

These *di homoeotéleuton* omissions number about 300 in the New Testament of Codex Sinaiticus. They are not taken seriously as various readings by the editors of critical editions and in fact are not even mentioned in the notes of the critical editions of currently used translations. (Information <http://www.bible-researcher.com/faulty.html>).

While these manuscripts may be (or may not be) old, it is obvious that they are corrupt. **It is these corrupt manuscripts that form the basis to the modern Bible versions.**

However, that is NOT the case with our King James Version of the Bible. It is based on...

MASSIVE MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE

While it is true that there are about 45 to 50 Greek manuscripts that support the Westcott/Hort Greek text that underlies the modern versions of the Bible, you must realize that there are more than 5000 that support the Textus Receptus type text that underlies our King James Bible. Figure it out. 99% of all the manuscript evidence supports the text type that the King James Bible is translated from. Further, this text type is overwhelmingly supported by the early church fathers.

Christian friends, there is no doubt in my mind that underlying the King James New Testament is a superior Greek text!

While there are many more things that could be said, this will be my final point, that relating to the method of translation.

FORMAL EQUIVALENCY – A SUPERIOR METHOD OF TRANSLATION

The King James Bible translators used a superior method in translating called **formal equivalency**. Formal Equivalence, sometimes called Verbal Equivalence is a method of translation, which takes the Greek, and Hebrew words and renders them as closely as possible into English. This is the method used by the King James translators and is certainly a superior method, seeing that our Lord is concerned about every word, even the jots and tittles (Matthew 5:18; 24:35).

DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCY & PARAPHRASING – AN INFERIOR METHOD OF TRANSLATING

The modern versions of the Bible use **dynamic equivalency**, also called **concept inspiration** in their translations. Dynamic Equivalence is not following a word for word translation but changing, adding, or subtracting from the original to make it flow as the translator sees fit. We are warned against this in the Bible (**Deuteronomy 4:2; Proverbs 30:5-6; Revelation 22:19**). The New International Version is this type of a version.

Then, there is one further step that is even worse and that is **paraphrasing**. Paraphrasing is simply taking what the text says and rewriting it to what you think it says. It is more like a condensed commentary than a Bible. The most popular paraphrase is the *Living Bible*. It is really not a translation at all!

I use the King James Bible because it certainly is superior in its translation. There is much more that could be said, but I will save that for another time. Therefore I will move to the summary.

The King James Bible is built on the foundation of faith by men who had a high regard for the Bible, Massive manuscript evidence to support their work. They meticulously translated the Greek and Hebrew words, rendering them as closely as possible into English.

The Modern versions are built on a foundation of doubt by men who have a low regard for the Bible. A few corrupt manuscripts were used to support their work. For the most part, they loosely translated the concepts of the Greek and Hebrew and some versions are even sloppier, not translating at all but paraphrasing.

Genuine Scholarship

As stated earlier, the translation of the King James Bible was achieved at a "parenthesis of purity" in English history. It was produced during a brief period following the overthrow of Roman authority and prior to the apostasy of the Church of England. It was translated in the era when the still young English language was at its height of purity. Dr. McClure succeeds in aptly describing this esteemed company of translators:

"As to the capability of those men, we say again, that, by the good providence of God, their work was undertaken in a fortunate time. Not only had the English language, that singular compound, then ripened to its full perfection, but the study of Greek and of the Oriental tongues and/or rabbinical lore had then been carried to a greater extent in England than ever before or since."

"This particular field of learning has never been so highly cultivated among English divines as it was at that day. To evidence this fact, so far as necessary limits will admit, it will be requisite to sketch the characters and scholarship of those men, who have made all coming ages their debtors. When this pleasing task is done, it is confidently expected that the reader of these pages will yield to the conviction, that all of the colleges of Great Britain and America, even in this proud day of

boastings, could not bring together the same number of divines equally qualified by learning and piety for the great undertaking. Few indeed are the living names worthy to be enrolled with those mighty men. It would be impossible to convene out of any one Christian denomination, or out of all, a body of translators on whom the whole Christian community would bestow such a confidence as is reposed upon that illustrious company, or who would prove themselves as deserving of such confidence. Very many self-styled "improved versions" of the Bible, or of parts of it, have been paraded before the world, but the religious public has doomed them all, without exception, to utter neglect."

As Dr. McClure has already stated, to fully appreciate the depth of true scholarship present at the translation of the King James Bible, it is necessary to investigate the character of the individuals on the translating committee. His excellent book, *Translator Revived*, will be the primary source of the following brief biographical comments.

The King James Apocrypha

Another one of the assaults on the Authorized Version is that the early editions contained the Apocrypha between the Old and New Testaments. In defense, we shall list the seven reasons why the Apocrypha was NOT considered inspired by the Authorized Version translators. The reasons assigned for not admitting the Apocryphal books into the Canon, or list, of inspired Scriptures are briefly the following:

1. Not one of them is in the Hebrew language, which was alone used by the inspired historians and poets of the Old Testament.
2. Not one of the writers lays any claim to inspiration.
3. These books were never acknowledged as sacred Scriptures by the Jewish church and, therefore, never sanctioned by our Lord.
4. They were not allowed among the sacred books, during the first four centuries of the Christian church.
5. They contain fabulous statements, and statements which contradict not only the canonical Scriptures, but themselves; as when, in the two books of Maccabees, Antiochus Epiphanes is made to die three different deaths in as many places.
6. It includes doctrines in variance with the Bible, such as prayers for the dead and sinless perfection.
7. It teaches immoral practices, such as lying, suicide, assassination, and magical incarnation.

For these and other reasons the Apocryphal books, which are all in Greek, except one which is extant only in Latin, are valuable only as "ancient documents, illustrative of the manners, language, opinions, and history of the East."

We see then that the King James translators did not accept the books of the Apocrypha as inspired by God.

The Greek Game in Action

Still another complaint against God's Authorized Version is the manner in which certain Greek words have been translated. Today's "God-honoring" scholars "love the Lord and His Bible" but are quick to point out and attack any seeming inconsistency in translation in the Authorized Version. Even the most infinitesimal Greek article is attacked under the guise of seeking to give a more "grammatically correct" translation. This is the claim consistently made by the translating groups, such as the anonymous Lockman Foundation.

This is all very noble sounding. It puts into one's mind a picture of these "hard working scholars" slaving away to remove all of the "mistakes" from the Authorized Version so that we can finally have the pure "Word of God." This is the farthest thing from the truth. The truth is that the new "Bibles" are translated by men who first, desire to eliminate the detested Authorized Version and second, though never admittedly, to make money in the "Bible business." Sad as that is to think, it is true.

The problem with their hypercritical examination of the Authorized Versions is that the *same scrutiny* is *never* applied to their *own work*.

The Greek Game in Reverse

Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, who is known for being very Burgonian in his comments, is nonetheless an outstanding authority in manuscript readings. In several of his works, he has done no more than to examine the new translations under the same unyielding eye with which the modern translators examine the Authorized Version.

Before examining any of his findings and the evidence of the critical apparatus of Nestle's 23rd edition, it must first be remembered that the present day translations and translators act under the premise that the Nestle's Greek New Testament is the closest to the original text. Nestle's text is basically Westcott and Hort's text, which is in turn primarily Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, as Dr. Wilkenson has recorded.

"It was of necessity that Westcott and Hort should take this position. Their own Greek New Testament upon which they had been working for twenty years was founded on Codex B and Codex (Aleph), as the following quotations show:

"If Westcott and Hort have failed, it is an overestimate of the Vatican Codex, to which (like Lachman and Tregelles) they assign the supremacy, while Tischendorf may have given too much weight to the Sinaitic Codex."

All modern translators give B and Aleph unbalanced superiority, assuming them to be more accurate because they assume that they are older.

They unfortunately overlooked the fact that the Universal Text has MSS just as old, plus the backing of the church fathers. They also seem not to realize that Egypt is NOT the location for the pure text - old manuscripts maybe, but *not* pure readings.

Modern translators build their arguments for changing the Authorized Version readings around two very loose rules:

1. The oldest reading is best.
2. The majority reading is best.

This sounds very good except for one small problem. What happens when the *oldest* reading conflicts with the *majority*? The answer is: Do what you want as long as you do *not* agree with the Authorized Version. This is not an over statement, but it describes the animosity which modern scholarship has for the text of the Authorized Version.

Following will be examples of translations in which modern translators break all their own rules of translating in order to eliminate the readings of the Universal Text of the King James Bible.

The readings to be examined are those which have been pointed out by Dr. Ruckman. We shall compare his references to the footnotes in the critical apparatus of Nestlé's 23rd Edition, unless he states such evidence already. The English translation to be examined will be the New American Standard Version, since it is the one which is assumed by most Christians to be sound.

First, the verse to be discussed will be quoted from the Authorized Version, then it will be quoted from the New American Standard Version. The word, words, or passage in question will be italicized.

Mark 1:2

AV: "As it is written in the *prophets*, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee."

NASV: "As it is written in *Isaiah the prophet*, Behold, I will send my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way."

Here the New American Standard Version sticks with the premise of using the "oldest" reading. The phrase, "Isaiah the prophet" appears in the Hesychian (Local Text) family represented primarily by B, C, and Aleph.

The problem arises when you *read* the remainder of verse two and then verse three, the Old Testament quote in verse two is *NOT* from Isaiah! It is quoted from Malachi 3:1. Verse *three* is from Isaiah. (Isaiah 40:3) Malachi plus Isaiah does *not* equal "Isaiah the prophet;" it equals "the prophets."

The reading "the prophets" is found in W along with the Textus Receptus (Universal Text) which is represented by E, F, G, and H in the gospels. It is also found in the *majority* of witnesses. Also it was cited in 202 A.D., 150 years *before* Vaticanus or Sinaiticus.

Immediately we run into the problem of the "oldest" versus the "majority." It happens though that *neither* of these two groups is to be judged just because of what they represent. The *deciding* factor is, which group reads with the Universal Text? That group is the correct group.

In sticking with the Local Text, the Lockman Foundation has managed to *print a Bible with a MISTAKE in it!* It is obvious that the reading "Isaiah the prophet" is wrong, because Isaiah never said what is quoted in verse two.

Why would anyone try to hide the quote by Malachi? Dr. Ruckman explains, "You see, the quotation from Malachi was reference to Jehovah God the Father! If anyone were to find this reference, they would see that "thy" and "thee" of Mark 1:1,2 is the "me" of Malachi 3:1!" 253

Thus the deity of Christ is hidden in the New American Standard Version even though it claims to "confirm" the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Unfortunately for the egos of the nameless Lockman Foundation, the Lordship of Jesus Christ was "confirmed" in the wilderness in Matthew chapter four, and God did not have to wait over 1900 years for them to "confirm" it.

Luke 24:51

AV: "And it came to pass while he blessed them, he was parted from them and *carried up to heaven.*"

NASV: "And it came about that while He was blessing them, He parted from them."

Here we see a portion of Scripture where both the "oldest" and "majority" texts *read in favor* of the Authorized Version. The inconsistent Lockman Foundation has omitted the phrase "and carried up into heaven" (kai ephereto eis ton houranan) which is *in* P75, a papyrus MS of the *second* century, as well as the entire Receptus family, plus A, B, C, E, most other witnesses, and every Latin copy.

On what "weighty" evidence does the Lockman Foundation remove the bodily ascension of Jesus Christ? On the weight of *ONE* copy of Sinaiticus and *ONE* copy of D.

As stated before the only rule which is *consistently* kept by supposed "godly Christian scholars" is the practice of attacking the Authorized Version reading because it upholds the deity of Christ.

It might be advisable for us to look at Acts 1:1,2.

"The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach.

"Until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen:"

You will notice that Luke claims that his "former treatise" (the gospel of Luke) ended with a record of Jesus being "taken up." But in the New American Standard Version's translation of Luke's gospel, Jesus Christ does *NOT* ascend, but He is left standing flat-footed on the Mount of Olives. Thus, we see that if the gospelist, Luke, could examine both a King James Bible and a New American Standard Version, he would quickly expose the New American Standard Version as a fraudulent adulteration of his 'former treatise.'

In other words, "If the King James Bible is good enough for the disciple Luke, then it's good enough for me!"

Luke 24:52

AV: "And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy."

NASV: "And they returned to Jerusalem with great joy."

In the case of "And they worshipped him" (proskunesantes auton), the New American Standard Version translators actually *lose* a witness, for in Luke 24:52 even Aleph joins the innumerable mass of witnesses in favor of the King James translators' scholarship. This leaves D to stand alone against several *thousands* of MSS which uphold the deity of Christ.

With evidence like this, it seems somewhat hypocritical to hear "good, godly men" deride Erasmus for using only five MSS, which represented the oldest and the majority, to collate his text, a text which *upholds* our Savior. While here we see the Lockman Foundation's corrupters use a *minority* of the *minority* to attack two major doctrines of the Bible, the bodily ascension and the deity of Christ.

The argument may be forwarded that "I can still *find* these doctrines in the New American Standard Version." Yes, but *not* in as many places as in the Authorized Version. There is *NO* Bible which upholds Christ's deity as much as the Authorized King James Version.

2 Timothy 2:15

AV: "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

NASV: "Be diligent to present yourself approved to God as a workman who need not to be ashamed, handling accurately the word of truth."

The critics of the Authorized Version often complain that the scholars of the translation of 1611 have translated a Greek word with an English word which supposedly does not correspond with the correct meaning. This makes the modern translators seem very sincere in that they present themselves as if they would *never* do such a thing. Here in 2 Timothy 2:15 we find them guilty of that very thing for which they assail the King James translators.

The Greek word the King James translators translate "rightly dividing" (orthotomeo) means just that. *The Analytical Greek Lexicon* (Zondervan 1970) has it as "to cut straight." There is *no* Greek evidence for the two words "handling accurately." The Greek word for 'handle'(pselapho) is found in I John 1:1. The

Greek word for "accurate" (*doloo*) *does not appear in the Bible*. These two words together in *no way* resemble the Greek word used in II Timothy 2:15 and correctly translated "rightly dividing." As Dr. Ruckman points out, "The Greek word for 'rightly dividing' is found in all four families of manuscripts, all cursives and uncials, of any century." Nestle's Greek Text *does not even give* an alternate reading!

The question which naturally arises in our mind is, "Why would anyone want 2 Timothy 2:15 to read "handling accurately?" The answer is found in the preface to the New American Standard Version in which it (the NASV) is called a translation of "linguistic accuracy."

In other words the Lockman Foundation says, "Be diligent to present yourself approved to God as a workman who does not need to be ashamed, handling accurately the word of truth." The Lockman Foundation then says that IT has handled God's Word accurately! To pat one's self on the back so often and so obviously must make for tired arms.

Let us look at a word change which is designed to keep the Roman Catholic Church "in business."

James 5:16

AV: "Confess your *faults* one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."

NASV: "Therefore, confess your *sins* to one another, and pray for one another, so that you may be healed. The effective prayer of a righteous man can accomplish much."

Confession of *sins* has been a teaching of the Roman Catholic Church for centuries.

The Greek word for "faults" (*paraptomata*) is found in MSS E, F, G, H, S, V, Y, and Omega, plus the rest of the Receptus family and the *greater* number of all remaining witnesses. Nestle's text inserts "sins" (tax *amartias*) with NO manuscript authority, and the misguided men of the Lockman Foundation *accept it with no evidence*. Perhaps there are more Jesuits lurking in the shadows than we think! Anyone accepting an alternate reading with *no evidence* CANNOT be credited with acting ethically or scholarly.

One last passage shall suffice:

John 9:35

AV: "Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe on the *Son of God?*"

NASV: "Jesus heard that they had put him out; and finding him, He said, 'Do you believe in the *Son of Man?*'"

Here once again the "conservative scholars" of the New American Standard Version and other "Bibles" have attempted to water down the deity of Christ.

The word for "God" (*Theou*) is found in MSS E, F, G, H, S, V, Y, Omega, Theta, the majority of the remaining miniscules, most of the remaining witnesses, plus the entire Latin tradition.

The Greek word "man" (*anthropou*) is upheld by one Twentieth Century Greek scholar.

It is strange indeed that the Lockman Foundation is quick to strip Jesus Christ's Godship away from Him. Here, the "conservative" scholars of the secret Lockman Foundation are in complete agreement with the "liberal" scholars of the Revised Standard Version. These are strange bedfellows! I am certainly glad

that the translators of the Christ-exalting Authorized Version never "slept" in this bed.

This is, of course, NOT a "God-honoring" translation. I know that the deity of Christ "can be found" in other places in the New American Standard Version, but it now "can be found" in one *less* place than in the Authorized Version.

Would John, in penning the gospel that is intended to exalt Jesus Christ as God, use the term "Son of Man"? Dr. Ruckman explains:

"One of the great critical dictums for correcting the A.V. 1611 Greek manuscripts is that 'one should always choose language and expressions most characteristic of the author.' Well, what in the world would possess a man who was acquainted with John's style (in the Gospels), to suddenly write "Son of man" where Jesus is dealing with a sinner on matters of doctrinal belief? Is this characteristic of John? It isn't in any 20 passages, anywhere, in the Gospel of John! "The Son of God" is the correct reading, and the ASV, RSV, and all the new 'Bibles' are greatly in error, 'not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.'"

The Apostle John NEVER called Jesus Christ the "Son of Man" anywhere in his gospel when dealing with a doctrinal belief. Furthermore, the context of the book defines the correct translation in that the multitude cried for Jesus Christ's crucifixion in John 19:7 because "he made himself the Son of God." (Greek: huion Theos heauton epoinsen.) This statement so struck the already frantic Pilate, that "he was more afraid" (John 19:8) at which time he hurried back to where Jesus Christ was waiting and asked, "Whence art thou?" Pilate realized that there was something supernatural about Jesus Christ. It is too bad the elusive Lockman Foundation has never come to such a realization.

We have looked at only a *few* passages where modern translators have made unwarranted changes in God's Word. The result is a change in doctrine. It is evident then that, no matter *what* Bible salesmen may say about being able to "find" the fundamentals in *any* of the new translations, they are still *weaker on doctrine* than the God-honoring Authorized Version. I repeat, EVERY new "Bible" is *doctrinally weaker* than the King James Authorized Version. Why then should any school or preacher use a "Bible" in which they must "search" to prove doctrines which are more than evident in the King James Bible? If we honor Jesus Christ, then we should just naturally choose and use the Bible which honors Him the most. In case after case, the Christ-honoring Bible is found to be the King James Bible.

Virtue, Not Fanfare

Finally, it must be remembered that the Authorized Version is the only Bible ever released without fanfare.

The Revised Version, the American Standard Version, the Revised Standard Version, the New American Standard Version, the Living Bible, the Good News for Modern Man, the New International Version, the New King James Version, and all other new translations have been published with a great advertising "blitz." They have all attempted to replace the Authorized Version in the study, in the pulpit, in memorization, and in the hearts of believers. They have all failed. Those which have not failed are destined to fail, except for *one*.

The Counterfeits

To explain the last statement, let us look at a few facts. For every truth which God has, Satan has many counterfeits and then one *ultimate* counterfeit. Look at the following example:

God's Truth	Satan's Counterfeits	Satan's Ultimate Counterfeit
One God	Many "gods"	Satan is "god" of this world

One Christ	Many "anti-Christ's"	<i>The Antichrist</i>
One Church	Many false churches	One ultimate church, Rome
One Bible (AV)	Many "Bibles" (ASV, NIV, etc.)	One ultimate false "Bible"

We see from the above example that there is one *true* God. Satan has many false "gods" for people in this world to worship. Satan himself is the *ultimate* "false god."

We further see that there is one true Christ. Satan has many spirits of anti-Christ. During the tribulation there will be a manifestation of "the Antichrist."

God has one true church made up of born-again believers. Satan has many congregations serving him on this earth today. During the tribulation the ultimate Satanic church located in Rome (Babylon the Great) will again be in power.

God has preserved His Words in one Bible. Satan has many "Bibles." I believe it seems certain that someday in the future he will have one ultimate Satanic "Bible." It will probably be called a "New Authorized Version."

Notice that in the examples above, the "many" counterfeits seem to run in conjunction with the Church Age. Satan's *ultimate* counterfeit is always manifested during the Great Tribulation when the Holy Spirit has ceased to deal with mankind. I believe that there is a time when Satan will have an anti-bible exalted as the true Word of God just as surely as he will have an Antichrist exalted as the Son of God. It seems likely that this will not take place until the great Tribulation. Until then, *God* will be exalted, *Jesus Christ* will be exalted, *Christ's church* will be exalted, and the *Authorized Version* will be exalted.

The ASV "Bust"

In spite of the publicity campaigns to sell "Bibles," they all fail. The American Standard Version is a prime example. It was heralded as a replacement for the King James when it was published in 1901. Twenty-three years later it went broke and sold its copyright to the National Council of Churches. Was God's hand on this "Bible?" If so, WHY wasn't it accepted and used by Christianity even MORE than the Authorized Version? Was Satan able to overcome God's Will? If God's hand was not on the American Standard Version, why would the Lockman Foundation try to "resurrect" it?

"The producers of this translation were imbued with the conviction that interest in the American Standard Version should be renewed and increased.

"Perhaps the most weighty impetus for this undertaking can be attributed to a disturbing awareness that the American Standard Version of 1901 was fast disappearing from the scene." (From the Preface of the New American Standard Bible.)

If God wouldn't use the American Standard Version, WHY would the Lockman Foundation want to? If God's blessing was on the American Standard Version, and it died in twenty-three years without even a *minor* revival, HOW has the Authorized Version lasted nearly four hundred years in spite of all of the "better translations" which God has supposedly been "blessing"?

Of course, there is no answer for these questions, unless it is admitted that *God's* Bible is the Authorized Version and that He will preserve it whether the Christian educators can help it or not. God will continue to use this English version of the Universal Text and will continue to ignore the English versions of the Local Text, no matter who the fundamentalist is that recommends them and no matter what size college may use them. Advertisement will not help.

Vindication

We have taken a scriptural look at the localities from which we have obtained the extant MSS.

We have looked closely at the witnesses and have examined their testimony in light of our two ground rules, and in respect to their place of origin and faithfulness to the Lordship of Christ.

We have taken a careful look at the *true* enemy of the Word of God, the Roman Catholic Church. In so doing, we have examined Rome's efforts and goals concerning the overthrow of the God-honored Universal Text. We have seen that in the past, this organization has been ruthless in her attempt to exterminate both Christians and their Bible. We can be confident that her goals have not changed.

We have looked into the lives of the two men who were primarily responsible for the successful overthrow of the Universal Text in textual criticism, and have discovered that they were *not* the "godly conservative scholars" which many brethren claim they were.

Lastly, we have looked at the Authorized Version, a Bible which has lasted through time in spite of *major* efforts by Christians and liberals *both* to replace it with the Roman Catholic Local Text of Alexandria, Egypt. We have compared the scholarship and piety of the King James translators to the liberal and infidelic standards of the revisors of 1881 and 1952, who have been faithfully followed by the Lockman Foundation and other modern translators. We have briefly investigated the manuscript readings in a *Christ-honoring* light.

Throughout this work we have answered some of the common innuendoes hurled at God's Authorized Version, such as "archaic words," supposed authorization by King James, supposed "better" MSS being in favor of new translations, etc.

What is the conclusion?

The conclusion is that first, we Christians who call ourselves "Bible-believing Christians" need to realize that the true enemy to the King James Bible is Rome. Christian colleges should closely examine their *curriculum and philosophy* of teaching concerning its relationship to the Authorized Version. Preachers should remove all new "Bibles" from their pulpits and private studies, realizing that Rome's teaching moves very subtly.

Secondly, it is time to turn away from the teaching that Westcott and Hort were two born-again, Bible-believing scholars. They were not. They and their long-dead theories concerning the Bible should be treated with all the sincerity with which Darwin and his theory are treated in Christian circles.

Thirdly, it is hoped that Christian preachers and teachers would direct their zeal for the Lord in more positive action than in attempting to destroy the Christians faith in God's perfect Word, and to insult or ruin fundamental brethren who disagree with them concerning the history of the manuscripts. I believe that parties on *both* sides have been extremely guilty of attacking each other with such zeal as to be a source of never ending joy for the Roman Catholic Church.

Brethren who believe the Authorized Version have been sadly maligned due to a mis-teaching on the part of those who do not believe it. Believers in the Authorized Version attempted to "fight fire with fire." This has left a sad division in fundamental circles. A faithful return to the Authorized Version will not only be honoring to God, but will be helpful in mending the wounds of nearly one hundred years of warfare with the wrong enemy.

There is no Bible that exalts Jesus Christ any higher than the Authorized Version. There is no Bible that has ever been more blessed by God than the Authorized Version. There is no Bible which is more hated by Satan and the Roman Catholic Church than the Authorized Version. There is no Bible which is more clearly translated nor is any easier to read than the Authorized Version. There is no Bible which teaches doctrine more clearly than the Authorized Version.

I love the Lord Jesus Christ. I love His Book. I am thankful for His graciousness in giving me a perfect Bible in English. To show my appreciation, I intend to read it, believe it, learn it, memorize it, promote it, defend it, love it, keep it, and most of all, be in subjection to God's authority through it. In appreciation, I will not change it - not a colon or a comma, not even an italicized word, not a chapter, nor a verse marking. Nor will I condemn the parts I do not understand. I will not "correct" the parts I do not like. I will exalt Jesus Christ and give His Book any benefit of the doubt. I will not worry about "what the Greek says" but will accept the "English" God has given me. It is a spiritual Book. God's Hand is on it. I need no more. No other version comes close to it nor ever will. There is no reason that it should be replaced, for it is every word of God preserved in English and placed in my hand. It is up to me to place it in my heart.

As the very great man of God, Lester Roloff, once said, "The Bible - we don't need to *rewrite* it, we need to *reread* it!"

What more can be said about this grand Book than what it says about itself?

Psalms 12:6, 7 says, "The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.

Thou shall keep them, O LORD, thou shall preserve them from this generation for ever."

Questions and Answers

Question: What about the 21st century King James Bible? Isn't it supposed to be an exact reprint of the original 1611 version but with archaic words replaced for the closest modern word? Can it be trusted?

Why does the original 1611 version have "strain out a gnat" and modern King James versions misprint that by saying "strain at a gnat" When will this error be corrected?

Answer: The 21st Century King James Bible is not really a true King James Bible at all. I trust only what God has blessed. Do you have any evidence of massive revival sweeping the land with ANY modern version but the King James, from 1611 to the present? Of missionary movements inspired by those believing it? Of preachers who are SURE they are preaching "thus says the Lord"? I don't trust any fake KJV. Just the real one.

You were lied to about Matthew 23:24. It is a lie spread by anti-King James people. It is important to be careful and not just believe every anti-King James accusation you read on the web. Many of them are simply incorrect. Check them out before you believe them!

I have a letter-for-letter exact reproduction (I know a couple who've spent thousands on research materials, and they checked every letter; this is an exact Bible I have) of the 1611 King James Bible, first printing by Robert Barker, the King's own printer. Here's exactly what it says:

24 Ye blind guides, which straine at a gnat, and swallow a camel.

There you have it. The King James NEVER said "strain out a gnat." It ALWAYS said, in proper English, "strain at a gnat." The modern printings that say "strain at a gnat" are correct. Sure, NOW we say "strain out," but that's new. We're the ones who have changed. The Cambridge King James Bible is an exact replica, with updated spelling and all printing errors removed, of precisely what the translators handed Robert Barker to be printed! I have an article on that, too, which you will find [here](#).

In short, there is no error, thus nothing to be corrected, in accurate printings of the King James Bible like the Cambridge. I come from a totally anti-KJV training in Bible college and seminary. It has taken years of research to dispel the stories and lies and doubts placed on God's preserved words, the King James Bible.

Question: How do I handle professors that don't like to hear "King James only" arguments? They are

evaluating using a certain Bible version. They say they'll listen to evidence about other Bible versions, but they do not want the King James mentioned specifically. What do I do?

Answer: The key is to show them how the broad evidence of history tells us which Greek text is correct. It then becomes easy to know which Bible we can trust. First, please remember the simple fact that there are two streams of Bible history. The first is the line that comes straight from the Apostles and people of Antioch. That line has to date 5,321 manuscripts in support of it. It has the broad evidence of history in support of it.

The Broad Evidence of History

This evidence for this stream spans from some of our oldest manuscripts to some of the least ancient. These manuscripts are in agreement with those of the persecuted believers, such as the Vaudois in the French Alps. They received the Scriptures from apostolic groups from Antioch of Syria about AD 120 and finished their translation by AD 157, according to Calvin's successor, Theodore Beza. These manuscripts influenced one of the greatest events in Christian history: the Protestant Reformation.

The Polluted Stream

The other stream comes from questionable sources. About the time of Christ, a Jewish man named Philo decided to blend pagan Greek philosophy with Judaism. The so-called "Christians" who came after him in Alexandria were not much better. Though they talked about "Jesus" and "Christianity," they did not believe that Jesus was God. They also did not believe that the Old Testament detailed literal events. It was a school in this pagan city that decided to write their own copies of the Bible.

The problem is that they changed the Scriptures, while saying they were copying them. They used the heretic Marcion's Lord's Prayer in Luke, for example (see "[Is the Lord's Prayer in Your Bible?](#)") From there it goes downhill.

In truth there are only a handful of semi-complete "Bibles" from Alexandria, Egypt. The only other texts from there are literally pieces of paper. The grand total of manuscripts is only 45. Of those 45, only 3 are taken very seriously: the Sinaiticus (Aleph), the Alexandrinus (A) and Vaticanus (B).

But there is a very big problem. It is rare that these three ever agree. Between Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, for example, it is extremely difficult to find just two successive verses that agree.

Look at the Lord's Prayer in Luke again. Between codices Aleph, A [Alexandrinus], B [Vaticanus], C [Ephraemi Rescriptus] and D [Bezae Cantabrigiensis] there is no agreement in 32 out of 45 words. That means these major books only agree in 13 out of 45 words!

A Visual Image

Here's one way to explain the difference between the manuscripts. Imagine a stadium with 5,366 people. 5,321 of them are in harmony, agreeing with one another and enjoying themselves. But there are also 45 other people. These are not like the first. They dislike the crowd around them and slander their words when they can. But they have another problem: they also disagree with each other.

Which group would you rather listen to? The one with people in one accord, or the one that is filled with discord? The one that knows what it is saying, or the one that cannot agree on what they want to say? The answer is obvious.

Where Do the Two Streams Lead?

A tree is known by its fruit. Where, then, do these two streams of Bibles lead?

The Alexandrian manuscripts fell into disuse, and many were relegated to a desert trashcan. A number tried to make the expensive codices better by changing the words to be more like the other stream, but they finally gave up. Those are the many correctors we see in the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.

But where do the Alexandrian manuscripts lead? Straight to the Roman Catholic institution. They were used by Constantine with the help of Eusebius. They became the basis of the Apocrypha and many incorrect readings in the Roman Catholic Bible. They were used to dominate and subject true believers under a false religion. This was the Bible of the persecutors.

Alexandrian Bibles are legion. Such are the NIV, NASV, ASV, RV, TEV, GNB, Living, NCV, RSV, NRSV, etc., but also Catholic Bibles as the New American Bible, the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.

The Antiochian manuscripts (from which we got the King James Bible) continued to be used and were passed down by faithful Christians from generation to generation. The Vaudois, for example, passed them down faithfully by even having their children memorize whole books of the Bible. These faithful hand-copied little Bibles they could fit in their heavy garments. They were ready to give an answer, literally "in season and out of season"!

And where do the Antiochian manuscripts lead? Straight to the Protestant Reformation. Wesley and writers of the Geneva Bible actually saw the Vaudois as a "pre-Reformation" group, even as the "two witnesses" who were protected by God in Revelation. That is how much they were indebted to these faithful.

Antiochian Bibles are easily recognizable. They are the Bibles of the Reformation. The Reina-Valera (Spanish), Diodati (Italian), and all the other Protestant Bibles published between the 1530s and 1600s. In English they are the Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew's, Great Bible, Bishops Bible, Geneva and King James.

The fruit, for example, of the King James Bible in English is easily discernible. Look at many English-speaking Protestant denominations that were formed in an effort to get "back to the Bible." The King James Bible was the starting point. The pilgrim Puritans in the USA switched from the Geneva to the King James in their next generation, despite the fact that they had used the Geneva since the 1560s. And ironically, the churches and Christians called "extreme Christians" and "right-wing extremists" are simply the churches that did not leave the fundamentals.

There are two kinds of churches: those that left their founding doctrines and those that stuck to them. There are also two kinds of Bibles: those that follow corrupt and perverted Alexandrian texts and/or Roman Catholic doctrine, and those that follow the line of preservation through godly and persecuted Christian brethren.

The choice is obvious.

Question: Why is the King James Bible called the "Authorized Version"? How did King James authorize it?

Answer: Despite stories to the contrary, King James, in no uncertain terms, clearly authorized the translation of the Bible that now bears his name.

[Note: This is a drastically shortened account of the birth of God's preserved words in English. Longer accounts are available,

as in [Final Authority: A Christian's Guide to the King James Bible](#), by William P. Grady.]

Sanctioning the Authorized Version

When Elizabeth died on April 1, 1603, she had seen 130 editions of the New Testament and the Bible published during her 45 years as Queen of England. James VI of Scotland, son of Mary, "Queen of Scots,"

became James I of England.

Four days later, on his way to London, a delegation of Puritan ministers met James, asking him to hear their grievances against the Church of England. James consented, and on January of 1604, four Puritans came to express their troubles at Hampton Court, in front of King James and over 50 Anglican (Church of England) officials. One by one each request was rejected, until the Puritan group's leader, John Rainolds said these famous words:

"May your Majesty be pleased to direct that the Bible be now translated, [since] such versions as are extant [are] not answering to the original."

At first, Bishop Bancroft of London was dead-set against it, saying, "If every man's humor might be followed, there would be no end to translating." But the King made it clear he liked the idea. Not too long later Bancroft wrote this to a friend:

I move you in his majesty's name that, ... no time may be overstepped by you for the better furtherance of this holy work.... You will scarcely conceive how earnest his majesty is to have this work begun!

When this Bible was translated, the title page was printed basically as you find it today in Cambridge Bibles:

THE
HOLY BIBLE
CONTAINING THE
OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

TRANSLATED OUT OF THE ORIGINAL TONGUES:
AND WITH THE FORMER TRANSLATIONS
DILIGENTLY COMPARED AND REVISED
BY HIS MAJESTY'S SPECIAL COMMAND

APPOINTED TO BE READ IN CHURCHES

The King James Bible was "Authorized" to be translated as God's Word for the English-speaking people of the world. God bless you as you study His authorized and preserved words in English, the King James Bible.

Question: Wasn't Erasmus, whose work led to the Textus Receptus and ultimately the King James Bible, really a Roman Catholic? Doesn't this mean that the King James Bible is just another Roman Catholic Bible?

Answer: Erasmus was raised a Catholic, and did not openly "leave" the Roman Catholic religion, but he did not believe Roman Catholic doctrine either. In fact, his best friends and defenders were the Christians, like the Anabaptists and Martin Luther. Here is proof from researcher Gail Riplinger.

Gail Riplinger, author of [New Age Bible Versions](#) and [The Language of the King James Bible](#) has written another excellent book, [The History of the Bible: Erasmus and the Received Text](#). In it she proves the Christian, Biblical beliefs of Erasmus and exposes the evil motives of the people who try to defame him. The following research can be found in her book.

Did Erasmus' Contemporaries Believe he was a Catholic?

The following are quotes from various researchers:

"In the midst of the group of Protestant scholars who had long been his truest friends, and so far as is known, without relations of any sort with the Roman Catholic Church, he died."

"He died at Basel in 1536, committed to neither party, but amid an admiring circle of friends who were all on the , Reformed side."

[He was an] "ex monk ... a Protestant pastor preached his funeral sermon and the money that he left was used to , help Protestant refugees."

"In 1559 Pope Paul IV 'placed everything Erasmus had ever written , on The Index of Forbidden Books."

"[H]e was branded an impious heretic, and his works were forbidden , to Catholic readers"

"The Council of Trent , condemned Erasmus' translation" of the Bible. It is clear that his Bible was not a perverted Roman Catholic Vulgate translation at all.

In 1527, Spanish "monks of the Inquisition began a systematic scrutiny of Erasmus' works, with a view to having [Erasmus] condemned , as a heretic."

In the Words of Erasmus

Listen to Erasmus explain his own views:

"All I ask for is the leisure to live wholly to God, to repent of the sins of my foolish youth, to study Holy Scriptures, and to read or write something of real value. I could do nothing of this , in a convent."

In 1505 he wrote, "I shall sit down to Holy Scriptures with my whole heart, and devote the rest of my life to it... all these three years I have been working entirely at Greek and have not been , playing with it."

Here are some other quotes, cited by Riplinger:

"As to me, all I have sought has been to open my contemporaries' eyes and bring them back from ritual to Christianity."

"Read the Gospels ... and see how we have degenerated."

"A man of piety would feel that he could not employ his time better than in bringing little ones to Christ."

"We must forget ourselves, and think , first of Christ's glory."

Are **these** the words of a Roman Catholic?

The Judgment of History

Even historian Will Durant wrote of him that by 1500 (when he was 34 years old), he had "formed his resolve to study and edit the Greek New Testament as the distilled essence of that real Christianity which, in the judgment of reformers and humanists alike, had been overlaid and concealed by the dogmas , and accretions of centuries."

These facts and others lead us to believe that Erasmus did not believe in the doctrines of the Roman Catholic

religion. We see why he worked so hard to find God's preserved words and publish them for all to read. A copy of the second edition of Erasmus' Greek New Testament ended up in a school in Wittenberg, Germany, where a monk named Martin Luther found it. That Greek text helped Martin Luther to start the Reformation, which brought us the King James Bible.

Erasmus, who was counted by everyone around him as a Christian, not a Catholic, helped to bring about the resurrection of the preserved Bible (not the Roman Catholic perversion), which in turn helped bring the Protestant Reformation.

Question: Do all publishing companies publish "the same" identical King James Bible?

Answer: No. All KJVs are not the same. The best text is the Cambridge KJV. Here's why.

Two Kinds of Changes

As I mentioned before, [there have been only two changes](#) in the actual KJV text from 1611 to today: 1) spelling errors corrected and 2) spelling changes made to match changes in the English language itself. Other editions of the KJV, printed by different publishers, have slight differences that are not what the pure King James text says.

Slight Differences

Many publishers, large and small, such as those that made family Bibles between the 1800s and 1900s, did not use the Cambridge text as the standard. These people sometimes spelled a few words differently, or substituted one word for another, such as "always" where the KJV says "alway." (See Numbers 9:16; Deuteronomy 11:1; 2 Kings 8:19, etc.). Of course, the most obvious change in text is the Oxford error: wrongly putting "sins" for "sin" (2 Chronicles 33:19) and "he" for "ye" (Jeremiah 34:16). But even these slight differences in the worst copies of the KJV are far better than the "best" readings in the Alexandrian perversions!

The Best Kind of KJV

The only KJV I completely trust is the Cambridge-type. Those Bibles that use that exact Cambridge text, such as all Cambridge KJV Bibles and the Prophecy Study Bible, are what you want. This is the only way to be sure you have an absolutely correct King James Bible. That's what I use and that's what I recommend.

Question: I know the New King James is said to be a "revision of the King James." But were the Greek and Hebrew texts for the New King James the same as they were for the King James?

Answer: The NKJV is **not** a revision of the King James Bible at all. The Greek and Hebrew *behind* the NKJV are the same as for the *modern perversions*. They are **not** the same as the Greek and Hebrew behind the King James Bible, God's preserved words in English.

A History of Preservation

There is a big difference between God's *preserved* words and man's *perverted* words.

Old Testament

God preserved the words of the Old Testament by the Levitical priests, who faithfully copied them through the centuries. The best manuscript, used by the King James Bible, was the *Ben Chayyim*, also called the "Bomberg Text." This faithful Rabbinic Old Testament, used for the King James Bible, was rejected by the NKJV committee in favor of a Vatican-published text.

New Testament

God preserved the words of the New Testament by His faithful Christian disciples, from Antioch of Syria (Acts 11:26) to the Vaudois people of the French Alps about AD 120. From the 150s on they passed this Old Latin Bible (called "Common Bible" or "Vulgate") throughout Europe and the British Isles. The Vaudois people were regarded by the Protestants and Baptists as "pre-Reformers," passing down the gospel message till the Reformation of the 1500s. Their Bibles, as well as others translated from them, were so accurate they were included in translating the King James Bible. The NKJV committee unwisely used none of these Bibles.

The Preserved vs. the Perverted "Vulgate"

Please remember: the Old Latin Vulgate of the Vaudois is not the same as the later Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate. The Vaudois Vulgate is the preserved words of God in Old Latin that was used to bring the gospel throughout Europe. The Roman Catholic Vulgate is completely different. It wrongly diluted God's words with the perverted Alexandrian Greek Old Testament, Apocrypha and New Testament. Modern "scholars" falsely declare there's only one Latin Vulgate. But there are two: the preserved (Vaudois) and the perverted (Roman Catholic).

A Mixture of Perversion

The New King James Version is **not** a true King James Bible. It is a mixture of some true King James accuracy, mixed in with a lot of Alexandrian and "new version" errors. We know this because the NKJV tells us **which** Bible texts they used when they compiled their Bible. Don't be fooled by the clever names and symbols. Here is what each text they used *really is*:

- The Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, or BHS. This is **not** the preserved Hebrew Old Testament. This one is approved by the **Vatican** (Roman Catholic institution) and printed jointly by the Vatican and Protestant Bible societies. In 1937 the "scholars" **rejected** the preserved *Ben Chayyim* it for an "older" (but not more accurate) text: the Leningrad Ms B 19a (also called the "*Ben Asher* text"). The BHS states:

"...it is a welcome sign of the times that it was published jointly in 1971 by the Wurttemberg Bible Society, Stuttgart, and **the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome....**"
--Prolegomena, p. XII

- The Septuagint, or LXX. As you have seen [elsewhere](#), the so-called "Septuagint" is a fable. It is actually a **post-Christian** Greek Old Testament. But there are *many* Septuagints, since each Alexandrian Old Testament is *different* from every other. Know what they are? Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Alexandrinus. These are the same codices (big books) where the modern perverted **New Testaments** come from!
- The Latin Vulgate. This is **not** the preserved Vaudois Christian, Old Latin Vulgate. The NKJV "scholars" consulted the perverted, **Roman Catholic** Latin Vulgate.
- The Dead Sea Scrolls, or DSS. It is clear through Scripture that God preserved His words through the tribe of Levi (Deuteronomy 17:18, 31:9-13, 25-26, Nehemiah 8 and Malachi 2:7). The Qumran community that produced the DSS are **never** said to be Levites. But though God says "the **priest's** lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at *his* mouth" (Malachi 2:7), the NKJV committee instead consulted the DSS as well.
- The Majority Text, or MT. With a name like **Majority Text** it *should* be a compilation of the **majority** of Greek New Testament manuscripts. **But it is not**. The "Majority Text" is actually a hand-

picked set of manuscripts grouped together by "pro-Alexandrian" liberal Hermann von Soden. Less than **8%** of the over 5,000 Greek manuscripts were compared to each other by von Soden!

But the NKJV people give the MT great prominence, writing this inaccurate information in the footnotes. So people **think** that the King James is wrong, since it disagrees with "the Majority Text." Who cares? The "Majority Text" is **not** the majority of texts! The "Majority Text" is a **big fake**. Don't believe it. And don't trust any Bible that does.

If It Looks Like a Duck and Talks Like a Duck...

There is another side to the New King James that reveals its ugly alliances. Take a look at these examples:

Verse	King James	NKJV	Perversions agreeing with the NKJV
Acts 3:26	God, having raised up his Son	His Servant	NIV, NASV, ASV, RSV, Roman Catholic New American Bible (NAB), etc.
Acts 17:22	I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious .	very religious	NIV, NASV, ASV, RSV, Catholic NAB, etc.
Romans 1:25	Who changed the truth of God into a lie	who exchanged the truth of God for the lie	NIV, NASV, ASV, RSV, Catholic NAB, etc.
1 Corinthians 1:18	For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.	who are being saved [This teaches the Roman Catholic lie that salvation is a process.]	NIV, NASV, NASU, RSV, Catholic NAB, etc.

The fact is that in **most places where the NKJV disagrees with the King James Bible, it agrees with the Alexandrian perversions**, whether Protestant like the NIV, NASV, RSV, ASV, etc., or Roman Catholic like the New American Bible.

The King James Bible is God's preserved words in English. The NKJV is just man's **most subtle perversion** of God's words. Don't be deceived. Insist on the King James Bible, not "New" King James, "Modern" King James, King James "2" or "21" or "Millennium." Even though it is very **similar** to a King James Bible, it is **not** a King James Bible. Insist on the one you can stake your faith on, the genuine King James Bible.

Question: Wasn't it the Catholic Church that was responsible for the Bible being written?

Answer: No. The Catholic Church tried to take credit for what the Lord did without their help.

Another short history of the Bible:

1. Old Testament

The Old Testament was written by Moses, David and Solomon, prophets, seers and kings. There was no "church" of any kind to claim responsibility for it. God inspired individuals to bring God's word to the people. The Old Testament is the recorded revelation of God up until about 400 BC.

2. The Inter-Testamental Period

The time between about 400 BC and about 5 BC is usually called the Years of Prophetic Silence. This is because God created a process that lasted 400 years to create a world climate ready for the coming of the promised Messiah. There was no "church" at this time, either. But there was the new creation of the "synagogue," since the Jewish people needed to worship God and did not have the Temple when they were in exile. When many came back 400-500 BC, they already had functional synagogues; and even though the Temple was being rebuilt by those returning from exile, the synagogue idea remained and more were built. This was the beginning of the "congregation" or "church" as we have it today.

But there was no Scripture being written during this period. That was yet to come after one came "in the spirit and power of Elias" (Luke 1:17).

3. The Time of Christ

It is likely that Matthew (Levi) the tax collector and later disciple of Jesus took notes of what happened during Jesus' ministry. However, it is also true that were God in the flesh living among you, His words would burn into your soul. I am sure, as the apostles clearly recollected as they wrote the New Testament (2 Peter 1:16-21; 1 John 1:1-3; 4:14), they could not escape the image and words of Jesus Christ, God the Son and Son of God, when He spoke into their hearts (Luke 9:44; 24:32).

But it wasn't a "church" that made them write.

2 Timothy 3:16-17

16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

17 That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.

And

2 Peter 1:19-21

19 We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts:

20 Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.

21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

God the Holy Spirit inspired them, perfectly and accurately, to write the words of God for the church. The church did not "inspire" anything.

4. The Church Age

When the apostles wrote their letters, the congregations received them. They read them. They spread them. They copied them for other brethren in Christ Jesus. And they recognized their authority in the Christian's life. So the Scriptures were produced by men of God, not by "the church." But they were produced FOR the church.

The last book of the Bible was Revelation, written about 96 AD, just before the apostle John died around 100 AD. After the apostles died, the churches continued to collect the letters they did not have, to read them and understand the authority under God by which they wrote.

But no one else shared that place. There is an "epistle of Barnabas" (which bears no proof it was written by Barnabas), which many think was penned in the first century. But the difference between its message of

salvation and of the apostolic writings is too easy to see. If you believe the Scriptures, you cannot believe the so-called "epistle of Barnabas."

There are the writings of Polycarp, disciple of John (when John was very aged). There are writings of Clement and others. But those are all writings of Christians. Just Christians. Some were even martyrs, but their writings depended on the Scriptures--they were not Scripture themselves. Anyone who would base their faith on them would have a horrid foundation, just as if there were "Lutherans" today, learning of God's word only what they find in Martin Luther's writings. Interesting writing, at times "inspirational" writing, fine. Inspired? Not a chance.

The Roman Catholic church has had only one aim from its earliest, pagan and political origins: To destroy the Christians, and to destroy their Bible. That is why they substituted the corrupt Alexandrian perversions of scripture, instead of using the preserved, prophetic and apostolic Words of God as found in Antioch of Syria, where "the disciples were first called Christians" (Acts 11:26). That is why they also added the Alexandrian writings we now call "Apocrypha" to their perverted bibles. That is why they used their Jesuits to infiltrate the Protestant Seminaries, Colleges and Bible Schools. Their Jesuits became the "teachers" and planted seeds of doubt in the Christians' minds. These doubt-ridden Christians then taught at other colleges and schools. All the while they planted that same seed of doubt of God's word in their students.

The stage was set: Once people no longer believed in God's Preserved Words, which we find perfectly presented in the King James Bible, they were ripe for destruction. Now, 120 years after the switch from God's Word to devil's lies (the King James abandoned for the Alexandrian texts), while pretending to "improve" our copies of God's words, they really set up the abandonment of God's words. Now almost every Bible in the English-speaking world (and most other languages) is just another re-translation of the Alexandrian polluted stream.

Another way to view it is that the Scriptures as we find them preserved in the King James is like God's fountain ...

Jeremiah 2:13

13 For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.

And that's the point: The bible spewed out by the Catholic church, which now almost all Protestants and other Christians use, ... *simply doesn't hold water.*

Question: My main Bible, and the Bible type I always use is the King James Version. However, I own New King James Version and a New American Standard. What should I do with these versions now that I am convinced the KJV is the only true and right version? I don't want to "give" them away (the NKJV and NAS) as they are full of fallacies ... should they be destined for the trash???

Answer: You have a valuable resource in those perversions of God's word! For instance, as you find various examples of errors, omissions and completely changed verses, you can mark them to show your friends. I will do all I can to provide lists and examples of where the other English versions fall flat.

I like to highlight the changes. For example, I have marked my Jehovah's Witness New World Translation with the proper readings of the King James Bible Then I can easily compare it to the other perversions, to show how the JW Bible is nearly identical to the NIV, NASV, RSV, etc.

Another kind of change to note (for your NKJV, for example) is where the so-called New King James reads the same as a NASV, NIV, or RSV. Check Song of Solomon for a pile of word-for-word copying. If the NKJV were supposed to be an "updating" of the King James, why use the word changes from the modern

perversions?

You can have great fun and quite a learning experience by noting and marking the kinds of changes in the modern perversions. If you find anything really interesting, please send them to me. It would be a pleasure to post more proof of the horrible mistake people make when they abandon God's words in English, the King James Bible.

"The Scripture cannot be broken" (John 10:35)

The King James Version-- relying upon the *Textus Receptus* or the Received Text, which has been known as the Majority Text or Universal Text from the Byzantine family of Greek manuscripts [MSS] of the New Testament-- preserves against the corrupting tendencies found in the modern translations. **"Every word of God is pure: He is a shield unto them that put their trust in Him"** (Proverbs 30:5). The Alexandrian Text-- once identified as the Minority Text or the Egyptian Text-- with its non-Biblical Apocrypha and Gnostic tendencies were used to produce the Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament (1881), which are found in those modern translations. **"18 For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this Book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this Book: 19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the Book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life, and out of the Holy City, and from the things which are written in this Book"** (Revelation 22:18-19). Two liberal theologians, Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892)-- both rejecting the inerrancy of the Scriptures and Its literal interpretation, with Westcott confessing, "No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history," and Hort admitting his inability to assert the "absolute infallibility of a canonical writing"-- based their New Testament upon the Codex Vaticanus (B) manuscripts in the custodial care of the Great Whore, which is the Church of Rome, and upon Constantin Tischendorf's Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph)-- found actually in the wastebasket of the Monastery of Saint Catherine on the Sinai Peninsula in 1859. **"Come out of her, My people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues"** (Revelation 18:4). The Church of Rome's pleasure in any Critical Scholarship that insists upon the superiority of the "older manuscripts" of the Alexandrian Text is understandable, for not only would it slay the Protestant notion of an Infallible Bible; but even better, it would strengthen their foundation of an Infallible Pope with his false teachings from the non-Biblical Apocrypha for their Roman Bibles. **"If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"** (Psalm 11:3). Further, there is no need for a "redaction" of any Old Testament manuscripts, for the Levitical copyists have already faithfully preserved the Hebrew Old Testament, which can be found in the *Ben Chayim* or Bomberg Text of the Rabbinic Old Testament, without the necessity of a mythical translation of the Hebrew into the Greek in the form of a 250 BC Septuagint (LXX)-- with Origen's very real and subsequent Hexapla inclusion (third century AD) of the spurious Apocryphal books later found in the Catholic Bibles. **"Cursed be he that doeth the work of the LORD deceitfully"** (Jeremiah 48:10).

Though the Holy Spirit's inspiration of the Original Manuscripts extends to both the Old and New Testament writings of the Scriptures, i.e., **"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness"** (2Timothy 3:16), of what value can such no longer existing Original Manuscripts be to us, if the Almighty has not provided some kind of *preservation* by which we might still be benefitted? **"6 The Words of the LORD are Pure Words: as silver tried in a furnace of Earth, purified seven times. 7 Thou shalt keep Them, O LORD, Thou shalt preserve Them from this generation for ever"** (Psalm 12:6-7). Unlike the handful of 45 Alexandrian manuscripts, where the Vaticanus (350 AD) and the Sinaiticus (about 350 AD) disagree thousands of times with each other, the 5,321 manuscripts of the *Textus Receptus* of the King James Version speak with a unified voice, being descended from the Byzantine manuscripts, which come to us from the original Church at Antioch. **"The LORD gave the Word: great was the company of those that published It"** (Psalm 68:11). The most critical question to ask in determining the validity of the manuscript source of any translation of the Word of God is, **"Did it come through the polluted Roman stream of the Codex Vaticanus?"** If so, *have nothing to do with it*, for if you do not distrust it, then you have but small understanding of Babylon the Great. **"4 And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: 5 And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH"** (Revelation 17:4-5).

I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. 16 So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of My mouth. 19 As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous therefore, and repent" (Revelation 3:15-16, 19).

The lineage of the manuscripts used for the King James Version show a chain of custody dating back to the Church of Antioch in Syria, where the "disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" (Acts 11:26). It is said of the Vaudois [pronounced vo - DWAH], who were known also as Waldensians, by John Calvin's successor Theodore Beza that the Vaudois of the valleys of the Piedmontese Alps had received the Scriptures from missionaries from Antioch of Syria sometime after 120 AD and had completed a translation of the Scriptures into their native Latin tongue by 157 AD-- the Old Latin Vulgate, which is distinct from and not to be confused with the later Vulgate of Jerome (380 AD) with its Roman Catholic Apocrypha. "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also" (2Timothy 2:2). James A. Wylie (1808-1890) describes the "apostolicity of the Churches of the Waldensian valleys" with the observation that "Rome manifestly was the schismatic," while the Vaudois or Waldenses deserved the "valid title of the True Church," and even the Waldenses' "greatest enemies, Claude Seyssel of Turin (1517), and Reynerius the Inquisitor (1250), have admitted their antiquity, and stigmatized them as 'the most dangerous of all heretics, because the most ancient'"

Since the Byzantine Manuscripts commonly accessible to Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) were used in his production of the Greek New Testament, which formed the *Textus Receptus* (1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, 1535), their use demonstrated a continuity with the Vaudois. The Vaudois Christians had likewise used and preserved the ancient Byzantine manuscripts of Antioch in the form of Latin Scripture; and, their survival from the wrath of Papal Rome from the time of the Early Church until the *sola scriptura* ("Scripture alone") of the Protestant Reformation (1521) is testament that the True Church and the True Word of God did continuously testify against the False Church and False Scriptures of the Whore of Rome-- and triumphed! "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our Faith" (1John 5:4). The Vaudois rendezvous with the Protestant Reformation represents a Divine Approval of the Reformation, in that the Ancient Christian Church of the Vaudois attested to the Truth of the Reformers, and specifically to the validity of the Scriptures of the Reformers, which were used to translate the *Textus Receptus* Bibles of the Reformation, i.e., the Spanish Reina-Valera (1569), the Italian Diodati (1603), the Coverdale Bible (1535), the Tyndale New Testament (1536), the Great Bible (1539), the Bishops Bible (1568), the Geneva Bible (1560-1599), and, of course, the King James Bible (1611). "For by wise counsel thou shalt make thy war: and in multitude of counsellors there is safety" (Proverbs 24:6). Significantly, men of God, such as John Wesley (1703-1791) and Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758), have attested to the accuracy of understanding that the Vaudois Christians were *not* merely a more recent vintage of Protestant reaction to the Church of Rome, coming upon the scene through Peter Waldo in twelfth century France (1171 AD), but that the Vaudois were *ancient* Christians, who preserved their Christianity along with the Scriptures-- separate from the Church of Rome-- as far back as the early second century AD. "That in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established" (Matthew 18:16).

John Wesley has this to say about the Vaudois or Waldenses: "It is a vulgar mistake, that the Waldenses were so called from Peter Waldo of Lyons. They were much more ancient than him; and their true name was Vallenses or Vaudois from their inhabiting the valleys of Lucerne and Agrogne. This name, Vallenses, after Waldo appeared about the year 1160, was changed by the Papists into Waldenses, on purpose to represent them as of modern original." (*Notes on the Revelation of John*, Revelation, Chapter 13, Verse 6, p. 936.)

Here is an important fact cited by Jonathan Edwards: "Some of the popish writers themselves own, that this people never submitted to the church of Rome. One of the popish writers, speaking of the Waldenses, says, The heresy of the Waldenses is the oldest heresy in the world. It is supposed that they first betook themselves to this place among the mountains, to hide themselves from the severity of the heathen persecutions which existed before Constantine the Great [272-337 AD]. And thus the woman fled into the wilderness from the face of the serpent" (*The Works of Jonathan Edwards* Vol. 4, Work of Redemption., Period 3 - From Christ's Resurrection to the End Of the World, Part 4, p.

Is the Authorized Version (AV) or the King James Version to be considered the perfect Word of God in the English language? Yes! "And the LORD answered me, and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it" (Habakkuk 2:2). Obviously, the Authorized Version is *not* one and the same as the Original Autographs; however, the modern translations must often rely upon the Received Text for substance, for the manuscripts of the *Textus Receptus* are historically more numerous than the Alexandrian manuscripts of the modern translations, not to mention, massively more consistent with one another textually than the *rarely-agreeing-with-one-another* Alexandrian manuscripts. "Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but My Words shall not pass away" (Matthew 24:35). By Providence, the evidence demonstrates that *the King James Version is worthy to be considered God's perfect Word for the English language*. "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the Word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in Truth, the Word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe" (1Thessalonians 2:13). Modern Liberal Professed Christianity demands a Bible that may be critically revised to support its emphasis upon the Social Gospel and Social Justice, thereby establishing their authority to criticize God's Word. "And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing" (1Corinthians 13:3). "For this is the Love of God, that we keep His commandments: and His commandments are not grievous" (1John 5:3).

We advocate the use of the King James Version of the Scriptures, and believe that It should be treated as the Word of God, i.e., "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life" (1John 1:1), because:

(1) The King James Version is based upon the most accurate and pure text of the Original Autographs. "Sanctify them through Thy Truth: Thy Word is Truth" (John 17:17).

(2) The King James Version bears the authenticity of Divine Providence and Miraculous Preservation. "6 The Words of the LORD are Pure Words: as silver tried in a furnace of Earth, purified seven times. 7 Thou shalt keep Them, O LORD, Thou shalt preserve Them from this generation for ever" (Psalm 12:6-7).

(3) The King James Version dispels confusion over what God said, simply by appealing to the undisputable text of Scripture, i.e., "What Saith the Scripture?" (Romans 4:3).

(4) The King James Version prevents the perversion that must come from those who refuse to embrace the Truth, i.e., "3 If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our LORD Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; 4 He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, 5 Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the Truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself" (1Timothy 6:3-5), and

(5) The King James Version resists the tendency of division that results when each adopts their own variant reading of the Scriptures of the differing Greek texts, i.e., "20 Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. 21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2Peter 1:20-21).

Would it make a difference if you knew that the New Testament of your Modern Bible did not have First and Second Peter? Yet if the total number of missing words were added up, this is how much shorter the modern translations are than the King James Version. Is it a cause for concern if the names of Christ are missing 175 times, or if the word "hell" is not found in the Old Testament, or if key doctrinal passages have been diminished? And, the biggest shock of all! Is it possible that the most basic and blatant of all early heresies concerning the Person of Christ has been given a "new lease on life" through the Modern Versions? That these things are so, with the reasons why, are set forth in the following pages.

Many have gone over to the new Bibles without realizing that much, much more is involved than the question of modern English. The entire fabric has been affected! The underlying text is substantially

different. The philosophy and methodology of the translators is in marked contrast to that of the Authorized Version. The English of the new versions is assumed at first to be "easier," but whether it is actually more readable, authoritative, and conducive to meditation, study, and memorization is quite another matter.

From 1611 until recently there was really only one Bible in the English speaking world. The AV became the Standard in that empire upon which the sun never set, and in that language which is the primary vehicle of international discourse. It penetrated the world's continents and brought multitudes to saving faith in Christ. It became the impetus of the great missionary movements. Through it men and women heard the call to world evangelization. It was the source of the greatest revivals since the days of the Apostles. Street preachers, colporteurs, church planters. Sunday School teachers, and tract distributors took the King James Bible into teeming cities and across country lanes. It was the high water mark in the history of the Gospel's spread. But sadly, we all have a tendency to put aside the good and substitute something of lesser quality. And so, during the last century the call for a revised Bible began to be heard. For the most part -- at least in the beginning -- the call did not come from fervent Bible believers, but rather from those who were leaning toward theological liberalism. These were men who often felt comfortable with German rationalism, Darwin, and the back-to-Rome movement.

The first major revision was published in 1881. After the initial excitement there was little public support. The same response greeted the American (ASV) edition in 1901. Others followed: Weymouth, Williams, Moffat, Beck, Goodspeed, Twentieth Century, but still with little impact. But then in 1952 came the Revised Standard Version, produced with the backing of the liberal National Council of Churches in the U.S.A. The pace now quickened; public acceptance began to rise. Others followed: The New English, Amplified, Berkley, Phillips, Wuest, Living, New American, Good News, Jerusalem, New International, New King James. Each came with the promise that it was based on the earliest manuscripts and the latest scholarship, and that God's Word would now be more easily understood.

Taking up this last point, it is interesting to see the names given to a number of twentieth century versions -- The Authentic New Testament, The N.T. in Plain English, the N.T. in Basic English, The Simplified N.T. in Plain English for Today's Reader, Inspired Letters of the N.T. in Clearest English!! And then a number of the revisions have been revised: The New Revised Standard Version, the New Berkley Version, The New (that's right!) Jerusalem Bible. There have been at least seventy modern Bibles published this century.

Now, frankly, after seventy attempts to replace the Authorized Version, one cannot help wonder whether God wants it replaced! This conviction is strengthened when we note that believers do not seem to study the modern versions as they once did the AV. They are not marked up and study worn. Passages are seldom memorized. Preachers do not quote verses from the NIV in the pulpit as they once did the AV. Nor is expository preaching and doctrinal study emphasized as it once was. What is more, the issue of authority has been undermined. "What does the Bible say," has been replaced by an anemic, "How does this version render the passage." And then, is it a coincidence that this multiplication of versions comes at the same time as the tongues, prophecies, and extra biblical revelations of the charismatic movement? Thus, it may be rightly asked, where are we to go to hear God's Word today?

Relatively few words in the King James Version would fall into the category of "Old English." This is not nearly so great a problem as is claimed. It is doubtful that more than twenty words would cause a problem, and here the dictionary will quickly give the meaning. It seems strange that with the great increase of knowledge, people should have trouble with the "Thee's" and "Thou's" of the Authorized Version.

Of course, the great "problem" with the Bible is the fact that it is the Bible! It cannot be read like other books. Unless the Author is known by personal faith in the Finished Work of Jesus Christ on the Cross it will not be understood or appreciated. No amount of translational skill or modern English idiom can cross that divide. It must be read with a submissive heart to God.

The following is intended to show that whatever help a modern version may seem at first to give in updating the language, the price paid in missing words, phrases, verses, lack of reverence and doctrinal perspicuity, readability, and... the almost certain reintroduction of an ancient heresy, is simply too great.

The Modern Bibles have several basic characteristics. What is said about one can usually be said about another. As the New International Version is the current bestseller we will use it as a representative of the others in comparisons with the King James Version.

Key Passages Missing from Modern Translations

The first list is a sampling of the kind of passage that is often missing from the Modern Bibles. These omissions often diminish basic doctrines. The New International Version which we have used as a representative has somewhat fewer omissions than, for example, the New American Standard, Revised Standard, New English, Good News, etc. But even here the deletions are quite considerable and noteworthy. This will become increasingly evident when we look at the second list which gives the Names of Deity that have been omitted. By placing the two translations together, you can come to your own conclusion as to whether the NIV has the same sense of authority, reverence, and readability as the KJV.

KJV Compared to the NIV

Matthew

Matthew 1:25

And knew her not till she had brought forth her **firstborn** son... (KJV)
But he had no union with her until she gave birth to a son. (NIV)

Matthew 5:44

But I say unto you, Love your enemies, **blest them that curse you, do good to them that hate you**, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you: (KJV)
But I tell you; Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. (NIV)

Matthew 6:13

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: **For thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory, forever. Amen.** (KJV)
And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one. (NIV)

Matthew 9:13

...for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners **to repentance.** (KJV)
...For I have not come to call the righteous but sinners. (NIV)

Matthew 15:8

This people **draweth nigh unto me with their mouth**, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. (KJV)
These people honour me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me. (NIV)

Matthew 16:3

O Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky, but can ye not discern the signs of the times? (KJV)
You know how to interpret the appearance of the sky, but you cannot interpret the signs of the times. (NIV)

Matthew 17:21

Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting. (KJV)

Verse is completely missing in the NIV.

Matthew 19:9

And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: **and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.** (KJV)

I tell you that anyone who divorces his wife, except for marital unfaithfulness and marries another woman commits adultery. (NIV)

Matthew 20:16

So the last shall be first and the first last: **for many be called but few chosen.** (KJV)

So the last will be first, and the first will be last. (NIV)

Matthew 20:22

But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, **and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?...** (KJV)

Ye don't know what you are asking, Jesus said to them. Can you drink the cup I am going to drink? (NIV)

Matthew 23:14

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. (KJV)

Verse is completely missing in the NIV

Matthew 27:35

And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: **that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments amongst them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.** (KJV)

When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots. (NIV)

Matthew 28:2

...for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone **from the door**, and sat upon it. (KJV)

...for an angel of the Lord came down from heaven and going to the tomb, rolled back the stone and sat on it. (NIV)

Matthew 28:9

And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them saying, All... (KJV)

Suddenly Jesus met them. "Greetings," he said (NIV)

For the sake of space, we continue now by showing only the missing phrases.

Mark--

1:14 Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel **of the kingdom of God.**

1:31 ... and **immediately** the fever left her...

2:17 ... I came not to call the righteous, but sinners **to repentance.**

6:11 ... shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. **Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city.**

7:8 Ye hold the tradition of men, **as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do.**

7:16 **If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.**

9:44 **Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.**

9:46 **Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.**

9:49 **For every one shall be salted with fire and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.**

10:21 ... come, **take up the cross.** and follow me.

10:24 ... Children, how hard is it **for them that trust in riches** to enter into the kingdom of God.

11:26 **But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.**

13:14 But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation **spoken of by Daniel the prophet...**

13:33 Take ye heed, watch **and pray:**

14:68 And he went out into the porch; **and the cock crew.**

15:28 **And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.**

Luke--

1:28 ... the Lord is with thee: **blessed art thou among women.**

2:43 Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem; and **Joseph and his mother** knew not of it.

4:8 And Jesus answered **and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan:**

9:54 Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, **even as Elias did?**

9:55 But he turned and rebuked them, **and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.**

11:2-4 When ye pray, say, **Our Father which art in heaven.** Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. **Thy will be done. as in heaven. so in earth... but deliver us from evil.**

11:29 ... they seek a sign; and there shall no sign be given it but the sign of Jonas **the prophet.**

17:36 **Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.**

22:31 **And the Lord said** , Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath **desired to have you...**

22:64 And when they had blindfolded him, **they struck him on the face...**

23:17 **For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.**

23:38 And a superscription also was written over him **in letters of Greek. and Latin, and Hebrew,** THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

John--

1:27 He it is, who coming after me **is preferred before me...**

3:13 And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man **which is in heaven.**

5:3-4 In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, **waiting for the moving of the water, For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.**

6:47 He that believeth **on me** hath everlasting life.

11:41 Then they took away the stone **from the place where the dead was laid...**

17:12 While I was with them **in the world,** I kept them in thy name...

Acts--

10:6 ... **he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do.**

20:32 And now, **brethren,** I commend you to God,

24:6-8 Who also hath gone about to profane the temple: whom we took, **and would have judged according to our law. But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands, Commanding his accusers to come unto thee:**

24:15 ... there shall be a resurrection **of the dead** both of the just and unjust.

28:16 And when we came to Rome, **the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard:**

28:29 **And when he had said these words. the Jews departed and had great reasoning among themselves.**

Romans--

1:29 Being filled with all unrighteousness, **fornication,** wickedness...

9:28 For he will finish the work, and cut it short in **righteousness: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth.**

10:15 How beautiful are the feet of them that **preach the gospel of peace...**

13:9 ... Thou shalt not steal, **Thou shalt not bear false witness...**

14:6 He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; **and he that regardeth not the day. to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord. for he giveth God thanks:**

14:21 ... whereby thy brother stumbleth, **or is offended, or is made weak.**

15:29 I shall come in the fullness of the blessing **of the gospel** of Christ.

1 Corinthians--

5:7 For even Christ our passover is sacrificed **for us.**

7:5 ... that ye may give yourselves **to fasting** and prayer;

7:39 The wife is bound **by the law** as long as her husband liveth;

11:24 **Take, eat:** this is my body, which is **broken** for you:

Galatians--

3:1 ... who hath bewitched you, **that ye should not obey the truth...**

Ephesians--

5:30 For we are members of his body, **of his flesh, and of his bones.**

6:10 Finally, **my brethren**, be strong in the Lord...

Philipplans--

3:16 Let us walk **by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.**

Colossians--

1:14 In whom we have redemption **through his blood...**

3:6 ... the wrath of God cometh **on the children of disobedience.**

2 Thessalonians--

1:8 **In flaming fire** taking vengeance on them that know not God.

1 Timothy--

1:17 ... immortal, invisible, the only **wise** God.

4:12 ... in charity, **in spirit**, in faith, in purity.

6:5 ... destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: **from such withdraw thyself.**

2 Timothy--

1:11 I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher **of the Gentiles.**

Philemon--

1:12 Whom I have sent again: **thou therefore receive him...**

Hebrews--

1:3 ... when he had **by himself** purged our sins,

2:7 ... thou crownedst him with glory and honour **and didst set him over the works of thy hands.**

7:21 Thou art a priest for ever **after the order of Melchisedec.**

10:34 ... knowing in yourselves that ye have **in heaven** a better and an enduring substance.

1 Peter--

4:1 Christ hath suffered **for us** in the flesh.

4:14 ... **on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified.**

5:11 To him be **glory** and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

2 Peter--

2:17 ... to whom the mist of darkness is reserved **for ever.**

1 John--

2:7 The old commandment is the word which ye have heard **from the beginning.**

Jude--

25 To the only **wise** God our Saviour...

Revelation--

2:13 I Know **thy works**, and where thou dwellest...

6:1 ... one of the four beasts saying Come **and see**, Also in verses 3, 5 and 7.

11:17 Saying, We give thee thanks O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, **and art to come...**

12:12 Woe to **the inhabitants of** the earth and of the sea...

16:17 there came a great voice out of the temple **of heaven**...

21:24 And the nations **of them which are saved** shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and **honour** into it.

None of the bold words are in the text of the New International Version (1978 edition). Occasional reference is made to omitted passages in footnotes. Many of the passages which the NIV does include but are omitted by the other modern versions are given a footnote expressing doubt.

Names of Jesus Christ Missing

THE DARK SECRET

It is this fact of omitted Sacred Names which has often caused the first doubts over the Modern Bibles. Names of Deity are missing and they are missing frequently! The totals of such omissions in two of the most popular versions -- The New American Standard and The New International -- are tabulated below. Where these Names are in combination, they have been counted separately.

	<u>NASV</u>	<u>NIV</u>
Jesus	73	36
Christ	43	44
Lord	35	35
God	33	31
Other Names	30	30
Total Missing Names	214	176

KJV Compared to the NIV with respect to Names of Deity

Matthew

Matthew 6:33

But seek ye first the kingdom **of God**, and his righteousness...(KJV)

But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness... (NIV)

Matthew 8:29

And behold, they cried out saying, What have we to do with thee, **Jesus**, thou Son of God? (KJV)

What do you want with us, Son of God? they shouted... (NIV)

Matthew 13:36

Then **Jesus** sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him... (KJV)

Then he left the crowd and went into the house. His disciples came to him (NIV)

Matthew 13:51

Jesus saith unto them, Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him, Yea, **Lord**. (KJV)

Have you understood all these things? Jesus asked. Yes, they replied. (NIV)

Matthew 15:30

And great multitudes came unto him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at **Jesus'** feet; and he healed them: (KJV)
Great crowds came to him, bringing the lame, the blind, the crippled, the dumb and many others, and laid them at his feet; and he healed them. (NIV)

Matthew 16:20

Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was **Jesus** the Christ. (KJV)
Then he warned his disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Christ. (NIV)

Matthew 17:20

And **Jesus** said unto them, because of your unbelief... (KJV)
He replied, "Because you have so little faith..." (NIV)

Matthew 18:2

And **Jesus** called a little child unto him... (KJV)
He called a little child (NIV)

Matthew 18:11

For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost. (KJV)
Verse is completely missing in the NIV.

Matthew 19:17

And he said unto him, **Why Callest thou me good?** there is none good but **one, that is God:** (KJV)
"Why do you ask me about what is good?" Jesus replied. "There is only One who is good..." (NIV)

Matthew 21:12

And Jesus went into the temple **of God** and cast out all them that sold and bought... (KJV)
Jesus entered the temple area and drove out all who were buying and selling there... (NIV)

Matthew 22:30

For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels **of God** in heaven. (KJV)
At the resurrection people will neither marry nor be given in marriage; they will be like the angels in heaven. (NIV)

Matthew 22:32

...**God** is not the God of the dead, but of the living. (KJV)
...He is not the God of the dead but of the living. (NIV)

Matthew 23:8

But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, **even Christ...** (KJV)
"But you are not to be called 'Rabbi', for you have only one Master..." (NIV)

Matthew 24:2

And **Jesus** said unto them, See ye not all these things? Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another... (KJV)
"Do you see all these things?" he asked. "I tell you the truth, not one stone here will be left on another..." (NIV)

Matthew 25:13

Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour **wherein the Son of man cometh.** (KJV)
Therefore keep watch, because you do not know the day or the hour. (NIV)

Matthew 28:6

He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where **the Lord** lay. (KJV)
He is not here; he has risen, just as he said. Come and see the place where he lay. (NIV)

The list continues by showing only the missing names:

Mark--

5:13 And **forthwith Jesus** gave them leave...

6:33 And the people saw them departing, and many knew **him**, and ran afoot thither out of all cities, and outwent them, and came together unto **him**.

7:27 But **Jesus** said unto her, Let the children first be filled...

9:24 The father of the child cried out, **and said with tears. Lord...**

11:10 Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, **that cometh in the name of the Lord...**

11:14 And **Jesus** answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee...

11:26 **But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.**

12:27 He is not the God of the dead, but the **God** of the living...

14:45 ... and saith, Master, **master**, and kissed him.

Luke--

2:40 And the child grew, and waxed strong **in spirit...**

4:4 ... man shall not live by bread alone, **but by every word of God...**

4:41 Thou art **Christ** the Son of God.

7:22 Then **Jesus** answering said unto them, Go your way...

7:31 **And the Lord said**, Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation?

9:56 **For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.**

9:57 **Lord**, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.

12:31 But rather seek ye the kingdom **of God**...

13:25 **Lord, Lord** open to us;

21:4 For all these have of their abundance cast in unto the offerings **of God**...

22:31 **And the Lord said**, Simon, Simon...

23:42 And he said unto **Jesus**, Lord, remember me...

John--

4:16 **JESUS** saith unto her, Go, call thy husband...

4:42 ... and know that this is indeed **the Christ**. the Saviour of the world.

4:46 So **Jesus** came again into Cana of Galilee...

5:30 ... because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the **Father** which hath sent me.

6:39 And this is the **Father's** will which hath sent me...

6:69 And we believe and are sure that thou art that **Christ, the Son** of the living God.

8:20 These words spake **Jesus** in the treasury.

8:29 ... the **Father** hath not left me alone...

9:35 Dost thou believe on the **Son of God**?

16:16 ... a little while, and ye shall see me, **because I go to the Father.**

19:38 He came therefore, and took the body **of Jesus**.

Acts--

2:30 ... **according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ** to sit on his throne.

3:26 Unto you first God, having raised up his **Son Jesus**...

4:24 Lord, **thou art God**...

7:30 ... there appeared to him in the wilderness of Mount Sina an angel **of the Lord**...

7:32 I am the God of thy fathers, the **God** of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of

Jacob.

7:37 A prophet shall the **Lord** your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me; him shall ye hear.

8:37 **And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.**

9:5-6 And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And **the Lord** said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: **It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said** unto him, Arise...

9:29 **And he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus...**

15:11 ... through the grace of the Lord Jesus **Christ** we shall be saved, even as they.

15:18 **Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world.**

16:31 Believe on the Lord Jesus **Christ** and thou shalt be saved...

19:4 ... that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on **Christ** Jesus.

19:10 ... so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord **Jesus**.

20:21 ... repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus **Christ**.

20:25 ... among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom **of God**.

22:16 ... wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the **Lord**.

23:9 ... **let us not fight against God**.

Romans--

1:16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel **of Christ**.

6:11 ... alive unto God through Jesus Christ **our Lord**.

8:1 There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, **who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit**.

14:6 He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; **and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord...**

15:8 Now I say that **Jesus** Christ was a minister of the circumcision...

15:19 Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit **of God**...

16:18 For they that are such serve not our Lord **Jesus** Christ...

16:24 **The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.**

1 Corinthians--

1:14 I thank **God** that I baptized none of you...

5:4 In the name of our Lord Jesus **Christ**, when ye are gathered together...

5:5 ... that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord **Jesus**.

6:20 ... glorify God in your body **and in your spirit, which are God's**.

9:1 ... have I not seen Jesus **Christ** our Lord?

9:18 Verily that, when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel **of Christ** without charge...

10:28 ... **for the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof**.

15:47 ... the second man is **the Lord** from heaven.

16:22 If any man love not the Lord **Jesus Christ**, let him be Anathema...

16:23 The grace of our Lord Jesus **Christ** be with you.

2 Corinthians--

4:6 ... the glory of God in the face of **Jesus Christ**.

4:10 Always bearing about in the body the dying of **the Lord Jesus**...

5:18 ... hath reconciled us to himself by **Jesus Christ**...

10:7 ... that, as he is **Christ's**, even so are we Christ's.

11:31 The God and Father of **our Lord Jesus Christ**...

Galatians--

3:17 ... the covenant, that was confirmed before of God **in Christ**.

4:7 ... heir of God **through Christ**.

6:15 For **in Christ Jesus** neither circumcision availeth any thing...

6:17 ... I bear in my body the marks of **the Lord Jesus**.

Ephesians--

3:9 ... God, who created all things **by Jesus Christ**.

3:14 ... I bow my knees unto the Father **of our Lord Jesus Christ**.

5:9 For the fruit of the **Spirit** is in all goodness...

Philippians--

4:13 I can do all things through **Christ**...

Colossians--

1:2 ... peace, from God our Father **and the Lord Jesus Christ**.

1:28 ... that we may present every man perfect in Christ **Jesus**.

2:2 ... to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the **Father**, and of Christ.

1 Thessalonians--

1:1 ... peace, **from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ**.

2:19 ... in the presence of our Lord **Jesus** Christ at his coming?

3:11 Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus **Christ**...

3:13 ... at the coming of our Lord Jesus **Christ** with all his saints.

2 Thessalonians--

1:8 ... that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus **Christ**.

1:12 That the name of our Lord Jesus **Christ** may be glorified

2:4 ... so that he **as God** sitteth in the temple of God...

1 Timothy--

1:1 ... and **Lord** Jesus Christ, which is our hope...

2:7 ... speak the truth **in Christ**, and lie not...

3:16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: **God** was manifest in the flesh...

5:21 I charge thee before God, and the **Lord** Jesus Christ...

2 Timothy--

4:1 I charge thee therefore before God and **the Lord** Jesus Christ...

4:22 The Lord **Jesus Christ** be with thy spirit...

Titus--

1:4 ... from God the Father and the **Lord** Jesus Christ our Saviour.

Philemon--

6 ... every good thing which is in you in Christ **Jesus**.

Hebrews--

3:1 ... the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, **Christ** Jesus.

10:9 Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, **O God...**

10:30 ... I will recompence, **saith the Lord...**

1 Peter--

1:22 Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth **through the Spirit...**

5:10 ... who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ **Jesus...**

5:14 ... Peace be with you all that are in Christ **Jesus. Amen.**

1 John--

1:7 ... the blood of Jesus **Christ** his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

3:16 Hereby perceive we the love **of God...**

4:3 And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus **Christ is come in the flesh** is not of God...

5:7-8 For there are three that bear record **in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth,** the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

5:13 ... **and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.**

2 John--

3 ... and from the **Lord** Jesus Christ...

9 ... He that abideth in the doctrine **of Christ**, he hath both the Father and the Son.

Jude--

4 ... denying the only **Lord** God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

Revelation--

1:8 I am Alpha and Omega, **the beginning and the ending...**

1:9 ... the kingdom and patience of Jesus **Christ...** and for the testimony of Jesus Christ.

1:11 Saying, **I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last...**

5:14 ... the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped **him that liveth for ever and ever.**

12:17 ... and have the testimony of Jesus **Christ.**

14:5 ... they are without fault **before the throne of God**.

16:5 ... Thou art righteous, **O Lord**, which art, and wast, and shalt be...

19:1 ... glory, and honour, and power, unto **the Lord** our God.

20:9 ... and fire came down from **God out** of heaven, and devoured them.

20:12 And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before **God**...

21:4 And **God** shall wipe away all tears from their eyes...

22:21 The grace of our Lord Jesus **Christ** be with you all. Amen.

Defenders of the modern versions have sought to minimize the fact of these missing Names of Deity. Dr. Homer Kent, president of the well-known Grace Theological Seminary is typical. He says in his tract "The King James Only?" "One common objection...is that in a relatively few cases the names "Christ" and "Lord" are omitted when referring to Jesus." Whatever arguments one might attempt to raise, the above evidence demonstrates that these Names are missing more than in a "relatively few cases"!

But, what has been shown above is only part of the story and introduces us now to the darkest secret in this entire Modern Version controversy.

ADAPTIANISM: The Dark Secret Behind the Text of the Modern Versions

By scanning the above list certain trends or patterns begin to appear. For example:

The Name "Jesus" is frequently disassociated from the titles "Lord" and "Christ." Whereas in the AV we will read "Jesus Christ" or the "Lord Jesus Christ," in the Modern Versions "Jesus" is often made to stand alone or not at all. **In fact, our Savior's full title "Lord Jesus Christ" is found 84 times in 81 verses in the AV and only 60 times in 60 verses in the NIV, 62 times in 62 verses in the NRSV, and 63 times in 63 verses in the RSV.** A noticeable difference is clearly apparent!

The name "Jesus" is frequently removed from statements of Deity and works of Deity.

Looking, for example, at Matthew and Mark, Jesus is removed from

Matthew:

4:12 -- the prophecy of the great light (12-16).

4:18 -- the call to discipleship (18-22).

4:23 -- the miracle working ministry in Galilee (23-25).

8:29 -- association with the title "thou Son of God."

12:25 -- the healing of the blind and dumb demoniac (22-30).

13:36 -- the interpretation of "wheat and tares" (36-43).

13:51 -- association with the title "Lord" (which is also removed).

14:14 -- the immediate account of a miracle.

14:22, 25, 27 -- much of the account of walking on the sea.

15:16 -- the discourse about defilement (10-20).

15:30 -- the immediate account of a miracle.

16:20 -- association with the title "the Christ."

Mark:

1:41 -- the immediate account of a miracle.

5:13 -- the immediate account of a miracle.

5:19 -- association with the title "Lord."

6:34 -- the "feeding of the 5,000" (32-44).

7:27 -- the healing of the Syrophenician woman's daughter (24-30).

8:1 -- the "feeding of the 4,000" (1-9).

8:17 -- the discourse concerning leaven (14-21).

11:14 -- the "cursing of the fig tree" (12-14).

11:15 -- the "cleansing of the Temple" (15-19).

12:41 -- the account of the widow's mite (41-44).

14:22 -- the account of the Last Supper (22-25).

In our larger book, *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version*, eighty-six examples of this disassociation are listed

What Lies Behind This Separation?

This separation of "Jesus" from "Christ" occurs far too often to look for any cause other than deliberate editing in certain N.T. manuscripts. That there was a strong movement in the early centuries which could result in such a systematic editing, there can be no doubt! The foremost error regarding the Person of Christ, is of course, to deny His true Deity and true Humanity. The chief means by which this was done, and which finds expression down to our own day, is technically known as "Adoptianism" or "Spirit Christology." Here: Jesus of Nazareth, an ordinary man of unusual virtue, was "adopted" by God into divine Sonship by the advent of the "Christ-Spirit" at His baptism. Therefore, Jesus became Christ at His baptism, rather than, the fact that He was always the Christ from eternity. And though united for a time, Jesus and Christ were separate personages. Many names and groups are associated with this wicked teaching, foremost of whom were the Gnostics. The liberal J. N. D. Kelly writes:

There was a great variety of Gnostic systems, but a common pattern ran through them all. From the pleroma, or spiritual world of aeons the divine Christ descended and united Himself for a time (according to Ptolemy, between the baptism and the passion) to the historical personage ... These were tendencies on the fringe, yet Gnosticism at any rate came within an

ace of swamping the central tradition (*Early Christian Doctrines*, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958, pp. 141,142).

Ponder carefully Kelly's statement about how near this came to "swamping the central tradition"! In the Summaries we will be looking more closely at Egypt; but notice for now that Kelly's mention of Ptolemy and Gnosticism takes us to that city which gave such force and rise to the Gnostic error -- *Alexandria*. **Now we understand why the Bible closes with a fourfold warning:**

"Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?" (1 Jn. 2:22).

"Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of anti-christ" (1 Jn. 4:2, 3).

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (1 Jn. 5:1).

"For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh: This is a deceiver and an antichrist" (2 Jn. 7).

This terrible heresy has found expression in a number of ways down through the centuries, and it has been given a new lease on life through the Modern Versions. *This then is the Dark Secret!*

SIGNIFICANT PASSAGES MISSING

Very few Christians are aware as to how much is actually missing in the Modern Bibles and what the consequence actually is. With this third list the extent of the problem can now begin to be realized. The underlined portions are omitted in the New International Version and most other twentieth century versions both in English and other languages.

Matthew--

5:22 ... whosoever is angry with his brother **without a cause** shall be in danger...

5:27 Ye have heard that it was said **by them of old time**, Thou shalt not commit adultery.

6:4 ... thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee **openly**.

6:6 ... thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee **openly**.

6:18 ... and thy father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee **openly**.

15:6 And honour not his father **or his mother**...

19:16 ... **Good** Master, what good thing shall I do...

19:20 ... All these things have I kept **from my youth up**...

20:23 ... Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, **and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with**.

20:34 ... and immediately **their eyes** received sight, and they followed him.

22:7 But when the king **heard** thereof, he was wroth...

22:13 Bind him hand and foot, **and take him away**, and cast him into outer darkness...

23:4 For they bind heavy burdens **and grievous to be borne**...

23:19 Ye **fools and** blind; for whether is greater...

24:7 ... and there shall be famines, **and pestilences**, and earthquakes, in divers places.

24:48 ... that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth **his coming**.

25:31 When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the **holy** angels with him...

26:3 Then assembled together the chief priests, **and the scribes**, and the elders...

26:28 For this is my blood of the **new** testament, which is shed...

26:59 Now the chief priests, **and elders**, and all the council...

26:60 But found none; yea, though many false witnesses came, **yet found they none**.

27:42 ... **If** he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross...

27:64 ... lest his disciples come **by night**, and steal him away...

Mark--

1:42 And **as soon as he had spoken**, immediately the leprosy departed...

2:16 ... they said unto his disciples, **How is it** that he eateth and drinketh...?

2:22 ... else the new wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine **is spilled**...

3:15 And to have power **to heal sicknesses** and to cast out devils...

4:11 ... unto you it is given **to know** the mystery of the kingdom of God...

6:36 ... and buy themselves bread: **for they have nothing** to eat.

7:2 ... that is to say, with unwashen hands, **they found fault**.

8:9 And **they that had eaten** were about four thousand...

8:26 ... Neither go into the town, **nor tell it to any in the town**.

9:29 ... This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer **and fasting**.

9:45 ... then having two feet to be cast into hell, **into the fire that never shall be quenched**.

9:49 For every one shall be salted with fire, **and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt**.

10:21 ... and come, **take up the cross**, and follow me.

11:8 ... and others cut down branches off the trees, and strawed them **in the way**.

11:23 ... those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have **whatsoever he saith**.

12:4 ... at him **they cast stones**, and wounded him in the head, and **sent him** away shamefully handled.

12:23 In the resurrection **therefore, when they shall rise**, whose wife shall she be of them?

12:29 ... The first of **all the commandments** is, Hear, O Israel...

12:30 ... and with all thy strength: **this is the first commandment**.

12:33 ... and with all the understanding, **and with all the soul**...

13:8 ... and there shall be famines **and troubles**.

13:11 ... take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, **neither do ye premeditate**:

14:19 ... to say unto him one by one, Is it I? **and another said, Is it I?**

14:22 ... Take, **eat**: this is my body.

14:24 ... This is my blood of the **new** testament, which is shed for many.

14:27 ... All ye shall be offended **because of me this night**...

14:51 ... and **the young men** laid hold on him.

14:70 ... thou art a Galilaeen, **and thy speech agreeth thereto**.

15:3 ... accused him of many things: **but he answered nothing**.

15:39 ... saw that **he so cried out**, and gave up the ghost...

Luke--

1:29 And **when she saw him**, she was troubled at his saying...

2:42 ... they went **up to Jerusalem** after the custom of the feast.

4:18 ... he hath sent me **to heal the brokenhearted**, to preach deliverance...

5:38 But new wine must be put into new bottles; **and both are preserved**.

7:28 ... there is not a greater **prophet** than John the Baptist.

8:43 And a woman having an issue of blood twelve years, which **had spent all her living upon physicians**...

8:45 ... When all denied, Peter **and they that were with him** said, Master, the multitude throug thee and press thee, **and sayest thou, Who touched me?**

8:48 ... **be of good comfort**: thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace.

8:54 And he **put them all out**, and took her by the hand...

9:10 ... And he took them, and went aside privately into **a desert place** belonging to the city called Bethsaida.

11:11 If a son shall ask **bread of any of you** that is a father, **will he give him a stone?** or if he ask a fish...

11:44 Woe unto you, **scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!**

11:54 ... seeking to catch something out of his mouth, **that they might accuse him.**

12:39 ... had known what hour the thief would come, **he would have watched**, and not have suffered his house to be broken through.

17:3 ... If thy brother trespass **against thee**, rebuke him...

17:9 ... that were commanded **him? I trow not.**

18:24 And when Jesus **saw that he was very sorrowful**, he said...

19:45 ... and began to cast out them that sold **therein, and them that bought...**

20:13 ... it may be they will reverence him **when they see him.**

20:23 But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, **Why tempt ye me?**

20:30 And the second **took her to wife, and he died childless.**

22:68 ... ye will not answer **me, nor let me go.**

23:23 ... And the voices of them **and of the chief priests** prevailed.

24:1 ... spices which they had prepared, **and certain others with them.**

24:46 ... Thus it is written **and thus it behoved** Christ to suffer...

John--

1:51 **Hereafter** ye shall see heaven open...

3:15 ... **should not perish**, but have eternal life.

5:16 ... therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, **and sought to slay him...**

6:11 ... he distributed **to the disciples, and the disciples** to them...

6:22 ... save **that one whereinto his disciples** were entered...

6:65 ... except it were given unto him of **my** Father.

8:9 ... **being convicted by their own conscience**, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, **even unto the last...**

8:10 When Jesus had lifted up himself, **and saw none but the woman**, he said unto her, Woman, where are **those thine accusers?**

8:28 ... but as **my** Father hath taught me, I speak these things.

8:38 I speak that which I have seen with **my** Father...

8:59 ... and went out of the temple, **going through the midst of them, and so passed by.**

9:6 ... and he anointed the eyes of the **blind** man with the clay...

10:26 ... because ye are not of my sheep, **as I said unto you.**

12:1 ... where Lazarus was **which had been dead...**

14:28 ... I go unto the Father: for **my** Father is greater than I.

16:10 ... because I go to **my** Father...

17:17 Sanctify them through **thy** truth: thy word is truth.

18:40 Then cried they **all** again, saying...

19:16 ... And they took Jesus, **and led him away.**

20:17 ... for I am not yet ascended to **my** Father...

Acts--

3:11 And as **the lame man which was healed** held Peter and John...

5:16 There came also a multitude out of the cities round about **unto** Jerusalem...

6:13 ... This man ceaseth not to speak **blasphemous** words against this holy place, and the law...

7:37 ... A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me: **him shall ye hear.**

10:12 Wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, **and wild beasts...**

10:21 Then Peter went down to the men **which were sent unto him from Cornelius...**

10:30 Four days ago I was **fasting** until this hour...

10:32 ... he is lodged in the house of one Simon a tanner by the sea side: **who, when he cometh, shall speak unto thee.**

13:45 ... spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, **contradicting and blaspheming.**

15:23 And they wrote letters by them **after this manner...**

15:24 ... subverting your souls, saying, **Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law...**

17:5 But the Jews **which believed not**, moved with envy, took unto them...

17:26 And hath made of one **blood** all nations of men...

18:17 Then all **the Greeks** took Sosthenes...

18:21 But bade them farewell, saying, **I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem...**

20:15 ... we arrived at Samos, **and tarried at Trogyllium...**

21:8 And the next day we **that were of Paul's company** departed...

21:22 What is it therefore? **the multitude must needs come together: for** they will hear...

21:25 ... we have written and concluded **that they observe no such thing**, save only that they keep themselves from...

22:9 And they that were with me saw indeed the light, **and were afraid...**

22:20 ... I also was standing by, and consenting **unto his death...**

22:26 ... and told the chief captain, saying, **Take heed** what thou doest...

23:12 And when it was day, **certain** of the Jews banded together...

23:15 ... that he bring him down unto you **to morrow...**

24:26 He hoped also that money should have been given him of Paul, **that he might loose him...**

25:16 ... to deliver any man **to die**, before that he which is accused...

26:30 **And when he had thus spoken**, the king rose up...

28:16 And when we came to Rome, **the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard...**

Romans--

9:32 ... they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works **of the law**.

11:6 ... no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. **But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.**

15:24 Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, **I will come to you...**

15:29 ... I shall come in the fullness of the blessing **of the gospel** of Christ.

1 Corinthians--

6:20 ... glorify God in your body, **and in your spirit, which are God's.**

7:39 The wife is bound **by the law** as long as her husband liveth...

9:22 To the weak became I **as** weak...

10:28 ... conscience sake: **for the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof.**

2 Corinthians--

5:17 ... old things are passed away; behold, **all things** are become new.

Galatians--

5:19 **Adultery**, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness...

5:21 Envyings, **murders**, drunkenness...

Ephesians--

4:9 ... that he also descended **first** into the lower parts of the earth?

4:17 ... that ye henceforth walk not as **other** Gentiles walk...

Colossians--

2:18 ... intruding into those things which he hath **not** seen...

1 Thessalonians--

2:15 Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and **their own** prophets...

1 Timothy--

5:4 ... for that is **good and** acceptable before God.

5:16 If any **man or** woman that believeth have widows...

6:7 ... into this world, **and it is certain** we can carry nothing out.

Titus--

1:4 Grace, **mercy**, and peace, from God the Father...

Hebrews--

2:7 ... thou crownedst him with glory and honour, **and didst set him over the works of thy hands.**

3:6 ... if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope **firm unto the end.**

8:12 ... and their sins **and their iniquities** will I remember no more.

10:34 ... that ye have **in heaven** a better and an enduring substance.

11:11 ... received strength to conceive seed, and was **delivered of a child** when she was past age...

11:13 ... but having seen them afar off, **and were persuaded of them...**

12:20 ... touch the mountain, it shall be stoned **or thrust through with a dart.**

13:21 Make you perfect in every good **work** to do his will...

James--

4:4 Ye **adulterers and** adulteresses, know ye not...

5:5 ... ye have nourished your hearts, **as** in a day of slaughter.

1 Peter--

3:16 ... whereas they speak evil of you, **as of evildoers...**

4:3 For the time past **of our life** may suffice us...

5:5 Yea, all of you **be subject** one to another...

2 Peter--

3:10 But the day of the Lord will come as a thief **in the night...**

Revelation--

2:3 ... for my name's sake **hast laboured**, and hast not fainted.

2:9 I know thy **works, and** tribulation...

2:13 I know **thy works, and** where thou dwellest...

2:20 Notwithstanding I have a **few things** against thee...

5:4 ... no man was found worthy to open **and to read** the book...

11:1 ... **and the angel stood**, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God...

13:10 He that **leadeth** into captivity shall go into captivity:

15:2 ... and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and **over his mark...**

16:17 ... and there came a great voice out of the temple of **heaven...**

19:1 Alleluia; Salvation, and glory, **and honour**, and power, unto the Lord...

HELL IS MISSING!

The doctrine of eternal hell is a fearful Bible truth. The word itself has from the beginning of the English language had a fixed and established meaning. *"The wicked shall be turned into **hell** and all the nations that forget God"* (Psalm 9:17) is very plain. In fact, for many (including preachers and Bible translators) it is apparently too plain. Many people today do not mind using the word in their daily conversation, but do not like seeing it in the Bible.

Modern translations seem to have tried to make the Bible more acceptable by taking some of the terror out of the fact that a man or woman who dies outside of faith in Jesus Christ goes to an eternal and conscious hell. Translators do this in two ways. First, the word is often left in its untranslated Hebrew or Greek form (Sheol, Hades), and thus its impact upon an English reader is diminished. The New American Standard Bible reverts to this practice. Secondly, some simply translate sheol as "death" or "grave." The Jehovah's Witness "Bible" does this and (if you can believe it!) so does the New International Version.

In the previous lists, the point at issue has been the underlying Greek text of the New Testament. The modern versions are based on a different text than the KJV. This as we will show in the following chapters is the reason for the omissions. Here, though, it is a question of the philosophy of the translators. In the case of the NIV this philosophy has completely taken hell out of the Old Testament!

KJV Compared to the NIV with respect to Hell

Deuteronomy 32:22

For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn into the **lowest hell**... (KJV)

For a fire has been kindled by my wrath, one that burns to the realm of death below. (NIV)

2 Samuel 22:6

The **sorrows of hell** compassed me about... (KJV)

The cords of the grave coiled around me; the snares of death confronted me. (NIV)

Job 11:8

It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? **deeper than hell**: what canst thou know? (KJV)

They are higher than the heavens -- what can you do? They are deeper than the depths of the grave -- what can you know? (NIV)

Job 26:6

Hell is naked before him... (KJV)

Death naked before God... (NIV)

Psalms 9:17

The wicked shall be **turned** into **Hell**, and all the nations that forget God. (KJV)

The wicked return to the grave, all nations that forget God. (NIV)

Psalms 16:10

For thou wilt not leave my soul in **hell**; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. (KJV)

Because you will not abandon me to the grave, nor will you let your Holy One see decay. (NIV)

Psalms 18:5

The sorrows of **hell** compassed me about: the snares of death prevented me. (KJV)
The cords of the grave coiled around me; the snares of death confronted me. (NIV)

Psalm 55:15

Let death seize upon them, and let them go down quick into **hell**; (KJV)
Let death take my enemies by surprise; let them go down alive to the grave, (NIV)

Psalm 86:13

...thou hast delivered my soul from the **lowest hell**. (KJV)
...you have delivered my soul from the depths of the grave. (NIV)

Psalm 116:3

The sorrows of death compassed me, and the **pains of hell** gat hold upon me: (KJV)
The cords of death entangled me, the anguish of the grave came upon me; (NIV)

Psalm 139:8

If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in **hell**, behold, thou art there. (KJV)
If I go up to the heavens, you are there; if I make my bed in the depths, you are there. (NIV)

Proverbs 5:5

Her feet go down to death; her steps take hold on **hell**. (KJV)
Her feet go down to death; her steps lead straight to the grave. (NIV)

Proverbs 7:27

Her house is the way to **hell**, going down to the chambers of death. (KJV)
Her house is a highway to the grave, dealing down to the chambers of death. (NIV)

Proverbs 9:18

...her guests are in the depths of **hell**. (KJV)
...her guests are in the depths of the grave. (NIV)

Proverbs 15:11

Hell and destruction are before the Lord: (KJV)
Death and Destruction lie open before the Lord. (NIV)

Proverbs 15:24

The way of life is above to the wise, that he may depart from **hell** beneath. (KJV)
The path of life leads upward for the wise to keep him from going down to the grave. (NIV)

Proverbs 23:14

...and shalt deliver his soul from **hell**. (KJV)
...and save his soul from death. (NIV)

Proverbs 27:20

Hell and destruction are never full; (KJV)
Death and Destruction are never satisfied, (NIV)

Isaiah 5:14

Therefore **hell** hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure... (KJV)
Therefore the grave enlarges its appetite and opens its mouth without limit; (NIV)

Isaiah 14:9

Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth; (KJV)
The grave below is all astir to meet you at your coming; it rouses the spirits of the departed to greet you -- all those who were leaders in the world; (NIV)

Isaiah 14:15

Yet thou shalt be brought down to **hell**, to the sides of the pit. (KJV)
But you are brought down to the grave, to the depths of the pit. (NIV)

Isaiah 28:15

Because ye have said, We have made a covenant with death, and with **hell** are we at agreement... (KJV)
You boast, "We have entered into a covenant with death, with the grave we have made an agreement..." (NIV)

Isaiah 28:18

And your covenant with death shall be disannulled and your agreement with **hell** shall not stand... (KJV)
Your covenant with death will be annulled; your agreement with the grave will not stand... (NIV)

Isaiah 57:9

...and didst debase thyself even unto **hell**. (KJV)
...you descended to the grave itself. (NIV)

Ezekiel 31:16

...I cast him down to **hell** with them that descend into the pit... (KJV)
...I brought it down to the grave with those who go down to the pit... (NIV)

Ezekiel 31:17

They also went down into **hell**... (KJV)
...had also gone down to the grave, (NIV)

Ezekiel 32:21

The strong among the mighty shall speak to him out of the midst **of hell**... (KJV)

From within the grave the mighty leaders will say... (NIV)

Ezekiel 32:27

...which are gone down to **hell**... (KJV)
...who went down to the grave... (NIV)

Amos 9:2

Though they dig into **hell**, thence shall mine hand take them... (KJV)
Though they dig down to the depths of the grave, from there my hand take them... (NIV)

Jonah 2:2

...out of the **belly of hell** cried I, and thou heardest my voice. (KJV)
From the depths of the grave I called for help... (NIV)

Habakkuk 2:5

...who enlarges his desire as **hell**, and is as death, (KJV)
...because he is as greedy as the grave and like death... (NIV)

In the New Testament the word hell is found twenty-two times in the Authorized Version, compared with thirteen occurrences in the New International Version. But the big shock is to see how this popular translation completely removes it from the Old Testament. Yes, the Modern Bibles have gotten rid of the "Thee's" and "Thou's" ...and a lot else!

HOW MANY MISSING WORDS?

The most striking fact about the Modern Bibles is that in the New Testament they are clearly shorter than the Authorized Version. The following gives an idea of how much shorter, by comparing the Greek texts which underlie the AV and Modern Versions. The two most popular editions of the Modern Version Text are: The Nestle Aland -- 26th Edition, and The United Bible Society -- 3rd Edition. These have a different format but their text is identical. The most widely used edition of the Received Text was that prepared by Robert Stephanus in 1550. The KJV does not follow Stephanus in every instance, nor is the NIV identical with the Nestle Aland, but they are close; and these two Greek Testaments provide a good basis for comparison. We begin with a chapter by chapter count of Matthew (with the number of words in the AV Text given first) and then to conserve space give a book by book total.

Matthew (twenty-eight chapters):

(1) 445 vs. 438	(2) 458 vs. 457	(3) 334 vs. 335	(4) 432 vs. 427
(5) 841 vs. 822	(6) 683 vs. 653	(7) 514 vs. 517	(8) 599 vs. 585
(9) 657 vs. 646	(10) 721 vs. 724	(11) 498 vs. 493	(12) 920 vs. 905
(13) 1096 vs. 1076	(14) 565 vs. 561	(15) 625 vs. 610	(16) 533 vs. 525
(17) 517 vs. 496	(18) 695 vs. 668	(19) 549 vs. 533	(20) 572 vs. 542
(21) 869 vs. 865	(22) 668 vs. 661	(23) 688 vs. 656	(24) 835 vs. 825
(25) 773 vs. 763	(26) 1274 vs. 1239	(27) 1036 vs. 1008	(28) 341 vs. 329

Total- (18,740 vs. 18,359), 381 fewer words in the modern version text.

Mark: (11,646 vs. 11,268), 78 fewer words in the modern version text.

Luke: (19,935 vs. 19,473), 462 less;

John: (15,957 vs. 15,636), 321 less;

Acts: (18,794 vs. 18,448), 346 less;
Romans: (7,2044 vs. 7,108), 96 less;
1 Corinthians: (6,933 vs. 6,830), 103 less;
2 Corinthians: (4,509 vs. 4,476), 33 less;
Galatians: (2,251 vs. 2231), 20 less;
Ephesians: (2,462 vs. 2,421), 41 less;
Philippians: (1,641 vs. 1,629), 12 less;
Colossians: (1,621 vs. 1,581), 40 less;
1 Thessalonians: (1,495 vs. 1,481), 14 less;
2 Thessalonians: (834 vs. 819), 15 less;
1 Timothy: (1,624 vs. 1,591), 33 less;
2 Timothy: (1,254 vs. 1,238), 16 less;
Titus: (666 vs. 659), 7 less;
Philemon: (339 vs. 334), 5 less;
Hebrews: (4,990 vs. 4,953), 37 less;
James: (1,763 vs. 1742), 21 less;
1 Peter: (1,724 vs. 1,684), 40 less;
2 Peter: (1,104 vs. 1,099), 5 less;
1 John: (2,175 vs. 2,141), 34 less;
2 John: (249 vs. 245), 4 less;
3 John: (218 vs. 219), 1 more word in the modern version text;
Jude: (452 vs. 461), 9 more words in the modern version text;
Revelation: (9,941 vs. 9,851), 90 fewer words in the modern version text.

Subtotal -- (140,521 vs. 137,977)* with 2,544* fewer words in the modern version text.

*The modern versions either omit, place in the foot notes, question their authenticity, or place in brackets, Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11. After taking these two well-known passages into account the final tally is:

Final Total -- 140,521 vs. 137,602 with 2,886 fewer words in the modern version text.

In the New Testament the modern version text is shorter than that of the King James Version by about the number of words in 1 and 2 Peter!

Keep in mind that these omissions are only part of the story, there are also *many thousands of word alterations* in the Modern Version Text.

A THEORY BEHIND SHORTER BIBLES

Are words missing from the Modern Bibles or have they been added to the Authorized Version? This is the question that must now be asked! Have words been deleted, either intentionally or accidentally from the text underlying the Modern Versions, or have they been somehow added to the text of the King James Version?

Scholars who favour the newer translations have had a ready answer for this question, "Conflation." They've said the King James text conflated or combined readings of the different "text types" or manuscript groupings. For example, if in a certain passage, one group of manuscripts reads "Peter walked by the sea," but another "John walked by the sea"; the manuscripts which form the basis of the Received Text merely combined the two, "Peter and John walked by the sea." This has been the standard explanation for the Received Text's greater length. But, as is now known, conflation cannot begin to offer any such explanation, and today textual scholars are reluctant to appeal to it.

Conflation is but one aspect of what is known as - *The Westcott and Hort Theory*. Last century about the time when Darwin was trying to show how there could be a creation without a Creator, two Cambridge professors, B.F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort built up an elaborate argument in favour of the shorter text and against the Received Text. Others before had labored to the same end, but Westcott and Hort developed the various facets into a powerful and plausible argument. Their theory of the New Testament text has

dominated the views of Bible translators this century. But what is so remarkable: its major tenets have been disproven or diminished by scholars and yet still appealed to by them. Textual Criticism has reached a blind alley with little left to argue the point. One thing has become obvious, they seem no more likely to return to the KJV type of text than an evolutionist whose theories have also been disproven would come back to the Genesis account of creation. Textual critics merely continue to cleave to, and attempt to rehabilitate the wreckage of the Westcott and Hort theory.

Opponents of the Authorized Version have had a very big task on their hands. They must explain the dominance and uniformity of the Traditional/KJV Text. About 90% of known manuscripts fall into this category, and they are strongly cohesive. Further, they must describe the means by which it "became longer."

Here then are the major points of the Westcott and Hort Theory?

One: "In matters of textual criticism the Bible is to be treated like any other ancient book. No special considerations are to be made concerning its claims of inspiration and preservation."

To approach the Scriptures with anything less than the greatest reverence and respect is a reproach to its Author! God has committed Himself to His Book in its inspiration, preservation, and transmission. Textual scholars and translators who have not taken this into account have made a fatal error which reveals itself only too readily in the product.

Two: "Because of their age (mid fourth century), the primary basis of the Greek text is to be found in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts."

These two well preserved manuscripts contain most of the New Testament. Vaticanus has for centuries been in the Vatican library, while Sinaiticus, which was discovered last century in a monastery at the foot of Mt. Sinai, is on display at the British Museum. They exhibit the shorter text and are the chief reason for the new versions being shorter. They are corrupted by Adoptionism. They, with a few allies, constitute the main pillars of the modern Critical Greek Text. They are continually referred to in footnotes as the "oldest and best manuscripts." They are old but certainly not the best! Their great age and good condition can only point to disuse by the early church. How else could they be in such remarkably good condition? We have very little evidence of copies being made from them in subsequent centuries. The comparatively few manuscripts which also exhibit the shorter text frequently disagree with them in other particulars. In fact, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus disagree between themselves over 3000 times in the four Gospels alone. The source of this shorter text seems certain to have been Alexandria, Egypt, and it did not spread and become an accepted text outside of that area. These two primary representatives of the Alexandrian Text remained in their places of disuse for the better part of the Christian era only to be retrieved last century to form the basis of the Modern Bibles.

Three: "Despite its numerical advantage, the Received or Byzantine Text (as it is called) is merely one of three or four competing text types."

This was the great "leveler" used by textual critics when faced with the overwhelming numbers of the Received Text. Rather than view manuscripts on a 90 to 10 ratio (that is 90 for the Received and 10 for the others), the Received Text was made merely one of several competing families. The others being said to be the Alexandrian, Western and possibly the Caesarean.

Now for a start, to divide ten percent of the remaining manuscripts among three textual groupings, shows how small each would be. Today it is admitted that because of their lack of uniformity the Western and Caesarean can no longer be regarded as text types. This leaves the Received and Alexandrian. And the Alexandrian is very small as the following shows:

(1) There are 88 papyri fragments (2nd, 3rd centuries). Many are too fragmentary to show whether they support the longer or shorter text; coming as they do from the Alexandria area we would expect them to support the latter. Scholars such as Fredrick Kenyon usually single out between nine and thirteen in support

of the Alexandrian Text. But, as shown below, the papyri also supports the AV Text.

(2) There are 267 uncial or large-lettered manuscripts (4th-10th centuries). Advocates of the Alexandrian Text claim support from only about nine.

(3) There are 2401 minuscule or small-lettered manuscripts (10th-16th centuries). Supporters of the shorter text are prepared to list only about twenty-two for their side. Thus the Alexandrian manuscripts comprise only a small fraction of those discovered. Further there is wide variation among them; far more so than the great mass of manuscripts which comprise the Received Text. We are actually being quite generous to give as many as 40 manuscripts to the Alexandrian side, for frequently they display the shorter text in only a portion of a manuscript. There is in fact only one cohesive text type; that which underlies the King James Version. Most of what remains is total confusion! We are bound to ask: If the shorter Alexandrian Text used in the modern Bibles is the true one, why did the early church make so few and widely variant copies?

Four: "The numerical preponderance of the Received Text can be explained by a study of the genealogical descent of its manuscripts. If, for example, of ten manuscripts, nine agree against one, but the nine have a common original, the numerical advantage counts for nothing. It is merely one to one."

This was the classic argument W/H used to deny the Received Text any preference on the basis of numbers. The argument implies that many of the Received Text manuscripts are but copies of each other or of near ancestors. Surprisingly, W/H merely theorized at this point, they did not present actual data of parent-to-child and ancestral relationships between manuscripts. Research since W/H has shown that the great mass of Received Text manuscripts are not "mimeographed" copies; very few have a parent-child relationship. Instead they are individual representatives of lines of transmission which go deep into the past.

Five: "The Received Text is fuller due to conflation. It combined the variant readings of other competing text types (usually the Western and Alexandrian). Rather than choose between one or the other, both were used. Much of this took the form of an official revision sanctioned by the Byzantine Church probably under the leadership of Lucan (died 311 A.D.) bishop of Antioch."

If this were true, then most of the underlined KJV passages in our lists which have been omitted from the modern version-should in fact be combinations of material from existing text types. Yet a search of the Alexandrian and Western texts in these passages reveals that there is seldom enough material for the Received Text to make such a conflation. Thus, wherever the unique KJV readings came from, it most certainly was not from that source. This is clearly the reason why Westcott and Hort, who were long on theory but short on demonstration, presented only eight "examples" of conflation. And frankly, the eight are not very convincing. To make conflation the reason for the greater length of the KJV would require virtually thousands of clear instances.

Coming to the second part of the argument, that this conflating was officially carried out around the year 300 A.D., history has left not the slightest trace. This historical blank has led modern scholars to speak of the "lengthening" of the Received Text in terms of a "process which occurred over a considerable time, possibly centuries." Yet how such a process-again unnoticed by history carried out by many scribes, over centuries, across a vast geographic area, could achieve the widespread uniformity so apparent in the Received Text manuscripts is beyond imagination.

Six. "The distinctive Received Text readings (i.e. those we have underlined in the lists) are not generally seen before 35 A.D. For the most part they are absent from the Greek manuscripts, Versions, and Scripture quotations of the Church Fathers."

For a full discussion see the author's "Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version."

But, to summarize the following may be said.

1. The Greek Manuscripts

Clearly, Christians through the centuries believed that the longer text was very old, and that it accurately reflected the original, for they continually multiplied copies of it. This they most certainly would not have done had they felt it was merely a secondary and conflated revision. Nevertheless, Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and some of the papyri portions which have survived for over 1650 years often exhibit the shorter text.

Let it be pointed out first that to expect a manuscript to hold up under the copying process for 1650 years is of course to expect the impossible. It is abundantly clear that these few manuscripts endured precisely because they were not so used. Where are the copies? Further, coming as they do from Egypt, they had the benefit of being stored in a dry climate which greatly contributed to their preservation.

There is, however, clear evidence for the longer TR readings in these few very early relics. Harry A. Sturz in his book "The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism" strikes a devastating blow at arguments which seek to minimize the fact that distinctive Byzantine readings do appear in the early papyri. He lists 150 Received Text readings which though not supported by the early Alexandrian and Western manuscripts are read by the mass of later manuscripts and by the early papyri. He lists a further 170 TR readings which again run counter to Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, but in this case find support from the Western manuscripts. These also are supported in the early papyri. In fact Sturz demonstrates papyri support for a total of 839 readings which in varying degrees would be classed as "distinctly Byzantine." As the papyri is available for only 30% of the New Testament, existing evidence allows us to reasonably project that the story would be the same for the rest of the New Testament. What is especially remarkable about this is, the papyri comes from that area where the Alexandrian/shorter text was prevalent. Nearly all of the 267 uncial manuscripts move strongly to the side of the AV Text, with the same being true of the minuscules.

2. The Early Versions

The early versions, i.e. where Greek was translated into another language, strongly support the Received Text, both before and after 350 A.D. The three primary versions are the Old Latin, Syriac Peshitta, and Egyptian Coptic. The two former were translated about 150 A.D. and the Coptic about 200 A.D. As might be expected existing manuscripts of the Coptic lean toward the Alexandrian/shorter text. Yet, in a significant number of places the Coptic is found to agree with the Received Text against Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

The Old Latin

One view of the origin of the Old Latin is that it was translated in Antioch, Syria, by missionaries to the West. Support for this view is demonstrated by the strong Syrian and Aramaic tendencies in the existing manuscripts. If this is the case then the Old Latin is associated with that city which was not only the missionary center in the Book of Acts, but also the place that history accords as the fountainhead of the Received Text.

The 65 or so existing manuscripts often disagree among themselves and are probably not very good reflections of the original Old Latin text. Those associated with North Africa show some strange additions as well as subtractions. Whereas, the manuscripts connected with Europe are generally favourable to the Received text. It is this African strain of the old Latin that is often termed "the Western text type." One thing is certain; the Old Latin whether European or African does not give much support to the Alexandrian/Modern Version text!

It is the branch of the Old Latin used in northern Italy that attracts our interest most, and establishes one of the crucial chapters in Bible transmission history. This version, known as the Itala, is associated with the Christians of the Vaudois-the valleys of northern Italy and southern France. These noble believers withstood every attempt of Rome to "bring them into the fold." From the days of Pope Sylvester (early 300's) unto the massacres of 1655, they were slaughtered, their name blackened, and their records destroyed; yet they remained true to the Scriptures. They are known by a number of names, but best as the Waldensians. Research into the text and history of the Waldensian Bible has shown that it is a lineal descendant of the Old

Latin Itala. In other words, the Itala has come down to us in the Waldensian form, and is firmly in the Received Text tradition. The same can be said of other Bibles belonging to those groups who remained separate from Rome. Thus, in the Received Text we have the convergence of the Greek speaking East and the non-Catholic Latin-speaking West.

The Syriac Peshitta

Coming now to the third primary version, the Syriac Peshitta, we have a curious case of textual history being rewritten. From the days of Westcott and Hort and the establishing of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus as the basis of the new Bibles, every attempt has been made to discredit all pre 350 A.D. evidence for the Received Text. This is nowhere more apparent than with the famous Syriac Peshitta.

The importance of this version and the church it came from cannot be overemphasized. The virtual center of first century Christianity was Antioch in Syria. "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" (Acts 11:20). Paul's great church planting ministries had their base in Antioch. Syrian Christianity had a close proximity and linkage with many of the churches that had received the inspired New Testament letters. The Syrian church had direct contact with the Apostles and writers of the Scriptures, therefore, the Syrian version may have been written with direct access to the original autographs. Indeed, Bishop Elliott in 1870 wrote, "It is no stretch of imagination to suppose that portions of the Peshitta might have been in the hands of St. John."

Now, in the years following 1870 the good bishop must have bit his tongue for so openly stating this commonly held view concerning the near apostolic age of the Peshitta. For in the movement to bring out a revised Bible, in which he himself played a leading role, the Peshitta posed a major stumbling block. Its manuscripts (now numbering over 259) are in line with the Received Text! Thus, practically by itself the Peshitta could undermine the entire Westcott and Hort superstructure. The answer was to take two other Syriac manuscripts (one discovered in 1842, the other in 1892) which differed from the Peshitta, and call them the "Old Syriac." The Peshitta was then made to be a revision of this so-called Old Syriac. To make the story complete, the Peshitta's date was moved back from 150 to about 425 A.D., with the "revision" being performed by a certain Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa in Syria.

Needless to say, there is not a trace in Syrian ecclesiastical history of such a thing happening. As Arthur Voobus writes "this kind of reconstruction of textual history is pure fiction without a shred of evidence to support it" (*Early Versions of the New Testament*, Estonian Theological Society, 1954, see pp. 90-97). Further, the view is contrary to established facts of history. In Rabbula's day a massive split occurred in the Syrian Church. The opposing sides were known as the Nestorians and Monophysites (led by Rabbula). Yet, both sides regarded the Peshitta as their authoritative Bible. It is impossible to believe that the side bitterly opposed to Rabbula should at the same time embrace unanimously his "revision" of the Scriptures. Further, such a unanimous acceptance by both parties in the early 400's argues powerfully for the Peshitta's early origin.

Regarding the two sole manuscripts of the so-called Old Syrian text. They are not all that close to each other. One denies the virgin birth of Christ in Matthew 1:16. Nor do they lend particularly convincing support to the Alexandrian Text ' In fact, they contain a significant number of Received Text readings. They are merely corrupted copies, all but ignored by the Syrian church, yet with the Received Text base still discernible.

The other European versions-the Gothic (350 A.D.), Armenian (early 400's), and Georgian (mid-400's)-follow the Received Text. Even the Ethiopic (400), despite its proximity to Egypt, is basically Received Text. Therefore, in the early versional history support for the Received Text, in contrast with the Alexandrian Text, is overwhelming.

3. The Scripture Quotations of the Early Church Writers

Westcott and Hort confidently declared that ecclesiastical writers before 350 A.D. did not quote from the longer type of text. Their confidence rested in part on what is an immediate disadvantage for the Received

Text. Most early writers (or at least those whose writings exist now) were located near those areas where the shorter text was prevalent (Alexandria), and where most divergences have been noted in the manuscripts- (North Africa and the West).

In this entire inquiry it cannot be overstressed that in early textual history the Received Text is most directly associated with those places that were either the senders or recipients of the original New Testament autographs, i.e. Antioch, Asia Minor, Greece, Macedonia. While volumes of theological literature poured out of Alexandria, North Africa and Italy, very little is available for us prior to 350 from the eastern areas. Yet even with this disadvantage, the Received Text can be shown to prevail in the Alexandrian/Western writings.

Toward the end of last century John Burgon compiled an extensive index of Scripture quotations from the early Church Fathers. In mentioning Burgon we come to the man who so powerfully and eloquently fought against moves in England to replace the Received Text. Attempts have been made to discredit this good man's massive labours. It certainly cannot be done on the basis of his scholarship. After matriculating at Oxford with honours and taking his B.A. and M.A. there, he was to spend most of his adult life at that famous university. Burgon was Fellow of Oriel College, vicar of St. Mary's (the University Church) and Gresham Professor of Divinity. During his last twelve years he was Dean of Chichester. Unlike many of his contemporaries his was a "scholarship on fire." He believed and loved the Bible, and had a great zeal to defend it. While we cannot go along with his high churchmanship, we acknowledge him as a worthy champion of the Faith, and strongly urge the reading of his books.

Coming now to the index, Burgon cited 4,383 Scripture quotations from 76 writers who died before the year 400 A.D. Edward Miller carried on the work after Burgon's death and put the material in a tabulated form showing the times a Church Father witnesses for and against the Received Text. He found the Received Text had the greater support by 2,630 to 1,753 or 3 to 2. Keeping in mind the Alexandrian and Western localities of these 76 Fathers, we have here quite a strong majority for the Received Text. Had the quotations of the Eastern Fathers been available, all indications are that the support would have been quite overwhelming. But the above evidence shows clearly also that there was a struggle over the text of Scripture in those early centuries. But, there was a clear winner!

Miller concluded his research with the following challenge:

As far as the Fathers who died before 400 A.D. are concerned, the question may now be put and answered. Do they witness to the Traditional Text as existing from the first, or do they not? The results of the evidence, both as regards the quantity and the quality of the testimony, enable us to reply, not only that the traditional Text was in existence, but that it was predominant, during the period under review. Let any one who disputes this conclusion make out for the Western text, or the Alexandrian, or for the Text of B and Aleph (i.e. Vaticanus, Sinaiticus), a case from the evidence of the Fathers which can equal or surpass that which has been now placed before our reader.

Regarding the attempt to discredit Burgon's work by saying that later editors "adapted" the Church Father's quotations to the Traditional Text, Edward Hills writes:

In regard to my references to the Church Fathers, I am sure that if you examine the notes to my *King James Defended and my Believing Bible Study?* you will see that I have taken care to look up all the Burgon's references in the most modern editions available. During the years 1950-55, I spent many weeks at this task... In fact, the newer German editions of the Church Fathers differ little from those of the 17th and 18th centuries. Certainly not enough to affect Burgon's arguments (Letter from Edward F Hills to Theodore P. Letis, February 15, 1980, as quoted in Theodore P Letis, "Edward Freer Hills Contribution to the Revival of the Ecclesiastical Text," unpublished M.T.S. Thesis, Emory University, 1987).

Seven: "There are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for doctrinal purposes during the early centuries."

Such a view allowed Hort to treat the text of Scriptures as he would any other work of ancient literature (see

point one). If he admitted that there had been a significant attack with fairly wide spread results then he would not (or only with greatest difficulty) have been able to introduce his other theories of genealogy, conflation, official revision, and text types. An unpredictable variable would have been introduced which these neatly packaged theories could not have handled. Textual Criticism approaches the history of the Bible much in the same way an evolutionist does the history of the planet: no direct reaction, no flood, all has been left to natural processes, no direct intervention of any kind!

In the face of widespread testimony of early Church Fathers to the contrary, it is hard to believe that Westcott and Hort were ever very serious about this point. But, the tenet had to be accepted if the rest of the theory was to have a chance of standing.

Tertullian of Carthage is typical of many early Fathers. He accused heretics of tampering with the Scriptures in order to gain support for their special views. Around the year 208 A.D. he urged these men to compare their copies with those in the cities where the Originals had been sent. Tertullian may actually be referring to the original autographs of the Epistles of Paul, but if not they were most certainly first generation copies.

"Run over the apostolic churches, in which the very thrones of the apostles are still preeminent in their places, in which their own authentic writings are read. Achaia is very near you, in which you find Corinth. Since you are not far from Macedonia you have Philippi... and the Thessalonians. Since you are able to cross to Asia, you get Ephesus. Since, moreover, you are close upon Italy, you have Rome, from which there come even into our hands the very authority of the apostles themselves."

When the *Living Word*, the Lord Jesus Christ, returned to heaven Satan directed his fury against the *Written Word*. This is the key to understanding the history of the New Testament text. Any theory not taking this into account is totally adrift.

We are faced with the most direct question. Is the longer or the shorter text the offspring of these attempts at corruption? Did the 100 year period when deliberate alteration took place produce the text which more fully presents the Names, Person, and Work of Christ or the one which tends to diminish them? Which would be more likely: a believer adding to the Scriptures, or an enemy of the Faith deleting from the Scriptures? Which would be easier and less liable to immediate detection: adding words and phrases or removing them? Which could be more consistently and uniformly done? And which of these two kinds of text did believers through the centuries feel convinced to be the right one, and demonstrate their conviction by multiplying copies?

By now, you probably know the answer!

Eight: "The shorter reading is to be preferred. Corruption by addition is much more likely than corruption by omission."

This is clearly a case of devising a theory to fit the shorter Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts. As with the other theories it has no real basis in fact. Regarding deliberate alteration, it is far easier to remove a word or passage and get away with it (for a while!), than to add material. And when there is no particular attempt to editorialize, constant copying will result in accidental omission far more often than accidental addition.

But apart from the omission of significant words and passages, the Modern Version Text is shorter in another kind of way. It is more terse and not as lucid as the Received Text. And here it betrays the secret that it is not the original text of the first century, but rather one that is altered and secondary.

In Biblical times there were two major kinds of Greek dialect: Classical or Attic (the dialect of Athens on the Attica Peninsula), and Hellenistic or Koine. Though terse and compact, Attic was considered the more "elegant" of the two. It was the language of the golden age of Greece, and was in vogue from about 480 to 323 B.C. After Alexander the Great, the more simple and explicit *Koine* (meaning common dialect) began to be spoken, and became the lingua franca of the eastern Mediterranean region until the fourth century A.D. when it was superseded by Byzantine Greek.

Importantly for us, Koine was the dialect of the New Testament. This is a remarkable evidence of God's providence. The Attic left too much to the imagination, whereas Koine with its greater fullness could be more precise. It was simple, lucid, plain, and full; yet without the affected pretense of the Attic.

As time passed there were attempts to return the Attic to its former place. The second century A.D. was known as the "century of Atticism" when many did revert back to the Attic brevity. And as it was an occasion for attack against the Scriptures that they were written in the less cultured Koine, a significant number of "Christian" scholars were caught up in this. As we might expect, signs point to Alexandria being the prime mover to bring the Scripture Text into line with the Attic dialect. The manuscripts associated with that locality, certainly beyond all others, favour the Attic-like terseness.

When Westcott and Hort convinced textual scholarship to revise the N.T. away from the Received Text and toward Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; the implications of Attic and Koine Greek were not fully understood. Classical brevity was to them an attraction. Subsequent research has shown how wrong they were: the shorter, not the longer, is the altered text!

A Preconceived Malice

This then, with a few other arguments of a more secondary nature, is the Westcott and Hort (mainly Hort) theory which has resulted in the shorter New Testament of our day. These are the standard arguments against the Text of the King James Version. They are not fair. They are not honest. They do not deal with the actual facts of the case. Much of the argument was tailor-made by Fenton John Anthony Hort to support his own preconceived malice against the standard text.

Ponder what he wrote to a friend in 1851 when only twenty-three years old:

I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of texts, having read so little Greek Testament, and dragged on with the villainous Textus Receptus...Think of that vile Textus Receptus leaning entirely on late manuscripts; it is a blessing there are such early ones (*Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, 1896, Vol 1, p. 211).

Even granting his misconception about "late manuscripts," what would make a young man call the Text of the Reformation which had brought such light to the world, "villainous and vile"? Regardless, with this opening salvo he launched into a career dedicated to the overthrow of the Received Text.

Ernest Colwell wrote:

The dead hand of Fenton John Anthony Hort lies heavy upon us. In the early years of this century Kirsopp Lake described Hort's work as a failure, though a glorious one. But Hort did not fail to reach his major goal. He dethroned the Textus Receptus (*Scribal Habits in Early Papyri, The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, Abingdon, 1965, p. 370)

One Final Argument

So, we have a very curious thing today, the shorter Alexandrian text is being circulated more widely than at any time in history largely through a "glorious failure"! The producers of the Modern Bibles have chosen it rather than the Received Text as their base. Now frankly, we can be thankful for this as it places the issues in sharper contrast. It may well be that God has prevented the text He has honored and blessed from being the base of this endless succession of modern translations! Yet, in view of such a wholesale discrediting of their textual theory, what justification do they offer for continued use of the shorter text?

To a large extent we are now dealing with expediency rather than an honest evaluation of the evidence. The publishing houses have invested (and made!) huge sums in the Modern Versions. The NIV is now beginning to outsell the Authorized Version. Almost all of the world's Bible Societies use the shorter text for their foreign language translations. It is entrenched in practically all theological colleges. And despite its proven fallacy there is simply not the will to upset the status quo. Nevertheless, they must be able to offer some

reasonable justification for its use. They may merely try to repeat the old arguments, or raise some secondary points; but as far as factual evidence they have very little to offer for their case. Recently they have come up with an argument which does not offer any positive support for the shorter text but is more of a reaction against what they know only too well to be the considerable evidence for the text found in the vast majority of manuscripts.

Gordon D. Fee of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in Massachusetts has been at the forefront in seeking to dampen down popular support for the Received Text. He makes the following point:

... But the question still must be answered: How does one account for its dominance and general uniformity? ... How did the Byzantine text become dominant? ... The most important factor for the dominance and general uniformity of the Byzantine text... By the end of the seventh century the Greek NT was being transmitted in a very narrow sector of the church viz., the Greek Orthodox Church with its dominant patriarchate in Constantinople. By the time of Chalcedon (the famous council of 451 A.D.) Greek is almost unknown in the west, and after Chalcedon the decline of Alexandria and the subsequent rise of Islam narrow Greek speaking Christendom still further ("Modern Textual Criticism and the Revival of the Textus Receptus," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, March 1978, pp. 29, 30).

A New Argument

It is now being argued that the reason for the scarcity of manuscripts with the shorter text is due merely to the fact that they are associated with areas which ceased to speak Greek. This has become something of a last ditch defence for the Alexandrian Text in the face of its paucity of manuscript evidence.

Why This Argument is Not Valid:

1. At issue here is the shorter text of Alexandria, not that of the West generally. The argument tends to give an impression that the scarcity of Alexandrian manuscripts is due to Greek usage dying out in the West. Alexandria, of course, is not the West.
2. The Alexandrian Text is precisely what the term implies—the local text of Alexandria! There is little evidence that it spread beyond Egypt. It made no impact on the West or East, neither in Greek, Latin, or the other versional languages.
3. The Moslem conquest of Alexandria did not take place until A.D. 642. And though the Muslims restricted evangelism, they did not attempt to exterminate Christianity, or compel Christians to convert. Nor does there seem to be evidence that the Muslims halted manuscript transmission in the areas they conquered. Therefore, many centuries were available for the Alexandrian Text to proliferate and establish itself. But it did not! Not only did it fail to make an impression on the surrounding regions, but if surviving manuscripts are anything to go by it also lost favor on its own home base. This is demonstrated by the fact that the very few manuscripts which display this kind of text often do so only in a portion of their contents. Also one of its two primary representatives, Sinaiticus, has hundreds of scribal alterations made at the time of its production which move back toward the Traditional Text by a five to two margin!

These then are the arguments that have been used against the text of the King James Bible. The case cannot be sustained. The theory breaks down at every point, and serves only to highlight the formidable strength of the Bible we hold dear.

A Fearful Warning

That this issue of missing words and passages is more than mere academic wrangling, but has in fact eternal implications is made plain by the Bible's final warning.

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book.-

And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book" (Revelation 22:18, 19).

This warning in the first instance refers to the Book of Revelation. But, it is the Book of Revelation in its position as the capstone of Scripture. This seems evident as warnings of this kind are not found at the end of any of the other sixty-five books of the Bible. That modern Bible translators do not take it seriously does not diminish its force and fulfillment one bit.

The ANTIOCH Text Vs. The ALEXANDRIAN Text

There is one point upon which both sides of the current debate agree: the early transmissional history of the New Testament is a "tale of two cities", Antioch and Alexandria. And just as surely as the KJV Text was woven into the spiritual life of Antioch in Syria, so was also the Modern Version Text in Alexandria. Today a believer must decide whether he is more comfortable with a Bible whose roots go back to one or the other of these two cities. The choice is a clear one, as there is very little common ground between them.

Certainly Antioch has by far the more glorious Biblical heritage. It became to the Gentile Christians what Jerusalem had been to the Jews, and superseded Jerusalem as the base for the spread of the Gospel. The "disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" (Acts 11:26). It was the starting point for the Apostle Paul's missionary journeys. Mark, Barnabas, and Silas were there; as was Peter and probably Luke. The Book of Acts leaves us with no doubt that Antioch was the centre of early church activity.

Egypt shares no such glory. It has always been looked upon as a symbol of the world-system which is opposed to the things of God. God would not allow His Son (Mt. 2), His nation (Ex. 12), His patriarchs (Gen. 50), or even the bones of the patriarchs (Ex. 13:19) to remain there. The Jews were warned repeatedly not to return to Egypt, not to rely upon it for help, not to even purchase horses there, etc. Thus, in contrast to what is being claimed today, it is hard to believe that Egypt and Alexandria would have been the central place where God would preserve His Holy Word. Frankly, it was the last place on earth that one could trust in doctrinal and biblical matters. It certainly wasn't safe to get a Bible there!

Even Bruce Metzger, a supporter of the Alexandrian Text, is compelled to catalogue the vast amount of religious corruption which came from Alexandria:

Among Christians which during the second century either originated in Egypt or circulated there among both the orthodox and the Gnostics are numerous apocryphal gospels, acts, epistles, and apocalypses. Some of the more noteworthy are the Gospel according to the Egyptians, the Gospel of Truth, the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Philip, the Kerygma of Peter, the Acts of John, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistle of the Apostles, and the Apocalypse of Peter. There are also fragments of exegetical and dogmatic works composed by Alexandrian Christians, chiefly Gnostics during the second century. We know, for example, of such teachers as Basilides and his son Isidore, and of Valentinus, Ptolemaeus, Heracleon, and Pantaenus. All but the last-mentioned were unorthodox in one respect or another. In fact, to judge by the comments made by Clement of Alexandria, almost every deviant Christian sect was represented in Egypt during the second century; Clement mentions the Valentinians, the Basilidians, the Marcionites, the Peratae, the Encratites, the Docetists, the Haimetites, the Cainites, the Ophites, the Simonians, and the Eutyichites. What proportion of Christians in Egypt during the second century were orthodox is not known (*The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Clarendon Press, 1977, p. 101).

Let it be said again: Alexandria was the worst possible place to go for a Bible! Yet it is precisely the place that our present-day translators have gone in gathering the major sources of the modern Bible.

Which Bible is God's Word ?

Part 2 of 3

TIMELESS OR TIME-BOUND?

Translators of the Authorized Version and the other great Bibles believed that the Scriptures unfold absolute truth which transcended time and culture. Though the events and discourses of Scripture take place in a long ago age, and in a civilization different from our own; by the working of the Holy Spirit it speaks directly to the heart in all cultures and times. That this is so is demonstrated by man's common union in the fall of Adam (Rom. 5:12) and his need of the One Saviour (Acts 4:12). This two-fold unity overrides any considerations of time and culture.

There may have been the need for certain normal adjustments, but there was never a question of translating the Bible any other way than the way God gave it. It was also acknowledged by translators that there were many deep things in the Bible which could not be translated simple enough for "modern man" to understand at first reading. And any such attempt would "translate" the meaning away! Thus, this idea of bringing the Bible "down to the people" had definite limits.

With the advent of Eugene A. Nida and his widely accepted "Dynamic Equivalence Theory" this has all changed. According to him the message and events of Scripture are "bound in their ancient time and culture." By merely using the "static" equivalence method of translation-that is, a word for word translation-the message of the Bible remains bound as far as modern man is concerned. But when the principles of "dynamic" equivalence are applied the message will naturally "leap out" at him into his own day and surroundings (or so Nida would like us to think).

Nida says that formerly there was a one-sided regard for the message, but today the emphasis should be on how the message is connected with its receptor (the certain people to whom the message is sent). Thus, the translator must consider more than just the differences between two languages; he must consider the cultural differences between the past and present. If (to use Nida's example) the people of Jacob's day understood his wrestling with the angel in a literal sense, the people of this day probably would not. Therefore, the translator should, to a certain extent, adapt and

translate Genesis 32 "psychoanalytically or mythologically."

It becomes apparent that in dynamic equivalency a great deal of liberty can be taken with the events and discourses of Scripture so long as the translator "gets the message across."

Speaking in irony of this new method, missionary director Dan Truax writes: "Admittedly, the readers in the jungles of Brazil would understand Isaiah 1:18 better with the "corn flour" substitution. The "corn flour translation" would read as follows:

"Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as 'corn flour.'" But consider the dilemma of those translators when they came to certain Bible verses into which "corn flour" in the place of "snow" would not fit "He ... stew a lion in a pit in a snowy [corn flour?] day" (1 Chronicles 11:22) or; "For as the rain cometh down and the snow [corn flour?] from heaven..." (Isaiah 55:10).

What happened to the old practice of translating the Bible as it was, and then explaining concepts that were strange to the readers? (from *B.I.M.I. World*).

There is a limit as to how far the advocates of Dynamic Equivalency will go. Obviously, if the translation becomes too radical it will not be accepted. "The cultural adaptation must not totally enter the translation. At the same time, they are convinced that cultural adaptation is necessary." Therefore, they speak of the church as a "transformer of the truth" which completes the process began by the translator. Thus if the translator cannot convey that Jacob wrestling with the angel was really a "psychological struggle," the church and preacher should make that supposedly divine truth known!

Virtually all recent translations and the Bible Societies' work generally has been to a large extent influenced by Dynamic. Equivalence. It has made Eugene Nida the most influential person in the field. The theory is grounded in theological liberalism. It strips the Bible of its doctrinal content. It dishonours God by implying He is unable to speak absolutely to all generations and cultures. And to quote the verdict that a literary critic gave the New International Version, it makes the Bible "formica flat."

That the New International Version was influenced by Dynamic Equivalence is demonstrated by the following statement in its preface:

Because for most readers today the phrase "the LORD of hosts" and "God of hosts" have little meaning, this version renders them "The LORD Almighty and God Almighty" (p. ix).

Thus, they have confounded LORD of hosts with El Shaddai: (God Almighty)!

It is not only the underlying text which is at fault in the modern versions, the translations itself is seriously defective. Thankfully you'll not have to worry about either when you meditate in the pages of the King James Bible.

For an excellent (to whom I am indebted for the above), see *The Future of the Bible* by Jakob van Bruggen, Nelson Publishers.

The NIV vs. The AV ENGLISH

English is the closest thing there is today to a universal language. Upwards of 350 million speak it as their first language, with many more than that using it as a second language. It has the largest vocabulary of any language (550,000 separate entries in Webster's *Third New International Dictionary*). English has become the diplomatic language of the United States, and the standard language of science, technology, business and communications. It has been the primary medium through which the Word of God has spread during these last centuries of church history. Before giving several reasons why the English of 1611 was better suited as a vehicle for divine revelation, let us note briefly the preparations which led to the AV's translation.

The Authorized Version was the culmination of some 100 years of preparation. There was intensive study of the Greek Text (not to mention Hebrew). The five Greek editions of Erasmus, the four of Stephanus, the nine of Beza provided the translators with a refined text, representative of that which was in the majority of manuscripts, and had been acknowledged (John 16:13) by God's people through the centuries. There were no fewer than seven "preparatory" English translations: Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthews, Great, Taverners, Geneva, and Bishops. The AV translators themselves were men of unparalleled scholarship, representing the combined intellectual might of Oxford and Cambridge. But far more importantly, they were marked by a holy awe and deep reverence for the Word of God. It is this latter that places them poles apart from the translating teams of today.

Coming back now to the English in which our Authorized Bible was

written, it is an evidence of God's providence that after nearly four centuries, so little can be found to be archaic. Certainly there are "profound differences" between current and Elizabethan English. But, the AV is not Elizabethan English! As a comparison will show, there is a great difference between AV English and the wordy, affectations Elizabethan style.

Far from our Bible being a product of that day's literary style, the English language after 1611 owes its development to the Authorized Version! "The King James Version was a landmark in the development of English prose. Its elegant yet natural style had enormous influence on English-speaking writers" (*World Book Encyclopedia*). This partially explains why the AV is ever fresh and lucid while most else from that period is quite difficult to read.

Edward F. Hills speaks on the misconception that the English of the AV is Elizabethan:

The English of the King James Version is not the English of the early 17th century. To be exact, it is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is biblical English, which was not used on ordinary occasions even by the translators who produced the King James Version. As H. Wheeler Robinson (1940) pointed out, one need only compare the preface written by the translators with the text of their translation to feel the difference in style. And the observations of W.A. Irwin (1952) are to the same purport. The King James Version, he reminds us, owes its merit, not to 17th-century English - which was very difficult - but to its faithful translation of the original. Its style is that of the Hebrew and of the New Testament Greek. Even in their use of thee and thou the translators were not following 17th-century English usage but biblical usage, for at the time these translators were doing their work these singular forms had already been replaced by the plural you in polite conversation (*The King James Version Defended*, Des Moines: Christian Research Press, 1984, pp. 218).

In 1604 when James I authorized preparations for a new English version of the Bible, a watershed was reached not only in the history of Bible translation, but of the history of the English language itself.

The PRINCIPLES Of BIBLE PRESERVATION

One hundred years ago John Burgon wrote: "If you and I believe that the original writings of the Scriptures were verbally inspired by God, then of

necessity they must have been providentially preserved through the ages."

This is the crux of the matter; does God preserve that Word which He originally inspired? And if so, to what extent? Is it merely the concepts and basic message that is kept intact; or does preservation, as inspiration, extend to the words themselves?

That the Bible declares both the fact and extent of its preservation is made abundantly clear in the following:

- *"Know now that there shall fall unto the earth nothing of the word of the LORD" (2 Kings 10:10).*
- *"The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever" (Psalm 12:6, 7).*
- *"For the LORD is good, his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations" (Psalm 100:5).*
- *"For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven " (Psalm 119:89).*
- *"Thy word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it" (Psalm 119:140).*
- *"Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them for ever" (Psalm 119:152).*
- *"Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever" (Psalm 119:160).*
- *"Every word of God is pure" (Proverbs 30:5).*
- *"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever" (Isaiah 40:8).*
- *"So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isaiah 55:11).*
- *"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matthew 5:18).*
- *"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matthew 24:35).*
- *"And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail" (Luke 16:17).*
- *"The scripture cannot be broken" (John 10:35).*
- *"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" (I Peter 1:23).*
- *"But the word of the Lord endureth for ever" (I Peter 1:25).*

We have a strange anomaly today; Christians claim to believe what the

Bible says about its own inspiration but virtually ignore the equally direct statements concerning preservation. To say that you believe in the full inspiration of Scripture while at the same time accepting the textual theories inherent in the modern versions, is about as incongruous as taking Genesis one literally while holding to the theories of Darwin.

One: The Starting Point of Apostasy

The questioning of the Bible's preservation is the starting point of all other kinds of apostasy. Satan in Genesis 3 did not begin his attack by questioning whether there was a God, or whether God created, or whether the doctrine of the Trinity is true. Nor did it begin with the question of whether God's Word was inspired in the originals. Apostasy began when Satan asked Eve, "Yea hath God said"? "Eve, are you certain that you presently have a full recollection of what God said"? When doubt was given a bridgehead at this point, the other defenses soon fell. The same principles applies today: Has God preserved His word and kept intact His original word of inspiration or has He not? It is a fact, that the one common denominator in all the varied errors, deviations, and heresies is that their advocates will first criticize the standard received edition or translation of Scripture.

Two: Preservation Must Be Approached in an Attitude of Faith

Like all other Bible truths, the Scripture's teaching on its own preservation is to be in the first instance accepted by faith. Edward F. Hills in his book, *The King James Version Defended* calls it "the logic of faith." The facts and evidence of such preservation will then follow.

Three: Preservation is Grounded in the Eternal Counsels of God

The Bible's preservation is rooted in the eternal counsels of God. The Scriptures are as eternal as God Himself.

"For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven" (Psalm 119:89).

Four: Preservation is Brought to Pass Through the Priesthood of Believers

The Old Testament text was preserved by the Aaronic priests and the scribes who grouped around them. *"Unto them were committed the oracles of God"* (Romans 3:2).

In the New Testament dispensation every believer is a priest under Christ. Hence, the NT text has been preserved by faithful Christians in every walk of life. *"Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth"* (John 16:13).

It was not the pronouncements of church fathers or counsels that determined the text and canon of the New Testament. Rather, the Holy Spirit guided His own into the acceptance of the true word of God. Such copies proliferated, while defective ones were ignored. The Holy Spirit continues this work today in the questions that arise over the wording in the modern versions.

Five: Preservation Extends to the Actual Words

Preservation has to do with the actual words of Scripture, not merely the general teaching or concepts. This is made clear in the list of verses just given. Advocates of the modern versions commonly say: "There is not a single doctrine missing." But what they fail to tell you is that the words which support and develop these doctrines are frequently missing. Thus, the force of the doctrine is diminished. As inspiration of the Scriptures is verbal so also preservation must be verbal.

Six: Preservation is Operative in the Spread of the Scriptures

Preservation has taken place in the diffusion of God's word, not in its being hidden or stored. Stewart Custer in seeking to somehow equate the use of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus with the doctrine of preservation said: "God has preserved His word in the sands of Egypt" (stated in a debate at the Marquette Manor Baptist Church in Chicago, 1984).

To take such a position, would mean that believers have had the wrong text for 1800 years, and it has been only with the advent of two liberal British churchmen, and the retrieval of two disused Alexandrian manuscripts that we now have the "true preserved" word of God. No! The miracle of preservation was operative while the Scriptures were being disseminated. *"The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it"* (Psalm 68:1 1). *"Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world"* (Romans 10: 18).

Seven: Preservation Must of Necessity Apply to Key Translations

As so few can read the original languages, God's promise to preserve His Word has no practical relevance if it does not extend to translations. The Scripture frequently affirms "*...that we are born again by the Word of God*" (James 1:18; 1 Corinthians 4:15; 1 Peter 1:23). If a translation cannot be equated with the actual Word of God, then ultimately this leads to the situation that one must know Hebrew and Greek before they can be saved, or built up in the faith (Romans 10: 17; Matthew 4:4). Further, the Bible's use of the term "preserved" demonstrates that it is an absolute and not a relative term. To speak of the Bible, or in this discussion, a translation as being "almost preserved" is a misnomer. Either it is preserved or it isn't, either it has errors or it doesn't. Either the flower fades and the grass withers or it does not.

Eight: The Meaning of the Term "Scripture"

While it may be assumed that the Bible usage of the word "Scripture" has reference to the original autographs; yet virtually each time the word is used it is the copies or even translations of the Scriptures that are in view, e.g. it is the copies of the Scriptures that the people had access to. Note the following examples:

- "*...I will show thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth*" (Dan. 10:2 1).
- "*...Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures*" (Matt. 22:29).
- "*...This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears*" (Luke 4:2 1).
- "*...He expounded unto them in all the scriptures...*" (Luke 24:27).
- "*...And while he opened to us the scriptures*" (Luke 24:32).
- "*...That they might understand the scriptures*" (Luke 24:45).
- "*...They believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said*" (John. 2:22).
- "*...Search the scriptures...*" (Jn. 5:39).
- "*... The scripture cannot be broken*" (Jn. 10:35).
- "*...The place of the scripture which he read..*" (Acts 8:32).
- "*...And began at the same scripture and preached...*" (Acts 8:35).
- "*...Reasoned with them out of the scriptures'* (Acts 17:2).
- "*...That from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures...*" (2 Tim. 3:15).
- "*...All scripture is given by inspiration of God... '* (2 Tim. 3:16).

The above shows clearly that the word "scriptures" refers to what the people had access to, what was at hand, what was current, what they could then actually read and hear. Therefore, the Biblical usage of the word refers primarily to copies rather than the original autographs.

The fact that these copies and possibly even translations are called "scripture" strongly implies their preservation, and that the very qualities of the inspired original have been brought over into them:

- These copies are holy (2 Tim. 3:15; Rom. 1:2).
- These copies are true (Dan. 10:21).
- These copies are not broken (Jn. 10:35).
- These copies are worthy of belief (Jn. 2:22).
- The prophecies contained in these copies have been fulfilled to the very letter and await fulfillment (Luke 4:21).
- These copies are the very voice of God. This can be illustrated by a comparison of the following: Exodus 9:13-16 with Romans 9:17; Genesis 12:1-3 with Galatians 3:8; Genesis 21:10 with Galatians 4:30.

These verses establish the fact that there is no difference between the scriptures speaking and God speaking. And as the scriptures refer to that which is current and available, it follows that our copies are as much the voice of God as the original was.

Consider also that classic passage on inspiration:

"And that from a child thou has known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.- that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works. "
" -(2 Tim. 3:15-17)

There are some remarkable things about this passage that are often overlooked. The words "is given by inspiration of God" are translated from the one Greek word, "*theopneustos*" (God-breathed), and "is profitable" is from "*Ophelimos*." These two words are joined by the conjunction "*kai*." Thus, all scripture (*graphe*) is said to be "God-breathed and profitable." Therefore, while the Scriptures were inspired in the past and their profitability has to do with the present, yet both facts are joined together in an identical grammatical construction. Thus, it is the work of past

inspiration which makes the Scriptures profitable in the present. And conversely, the Scriptures cannot be profitable in the present if the manifold blessings of inspiration have not been preserved. **Past inspiration is inseparably linked to present profitability.**

Nine: The Bearing of John 16:13 upon the Translation and Preservation Process

Translation and Preservation Process

Translation and Preservation Process

Translation and Preservation Process

"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth" (John 16:13). God has promised to guide His people into all truth. "All" here does not mean "basically," "generally," "almost," "nearly," "relatively." It must surely mean ALL! "Truth" is defined in the next chapter of John as referring to the Bible. Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth (Jn. 17:17).

Through the priesthood of believers, God guided His people into all truth as to the canon of Scripture, e.g. which books were and were not inspired. He also guided them into all truth as to the text of Scripture (which were and were not the correct readings). And in order to make this relevant and practical he must also guide them into all truth concerning the translation of Scripture. Three important things can be seen in John 16:13:

1. The Guide-"the Spirit of Truth"
2. The Journey-"will guide you"
3. The Arrival-"into all truth"

The history of how our Bible came down to us after its inspiration in the original autographs is to be found under these three points. These must be considered in the history of every Bible of every language.

The Guide-

The same Holy Spirit of Truth who verbally inspired the Word in the autographs is committed also to its verbal preservation in the textual, transmission, and translation process.

The Journey-

The statement "will guide you" indicates that a process is in view. In the history of a given Bible where God was actively guiding there will be at least three key periods:

1. The Manuscript Period
2. The Early Printed Edition Period
3. The Period of an Authoritative Standard Edition

In each of these periods God's Word will be current and available to His people.

"But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart that thou mayest do it" (Deut. 30:14).

In the first two periods God's Word may not have been available from the same written source. Relatively minor variations existed in the hand copied manuscripts of the Received Text tradition. The early printed Greek texts of Erasmus, Stephanus and Beza had some variation, as did the early printed English versions. Yet, God's promise of guiding into all truth could still be counted and through the comparing of several sources He would put upon the heart of his people which of the variants was the true reading.

For example, Wycliffe's Bible was based on the Latin Vulgate in those remote and primitive areas where only a preliminary translation was available. The earnest seeker of truth can know what a true reading is, for God has promised to "guide into all truth." There is, however, the disadvantage today that many missionary Bibles are based on the Alexandrian text.

The Arrival-

If "will guide you" refers to the process or journey; then "into all truth" must refer to the arrival at a destination. This destination refers to that point when a given language receives an authoritative standardized Bible accepted over a considerable period of time by the great mass of believers. By any criterion the publication of the King James Version in that language which is most used in international communication is the single most important event in the transmission history of Scripture.

Certainly here we see the Biblical principle of 1 Corinthians 13:10:

"But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be

done away. "

History has shown this version in its widespread appeal to tower above the other great standard versions of Europe. Even to this day it is the measuring rod against which all others are judged.

The King James version is the grand culmination of God's promise to guide His people into all truth. Our conviction that this pinnacle was reached in 1611 is enforced by the fact that since then textual scholarship has been rationalistic, has denied the inspiration of Scripture, and has moved in precisely the opposite direction.

Ten: Life giving Qualities in a Translation

Inspiration in the originals will not only ensure preservation in certain key translations, but also animation. It is this quality which enables a translation to convict the sinner and bring manifold grace to the believer (Hebrews 4:12; Acts 2:27; Isaiah 55:11; Psalm 119:9,11,130; Romans 10:17). It is this which ensures that a translation will become an enduring standard among the humble people of God. The Old Latin, Syriac Peshitta, Armenian, Georgian, Gothic, Slavonic, Luther, Tyndale, Geneva and King James are examples of versions which in a sweetly natural way worked their way into the hearts of millions of God's people. High pressured promotion was not needed as was the case for Constantine's Bible, the Latin Vulgate or the New International Version.

Thus, when a translation is being prepared in accordance with the will of God, the life giving breath of God will be felt in that translation. Modern versions claim to be the "results of the most recent scholarship," but there is no life in them and they will fall flat after a few years. Ponder the fate of the once very popular Living Bible!

God's work of preservation does more than keep the Bible from error in its transmission and translation, it gives to the Bible an enduring freshness. Therefore, a translation can be as much the Sword of the Spirit as the original autographs. When God is active in the work of a translation (and is there any reason to think that He would not be?), the manifold blessings of the once delivered work of inspiration are transmitted to that translation. Our standard translation is not a valley of dry bones, it has breath! To test this fact read John 14 in the New International Version and then in the Authorized Version.

"Guiding into all truth" is not secondary inspiration. It does, however, enable a translation upon which God's favour rests to be a completely accurate vehicle of His "once given" original work of inspiration.

Eleven: A Standard Translation Should Be Accepted as the Preserved Word of God

It is only God who can make a translation or version a true Standard. Such a Standard will endure the test of time, receive universal acceptance, and result in widespread conversion. Such a Standard will spawn and encourage the publication of vast amounts of supplemental literature: commentaries, concordances, theological works, study helps of all kinds. And such a Standard will evoke the wrath of Satan. Since its inception, the King James Version has been called "the paper pope of the Protestants!"

That the Authorized Version is such a Standard and the only Standard in the English language for nearly 400 years argues convincingly that it is God's preserved word in that language. In response to God's promises of preservation and the abundant evidence of the same, the believer may be fully confident that the AV has no blemishes and is without proven error. There are places that may need explanation, and it is right for the teacher within reasonable limits to amplify, elucidate and expound the English as well as the underlying text. But this must not be done in such away as to imply to the listener that errors exist. For example, "This word means..." is acceptable; but "A better rendering would be..." is not. Before being too concerned about the "force of the Greek or Hebrew," the reader should be certain that he has a grasp on "the force of the English!"

I say that the KJV is without "proven error" because I am not aware of errors having been proven! Given all that can be said in behalf of the King James Bible, the burden of proof must rest with the one making the charge. If he feels he has better understanding and spiritual insight at a given point than did the fifty AV translators not to mention the translators of the seven Bibles from Tyndale to the Bishops which prepared the groundwork of the AV-then he must set forth his evidence.

That this is not so easy can be seen from the following incident involving one of the AV translators:

Dr. Richard Kilby, the translator in the Old Testament group at Oxford, heard a young parson complain in an earnest sermon that a certain passage should read in a way he stated. After the sermon Dr. Kilby took the young

man aside and told him that the group had discussed at length not only his proposed reading but thirteen others; only then had they decided on the phrasing as it appeared (Gustavis S. Paine, *The Men Behind the KJV*, Baker Book House, 1959, pp. 137,8).

A great amount of unnecessary harm has been done by "young parsons" (and older ones too!) who do this. Anyone who approaches a so-called problem passage in an attitude of honour towards God's Word will find the solution equally honouring. He will find that God's promise of preservation has been vindicated.

Twelve: Will There Be Another Standard Bible?

It is not impossible that in the providence of God another universally accepted standard translation could be produced. However, given the lateness of the hour, the lack of spiritual scholarship, and the fact that our language no longer has the depth and vitality it once had, this seems most unlikely. All indications point to the KJV as the Bible God would have His people use in these last days before the Second Coming of Christ. God has preserved in the King James Version His original work of inspiration. The flower has not faded! The Sword is as sharp as in the day it was first whetted!

QUESTION: Where do Bible manuscripts come from?

ANSWER: Most existing manuscripts of the Bible are divided into two "families". These families are generally represented by the cities of Alexandria, Egypt and Antioch, Syria.

EXPLANATION: There are only two Bibles, God's and the devil's. There are only two views of the Bible. It is totally perfect or it is imperfect.

The two Bibles, in manuscript form, and their corresponding ideologies originate in two vastly different locations in the Mid East. Alexandria, Egypt and Antioch, Syria. Discerning which location gives us the perfect Bible and the correct ideology and which gave us the devil's bible and incorrect ideology is one of the easiest tasks imaginable. This pursuit is made childishly easy due to one source, the **Bible**.

As we have stated so many times, yet shall again, we accept the Bible as our final authority in all matters of **faith** and **practice**. Therefore, all anyone need do is to explore the Bible and discover what **GOD** thinks of Alexandria, Egypt and what He thinks of Antioch, Syria.

When studying Scripture a fundamental rule that is followed is called "the

law of first mention". This means that it is **generally** true that the context in which someone or something is first mentioned sets the Bible attitude for that person or place.

In our study of Alexandria and Antioch we find it impossible to ignore the Bible's attitude toward Egypt itself.

Egypt

(1) Egypt is first mentioned in Genesis 12:10-12.

10 *"And there was a famine in the land: and Abram went down into Egypt to sojourn there: for the famine was grievous in the land.*

11 *And it came to pass, when he was come near to enter into Egypt, that he said unto Sarai his wife, Behold now, I know that thou art a fair woman to look upon:*

12 *Therefore it shall come to pass, when the Egyptians shall see thee, that they shall say, This is his wife: and they will kill me, but they will save thee alive."*

In Genesis 12:1-3 we find Abraham is given what is known as the Abrahamic Covenant. Literally it is God's promise to deliver the world to Abraham and his seed as their own private possession.

In Genesis 12:10 Abraham goes down into Egypt to escape a famine in his homeland. In verse 12 we find Abraham's fear that the Egyptians might kill him and steal Sarai his wife. **NOT** exactly a positive context. We see then that the **first** mention of **Egypt is negative**.

(2) In Exodus 1:11-14 we find that the Jews were slaves in Egypt.

11 *"Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses.*

12 *But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel.*

13 *And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour:*

14 *And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field: all their service, wherein they made them serve, was with rigour. "*

In fact, Pharaoh decrees that all male Jewish babies are to be killed in verses 15 and 16.

15 *"And the king of Egypt spake to the Hebrew midwives, of which the name of the one was Shiphrah, and the name of the other Puah:*

16 *And he said, When ye do the office of a midwife to the Hebrew women, and see them upon the stools; if it be a son, then ye shall kill him: but if it be a daughter, then she shall live."*

Obviously a **negative** connotation.

(3) In Exodus chapter 20, after He had brought the children out of Egypt, God, **with His own voice**, tells what He thinks of Egypt in verse 2 where He describes it as a "house of bondage" *"I am the LORD thy God, which*

have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

Again, a **negative** comment and this one directly from God's lips.

(4) In Deuteronomy 4:20 Moses refers to Egypt as "the iron furnace. "

"But the LORD hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him a people of inheritance, as ye are this day."

(5) In Deuteronomy 17:16 Israel is told that, in the future, when they have a king he is not to carry on commercial trade with Egypt.

"But he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the LORD hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way."

(6) And finally in Revelation 11:8, when God wants to denounce Jerusalem, He compares it to Sodom and Egypt.

"And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified."

This brief study has shown what most Christians already know. The Bible has a **negative** outlook on Egypt.

Alexandria

We find that Alexandria is mentioned only four times in Scripture and that each mention is bad.

(1) Alexandria is **first mentioned** in Acts 6:9.

"Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen."

It was Jews from Alexandria who were in the crowd that disputed with and eventually killed Stephen.

(2) The second mention of Alexandria is in Acts 18:24.

"And a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures, came to Ephesus."

Here we find a Jew from Alexandria named Apollos who though fervent in spirit was misinformed concerning the gospel. Not knowing the true gospel of Jesus Christ he preached, in Ephesus, the baptism of John the Baptist. (Acts 18:25, 19:3) Apollos was not saved and neither were his converts.

Later, Apollos is led to Christ by Aquila and Priscilla (verse 26) and gets his message straightened out (verse 28).

But in its second mention, Alexandria is synonymous with bad Bible teaching.

(3) The third and fourth mentions of Alexandria are very similar. After Paul is arrested in Acts 21 and appeals his case to Caesar he is sent to Rome, and eventual death, on a ship from, of all places Alexandria (Acts 27:6).

"And there the centurion found a ship of Alexandria sailing into Italy; and he put us therein."

(4) While sailing to Rome, Paul's ship is sunk in a tempest. After spending three months on the island of Melita he is sent on his way to eventual death on another ship. And where is this second ship from that is so ready to carry Paul to his death?

Acts 28:11: *"And after three months we departed in a ship of Alexandria, which had wintered in the isle, whose sign was Castor and Pollux."*

We see then that all four Bible references to Alexandria are negative. No one with any honesty could pretend that the Bible's representation of Alexandria is good.

It must also be noted here that Alexandria was a center of education and philosophy (Colossians 2:8) which it received from Athens in about 100 B. C. (Acts 17:16) There was a school of the Scriptures founded there by one Pantaenus who was a philosopher. Pantaenus interpreted scripture both philosophically and allegorically. That is to say that philosophically he believed truth to be relative, not absolute. He did not believe that the Bible was infallible. By looking at the Bible allegorically he believed that men such as Adam, Noah, Moses, and David existed only in Jewish poetry and were not true historical characters. He was succeeded as head of the school by Clement of Alexandria and later by Origen. Men who shared his skepticism.

It was Origen, deceived by the dual intoxicants of education and philosophy who upon receipt of pure copies of scripture altered them to parallel his twisted thinking. He is the father of all Bible critics and is not only responsible for the physical manuscripts which delete such verses as Luke 24:40, Acts 8:37 and I John 5:7, but he is also responsible for the Alexandrian philosophy parroted by so many of our fundamental scholars who claim that "The Bible is perfect and infallible" with one breath and then state "The Bible has mistakes and mistranslations" with the very next. It is this demented ideology that gave birth to the corrupt Alexandrian manuscripts in the first place. Thus we see that not only are the physical manuscripts of Alexandria corrupt and to be rejected, but the **Alexandrian philosophy**, that the Bible has mistakes in it and must be corrected, is even more subtle and dangerous and must be forsaken by true Bible believers.

Antioch

Ironically the **first mention** of Antioch is found in the very same book and chapter as Alexandria, Acts chapter 6, but in a radically different context.

(1) When the Apostles saw a need for helpers, helpers whom today we know as "deacons", they gave instructions for what kind of men should be chosen for the position.

Acts 6:3,4: *"Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.*

4 But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word."

The seven men chosen are listed in Acts 6:5.

"And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch:"

Please notice that one of the first deacons, Nicolas, was of Antioch. Is this a mere coincidence? Certainly not! Neither is it coincidental that Nicolas is the **only** deacon whose home town is given. Neither is it coincidental that Antioch is mentioned for the first time in Scripture in the same chapter in which Alexandria is mentioned. And it is certainly no difficult feat to see that one, Antioch, is first mentioned in a **positive** light and the other, Alexandria, is first mentioned in a negative light.

The next few pertinent appearances of Antioch start as a trickle and end as a flood of testimony to God's choice of Antioch for the center of His New Testament church.

(2) Antioch appears next in Scripture in Acts 11:19-21.

19 "Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen traveled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only.

20 And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus.

21 And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord."

Here we find that certain of the Christians who had taken flight during the persecution preached the gospel as they fled.

Upon arrival in Antioch they, not knowing what had happened in Acts 10 with Peter opening the door of the gospel to the Gentiles, preached the gospel to the Grecians. Verse 21 tells us that God's Holy Spirit worked mightily in Antioch and that a "great number" were saved.

We see then that the first great gentile awakening occurred in Antioch.

(3) In Acts 11:22-24 we find that Barnabas, (the son of consolation Acts 4:36) was sent to Antioch to see what was happening in Antioch.

22 "Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the church which was in Jerusalem: and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch.

23 Who, when he came, and had seen the grace of God, was glad, and exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord.

24 For he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith: and

much people was added unto the Lord."

Through the ministry of this great man of God, many more people were added to Christ,

(4) In Acts 11:25,26, two important facts are revealed.

25 "Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus, for to seek Saul: And when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch.

26 And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch."

First, we find Barnabas departing for Tarsus to seek the young convert Saul. It was Barnabas who defended Paul's conversion to the doubting disciples in Acts 9:26,27. Doubtless he was grieved to see the zealous young convert shipped off to Tarsus (Acts 9:30), and oblivion. Upon finding Saul, Barnabus does **not** bring him back to Jerusalem. (And certainly not to Alexandria.) He returns with him to Antioch, the spiritual capital of the New Testament church. All that Paul ever became, he owes to the gracious act of this godly old saint.

(5) In Acts 11:26 we find that born again believers were called "Christians" for the first time at Antioch. Thus every time we believers refer to ourselves as "Christians" we complete a spiritual connection to our spiritual forefathers in Antioch. Antioch is to the Christian what Plymouth Rock is to the American.

(6) In verses 27 and 28 we find that God has now packed up His prophets and sent them north to Antioch.

27 "And in these days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch.

28 And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius Caesar."

Jerusalem is left spiritually abandoned. Home only of the disciples, who were told to leave it years earlier in Acts 1:8.

(7) In Acts 11:29,30 we find that the saints **who God is blessing** in Antioch, must send monetary aid to the saints **who God is not blessing** in Jerusalem.

29 "Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judaea:

30 Which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul."

Yet these are not the final Biblical references to the capital of God's New Testament church.

(8) When God decides to send missionaries out into the world to preach the gospel, He never even glances in the direction of Jerusalem. (And most assuredly not Alexandria, Egypt) He looks instead to His faithful servants at Antioch.

Acts 13:1-3: *"Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul.*

2 *As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.*

3 *And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."*

Thus, it is evident that the **first** missionary journey mentioned in Scripture originated in Antioch, with "Christians" from Antioch. And when this great work was fulfilled, no one wasted any time sightseeing or sending reports to Jerusalem. They simply returned to Antioch.

Acts 14:25-28: *"And when they had preached the word in Perga, they went down unto Attalia:*

26 *And thence sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God for the work which they fulfilled.*

27 *And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles.*

28 *And there they abode long time with the disciples."*

Our last two glimpses of Antioch give evidence that to be in Antioch is to be in the middle of the will of God.

(9) In Acts chapter 15 the disciples in Jerusalem feel a need to send a pair of envoys to Antioch with their decrees concerning Gentile believers.

Acts 15:23-27: *"And they wrote letters by them after this manner; The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia:*

24 *Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law: to whom we gave no such commandment:*

25 *It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul,*

26 *Men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

27 *We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth."*

Following the completion of the mission, Judas returns to Jerusalem, **and oblivion**. Silas elects to stay in Antioch, and it is Silas who we find gaining a prominent place in Scripture as Paul's missionary partner on his second missionary journey.

(10) Of course, the second missionary journey did not originate in Jerusalem. It originated in the only place that it possibly could have, Antioch, as Acts 15:40 illustrates.

What was it about Antioch that was so attractive to God that He chose it as the center of New Testament Christianity?

It might be noted that, Antioch although it was a cultural center, had not abandoned itself to pagan religion, pagan education and pagan philosophy as had such prominent sites as Rome, Athens, and Alexandria.

It might also be weighed that Antioch, unlike the above mentioned cities, or even Jerusalem, was located almost exactly in the middle of the known world, and was built at the crossing of the East-West trade routes. It even boasted a sea port, via the Orontes River. These are all important attributes for the capital of Christianity, which is known for its mobility.

It may be that many of the original autographs of Paul's epistles were penned in Antioch.

In the second century, a disciple by the name of Lucian founded a school of the Scriptures in Antioch. Lucian was noted for his mistrust of pagan philosophy. His school magnified the authority and divinity of Scripture and taught that the Bible was to be taken literally, not figuratively as the philosophers of Alexandria taught.

So Antioch is not only the point of origin for the correct family of Bible manuscripts, but is also the source for the ideology that accepts the Bible as **literally** and **perfectly** God's words. Today many well meaning, but "Alexandrian" educated preachers are uplifting the Antiochian Bible (King James) but with the Alexandrian conviction that it cannot be perfect. In fact, this Egyptian conviction states that there cannot be a perfect Bible on earth, in spite of God's promise in Psalm 12:6,7.

To accept the proper Book with an improper attitude will only predestine one to make the same mistakes and corruptions that their Egyptian forefathers did.

Can **anyone** ignore a Bible admonition and not fall?

Solomon, the wisest man who ever lived, ignored the Biblical admonition to avoid Egypt and **not** go down to Egypt to multiply horses (Deuteronomy 17:16). In I Kings 3:1 he married Pharaoh's daughter. In I Kings 10:28 he had horses brought up out of Egypt. What was the result? By I Kings 11:3,4 we find that his heart had been turned away from following God. In verses 5-9 he began worshipping other gods. And by verses 9-43 God has pronounced judgment on him. If God doesn't want His people to go down to Egypt for horses, do we **dare** go there for a Bible or an ideology?

Solomon could not get away with ignoring the Bible's view of Egypt. Are **you** wiser than Solomon?

QUESTION: What is the LXX?

ANSWER: A figment of someone's imagination.

EXPLANATION: First, let's define what the LXX is **supposed** to be. An ancient document called "The Letter of Aristeas" revealed a plan to make an **OFFICIAL** translation of the Hebrew Bible (the Old Testament) in Greek. This translation was to be accepted as the official Bible of the Jews and was to **replace** the Hebrew Bible. Supposedly this translation work would be performed by 72 Jewish scholars (?), six from each of the twelve tribes of Israel. The supposed location of the work was to be Alexandria, Egypt. The alleged date of translation was supposedly around 250 BC, during the 400 years of silence between the close of the Old Testament in 397 BC and the birth of Christ in approximately 4 BC (due to a four year error in the calendar).

It has become known as the Septuagint, "The Interpretation of the 70 Elders". Also it is represented by the Roman (?) numerals whose combined value is 70, hence L-50, X-10, X-10. Why it isn't called the *LXXII* I'll never know.

This so called "Letter of Aristeas" is the **sole** evidence for the existence of this mystical document. There are absolutely **NO** Greek Old Testament manuscripts existent with a date of 250 BC or anywhere near it. Neither is there any record in Jewish history of such a work being contemplated or performed.

When pressed to **produce** hard evidence of the existence of such a document, scholars quickly point to Origen's Hexapla written around 200 **AD**, or approximately 450 years later than the LXX was supposedly penned, and more than 100 years after the New Testament was completed. The second column of Origen's Hexapla contains **his own** (hardly 72 Jewish scholars) Greek translation of the Old Testament including spurious books such as "Bel and the Dragon", "Judith" and "Tobit" and other apocryphal books accepted as authoritative only by the Roman Catholic Church.

Proponents of the invisible LXX will try to claim that Origen didn't translate the Hebrew into Greek, but only copied the LXX into the second column of his Hexapla. Can this argument be correct? No. If it were, then that would mean that those astute 72 Jewish scholars added the Apocryphal books to their work **before they were ever written.** (!) Or else, Origen took the liberty to add these spurious writings to God's Holy Word (Rev. 22:18).

Thus we see that the second column of the Hexapla is Origen's personal, unweilable translation of the Old Testament into Greek and nothing more.

Eusebius and Philo, both of questionable character, make mention of a Greek Pentateuch. Hardly the entire Old Testament and not mentioned as any kind of an officially accepted translation.

Is there ANY Greek manuscript of the Old Testament written **BEFORE** the time of Christ? Yes. There is one minute scrap dated at 150 BC, the Ryland's Papyrus, #458. It contains Deuteronomy chapters 23-28. No more. No less. If fact, it may be the existence of this fragment that led Eusebius

and Philo to **assume** that the entire Pentateuch had been translated by some scribe in an effort to interest Gentiles in the history of the Jews. It most certainly cannot be a portion of any pretended official Old Testament translation into Greek. We can rest assured that those 72 Jewish scholars supposedly chosen for the work in 250 BC would be just a mite feeble by 150 BC.

Besides the non-existence of any reason to believe such a translation was ever produced are several hurdles which the "Letter of Aristeas", Origen's Hexapla, Ryland's #458, and Eusebius and Philo just **cannot clear**.

The first one is the "Letter of Aristeas" itself. There is little doubt amongst scholars today that it was **not** written by anyone named Aristeas. In fact, some believe its **true** author is Philo. This would give it an A.D. date. If this were true, then its **REAL** intention would be to deceive believers into thinking that Origen's second column is a copy of the LXX. A feat that it has apparently accomplished "in spades".

If there **was** an Aristeas, he was faced with two insurmountable problems.

First, how did he **ever** locate the twelve tribes in order to pick his six representative scholars from each. Having been thoroughly scattered by their many defeats and captivities, the tribal lines of the 12 tribes had long since dissolved into virtual non-existence. It was **impossible** for **anyone** to distinctly identify the 12 individual tribes.

Secondly, if the 12 tribes **had** been identified, they would not have undertaken such a translation for two compelling reasons.

(1) Every Jew knew that the official caretaker of Scripture was the tribe of Levi as evidenced in Deuteronomy 17:18, 31:25,26 and Malachi 2:7. Thus, **NO** Jew of any of the eleven other tribes would **dare** join such a forbidden enterprise.

(2) It is obvious to **any** reader of the Bible that the Jews were to be distinctly different from the Gentile nations around them. Unto them was given such distinct practices as circumcision, Sabbath worship, sundry laws of cleansing and their own homeland. Added to this is the heritage of the Hebrew language. Even today, practicing Jews in China and India refuse to teach their children any language but Hebrew. The Falasha Jews of Ethiopia were distinct among the many tribes of their country by the fact that they jealously retained the Hebrew language as an evidence of their Jewish heritage.

Are we to be so naive as to believe that the Jews who considered Gentiles nothing more than **dogs**, would willingly forsake their heritage, the Hebrew language, for a Gentile language into which would be translated the holiest possession of all, their Bible? Such a supposition is as insane as it is absurd.

"What then," one might ask, "of the numerous quotes in the New Testament of the Old Testament that are ascribed to the LXX?" The LXX they speak of is nothing more than the second column of Origen's Hexapla.

The New Testament quotations are not quotes of any LXX or the Hexapla. They are the author, the Holy Spirit, taking the liberty of quoting His work in the Old Testament in whatever manner He wishes. And we can rest assured that He certainly is not quoting any non-existent Septuagint.

Only one more question arises. Then **why** are scholars so quick to accept the existence of this LXX in the face of such irrefutable arguments against it? The answer is sad and simple.

Hebrew is an extremely difficult language to learn. It takes years of study to attain a passing knowledge of it. And many more to be well enough versed to use it as a vehicle of study. By comparison a working knowledge of Greek is easily attainable. Thus, IF THERE WAS an official translation of the Old Testament into Greek, Bible critics could **triple** the field of influence overnight without a painstaking study of biblical Hebrew. Unfortunately, the acceptance of the existence of the Septuagint on such thin evidence is based solely on pride and voracity.

But stop and think. Even if such a spurious document as the LXX really did exist, how could a Bible critic, who, in reference to the King James Bible, say that "No translation has the authority of the original language, " claim in the same breath that his pet LXX has equal authority with the Hebrew Original? This scholarly double-talk is nothing more than a self exalting authority striving to keep his scholarly position above those "unschooled in the original languages."

If you accept such an argument, I have a bridge to sell you in Brooklyn!

QUESTION: Where was the Bible before 1611?

ANSWER: In the available Antiochian manuscripts.

EXPLANATION: Critics of the perfect Bible like to throw out this question as though it will "stun" Bible believers. It doesn't.

The overwhelming majority of Bible manuscripts existent throughout history have been the text found in Antioch. They have always been available in some form, either in copies of the original Greek, or the old Latin of 150 AD, (**NOT** to be confused with Jerome's corrupt "Vulgate") or the Syrian Peshetto of 157 AD.

That it would be difficult indeed to gather all of these sources together and place them in the hands of the common man gives credence to God's reasoning for the collation and translation of the King James Bible.

QUESTION: Did King James authorize his translation to be used in the churches in England?

ANSWER: No. He authorized it's translation, but not its usage.

EXPLANATION: It is difficult for someone in the twentieth century, especially someone in America to fathom the conditions of nearly four hundred years ago. We Christians not only have a Bible in our language, but more often than not, we have several. Added to that is our concordance and a raft of Bible commentaries and sundry other "Christian" books.

Yet the world of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was quite different. The common man in England had no Bible. The only copy available to him was chained to the altar of the church. As recently as 1536, William Tyndale had been burned at the stake for the high crime of printing Bibles in the language of the common man, English. When King James commissioned the fifty-four translators in 1603 he did not mandate the upcoming translation to be used in churches. In fact, that it was translated and **not** intended for the churches left it only one explainable destiny. That is, that it should be supplied to the common man.

It might be noted that the world has no greater power than the common man with the common Bible in his hand.

QUESTION: Don't King James Bible believer's "worship" the Bible? Didn't God destroy the originals because He didn't want these people to venerate them?

ANSWER: No and no.

EXPLANATION: Many critics of the perfect Bible have become very frustrated in recent years. This is due to the fact that their entire argument against the Bible has been systematically destroyed by historical fact, their own shortfall of scholastic ability and the consistent blessing of the King James Bible by the Holy Spirit.

In a desperate attempt to "sling mud" at Bible believers, they make the two statements found above.

Do King James Bible believers worship the Bible? No. They do not pray to it as they do to Jesus Christ. They do not preach that "the Bible saves" but that **Jesus** saves. They blissfully mark notes all over their Bibles, though none would dare to do so to Jesus Christ.

There is not even enough evidence to **mistakenly** believe that King James Bible believers worship the Bible. Therefore, the charge is unfortunately born of malice not sincerity.

Did God destroy the originals to keep King James Bible believers from someday worshipping them? No. Nothing could be farther from fact.

God allowed the originals to pass off the scene because their only value, was their words, which He preserved through copies. Once the originals had

served their purpose and were copied, they received no loyalty from God or His people.

If the originals were somehow to "miraculously" appear today, they would be of little interest to Bible believers since they make little of them now.

If anyone would venerate them, it would probably be the crowd that makes so much of them today, **the Bible critics**.

QUESTION: Aren't King James Bible believers a cult?

ANSWER: No.

EXPLANATION: The charge that King James Bible believers are a cult is similar to the charge that they worship the Bible. It is a result of the same frustration and born of the same malice. Sadly, when facts do not prove them right, character assassination is in order.

Cults are somewhat difficult to define, although there are two outstanding characteristics evident in all cults.

First, a cult has a central body that makes decisions for all of its disciples. Most King James Bible believers are fiercely independent and many times disagree about other doctrines, even with one another. Their only central authority is the Bible, not a college or university.

Secondly, most cults fear that their disciples will investigate their opposition's beliefs and then be converted by the truth. Therefore they make strict rules disallowing books and materials that disagree with their doctrine.

Again, since the **facts** support the Authorized Version, King James Bible believers are not afraid to study the charges of their critics. In fact, this book attempts to confront all of the Bible critic's charges with complete candor.

Now, it will be noted that, there are some Bible colleges and universities which have a policy of confiscating books which support the view of a perfect Bible. In fact, **this** book may be on that list someday.

It makes one wonder just **who** is the "cult" and who isn't.

QUESTION: Is the King James Bible inspired or preserved?

ANSWER: The original autographs were **inspired**. The King James Bible is those same autographs **preserved** up to today.

EXPLANATION: The best way to **simply** describe inspiration and preservation of the Bible is as follows:

Inspiration is when God takes a **blank** piece of paper (papyrus, vellum, etc.) and uses men to write His words.

Preservation is when God takes those words **already written** and uses men to preserve them to today.

Both of these actions are **DIVINE** and are assured by God as recorded in Psalm 12:6, 7.

6 *"The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.*

7 *Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever."*

In Psalm 12:6 God assures us that His originals are perfect. Even though penned by fallible men with the heinous sins of; murder (Moses and David), adultery (David), idolatry (Solomon), and denial of the lord (Peter), God's words are untainted by the sins of the penmen.

That the originals were inspired perfect in their entirety is an undisputed belief among Christians today.

But most Christians argue that only the "originals" were perfect. They say that today we have nothing but copies and translations of those copies. They seem indignant at the thought that any "mere translation" should be considered a perfect copy of the originals. They claim that copies and translations are products of uninspired men and therefore must all contain mistakes.

Christians clinging to this tenet are misled. Their folly in accepting this erroneous teaching is fourfold.

1. It is somewhat confusing and unexplainable that a person could claim that God could not use, sinful men to **preserve** His words when **all** Christians believe that he used sinful men to write His **inspired** words. Certainly a God who had enough power to **inspire** His words would also have enough power to preserve them. I highly doubt that He has **lost** such ability over the years.

2. Why would God inspire the originals and then lose them? Why give a **perfect** Bible to men like Peter, John, James, Andrew and company and not us? **They** had seen, heard, and touched the Lord (I John 1:1). We haven't! If anyone ever needed a **perfect** Bible it is us, nearly two thousand years separated from a Saviour we have **never seen!**

Why did God inspire a perfect original if He didn't plan on preserving it? Couldn't He have afforded some error, in His originals just as some believe He has allowed some errors in today's Bible! Or do critics of God's perfect Bible believe that God was unable to **prevent** errors in the copies. It would seem like only half of a God who had the power to do one but not the other.

3. It is a "convenient" faith which cannot be tested. In other words, it is rather safe to believe in a perfect set of originals which have been **LOST**. Since they are lost, no one can ever practically challenge such a belief. Adherents to such a shallow persuasion can rest safely in the fact that they will never be proven wrong since the evidence needed to prove them wrong

(the "originals") is lost.

But if they dare put the same faith in a Bible available today, they know that they will definitely be bloodied defending their faith.

Thus, to believe in a perfect set of originals, but not to believe in a perfect English Bible, is to believe **nothing** at all.

4. Regardless of their arguments against the doctrine of a **preserved perfect Bible**, such a fact as much guaranteed by Scripture as the bodily return of Jesus Christ (Acts 1:8).

Psalm 12:7 plainly states, thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever."

Thus we have **God** promising to **preserve** the same words that He **inspired**. Not too much of a feat to overwhelm such an omnipotent Being.

The fearful fundamentalist launches two attacks on the Scriptural teaching found in Psalm 12:7.

1. They claim, "Verse 7 is talking about the Jews, not the Bible." Then to add credence to their claim they rush out and publish a translation that says just that in Psalm 12:7. Let's look at this verse in the New International Version.

"O LORD, you will keep **us** safe and protect **us** from such people forever."

This is an irresponsible and dishonest translation. The Hebrew word "shamar" meaning "to keep" which the New International Version translators render "you will keep **us**" is found in the future second person singular "thou shalt keep" and is directed to the **THIRD** person plural "them" and **NOT** the **first** person plural "us" as the New International Version translators rendered it. Thus we see it is the King James, God's perfect, preserved Bible which has **accurately** preserved the reading of the originals, **not** the unreliable New International Version.

Psalm 12:7 is **not** God's promise to preserve the Jews, a promise which flourishes elsewhere in Scripture. It is God's promise to preserve His words, and is a direct reference to those words as described in Psalm 12:6.

2. Oftimes a Christian, whose faith is too weak to accept the literal truth of Psalm 12:6, 7, will piously quote Psalm 119:89.

"For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven." Then they will state that God actually meant that He preserved His perfect Bible in **Heaven**, not on Earth. And they say this with a straight face! This escape to a house of straw is embarrassingly humorous.

First, it is foolish for anyone to believe that God inspired a perfect original **on earth** so that He could have it brought to Heaven. Is **that** supposed to be the reason that He wrote the originals? The answer is embarrassingly simple. The **Bible** is addressed to **man**, not God. God did not write a perfect book directed to **man** and then put it in a library in Heaven where man cannot benefit from its existence. Again we ask, "What

good to us, **here** and **now**, is a perfect book locked up out of reach in Heaven?"

Secondly, Psalm 12:6 makes reference to His words being on **earth**. To preserve them somewhere other than on earth is not to preserve them at all. So we see then that God **inspired** the originals perfectly. Then over the centuries He has **preserved** those same word today. They are found in the Authorized Version.

ADDITIONAL NOTE:

In the area of "inspired translations" it might be noted that the double truth of Genesis 22:8 which in a King James Bible is plainly revealed as a prophetic reference to Jesus Christ, is lost in such weak translations as the New King James, the New International Version, and the New American Standard Version.

QUESTION: Didn't the King James Bible when first printed contain the Apocrypha?

ANSWER: Yes.

EXPLANATION: Many critics of the perfect Bible like to point out that the original King James had the Apocrypha in it as though that fact compromises its integrity. But several things must be examined to get the factual picture.

First, in the days in which our Bible was translated, the Apocrypha was accepted reading based on its **historical** value, though not accepted as Scripture by anyone outside of the Catholic church. The King James translators therefore placed it **between** the Old and New Testaments for its historical benefit to its readers. They did **not** integrate it into the Old Testament text as do the corrupt Alexandrian manuscripts.

That they rejected the Apocrypha as divine is very obvious by the seven reasons which they gave for not incorporating it into the text. They are as follows:

1. Not one of them is in the Hebrew language, which was alone used by the inspired historians and poets of the Old Testament.
2. Not one of the writers lays any claim to inspiration.
3. These books were never acknowledged as sacred Scriptures by the Jewish Church, and therefore were never sanctioned by our Lord.
4. They were not allowed a place among the sacred books, during the first four centuries of the Christian Church.
5. They contain fabulous statements, and statements which contradict not only the canonical Scriptures, but themselves; as when, in the two Books of Maccabees, Antiochus Epiphanes is made to die three different deaths in as

many different places.

6. It inculcates doctrines at variance with the Bible, such as prayers for the dead and sinless perfection.

7. It teaches immoral practices, such as lying, suicide, assassination and magical incantation.

If having the Apocrypha **between** the Testaments disqualifies it as authoritative, then the corrupt Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts from Alexandria, Egypt must be totally worthless since their authors obviously didn't have the conviction of the King James translators and incorporated its books into the text of the Old Testament thus giving it authority with Scripture.

QUESTION: Do the Dead Sea Scrolls render the King James Bible obsolete?

ANSWER: No, they support it.

EXPLANATION: The Dead Sea Scrolls which were found by an Arab shepherd boy in 1947 in the Qumran caves near Jericho, Israel have no ill effect on the Bible.

Their text **actually** agrees with the King James Bible. This fact makes them unattractive to scholars desiring to overthrow the perfect Bible. So, other than commenting on the irony of the way in which they were found, they are largely ignored.

The translators of the King James Bible did not need the Dead Sea Scrolls since they already had the Textus Receptus which they match.

QUESTION: The New King James Version is based on the Antiochian manuscripts. Is it an improvement over the King James Bible?

ANSWER: No.

EXPLANATION: The New King James Version is to the English Bible what the Alexandrian manuscripts are to Greek. A corruption of a **pure** text by men who hold the deplorable doctrine that the Bible cannot be perfect (**regardless** of what they may say when they preach) and must be corrected by the feeble intellect of man.

The New King James Version unlike most modern translations is based on the correct Antiochian manuscripts instead of the corrupt Alexandrian manuscripts. Unfortunately, the men doing the translation work view the Bible as imperfect. They would vehemently deny this charge in public because their jobs depend on it, but in fact they do not believe that ANY

Bible is perfect. **Not even their own New King James Version!** Thus, to them, the Bible is lost ("settled" in heaven) and the minds of scholars are the only hope of rescuing its "thoughts" from oblivion.

Many of the men on the board of translator may indeed be great preachers and pastors, but that by no means entitles them to correct the Bible.

Sincerity cannot improve on perfection. Thus, instead of making a good thing better" they have only managed, for all of their trouble, to make a "perfect thing tainted".

It must be remembered, there is a great deal of prestige in sitting on the board of translators of a "modern" version of the Bible (Matthew 23:5-7).

QUESTION: Isn't the New Scofield Bible a King James Bible'?

ANSWER: Not only is the New Scofield Bible **NOT** a King James Bible, it is not even a "Scofield" Bible.

EXPLANATION: The first and most weighty reason why the New Scofield Bible is not a Scofield Bible at all is shamefully simple. **Dr. C.I. Scofield did not edit it.** Dr. Scofield **died** in 1921! Barring a very "selective" resurrection, it is impossible for a man who died in 1921 to edit a book in 1967.

The publisher's justification for a new "edition" is that Dr. Scofield, whose reference Bible was first published in 1909 added material and published another edition in 1917. But it is an author's prerogative to alter his own works, but that certainly does not give others, more than 45 years after his death, a blank check to make alterations and then sign his name to it!

If we altered the ending of "Macbeth" we would be less than honest to claim that the change met Shakespeare's approval.

Secondly, the editors exercised great liberty in changing attributes of Dr. Scofield's reference work that Dr. Scofield himself felt important enough to include in his work. In the introduction to their doubly dishonest 1967 publication they admit such changes.

New Scofield: "Among the changes and improvements in this edition are: important word changes in the text to help the reader; a modified system of self-pronunciation; revision of many of the introductions to the books of the Bible, including designation of the author, theme, and date; more subheadings; clarification of some footnotes, deletion of others, and the addition of many new notes; more marginal references; an entirely new chronology; a new index; a concordance especially prepared for this edition;

new maps; and more legible type. Some of these features are explained below."

By their own words, they admit to altering Dr. Scofield's text (the King James Bible), introduction of books of the Bible, notes, marginal references, chronology and many other features.

Did Dr. Scofield give his approval to these changes? Not unless one of the nine committee members had the witch of Endor conjure him up as she had Samuel!

In fact, the publisher even admits that the changes made were arbitrary choices of the revision committee.

"Each position taken represents the thinking or conviction of the committee as a group."

What are the results of such shenanigans? One example will suffice. Let us examine the footnote found in Acts 8:12 of the New Scofield Bible concerning baptism.

"Baptism has, since the apostolic age, been practiced by every major group in the Christian church and, in Protestant communions, is recognized as one of two sacraments - the other being the Lord's Supper. Since early in the Church's history three different modes of baptism have been used: aspersion (sprinkling); affusion (pouring); and immersion (dipping)."

Here we see that the nine revisors (**NOT** Dr. Scofield) believe that there is a difference between the Christians church and Protestant "communion". Might I ask? When one group is defined as "Protestant" what is the other group called?

Secondly, the nine apostate revisors (**NOT** Dr. Scofield) claim, **without scriptural proof** that Christians baptize by pouring and sprinkling as well as immersion.

Remember, the footnote is found in a S-C-O-F-I-E-L-D of 1967. A book which claims on its title page that a dead man (Dr. Scofield) is one of its editors.

What does the footnote for Acts 8:12 in the REAL Scofield Bible of 1917 which had a living Dr. Scofield as its editor say?

Nothing. There **IS** no such footnote!

That's right! The New "Scofield" bible has a "Scofield" note added after the death of "Scofield" the editor which the **REAL** Dr. Scofield never approved of and never had in a text anytime in his life time!

I ask you, is this honest?

Proof that the New Scofield Bible isn't a King James Bible is found on almost every page where the margin notes the twin Bible reading as "KJV". The text of the New Scofield Bible is **NOT** a King James Bible and it is **NOT** a Scofield Bible.

It might be noted that in recent years the size and shape of the New Scofield Bible has been changed to more resemble the Scofield Reference

Bible. Many Christians who desire a true Scofield Reference Bible have purchased a New Scofield Bible **by mistake**.

The "Bible" business is lucrative. Isn't it?

QUESTION: Is the New International Version trustworthy?

ANSWER: No.

EXPLANATION: The New International Version is based on the 26th edition of the Greek text of Eberhard Nestle published in 1979. It, like the New American Standard Version which is based on Nestle's 23rd edition of 1969, is an Egyptian bible. These and most modern translations (except the New King James Version and New Scofield Version which are handled separately in this book) are all products of Origen's tainted manuscripts from Alexandria, Egypt.

A few of the corruptions found in the New International Version and New American Standard Version are found under a previous section dealing with fundamentals. This work is by **no means** an exhaustive study of the many problems with these error riddled versions.

We suffice it to say, "You can't get **good** fruit from a **bad** tree." (Matthew 7:17, 18)

QUESTION: I've heard that there have been many manuscripts discovered since 1611 that the King James translators didn't have access to. Do these strengthen or weaken the King James Bible?

ANSWER: They strengthen the King James Bible.

EXPLANATION: There have been many manuscripts found since 1611, but there have been no new **READINGS** found.

Many critics of the Word of God have used the argument of "new evidence" that the King James translators didn't have as a basis to degrade its authority. The fact is, that the King James translators had all of the **readings** available to them that modern critics have available to them today.

One of the most prominent manuscripts which has been discovered since 1611 is the Sinaitic manuscript. This witness, though horribly flawed, was found amongst trash paper in St. Catherine's monastery at the foot of Mt. Sinai in 1841 by Constantine Tischendorf.

Sinaiticus is a sister manuscript of the corrupt manuscript, Vaticanus. Both read very similarly. So, although the Sinaitic manuscript was discovered over 200 years after the Authorized Version was translated, its **READINGS** were well known to the translators through the Vatican

manuscript which was discovered in 1481 and also through the Jesuit Bible, an English translation of 1582.

So we see that there are no readings available today to scholars which were not already in the hands of the King James translators. We might further add that an **honest** scholar will admit that this "great number of newly discovered manuscripts" that are trumped abroad, agree with the Greek text of the Authorized Version rather than challenging it.

QUESTION: Aren't modern English translations easier to understand?

ANSWER: No. Some may seem easier to **read**, but none are easier to **understand**.

EXPLANATION: One of the primary advertising gimmicks used to sell modern English translations is that they will be easier to understand for the potential customers. The customer, having been assured that he/she cannot possibly understand the "old archaic" King James gratefully purchases the modern English Bible and unknowingly condemns himself to a life of biblical ignorance. Modern English translations may be easier to read but they are **not** easier to understand.

Let's look at the equation in simple terms. If the "archaic" language and the "thee's" and "thou's" of the King James Bible **really** do hamper the effectiveness of the Holy Spirit in communicating His message to the Christians, then several things should be true of one or all of the raft of modern English translations on the Bible market today.

1. If modern English translations, such as the New American Standard Version, New International Version, New King James Version, and Today's English Version were easier to understand, then the Holy Spirit's message to the Christian would flow freer and accomplish greater spiritual victories in the lives of God's people on an individual basis. Yet it is sadly evident that this is not happening.

In fact it is only **too** evident to any objective observer that today's Christians are **more** worldly and **less** dedicated to Jesus Christ than their nineteenth or even early twentieth century counterparts who were raised on and **read** the King James Bible. Surely a Bible that was "easier to understand" would have dramatically increased successes in battling sin, worldliness and carnality, but this **JUST HAS NOT HAPPENED**.

2. Secondly, if the modern English translations were really easier to understand then I believe God would show a little more gratitude for them by using **at least one** to spark a major revival in this nation.

It is elementary to see that if the "old archaic" King James Bible has been hampering the **desired** work of the Holy Spirit, then God should be eager to bless the use of any translation that would be easier for His people to

understand.

Again, it is all too obvious that no mass spiritual awakening of **any kind** has been initiated by any one of today's modern translations. Today's modern translations haven't been able to spark a revival in a **Christian school**, let alone expected to close a bar.

In fact, since the arrival of our modern English translations, beginning with the ASV of 1901, America has seen:

1. God and prayer kicked out of our public school
2. Abortion on demand legalized
3. Homosexuality accepted nationally as an "alternate life style"
4. In home pornography via TV and VCR
5. Child kidnapping and pornography running rampant
6. Dope has become an epidemic
7. Satanism is on the rise

If this is considered a "revival" then let's turn back to the King James to **STOP it.**

In fact, the **ONLY** scale used to claim success for a new translation is **how well it sells.** This depraved Madison Avenue sales system should set alarms ringing in the Christian. Instead, deluded by television, they dutifully nod and remark that, "It must be good, everybody's buying one."

Is there any "good" coming from modern translations? Surely. The publishing companies are making millions.

Today American Christians are spiritually anemic. They turn instead to their favorite "Bible psychologist" for help rather than Scripture. America as a whole is as morally decayed as Sodom and Gomorrah. (Ezekiel 16:49).

Where is the spiritual help and hope that an "easier to understand" translation should bring'?

Instead, perhaps we are in this desperate condition **because** of those very translations.

QUESTION: Isn't the devil behind all the confusion and fighting over Bible versions?

ANSWER: Undoubtedly.

EXPLANATION: It is a great irony that many of the critics of the Bible claim rather indignantly that the devil is behind the battle over the King James Bible. In this they are correct. But **somehow** they have managed to assume that it is the people claiming perfection for the Bible who the devil is guiding. Is this a correct assumption? Let us consider the history of the battle.

From the time of its publication in 1611 the King James Bible has grown in popularity. Although not mandated by the King to be used in the

churches of England, it did, in a matter of a few years, manage to supplant all of the great versions translated before it. Though it was not advertised in the Madison Avenue fashion of today's versions, it soon swept all other versions from the hearts and hands of the citizenry of England and its colonies.

With the conquest of the British Empire behind it, it crossed the Atlantic to the United States. Landing here it overwhelmed the double foothold of the Roman Catholic Church planted previously under the flags of Spain and France.

It then began to permeate young America with its ideals. Its truths led to the establishment of an educational system, based on Scripture, that was unparalleled in the world. It instilled in men the ideals of freedom and personal liberty, thoughts so foreign to the minds of men that their inclusion in our Constitution could only be described as an "experiment" in government.

It commissioned preachers of righteousness who, on foot and horseback, broke trails into the wilderness and spread the truth of the gospel and of right living. In its wake was left what could only be described... "one nation, **under God...**" This accomplished, it set out for the conquest of the heathen world. Bible colleges (Princeton, Harvard, Yale) were founded. Mission societies formed. And eager young missionaries began to scour the globe with little more than a King James Bible and God's Holy Spirit.

But these activities did not go unnoticed by Satan. He who had successfully counterfeited God's church, ministers and powers certainly could not be expected to let God's Bible roam the world unchallenged. Through agents such as Brook Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, he published his own translation in 1884. (The New Testament had been published in 1881.) Though there had been sporadic personal translations between 1611 and 1884, this new translation, called the Revised Version, was the first ever to be designed from its outset to replace God's Authorized Bible. It failed to replace God's Bible, but the arguments of its adherents were the first shots fired in a nearly 400 year battle for the hearts and minds of God's people concerning the authority and fidelity of Scripture.

In 1901 another round was fired in the form of the American Revised Version, later called the American Standard Version. (An intentional misnomer since it never became the "standard" for **anything**.) This version, other than being the darling of critical American scholarship met a dismal end when, twenty-three years later, it was so totally rejected by God's people that its copyright had to be sold. (Does this sound like God's blessing?)

The ASV was further revised and republished in 1954 as the Revised Standard Version. This sequence of events has repeated itself innumerable

times, resulting in the New American Standard Version of 1960, the New Scofield Version of 1967, the New International Version of 1978, and the New King James Version of 1979 to name a **few**.

The process has never changed. Every new version that has been launched has been, without exception, a product of Satan's Alexandrian philosophy which rejects the premise of a perfect Bible. Furthermore, they have been copied, on the most part, from the corrupt Alexandrian manuscript. (Although a few have been translated from pure Antiochian manuscripts after they were tainted by the Alexandrian philosophy.)

THIS then was Satan's battle in **print**, BUT by **no** means was it his exclusive onslaught. He used a standard military "two-pronged" attack.

While popularizing his Alexandrian manuscripts via the press, he began to promote his Alexandrian philosophy in and through Christian Bible colleges.

Soon sincere, naive, young, Bible students attending **FUNDAMENTAL** Bible colleges began to hear the infallibility of the Bible challenged in their classrooms. In chapel services the Bible's perfection was much touted. But then, **the very same speakers**, would debase, degrade, and even mock the English Bible, always assuring their students that they were not a "liberal" or "modernist" because they believed that the Bible was infallible in "the originals". That non-existent, unobtainable, mystical entity which ALL apostates shield their unbelief behind.

Soon stalwartness gave in to acceptance and fidelity to a perfect bible became fidelity to one's "Alma Mater". Young graduates, disheartened and disarmed by their education, found themselves in pulpits across America parroting the professor's shameful criticism of the Word of God. They readily accepted new versions hot off the Alexandrian presses.

Then, when some Christian approached them claiming to believe the Bible (one you could **hold in your HAND**, not a lost relic from bygone days) was **word perfect** (a belief **they** had once held before their education stole it from them) they felt threatened. They try to dispel this "fanatic," this "cultist". Finally they look this faith filled Christian in the eye and piously ask, "Don't you feel that the devil is using this Bible version issue to divide and hinder the cause of Christ?"

"Undoubtedly," comes back the answer "But I'm certainly glad it's not **MY CROWD** that he's using."

Who's side are **YOU** on?

Additional Note:

Here's something that you need to think about. If we King James Bible believers have our way, a Preacher would stand in a pulpit to read Scripture and everyone else in the church would read from the **same Bible**. Isn't that **UNITY?**

But if the Bible-correctors have their way everyone would read from a different bible. That's confusion. And **who** is the author of confusion? (I Cor. 14:33)

QUESTION: Who were Westcott and Hort?

ANSWER: Two unsaved Bible critics.

EXPLANATION: Brook Foss Westcott (1825-1903) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892) were two non-Christian Anglican ministers. Fully steeped in the Alexandrian philosophy that "there is no perfect Bible", they had a vicious distaste for the King James Bible and its Antiochian Greek text, the Textus Receptus. [The infidelity of Westcott and Hort is well documented in this author's work entitled An Understandable History of the Bible, 1987, Bible Believer's Press, P.O. Box 1249, Pottstown, PA. 19464]

It cannot be said that they believed that one could attain Heaven by either works or faith, since both believed that Heaven existed only **in the mind of man.**

Westcott believed in and attempted to practice a form of Communism whose ultimate goal was communal living on college campus's which he called a "coenobium. "

Both believed it possible to communicate with the dead and made many attempts to do just that through a society which they organized and entitled "The Ghostly Guild."

Westcott accepted and promoted prayers for the dead. Both were admirers of Mary (Westcott going so far as to call his wife Sarah, "Mary"), and Hort was an admirer and proponent of Darwin and his theory of evolution.

It is obvious to even a casual observer why they were well equipped to guide the Revision Committee of 1871-1881 away from God's Antiochian text and into the spell of Alexandria.

They had compiled their own Greek text from Alexandrian manuscripts, which, though unpublished and inferior to the Textus Receptus, they secreted little by little to the Revision Committee. The result being a totally new Alexandrian English Bible instead of a "revision" of the Authorized Version as it was claimed to be.

It has only been in recent years that scholars have examined their unbalanced theories concerning manuscript history and admitted that their agreements were weak to non-existent.

Sadly, both men died having never known the joy and peace of claiming Jesus Christ as their Savior.

How is one to know if a religious leader is a man of God or a man of sin? One way is to look at whether he bears good fruit or evil fruit. What is meant by fruit? God tells us in the Holy Bible that the fruit of a person is what he speaks: "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth

that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh." (Luke 6:45 AV)

Without God's word, though, it is not possible to distinguish the good fruit from the evil fruit. If moral distinctions are going to be made between good and evil it is necessary to look to the book written by the creator of all things, good and evil.

Jesus admonished the people of the world to not simply call him Lord, but to also do what he says. (Luke 6:46 AV)

In order, however, to do what he says, we must first know his words contained in his Holy Bible. One should follow the example of the Bereans and compare any religious doctrine with the word of God. The Bereans were viewed by God as more noble than others because they searched the scriptures to check to see if Paul and Silas were correct in their doctrine. See Acts 17:10-11.

God's word is unique because it is God's revelation of Him to man. The Holy Bible states that:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. (John 1:1-3 AV)

In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. (Colossians 1:14-17 AV)

The gospel found in John states that God (the Word, the Creator) came to earth in the flesh: Jesus Christ.

And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth. (John 1:14 AV)

In the Holy Bible God the Father makes it clear that his Son, Jesus, is God. But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. (Hebrews 1:8 AV)

The Holy Bible is not like any other book, it is unique, it was written by God through men.

All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: (2 Timothy 3:16 AV)

Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.

For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. (2 Peter 1:20-21 AV)

Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto

him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. (1 Corinthians 2:13-14 AV)

Creation and Salvation Through God's Word

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. How did he create? He created by speaking. "God said . . . and it was so." See Genesis 1:1-2:25.

"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." (Hebrews 11:3 AV)

By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. He gathereth the waters of the sea together as an heap: he layeth up the depth in storehouses. Let all the earth fear the LORD: let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him. For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast. (Psalms 33:6-9 AV)

The Holy Bible clearly states that God not only created through his Word, he also eternally saves through his Word.

Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you. (1 Peter 1:23-25 AV)

And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. (2 Timothy 3:15 AV)

For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?

And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are

the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of

good

things! But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. (Romans 10:13-17 AV)

God Preserves His Word

God's word is the way to salvation. God would not leave us without the means for our salvation. The following scripture passages testify that God has promised that his word will be preserved forever.

For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no

wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. (Matthew 5:18 AV)

Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

(Matthew 24:35 AV)

The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever. (Psalms 12:6-7 AV)

The word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you. (1 Peter 1:25 AV)

The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand forever. (Isaiah 40:8 AV)

For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven. (Psalms 119:89 AV)

The Roman Catholic Attack on God's Word

Satan knows that the word of God is the way to salvation. Satan also knows that God has promised to preserve his words, and so it would be futile for him to try to destroy God's words.

Therefore, instead of trying to destroy God's words, Satan instituted a two prong strategy to keep the Holy Scriptures from the people. The first prong of the strategy was to outlaw the possession and reading of the Holy Bible. When, over the years, that strategy proved ineffective, Satan instituted his second prong, which is to deny that God has preserved his words and offer counterfeit bibles to the world and to deceive people into believing his counterfeits are the closest that they can get to God's genuine word.

The Roman Church knows that if the people are able to read for themselves God's word they will discover that the Catholic traditions and doctrines are not just in addition to the Scriptures, they violate the Scriptures.

The Catholic Church has a long history of trying to keep God's word from the people. For example, at the Council of Terragona in 1234 A.D. the

Roman Catholic Church prohibited anyone from possessing any part of the Old or New Testaments in any of the Romance languages (Portuguese, Spanish, Catalan, Provencal, French, Rhaeto-Romance, Italian, Sardinian, and Romanian). The council ruled that anyone owning a Bible was to turn it over to the local Catholic bishop to be burned. In 1229 at the Council of Toulouse (Pope Gregory IX presiding), the Catholic Church prohibited “laymen” from having the Holy Scriptures or translating them into the “vulgar tongue” (common language of the country). In 1551 the Catholic Inquisitional Index of Valentia forbade the Holy Bible to be translated into Spanish or any other “vernacular.” In 1559 the Roman Catholic Index Librorum Prohibitorum (Index of Prohibited Books) required permission from the Catholic Church to read the Catholic version of the Bible; all Christian Bible versions were simply prohibited. On September 8, 1713, Pope Clement XI issued his Dogmatic Constitution, Unigenitus, which in part condemned as error the teaching that all people may read the Sacred Scripture.

On May 5, 1824 Pope Leo XII issued his encyclical Ubi Primum which exhorted the bishops to remind their flocks not to read the Bible. On May 24, 1829 Pope Pius VIII issued the encyclical Traditi Humilitati, which exhorted Catholics to check the spread of Bibles translated into the vernacular, because those Bibles endangered the “sacred” teachings of the Catholic Church.

On May 8, 1844, Pope Gregory XVI issued his encyclical Inter Praecipuas in which he described Bible societies as plotting against the Catholic faith by providing Bibles to the common people, whom he referred to as “infidels.” On January 25, 1897 Pope Leo XIII issued his Apostolic Constitution Officiorum ac Munerum which prohibited all versions of the Bible in the vernacular tongue.

The 1918 Catholic Code of Canon Law, Index of Prohibited Books, Canon 1385, § 1 prohibited publishing any edition of the Holy Scriptures without previous Catholic “ecclesiastical censorship.”

The 1983 Catholic Code of Canon Law, Canon 825, § 1 prohibits the publishing of the Sacred Scriptures without the permission of the Apostolic See or the Conference of Bishops.

The official doctrines of the Catholic Church prohibiting the publication, possession, or reading of the Holy Bible, were not a mere suggestions, they were enforced. For example, on October 6, 1536 at Vilvorde (outside Brussels, Belgium) William Tyndale was burned at the stake.

His crime was that he translated the Holy Scriptures into English and was making copies available to the people in violation of the rules of the Roman Catholic Church.

The progenitors of the Catholic Church were around in the time of the apostles, wresting the Holy Scriptures from the people.

And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you;

As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction. Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness. (2 Peter 3:15-17 AV)

Satan's Counterfeit Bibles

With the advent of the printing press (circa 1455) making Bibles available to the ordinary man, it became obvious to Satan that he could not keep God's word from the masses, so he instituted the second prong of his attack on God's word in earnest. He offered counterfeit bibles. The Holy Scriptures reveal a pattern by Satan from the beginning to tamper with God's word. God commanded Adam not to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou may freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shall not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

(Genesis 2:16-17 AV)

In Genesis 3:1-5 the serpent misquotes God, changing God's words; he tricks Eve into eating from the tree of knowledge of good and evil by asking her if God commanded that they not eat of any of the trees in the garden. When Eve responds, she also misquotes God, saying that he commanded that they should not touch the fruit, when God merely prohibited the eating of the fruit.

God told Adam that if he ate from the tree "thou shalt surely die." Once Satan perceived that Eve was ignorant of God's true words he felt confident that he could convince Eve to disobey God by subtly misquoting what God had said. Satan took the warning by God and added one word. Satan said to Eve: "Ye shall not surely die." What Satan said sounded authoritative. It sounded almost like what God had said; but that one word corrupted God's word and turned it from the words of God to the words of Satan. The result

of the corruption by Satan of God's word was the greatest tragedy in history, the fall of Adam and Eve!

Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.

And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. (Genesis 3:1-5 AV)

In apparent reference to Satan's corruption of God's word in the Garden of Eden, Jesus admonished Satan: "That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God." (Luke 4:4 AV)

Just as Satan did in the Garden of Eden, he now tries to confuse people about what God has said: "Yea, hath God said" Pediatrician Dr. Lawrence Dunegan attended a lecture on March 20, 1969 at a gathering of pediatricians at a meeting of the Pittsburgh Pediatric Society. The lecturer at that meeting was a Dr. Richard Day (who died in 1989). At the time of the lecture Dr. Day was

Professor of Pediatrics at Mount Sinai Medical School in New York.

Previously, Dr. Day had served as Medical Director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Dr. Dunegan was well acquainted with Dr. Day and described him as an insider in the "order." Dr. Dunegan did not explain what the "order" was, but from the lecture it was clear that it was a very powerful secret society

made up of minions in service to Satan. During the lecture Dr. Day revealed many of the satanic plans that the members of the "order" had agreed upon that would change the United States from a Christian society to a pagan society. One of the strategies was to introduce new bible versions. By the time of the lecture in 1969, that strategy had long previously been implemented. Dr. Day was

indicating that the final success of that strategy was in sight as henceforth it would be implemented with new vigor. Dr. Dunegan explains:

Another area of discussion was Religion. This is an avowed atheist speaking. And he [Dr. Day] said, "Religion is not necessarily bad. A lot of people seem to need religion, with it's mysteries and rituals - so they will have religion. But the major religions of today have to be changed because they are not compatible with the changes to come. The old religions will have to go. Especially Christianity.

Once the Roman Catholic Church is brought down, the rest of Christianity will follow easily.

Then a new religion can be accepted for use all over the world. It will

incorporate something from all of the old ones to make it more easy for people to accept it, and feel at home in it. Most people won't be too concerned with religion. They will realize that they don't need it. In order to this, the Bible will be changed. It will be rewritten to fit the new religion.

Gradually, key words will be replaced with new words having various shades of meaning. Then the meaning attached to the new word can be close to the old word - and as time goes on, other shades of meaning of that word can be emphasized. and

then gradually that word replaced with another word." I don't know if I'm making that clear. But the idea is that everything in Scripture need not be rewritten, just key words replaced by other words. And the variability in meaning attached to any word

can be used as a tool to change the entire meaning of Scripture, and therefore make it acceptable to this new religion.

Most people won't know the difference; and this was another one of the times where he said, "the few who do notice the difference won't be enough to matter."

In accordance with the aforementioned conspiracy, Satan and his minions now offer people a whole assortment of different bible versions, which change and twist God's word. God's word is with us today in the Authorized (King James) Version (referred to as AV or KJV). All other bible versions are tainted by the hands of Satan and his minions, including the New King James Version (NKJV). "Ye have perverted the words of the living God, of the LORD of hosts our God." Jeremiah 23:36.

The corrupted bible versions are essentially Roman Catholic bible versions. Sadly, most of the so called church leaders of today have accepted Satan's counterfeit bibles.

The following is a partial list of the fraudulent bible versions:

New International Version (NIV),
Contemporary English Version (CEV),
New Century Version (NCV),
New World Translation (NWT),
American Standard Version (ASV),
New American Standard Bible (NASB),
Revised Version (RV),
Revised Standard Version (RSV),
New Revised Standard Version (NRSV),
Amplified Version (AMP),
New King James Version (NKJV),
21st Century King James Version (KJ21),
Third Millennium Bible (TMB),

Douay-Rheims Version (DRV),
Good News for Modern Man (GNB),
Today's English Version (TEV),
Living Bible (LB),
Darby Translation (DBY),
Jerusalem Bible (JB),
New Jerusalem Bible (NJB).

The Authorized (King James) Version is an English translation of the Masoretic (traditional) Hebrew Old Testament, whereas the new bible versions are taken from an inferior and corrupted mixture of the Septuagint (Greek old testament), Samaritan Pentateuch, Dead Sea Scrolls, and a variety of other transcripts. The corrupt Septuagint used today was translated by Origen (185-254 A.D.), who was a Unitarian evolutionist. Origen believed in reincarnation and denied the existence of hell.

There are approximately 4,489 Greek New Testament manuscripts known to be extant today.

Of these, 170 are papyrus fragments dating from the second to the seventh centuries; there are 212 uncial (capital letter) manuscripts, dating from the fourth to the tenth centuries; there are 2,429 minuscule (small letter) manuscripts, dating from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries; and there are 1,678 lectionaries, which are lesson books for public reading that contain extracts from the New Testament.

The vast majority of these manuscripts are in agreement and make up what is known as the Textus Receptus (received text). There has been a recent discovery of a small fragment of the earliest known New Testament manuscript not included in the above tally, which was dated to 66 A.D. and is in agreement with the Textus Receptus. The King James New Testament is based upon the Greek Textus Receptus, whereas the new translations are based upon a very few number of corrupt manuscripts including the Roman Catholic Greek texts Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and a few other texts, the origins of which are a mystery.

The manuscript Sinaiticus, which is often referred to by the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, Aleph, is written in book form (codex) on velum. It contains many spurious books such as the Shepherd of Hermes, the Didache, and the Epistle of Barnabas. Sinaiticus was discovered in a waste basket in St. Catherine's monastery on Mount Sinai in February of 1859. Sinaiticus is covered with alterations that are systematically spread over every page and were made by at least ten different revisors. The alterations are obvious to anyone who examines the manuscript. Most of the revisions to the text were made in the sixth or seventh century.

The manuscript Vaticanus, often referred to by the letter “B” originated in the Vatican library, hence the name. Vaticanus was first revealed in 1841; where the transcript had been prior to that date is unclear. One thing this is clear is that the manuscript omits many portions of scripture which explain vital Christian doctrines. Vaticanus omits Genesis 1:1 through Genesis 46:28; Psalms

106 through 138; Matthew 16:2,3; Romans 16:24; the Pauline Epistles; Revelation; and everything in Hebrews after 9:14.17 It should not be surprising that the Vatican would produce a manuscript that omits the portion of the book of Hebrews which exposes the mass as completely ineffectual and deletes Revelation chapter 17, which reveals Rome as the seat of “MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.” Notice that the two primary manuscripts used by the new bible versions were found in the care and custody of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts, which make up less than one percent of the existing ancient manuscripts, differ significantly from the Received Text. Vaticanus omits at least 2,877 words; it adds 536 words; it substitutes 935 words; it transposes 2,098 words; and it modifies 1,132 words; making a total of 7,578 verbal divergences from the Received Text. Sinaiticus is an even worse corruption, having almost 9,000 divergences from the Received Text.

John Burgon, Dean of Westminster and the preeminent Greek textual scholar of his time, said the following about the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts.

The impurity of the text exhibited by these codices is not a question of opinion but of fact. . . . In the Gospels alone Codex B (Vatican) leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 1,491 times. It bears traces of careless transcription on every page.

Codex Sinaiticus abounds with errors of the eye and pen to an extent not indeed unparalleled, but happily rather unusual in documents of first-rate importance.

On many occasions, 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through very carelessness.

Letters and words, even whole sentences, are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately cancelled; while that gross blunder, whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as a clause preceding, occur is no less than 115 times in the New Testament.

The Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts are so clearly corrupt that Dean Burgon was at a loss to explain textual scholars accepting them as valid. He

concluded that those manuscripts have “established a tyrannical ascendancy over the imagination of the critics which can only be fitly spoken of as blind superstition.”²⁰ The following is Dean Burgon’s assessment of the new Greek text, which was produced largely from the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts, and which underlies the new bible versions.

[T]he Greek Text which they have invented proves to be hopelessly depraved throughout . . . [I]t was deliberately invented . . . [T]he underlying Greek . . . is an entirely new thing, is a manufactured article throughout. . . . The new Greek text was full of errors from beginning to end. . . . Shame on [those] most incompetent men who - finding themselves in a evil hour occupied themselves . . . with falsifying the inspired Greek Text . . . Who will venture to predict the amount of mischief which must follow, if the ‘New’ Greek Text . . . should become used.

The Latin translation of the bible is called the Latin Vulgate. Incidentally, the Catholic Church used Jerome to pull a switch. The Latin text that is today called the Latin Vulgate is very different from the traditional Latin Vulgate. Jerome used corrupted Greek texts from Alexandria, which he translated into Latin, he then added 14 apocryphal books; the Catholic Church called Jerome’s new Latin translation the Latin Vulgate. This corrupted Latin Vulgate text is the official bible text for the Catholic Church and was the source text for the Jesuit Douay-Rheims English translation of the bible.

How did the new versions of the bible become so corrupted? The personalities behind the new texts have an occult new age agenda. The compilers and translators of the new editions aren’t just unchristian they are antichristian. The compilers of the corrupted Greek text used in virtually all of the new bible versions were Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. They were nominal Protestants, but they were defacto Roman Catholics.

Hort denied the infallibility of the Holy Scriptures, he did not believe in the existence of Satan, he did not believe in eternal punishment in Hell, nor did he believe in Christ’s atonement. Hort, however, did believe in Darwin’s theory of evolution, he believed in purgatory, and he also believed in baptismal regeneration. Hort hated the United States and wished for its destruction during the civil war, because he was a communist who hated all things democratic.

Westcott was equally Romish in his beliefs. He, like Hort, rejected the infallibility of the Holy Scriptures. He viewed the Genesis account of creation as merely an allegory. He did not believe the biblical account of the miracles of Jesus. He did, however, believe in praying for the dead and worshipping Mary. Politically, Westcott was a devout Socialist.

Westcott and Hort were both necromancers who were members of an occult club called the "Ghostly Guild." Westcott also founded another club and named it "Hermes." According to Luciferian H.P. Blavatsky, Hermes and Satan are one and the same. Hort viewed evangelical Christians as dangerous, perverted, unsound, and confused. Westcott and Hort's Greek text was largely based on the fraudulent Catholic texts Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

Assisting Westcott and Hort in their revision was Dr. G. Vance, a Unitarian, who denied the deity of Christ, the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and the Godhead (Jesus Christ, God the Father, and the Holy Ghost). Jesuit Roman Catholic Cardinal Carlo Maria Martini, the prelate of Milan, was the editor of the corrupted Greek text. Martini believed the occult new age philosophy that man can become divine. Remember, that is the very lie that Satan used to deceive Eve into eating the forbidden fruit: "ye shall be as gods." Genesis 3:5.

In addition, the new bible versions use a method of translation known as dynamic equivalence, rather than the formal equivalence used in the Authorized Version (AV), which is also known as the King James Version (KJV). Formal equivalence is a word for word translation, whereas dynamic equivalence is a thought for thought translation. A translator using dynamic equivalence is less a translator and more an interpreter. Thus, the new versions of bibles should more accurately be called interpretations, rather than translations. The dynamic equivalent interpreters of the new bible versions have often made unfounded assumptions as to the meaning of particular passage. Rather than translate what God wrote, they have, with some frequency, twisted passages by injecting their own personal bias. Some of these interpreters have displayed malicious intent and caused great mischief.

The subjective bias of the interpreters have caused changes in the new version English bibles that are not supported by any of Greek or Hebrew texts. For example, dynamic equivalencies caused 6,653 English word changes in the New International Version (NIV), approximately 4,000 word changes in the New American Standard Bible (NASB), and approximately 2,000 word changes in the New King James Version (NKJV), none of which are supported by the words in any of the Greek or Hebrew texts. Those word changes reflect the subjective bias of the interpreters. The combined effect of having a corrupted text and then having that text interpreted using dynamic equivalence has been that the NIV has 64,098 fewer words than the AV.⁴¹ That is a 10% loss in the bible. That means that an NIV bible would have 170 fewer pages than a typical 1,700

page AV bible.

The new versions of the bible are materially different; they are the product of the imaginations of interpreters who have applied their personal prejudices to slant already corrupted texts to comport with their own ideas. They are truly counterfeit bibles.

The Holy Bible is a legal document prepared by God. It contains the Old and New Testaments of Jesus Christ. A testament is a memorialization of the will of a testator. It only has legal effect once the testator has died. The New Testament, in reality, is the last will and testament of Jesus Christ. And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth. (Hebrews 9:15-17 AV)

A testator he is free to change the testament and add to it. That is what Jesus did when he added the New Testament to the Old Testament. "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament." (Hebrews 7:22 AV) However, it is only the testator who is allowed to change or add to a testament. If anyone else adds to or changes a testament, the changes make the resulting document a forgery.

When trying to determine the meaning of a last will and testament, courts always try to interpret what is the will of the testator. That is why a person's the testament is called a will. If a will is to be translated from one language to another, because the heirs or the court speak a different language, courts always use formal equivalence because it is important that the heirs know exactly what the testator said. In fact, a translator must take an oath to faithfully translate the will of the testator. It is important not to allow any bias from a translator to affect what is the meaning of the words used. If a court allowed dynamic equivalence to be used when translating a last will and testament then the court would not be interpreting the will of the testator; the interpretation would have already been done by the translator of the document when he interpreted the meaning of each passage. The judge would be stuck with a document which has been injected with meaning by the translator. The judge would, in effect, be interpreting the intent of the testator intermixed with the intent of the translator. The final verdict regarding the intent of the testator would be corrupted by the bias or errors of the translator.

In the case of the Holy Bible, it is the New and Old Testaments of God Almighty. They are the most important legal documents ever written. God

Almighty is the testator. He wrote both testaments. In addition, he created the languages into which his original testaments would be written. He also created the languages into which those testaments would be translated. Genesis 11:7-9. He has supernaturally controlled the process from beginning to end. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." (2 Timothy 3:16 AV)

In addition, he has promised to supernaturally preserve his testaments. "[T]he word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." (1 Peter 1:25 AV)

The heirs of Christ are Christians. "The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." (Romans 8:16-17 AV)

In order for Christ's heirs to understand his will they must have a faithful translation. If his heirs try to interpret God's will by using a translation that contains not the pure intent of God, but instead the intent of the translator, then they can no longer determine God's will. A will that has been rewritten and corrupted with the thoughts of one other than the testator, it is considered a forgery and a fraud. So also are the new translations of the bible forgeries and frauds.

Defenders of the new bibles claim that the essential doctrines of the Christian Faith are expressed in the new bibles, even though they have been deleted or changed in many passages.

James H. Son, author of *The New Athenians*, likened the logic of that argument to removing a stop sign from a busy street intersection and then justifying the removal because the other traffic signals in the city were left intact. Even though the sign only contained one word, that word is of critical importance to those who arrive at the intersection, just as each word in the Holy Bible is of critical

importance to those who are reading it. God has made the point in the Holy Bible that every word of God is important. "And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God." (Luke 4:4 AV)

Incidentally, the doctrine of Luke 4:4 is missing in the new bible versions. The NASB, for example leaves out the last clause and simply states: "And Jesus answered him, 'it is written, MAN SHALL NOT LIVE ON BREAD ALONE.'" (Luke 4:4 NASB) The new versions leave the reader in ignorance as to what it is other than bread by which man lives.

And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which

thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live. (Deuteronomy 8:3 AV)

Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him.
(Proverbs 30:5 AV)

Look at the passage in Galatians 3:16, wherein God points out the importance of every one of his words. In that passage God explains the importance of the distinction between the singular word “seed” and the plural word “seeds.”
Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. (Galatians 3:16 AV)

If one looks at the AV passages that refer to the promises made to Abraham, one sees that in fact God refers to Abraham’s “seed,” singular. In the NIV, however, the passages that prophesy the blessings that were to flow from Abraham’s seed, Jesus Christ, are changed and obscured. If one were to try to find the passages referred to in Galatians 3:16 in the NIV one would not be able to do so, because the NIV does not use the word chosen by God but has substituted words chosen by man as inspired by Satan.

AV

And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice. (Genesis 22:18 AV)

NIV

And through your offspring all nations on earth will be blessed, because you have obeyed me. (Genesis 22:18 NIV)

AV

And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.
(Genesis 17:7 AV)

NIV

I will establish my covenant as an everlasting

covenant between me and you and your descendants after you for the generations to come, to be your God and the God of your descendants after you. (Genesis 17:7 NIV)

It is important for God's heirs to know who they are. His heirs are those who have the faith of Abraham, not those that have the flesh of Abraham. Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.

Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.

And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith,

preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.

So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. (Galatians 3:6-9 AV)

This point is understood by the passage in Galatians 3:16 that explains what is meant by the

precise word "seed" used in the Old Testament. "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed,

and heirs according to the promise." (Galatians 3:29 AV)

Without the precise word "seed" the meaning of the will of God can be misinterpreted to

support false doctrines like that pretribulation rapture fraud, which makes Christ's church a mere

parenthesis in history. Under the pretribulation rapture corruption, fleshly Israel is to inherit the

promises of God; contrary to God's express intent that it is those who are chosen and justified by his

sovereign grace who are his heirs and not those who are born of the flesh of Abraham. "That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." (Titus 3:7 AV)

Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel,

which are of Israel: Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all

children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children

of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise

are counted for the seed.” (Romans 9:6-8 AV)

That is one example of a false doctrine that is supported by the change of just one word.

There are other false doctrines that have sprung from other corrupt changes to God’s word in the new bible versions.

The promoters of the new bible versions claim that they are merely updating the archaic

English in the King James Bible. They are being disingenuous. The Holy Bible is a legal document.

The English of the King James Bible is not archaic, it is precise. The precise language used has

eternal importance. Thee, thou, thy, and thine are singular pronouns. Thou is the subjective second

person singular, thee is the objective second person singular, and thy and thine are possessive second

person singular. Ye is a subjective second person plural pronoun. In the King James text the

precision of the language puts the reader in the midst of the narrative. The reader is able to tell

whether the person is the object of the action or the subject causing the action. The reader can also

tell if the subject or object is a group or an individual. The new versions use either the pronouns

“you” or “your” for all of the narratives and the reader is not able to know anything about the setting

of the narrative. All one need do is read Galatians 3:16 to know that singularity and plurality are important to God.

The writers of the Authorized (King James) Version (AV) did not use the more precise

pronouns because that was the customary language of the 16th century, they purposely used those

words because they wanted to accurately and faithfully translate God’s word into English. To prove

the point, all one need do is read the dedicatory at the beginning of the Holy Bible (AV); the

dedicatory was written at the completion of the AV Holy Bible in 1611 A. D., not once was thee,

thou, thy, thine, or ye used in the dedicatory.

One of the arguments used by the promoters of the new versions is that the new versions are

easier to read than the King James Bible. Some Bible passages are hard to

understand, but that is no excuse to change the meaning of the passages just to make them more readable. Dr. Donald Waite said it best: "Some people say they like a particular version because they say it's more readable. Now, readability is one thing, but does the readability conform to what's in the original Greek and Hebrew language? You can have a lot of readability, but if it doesn't match up with what God has said, it's of no profit. In the King James Bible, the words match what God has said. You may say it's difficult to read, but study it out. It's hard in the Hebrew and Greek and, perhaps, even in the English in the King James Bible. But to change it around just to make it simple, or interpreting it, instead of translating it, is wrong. You've got lots of interpretation, but we don't want that in a translation. We want exactly what God said in the Hebrew and Greek brought over into English."⁴³

Besides, it is simply not true that the new bible versions are easier to read. According to a readability study the AV reads at the 5th grade level, whereas the NKJV and NASB read at the 6th grade level and the NIV reads at the 8th grade level.⁴⁴ When reading the Holy Bible one should understand that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Corinthians 2:14 AV) If a passage is hard to understand pray for understanding and study the Bible for the answer. Let God's word explain God's word. God has promised to preserve his word forever (Psalms 12:6-7), that not one jot nor one tittle will pass from his law (Matthew 5:18), and that heaven and earth will pass away but his words will never pass away (Matthew 24:35). The promoters of the new bible versions call God a liar. They assert that God's word has not been preserved. They admit that they don't know which version is truly God's word. If you ask them to present God's word, they will tell you that parts of his word are lost forever, but that they can come up with a text that they [T]he word

of the Lord endureth for ever. will try to convince you comes close to God's word. But God has stated emphatically: "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." (1 Peter 1:25 AV) "[L]et God be true, but every man a liar." (Romans 3:4 AV)

S. Franklin Longsdon was assigned by Dewey Lockman of the Lockman Foundation to write the guidelines for the translation of the NASB. Longsdon prepared the guidelines, but after much study and prayer he wrote to Lockman that the NASB was terribly wrong and renounced any attachment to the NASB version of the bible.

The most popular version of the new bibles is the New International Version (NIV). Dr. Virginia Mollenkott, the textual style editor for the NIV, is an admitted lesbian. The Chairman of the NIV Old Testament Committee, Dr. Woudstra, was considered to be sympathetic to the interests and practices of sodomites. The NIV chief editor vaunted the fact that the NIV showed that it is a great error to believe that in order to be born again one has to have faith in Jesus as Savior. He also thought that few clear and decisive Bible texts express that Jesus is God. Rupert Murdoch owns the exclusive rights to the NIV. Murdoch has been described as an internationalist and a pornographer. Time magazine called Murdoch one of the four most powerful people in the world, and for good reason, he has a media empire that includes Twentieth Century Fox, Fox Television, cable television providers, satellites, and newspapers and television stations throughout America, Europe, and Asia. The pope bestowed upon Murdoch the title of "Knight Commander of St. Gregory" for promoting the interests of the Roman Catholic Church.

The New King James Version (NKJV) and the 21st Century King James Version (KJ21) are particularly misleading. They try to trade on the accuracy of the Authorized (King James) Version of the Holy Bible (AV) by putting King James in their titles. They claim that their bibles are simply updates of the King James. Their copyright, however, gives them away.

What they don't tell the public is that in order to obtain a copyright on a book that is in the public domain, as is the King James Bible, they are required to make substantial revision to the text, such that it can be clearly distinguishable from the original. Essentially, it must be a new literary work. Otherwise, the publisher of the revision cannot claim a copyright. The NKJV and the KJ21 are both copyrighted books; which means they must be substantially different from the King James Bible. Yet, in order to sell the new bible they tell the public that it is really the same as the old King James Bible, that they have simply updated the archaic language in order to make it more readable.

The publishers of the NKJV and the KJ21 versions are being disingenuous when they claim that their new versions are not new at all, but just easier to read updates of the original Authorized (King James) Version (AV). The NKJV made over 100,000 word changes from the AV, deleting 2,289 words from the New Testament alone. The NKJV removed the word "Lord" 66 times, removed the word "God" 51 times, and removed the word "Heaven" 50 times. Yet, Nelson publications has the nerve to advertise that "Nothing has been changed except to make the original meaning clearer."

The KJ21 publishers claim that:

The 21st Century King James Version (KJ21®) is neither a new translation nor a revision, but an updating of the King James Version (KJV) of A.D. 1611. While no attempt has been made to "improve" the timeless message or literary style of the KJV, words which are either obsolete or archaic, and are no longer understood by literate Bible readers, have been replaced by carefully selected current equivalents.

The KJ21 publishers state that in order to maintain the accuracy and keep the KJ21 faithful to the original AV they even kept the thees and thous, etc. They have, in fact, made many

unnecessary changes to the text, which make their bible less clear and understandable. If one reads the text of the KJ21, one sees that conjunctions are added when unnecessary and the word order is changed in passages, not to make the passages clearer, but so that the revision is considered substantially different from the King James Bible. They had to make substantial changes in order to obtain a copyright on the publication. The KJ21 is, quite simply, about making money. The publishers are not telling the truth when they claim that the KJ21 is not a revision but only an update.

George Shafer did a computer check of the verses in the four Gospels, comparing the KJ21 with the original AV. He discovered that the KJ21 modified 2,200 of the 3,779 verses. That is a change in approximately 60% of the verses in the four gospels. Why did they make so many changes, when they claimed to have only updated it? Remember, they must make substantial changes in order to get a copyright, but they also want to sell their corrupted bibles.

The KJ21 claims in their preface: "The KJ21® is unique among modern Bibles in that it is closer in language to the original King James Version than any other Bible copyrighted in the twentieth century. Unlike all other modern Bibles, it alone retains the power, beauty, and poetic language of the glorious King James Version."⁵⁵ The KJ21 publishers are saying that they have changed the powerful and beautiful King James Bible to a lesser degree than other copyrighted new bible versions. The KJ21 publishers seem to be admitting that the leaven of changes to the King James Bible are for the worse, so they made fewer of them. "A little leaven leavens the whole lump." (Galatians 5:9 AV) All it takes is a little poison to poison a well. These new bible versions are spiritual poison.

The publishers of both the KJ21 and the NKJV fall all over themselves praising the accuracy and literary beauty of the King James Bible. If it so accurate and beautiful, why change it? The answer is MONEY! "For the love of money is the root of all evil: which

while some coveted after,
they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.” (1 Timothy 6:10

AV) The new bible versions are evil.

The texts of the new bible versions, such as the NIV, manifest the pagan antichrist agenda of its publishers. In Isaiah there is a passage about Lucifer that refers to him as “Lucifer, son of the morning.” In the NIV, the Isaiah passage is changed.

AV

How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit. (Isaiah 14:12-15 AV)

NIV

How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn! You have been cast down to the earth, you who once laid low the nations! You said in your heart, “I will ascend to heaven, I will raise my throne above the stars of God: I will sit enthroned on the mount of assembly, in the utmost heights of the sacred mountain. I will ascend above the tops of the clouds; I will make myself like the most High.” But you are brought down to the grave, to the depths of the pit. (Isaiah 14:12-15 NIV)

Notice that the NIV has changed the subject of the passage from “Lucifer” to the “morning star.” What is the significance of that change? In Revelation 22:16, Jesus calls himself the “morning star.” Do you see what Satan has done? Jesus is the “morning star” in the NIV Isaiah passage.

Satan has taken a passage that refers to Satan’s destruction and has twisted it in the NIV to describe the destruction of Jesus, who is Lord God Almighty.

The authors of the NIV, who are evil minions of the devil, have committed

the unpardonable sin by changing Isaiah chapter 14 in the NIV to blasphemously attribute to God the evil characteristics of Lucifer. In their Satanic NIV, Isaiah chapter 14 has been changed to prophesy that it is not Lucifer who will in the end be cast into hell, but rather the “morning star,” who is the Lord God Jesus Christ.

But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man’s house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.

Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men.

And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. (Matthew 12:24-32 AV)

In Revelation 20:12 the small and great stand before God, who is seated on a great white throne. However, in the NIV, NASB and other corrupted versions Satan accomplishes his ultimate goal of taking God from his throne; in those new versions all mention of God sitting on the throne is deleted. The small and great are simply standing before the throne. Another example of Satan’s twisting of God’s word is found in Luke in the new versions of

the bible. In the Authorized Version, Mary's and Joseph's relationship to Jesus is described as

"Joseph and his mother." Whereas, in the NIV, and virtually every other new version of the bible,

Mary's and Joseph's relationship to Jesus is described as "the child's father and mother." We know

that Joseph was not Jesus' father, because Mary, when she was still a virgin, conceived Jesus by the

Holy Spirit. God is Jesus' Father. Jesus is the Son of God, not the son of Joseph. ". . .

That holy thing which shall be of thee shall be called the Son of God." Luke 1:35.

AV

And Joseph and his mother marveled at those things which were spoken of him.

(Luke 2:33 AV)

NIV

The child's father and mother marvelled at what was said about him. (Luke 2:33 NIV)

Throughout the corrupted bible versions, passages that prove the deity of Jesus are removed

or changed. For example, the translators of the NIV, NASB, RSV, and most of the new translations

delete Jesus' assertion in Revelation 1:11 that: "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last." In

addition, the NIV and the other new bible versions delete the word "God" from 1 Timothy 3:16,

using the pronoun "He" in its place. 1 Timothy 3:16 clearly reveals that Jesus is God. The new bible

versions, however, remove the revelation that Jesus is God from that passage.

AV

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. (1 Timothy 3:16 AV)

NIV

Beyond all question, the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in a body, was vindicated by the Spirit, was seen by angels, was preached among the nations, was believed

on in the world, was taken up in glory. (1 Timothy 3:16 NIV)

In Ephesians 3:9 the Holy Bible identifies Jesus as the Creator of the universe. However, the NIV removes the reference to Jesus.

AV

And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ.

(Ephesians 3:9 AV)

NIV

[A]nd to make plain to everyone the administration of this mystery, which for ages past was kept hidden in God, who created all things. (Ephesians 3:9 NIV)

Even where the new versions do not delete words they change the word order so as to obscure the clear message. For example in the following passage from 2 Corinthians 5:19 the NIV obscures the message that “God was in Christ”

AV

God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. (2 Corinthians 5:19 AV)

NIV

God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ, not counting men’s sins against them. And has committed to us the message of reconciliation. (2 Corinthians 5:19 NIV)

Another example of the new versions’ attacks on the deity of Jesus is found in the RSV

passage in Isaiah 7:14. In the AV Holy Bible there is a prophecy that God would be miraculously

born of a virgin and that he would be called Immanuel (which means God with us). See Matthew

1:23. On the translation committee for the RSV was a Jewish scholar (so called), H.M. Orlinsky of

the Jewish Institute of New York, who did not believe in the deity of Jesus.⁵⁶ It is no wonder that

in the RSV the Isaiah passage is changed to having Immanuel born not of a virgin but of a “young woman.”

AV

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 AV)

RSV

Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Behold, a young woman shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name

Immanuel. (Isaiah 7:14 RSV)

In 1996, Pope John Paul II announced that evolution is compatible with Christian beliefs.

While evolution is compatible with Catholicism, evolution is not compatible with Christianity; evolution is irreconcilable with and antagonistic to Christianity. In 1998, the pope toned down his position, by announcing that evolution alone cannot account for human existence. He, however, did not repudiate his pro-evolutionary position. God's word describes Adam as being "made a living soul." The NIV, however, follows the evolutionary philosophy of the world and changes God's word to say that Adam "became a living being." In the NIV man was not created, but instead just "became." This evolutionary slant fits in nicely with the Roman Catholic teachings.

AV

And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul. (1 Corinthians 15:45 AV)

NIV

So it is written: "The first man Adam became a living being." (1 Corinthians 15:45 NIV)

The theory of evolution is not only contrary to God's word, but it is not based on true science; its origins are from pagan religious beliefs. According to the established laws of science, evolution is an impossibility. The second law of thermodynamics, also known as the law of entropy, is that all matter, living or inanimate, goes from a state of order to disorder. The theory of evolution reverses that sequence and states that over time organisms go from a state of disorder to order; from the simple to the complex. To illustrate the conflict between evolution and

the laws of science,
suppose one were to write each letter of one's name on a separate card. If those cards were thrown out a second story they would scatter and fall to the ground in a chaotic display. The scattering of the cards over time as they fall to the ground illustrates the law of entropy. The evolutionist would say that the reason that the cards did not fall to the ground in order, spelling out the persons name, is that they were not given enough time to become orderly. The evolutionist would advise one to get into an airplane and throw the cards out of the plane when it reached an altitude of 10,000 feet. By the theory of evolution the more time the cards are in the air falling, the more time they have to organize and spell out the persons name when they finely land on the ground. According to the law of entropy, and common sense, giving the cards more time to fall to the ground only increases the disorder. The evolutionist, however, contrary to the laws of science and common sense, would have you believe that the more time the cards have to fall to the ground, the more orderly they will become.

The theory of evolution is the seed that germinated into communism and socialism. Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, and Trotsky, were all converts to the theory of evolution. Evolution was the foundational philosophy for their political actions and their justification for their maniacal brutality. Once one becomes a believer in evolution, it is a small step beyond that to being a believer in a communist revolution. If there is no life giver, there is no law giver, no one made me, no one owns me, and, therefore, there is no right and wrong. Thus, there is nothing intrinsically wrong with stealing, assault, torture, murder, even murdering millions of people. The theory of evolution is the seed that germinated into communism and socialism. Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, and Trotsky, were all converts to the theory of evolution. Evolution was the foundational philosophy for their political actions and their justification for their maniacal brutality.

Once one becomes a believer in evolution, it is a small step beyond that to being a believer in a communist revolution. If there is no life giver, there is no law giver, no one made me, no one owns me, and, therefore, there is no right and wrong. Thus, there is nothing intrinsically wrong with stealing, assault, torture, murder, even murdering millions of people. The theory of evolution is founded upon racism. In order to understand this evolutionary racism we must examine what is meant by the term race. Race is simply defined as a group of persons who have a common lineage.⁵⁷ Race is not a biblical concept. God in the bible does not once categorize different people according to race. He distinguishes different people by their tongues, families, nations, and countries. See Genesis 10:5, 20, 31; Revelation 10:11. Prior to the 1800's, races of people were generally categorized according to their nationality (the German race, the English race, etc.). With the popularity of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution, which was first published in 1859, it eventually became the widespread practice to define race according to physical appearance. Darwin was a racist who believed that Blacks were closer to apes in the evolutionary process. In fact, the liberal humanists don't want the general public to know that the full title of Darwin's seminal 1859 book on evolution was: "THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES BY MEANS OF NATURAL SELECTION OR THE PRESERVATION OF FAVORED RACES IN THE STRUGGLE FOR LIFE." Darwin elaborated on his racist views as follows: "At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest allies will be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, even that the Caucasian and some ape as low as a baboon instead of as now between the Negro or

Australian and the gorilla.”

Darwin’s racist theory of evolution is refuted by real science. Many scientists hold that

because the physical variations that are used to categorize people into different races (skin color, eye shape, etc.) are trivial (only .012 percent of human biological variation) and that genetically all

humans are fundamentally the same, racial distinctions based upon physical appearance are not

founded on biological reality but are in fact a social construct.

Professor of Epidemiology Raj Bhopal, who is the head of the Department of Epidemiology and Public Health at the University of

Newcastle, stated in the British Medical Journal: "Humans are one species: races are not biologically

distinct, there's little variation in genetic composition between geographically separate groups, and

the physical characteristics distinguishing races result from a small number of genes that do not

relate closely to either behaviors or disease.”

In addition, a panel of “scientists, including geneticists and anthropologists meeting at the

American Association for the Advancement of Science convention, said that the whole notion of

race, based on skin color and hair type, is a social construction that has nothing to do with the genetic

makeup of humans. . . . So while society busily tries to classify and reclassify races, the researchers

say, it should remember that race is an artificial way to organize and categorize and has nothing to

do with humans’ fundamental makeup.”

Those scientists maintain that it is a misnomer, therefore, to label people with different

physical characteristics as being of different races. Because racial distinctions are somewhat

arbitrary, there is no standardization of racial categories; in fact, the labels for the various races have

changed with some frequency. There has been a recent trend in the United States to categorize races

of people according to their perceived national or regional origin, such as African-American,

Mexican-American, etc.

In Saint Francis College et al. v. Al-Khazraji, Aka Allan, a United States citizen born in Iraq

was denied tenure at a private college in Pennsylvania. The professor made a claim under a federal statute, U.S.C. § 1981, alleging that he was discriminated against because of his ancestry. The college argued that § 1981 only prohibits racial prejudice and because the professor was considered a Caucasian under modern "scientific" theory that he could not be subjected to racial discrimination from another Caucasian. The U.S. Supreme Court examined dictionaries and encyclopedias from the 1800's and discovered that the theory of racial classifications has undergone a significant change since then. It was not until the early 20th Century that dictionaries started defining race according to physical appearance and listing the racial categories: Mongoloid, Caucasoid, and Negroid. The Court recognized the lack of scientific authority for the modern racial classifications and found those classifications to be inadequate to address the issue of racial prejudice that 42 U.S.C. § 1981 was drafted to prohibit. The Court ruled that § 1981 prohibited discrimination based on ancestry or ethnic characteristics, regardless of whether the person has the physical appearance that places him into one of the modern racial categories. The U.S. Supreme Court in the Saint Francis College case stated: There is a common understanding that there are three major human races - Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid. Many modern biologists and anthropologists, however, criticize racial classifications as arbitrary and of little use in understanding the variability of human beings. It is said that genetically homogeneous populations do not exist and traits are not discontinuous between populations; therefore, a population can only be described in terms of relative frequencies of various traits. Clear-cut categories do not exist. The particular traits which have generally been chosen to characterize races have been criticized as having little biological significance. It has been found that differences between individuals of the same race are often greater than the differences between the "average" individuals of

different
races. These observations and others have led some, but not all, scientist to
conclude
that racial classifications are for the most part sociopolitical, rather than
biological,
in nature. S. Molnar, *Human Variation*, (2d ed. 1983); S. Gould, *The
Mismeasure
of Man* (1981); M Banton & J. Harwood, *The Race Concept* (1975); A.
Montagu,
Man's Most Dangerous Myth (1974); A. Montagu, *Statement on Race* (3d
ed. 1972);
Science and the Concept of Race (M. Mead, T. Dobzhansky, E. Tobach, &
R. Light
eds. 1968; A. Montagu, *The Concept of Race* (1964); R. Benedict, *Race and
Racism*
(1942); Littlefield, Lieberman, & Reynolds, *Redefining Race: The Potential
Demise
of a Concept in Physical Anthropology*, 23 *Current Anthropology* 641
(1982);
Biological Aspects of Race, 17 *Int'l Soc. Sci. J.* 71 (1965); Washburn, *The
Study of
Race*, 65 *American Anthropologist* 521 (1963).
God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face
of the earth."
Acts 17:26. Racial distinctions are contrary to the commands of God:
"Judge not according to the
appearance, but judge righteous judgement." John 7:24. See also 1 Samuel
16:7 "But the LORD
said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his
stature; because I have
refused him: for the LORD seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the
outward appearance,
but the LORD looketh on the heart."
Christians should understand that our war is not a carnal war where
distinctions are made
between races of people as defined by the pagan world system. Christians
are in a spiritual war
against unseen "spiritual wickedness in high places." Ephesians 6:12. "For
though we walk in the
flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (For the weapons of our warfare are not
carnal, but mighty
through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) Casting down
imaginations, and every high thing

that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled. Do ye look on things after the outward appearance? If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that, as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's."

(2 Corinthians 10:3-7 AV)

It is a natural pagan view of the world that judges men after their outward appearance. A

Christian, on the other hand, is imbued with the Holy Spirit and does not judge a person based upon his skin color or outward physical appearance. A Christian instead has "the mind of Christ."

But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no

man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him?

But we

have the mind of Christ. (1 Corinthians 2:14-16 AV)

The racist carnal mind is enmity against God.

"For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after

the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be

spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against

God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that

are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if

so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of

Christ, he is none of his." (Romans 8:5-9 AV)

God condemns idolatry. When Paul tells the people gathered at Mars' Hill that their graven

images prove that they are "too superstitious," the NIV, NASB, and NKJV scribes change the rebuke

to a compliment; the same passage in the "new improved" versions reads that the people are "very

religious.” The new mistranslations support the idol worship practiced in the Roman Catholic Church.

God condemns idolatry. When Paul tells the people gathered at Mars’ Hill that their graven images prove that they are “too superstitious,” the NIV, NASB, and NKJV scribes change the rebuke to a compliment; the same passage in the “new improved” versions reads that the people are “very religious.” The new mistranslations support the idol worship practiced in the Roman Catholic Church.

AV

Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. (Acts 17:22

AV)

NKJV

Then Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus and said, "Men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are very religious. (Acts 17:22

NKJV)

That diabolical devil has left his unmistakable fingerprint on the new Bible versions. The devil used the “Holy One of God” to describe Jesus in Mark 1:24 and Luke 4:34. In those verses, a devil, who has possessed a man, cries out to Jesus to leave him alone and states: “I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God.” (Mark 1:24; Luke 4:34 AV) Jesus immediately rebuked the devil, telling him to “Hold thy peace, and come out of him.” Mark 1:25; Luke 4:35. The devil then came out of the man. Notice that many other times Jesus drove devils from people, in every other instant the devils identified Jesus as the Son of God. See e.g., Matthew 8:29 (“Jesus, thou son of God”); Mark 5:7 (“Jesus, thou son of the most high God”); Luke 8:28 (“Jesus, thou son of God most high”); See Luke 4:41 (“Christ the Son of God.”). It is only in Mark 1:24 and Luke 4:34 that Jesus is identified by the devils as the “Holy One of God.” There are two definitive verses in the Holy Bible where the apostle Peter expressly identifies

Jesus as the “Christ, the Son of the living God.” One verse is found in Matthew 16:16, the other verse is found in John 6:69. The new bible versions change the language in John 6:69 from “Christ, the Son of the living God.” to “Holy One of God.” Not only does the change in that verse obscure the fact that Jesus is the Christ, the son of the living God, but it also unmistakable evidence that the new bible versions are the work of the devil. The true authorship of the new Bible versions is exposed when we read the very words used by a devil to describe Jesus (Holy One of God) substituted in place of the revelation of who Jesus is (Christ, the Son of the Living God), which was given by his “Father which is in heaven.” See Matthew 16:16. Almighty God told the devil to hold his peace when he first described Jesus as the “Holy One of God,” yet the devil thinks nothing of disobeying God by having Peter in his new bible versions say the very words that God ordered him not to repeat.

AV

And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God. (John 6:69

AV)

NASB

And we believe and have come to know that You are the Holy one of God. (John 6:69

NASB)

Jesus is described elsewhere in the Holy Bible as the “Holy One” (See, e.g., Psalms 16:10;

Acts 3:14), and the “Holy One of Israel” (See, e.g., Isaiah 30:12; Jeremiah 50:29), but he is called

the “Holy One of God” in only two Bible passages (Mark 1:24 and Luke 4:34) and both passages

recount the words spoken by the devil. The devil certainly knows that Jesus is “Christ the Son of

God.” See Luke 4:41. Why then would the devil use the title “Holy one of God” to describe Jesus

as recounted in Mark 1:24 and Luke 4:34 and then put that title in place of the title “Christ the Son

of the living God” in John 6:69 in his new bibles? Because the devil is the unclean spirit of

antichrist, and his change of those passages in his new bibles is an implicit

denial that Jesus is the Christ. See 1 John 4:3. "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: (but) he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also." (1 John 2:22-23 AV) Just as the Catholic church has a different Jesus, they also have a different Peter than the Peter of the Holy Bible. By removing the revelation that Jesus is the Christ, the Catholic Peter in John 6:69 of the Catholic bible versions is implicitly denying that Jesus is the Christ. According to Catholic folklore, the Catholic Peter is purported to be the first pope of the Catholic church. The Catholic church claims that their Peter is the rock upon which the church is built and not Jesus. In another verse, Matthew 16:13-18, even in the new bible versions, Peter states that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. Jesus explains that upon this rock ("the Christ, the Son of the living God") I will build my church. However, the Catholic authorities claim that the rock is their Peter not Jesus. Again, denying that Jesus is the rock is an implicit denial that Jesus is the Christ, hence signifying that the pope is the antichrist in fulfillment of the prophecy in 1 John 2:22-23.

The rock is God Almighty. By claiming that Peter is the rock and that they are the successors of Peter, they are claiming to be God Almighty. It sounds incredible, but read the official pronouncement from the pope: "I have the authority of the King of kings. I am all in all and above all, so that God, Himself and I, The Vicar of God, have but one consistory, and I am able to do almost all that God can do. What therefore, can you make of me but God." The Bull Sanctum, November 18, 1302.

Pope John Paul II calls Jesus the Holy One of God in his letter *Dominicae Cenaе*: "There is a close link between this element of the Eucharist and its sacredness, that is to say, its being a holy and sacred action. Holy and sacred, because in it

are the continual presence and action of Christ, 'the Holy One' of God." LETTER DOMINICAE CENAE OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF JOHN PAUL II TO ALL THE BISHOPS OF THE CHURCH ON THE MYSTERY AND WORSHIP OF THE EUCHARIST. One of the passages that is footnoted for the term "holy one of God" in the letter Dominicae Cenae is John 6:69. The very passage that in God's word describes Jesus as the "Christ, the Son of the living God," the antichrist uses as authority for calling him "the Holy One of God." The Pope used the very words of the devil, which the devil is trying to insert in John 6:69 in his counterfeit bibles. See Mark 1:24, Luke 4:35.

There are numerous other examples of Satan tampering with God's word and trying to pass it off as more accurate than the original. Satan's strategy from the beginning is to "taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts." Mark 4:15. In the NIV, the verse at Matthew 23:14 is missing; it is the verse that criticizes the scribes for making pretentious, long prayers as are made by the Catholic priests of today. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." Matthew 23:14 AV. The scribes who removed that verse had an interest in removing a verse that promises that they would receive the greater damnation. Mathew 18:11 is deleted from the NIV, that verse states: "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost." Acts 8:37 is also deleted from the NIV. "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Acts 8:37 AV. In the NIV verse 1 John 5:7 Satan completely removes the reference to the three persons of the Godhead. He tries to cover his tracks by taking part of verse 8 and labeling it verse 7, hoping nobody would notice the missing verse. Verse 7 should read as follows: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." (1 John 5:7 AV) The following verses have

been completely removed from the NIV: Matthew 17:21; Mark 7:16; 9:44; 9:46; 11:26; Luke 17:37; 23:17; and Acts 28:29.

The new bible versions even hide the object of the faith that gains eternal salvation. In John 6:47 the AV passage reads: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." The NASB version of John 6:47, however, says: "Truly, truly I say to you, he who believes has eternal life." Notice that the NASB simply requires belief. Belief in what? Belief in whom?

The NASB passage gives room for the Catholic Church to say that belief in the Catholic Church (plus works) gains salvation. Jesus, however, says that only believing on him gains eternal salvation.

The NIV and the other new age bible versions change the word "faults" to "sins" in James 5:16. This is in accordance with the Roman Catholic doctrine of confessing sins to the priest in order to be forgiven.

AV

Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. (James 5:16 AV)

NIV

Therefore confess your sins to each other and pray for each other so that you may be healed. The prayer of a righteous man is powerful and effective. (James 5:16 NIV)

God has called us to be servants to one another as Jesus has set the example by giving his life. In the new versions, however, the word "servant" is changed to "slave" in Matthew 20:26 and Romans 6:22. God did not call us to slavery but to liberty, but that liberty is not to be used as an occasion for sin but to serve one another. "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another." (Galatians 5:13 AV) The theme of the New Testament of Jesus Christ is that those who believe in Jesus are set free from

bondage to sin; we are free indeed! He does not want us to go back to the heavy yoke of the regulations of the law and be slaves out of fear, he wants us to serve him out of love. The Catholic position is that the Pope is supreme and submission to him is necessary for salvation. God warned about such men: "While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage." (2 Peter 2:19 AV) We are not God's slaves, for he calls us his "friends." (John 15:15 AV) As the following Bible passages attest, we are adopted not with the spirit of bondage but with the Holy Spirit whereby we cry "Abba, Father." (Romans 8:15-17 AV) Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light. (Matthew 11:28-30 AV)

Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. (John 8:31-32 AV)

If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. (John 8:36 AV) But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. (Romans 6:22 AV) For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. (Romans 8:2 AV)

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. (Galatians 5:1 AV) And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: (Galatians 2:4 AV) For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion

to the flesh, but by love serve one another. (Galatians 5:13 AV)
Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. (Romans 8:21 AV)
As free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. (1 Peter 2:16 AV)

Not only do the new bibles mislead the readers as to their position with God, they also mislead the readers as to how they should act. For example, the Bible clearly admonishes against being prideful. Read the following passages and you will learn that God hates pride!
The fear of the LORD is to hate evil: pride, and arrogance, and the evil way, and the froward mouth, do I hate. (Proverbs 8:13 AV)
When pride cometh, then cometh shame: but with the lowly is wisdom. (Proverbs 11:2 AV)
In the mouth of the foolish is a rod of pride: but the lips of the wise shall preserve them. (Proverbs 14:3 AV)
Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall. (Proverbs 16:18 AV)

The NIV, however, advises one to be proud by changing the word “rejoice” to “take pride.”
God has made clear, in the above passages, that pride is a sin which God has admonished against in the strongest terms.

AV

Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted: (James 1:9 AV)

NIV

The brother in humble circumstances ought to take pride in his high position. (James 1:9 NIV)

AV

But let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another. (Galatians 6:4 AV)

NIV

Each one should test his own actions. Then he can take pride in himself, without comparing himself to somebody else. (Galatians 6:4 NIV)

The corrupters of God's word even change the passage that refers to them. In the NIV they changed the word "corrupt" to "peddle for profit" in 2 Corinthians 2:17. The passage "we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God" was changed in the NIV to say "[u]nlike so many, we do not peddle the word of God for profit." The passage in the Authorized Version establishes that from the beginning of the church there were those that were corrupting the word of God. Satan simply cannot permit that fact to be established in the scriptures, so he changed the passage for his counterfeit bibles. Because the new bible publishers do not believe that the Bible is God's word, but merely a book that has a good message, some have replaced the word "gospel" with the words "good news." The word "gospel" literally means "God's word."⁶⁶ Yet in passage after passage some new bible versions change "gospel" to "good news."

AV

But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you. (1 Peter 1:25 AV)

RSV

but the word of the Lord abides for ever. That word is the good news which was preached to you. (1 Peter 1:25 RSV)

The Bible itself has a built in dictionary, defining terms as they appear. In fact, in Romans 10:14-17 it defines the word "gospel" as the "word of God." This meaning is obscured in the new bible versions.

AV

How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. (Romans 10:14-17 AV)

NIV

How, then, can they call on the one they have not believed in? And how can they believe in the one of whom they have not heard? And how can they hear without someone preaching to them? And how can they preach unless they are sent? As it is written, "How beautiful are the feet of those who bring good news!" But not all the Israelites accepted the good news. For Isaiah says, "Lord who has believed our message?" Consequently, faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word of Christ. (Romans 10:14-17 NIV)

While the Holy Bible is inerrant, the new bibles are chock full of errors. Those errors prove that they could not be God's word. For example, the NIV, NASB and virtually every new bible version identifies the prophecy in Mark 1:2 as being from Isaiah, when in fact the quote is not from Isaiah but is from Malachi 3:1. The Isaiah prophecy is not quoted until Mark 1:3. The Authorized Version does not make that mistake; in the AV the two prophecies are correctly introduced in Mark 1:2: "As is written in the prophets." Incidentally, there is a footnote to Mark 1:1 in the NASB that states that "many" manuscripts do not contain the language "the Son of God." The NASB footnote is misleading, because approximately 99% of the manuscripts have that clause in them. The 1% that do not have that clause are the corrupt Alexandrian manuscripts. That footnote is just another example of Satan attacking the deity of Jesus Christ. Those type of footnotes are found throughout the NASB, the NIV and the other new bibles attacking the authenticity of scores of bible passages.

AV

The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. [Malachi 3:1] The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. [Isaiah 40:3] (Mark 1:1-3 AV)

NASB

The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ,

the Son of God. As it is written in Isaiah the prophet, Behold, I send my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way; [Malachi 3:1] The voice of one crying in the wilderness, make ready the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. [Isaiah 40:3] (Mark 1:1-3 NASB)

One of the favorite attacks by the new version advocates is to claim that the word “Easter”

in Acts 12:4 is an example of a mistranslation by the King James translators. They assert that the word pascha should be translated “Passover” not “Easter.”

AV

Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church.

And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also.

(Then were the days of unleavened bread.)

And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people.

(Acts 12:1-4 AV)

NKJV

Now about that time Herod the king stretched out his hand to harass some from the church.

Then he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to seize Peter also. Now it was during the Days of

Unleavened Bread. So when he had arrested him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four squads of soldiers to keep him,

intending to bring him before the people after Passover. (Acts 12:1-4 NKJV)

The so called biblical scholars begin their argument on the right foot but then stumble on

man’s wisdom. They correctly note that Easter is a word derived from the adoration and worship

of the pagan queen of heaven “Astarte” or “Ishtar.”⁶⁷ Easter was and is a pagan spring festival which

involved fertility symbols such as eggs and rabbits.⁶⁸ Easter has nothing at all to do with Passover or with the resurrection of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. It is the Roman Catholic Church in mixing the pagan festivals with the Christian history that has seduced people into believing that Christ rose from the dead on Easter Sunday. Because Easter is in fact a pagan holiday, the new versions translate the Greek word pascha in Acts 12:4 as “Passover,” thinking that God could not possibly mean to refer to a pagan holiday in his Holy Scriptures. In Acts 12:4, however, God is not using the word pascha to describe a Christian or Jewish holiday, he is describing the intentions of Herod. Herod was a pagan and it would not be unusual that he would desire to wait until his cherished Easter pagan holiday was over before he brought Peter out before the people.

While Passover is one of the possible English translations for pascha, that translation in the context of Acts 12:4 is simply wrong. The more accurate translation is “Easter,” which is the translation found in the King James Holy Bible. Pascha is a word of Chaldean origin and means either Passover or the pagan festival of Easter. The pedantic and rather sophomoric translation by the modern so called scholars is demonstrably erroneous. They assume that pascha must be translated “Passover” in Acts 12:4, based solely on the fact that pascha means Passover in all other biblical passages where it appears. They completely disregard the alternative English translation for pascha of Easter.

Pascha, however, cannot possibly mean Passover in Acts 12:4, because Herod intended to keep custody of Peter until after pascha. Pascha in that passage must mean Easter, because Passover had already taken place when Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread. The fourteenth day of the first month of the Jewish calendar is the Passover (Leviticus 23:4-5, Genesis 12:17-18). Passover is immediately followed by the seven days of unleavened bread (Leviticus 23:6-7, Genesis 12:15-16). Because Passover is memorialized with unleavened bread (Genesis 12:17-18), it and the seven day feast of unleavened bread are both referred to as the feast of unleavened bread

(Matthew 26:17, Mark 14:1, 14:12, Luke 22:1-7, Leviticus 23:6, Exodus 12:17-20).

Combining the Passover with the feast of unleavened bread we get eight (8) days of unleavened bread that span from the Fourteenth day (Passover) until the 21st day of the first month in the Jewish calendar (Genesis 12:18).

These are the feasts of the LORD, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons. In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the LORD'S Passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the LORD: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein. But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD seven days: in the seventh day is an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein. (Leviticus 23:4-8 AV)

In Acts 12:1-4 we see that Peter was taken into custody during the days of unleavened bread that follow Passover, Passover had already taken place. Because Passover had already taken place by that time, it makes no sense for the passage to say that Herod intended to hold Peter until after Passover. The pagan holiday Easter, on the other hand, always follows Passover and had not yet occurred. Herod intended to hold Peter until after the pagan holiday of Easter. Therefore, the King James translators were correct when they translated pascha as "Easter," and the modern translators are wrong in translating pascha as "Passover."

The translators of the new bible versions are more concerned with changing and twisting God's words to comport with popular opinion than using God's words to change the world. For example, God's word makes clear that the earth is God's creation and it is fixed and cannot be moved. "Fear before him, all the earth: the world also shall be stable, that it be not moved." (1 Chronicles 16:30 AV) "The LORD reigneth, he is clothed with majesty; the

LORD is clothed with strength, wherewith he hath girded himself: the world also is stablished, that it cannot be moved.”
(Psalms 93:1 AV)

So called scientists, however, have concluded that the earth orbits the sun. Nicolaus Copernicus died in 1543 on the day his book, *On the Revolutions of the Celestial Spheres*, was published. Most people do not know that Copernicus did not originate the theory that the earth revolves around the sun. Aristarchus of Samos (310 – 230 B. C.) is the first person known to have postulated that the earth rotates on an axis daily and orbits the sun annually. Aristarchus’ model had been rejected until Copernicus’ book was published. There was initially strong resistance to Copernicus’ heliocentric system. However, over time the heliocentric view, with the earth and the other planets rotating around sun, has won popular acceptance. The heliocentric theory removed the earth as the center of creation and challenged the entire ancient authority of the Bible regarding the universe and its origins. Under the heliocentric model the earth is supposed to be rotating on an axis at approximately 1,000 mph at the equator while at the same time it supposed to be traveling approximately 66,000 mph (which would be 30 times the speed of a rifle bullet) as it revolve around the sun once each year. Heliocentricity is the progenitor of the theory of evolution. Tycho Brahe (1546 – 1601), who was born three years after Copernicus died, was the most brilliant astronomer in all of history. His observations and models established that the earth is stationary and the sun revolves around the earth, with the other planets revolving around the sun. Scientists have through objective experiments confirmed Brahe’s findings. Today many of the astrophysical equations used to launch and navigate satellites assume a stationary earth. Satan has been successful in suppressing the fact that in 1898, physicists A.A. Michelson (1852 – 1931) and

chemist E. W. Morley (1838 – 1923) proved that the earth does not move. The series of Michelson/Morley experiments, using an interferometer, which measured light rays, established that the earth was stationary. Throughout history scientists have conducted experiments that each time gave results that were not only consistent with a stationary earth but indicative of a stationary earth, from the light polarization experiments of E. Muscart in 1872 to the mutual inductance experiments of Theodore de Coudres in 1889 to the 1903 Totton-Noble experiments. Evidence that the earth is stationary is all around us. For example, assuming the heliocentric model with the earth traveling at over 1000 mph at the equator, if one were to take a plane flight from New York to Miami, by the time the airplane arrived in Miami over two hours after taking off from New York, due to the Coriolis effect Miami would have rotated over 2000 miles to the East. Yet, in reality, the flight arrives in Miami on time and without the pilot having to adjust for the rotation of the earth. The reason that the pilot does not have to adjust for the rotation of the earth is that the earth is not rotating, it is stationary just as God has said in his Holy Bible. Some who accept that the earth rotates have argued that the atmosphere moves with the earth and therefore it keeps the plane synchronized with the earth. The problem with that argument is that nobody has ever identified or measured this mysterious force that keeps the plane synchronized with the rotation of the earth. The reason that the force has never been discovered is that it does not exist. This mystical (or rather fictional) lateral force does not exist because there is no need for it; the earth is not moving. Not only is the earth stationary, it is at the center of God's creation. In 1976 Y.P. Varshi did an extensive study of the distribution of Quasars and published his conclusion in the *Astrophysics and Space Science Journal*. Varshi was forced by the evidence to conclude that "the cosmological interpretation of the red shift in the spectra of quasars leads to yet another paradoxical result: namely,

that the earth is the center of the Universe.” Varshi calculated the odds for of the distribution of Quasars around the earth happening by chance at 3×10^{86} to one.

Despite the fact that God’s word states clearly the earth is immovable, the new bible versions wish to change God’s word to comport with what they believe is the “scientific fact” that the earth is rotating on its axis and at the same time orbiting around the sun. In 2 Kings God reveals a miracle he performed by making the shadow cast by the sun on Ahaz’s sundial to reverse and go back ten degrees.


And Isaiah said, This sign shalt thou have of the LORD, that the LORD will do the thing that he hath spoken: shall the shadow go forward ten degrees, or go back ten degrees? And Hezekiah answered, It is a light thing for the shadow to go down ten degrees: nay, but let the shadow return backward ten degrees. And Isaiah the prophet cried unto the LORD: and he brought the shadow ten degrees backward, by which it had gone down in the dial of Ahaz. (2 Kings 20:9-11 AV)

Now, if you accept what God says in his word as true that the earth cannot be moved, it must have been the sun that went back ten degrees. In fact, in Isaiah 38:8, God reveals that is exactly what happened, the sun moved back ten degrees by which degrees it had already gone down. In order for the sun to return the ten degrees that it had already gone down, the sun must have been moving across the sky in its ordinary path before its reversal. Hence, the earth is stationary and the sun revolves around the earth.

AV

Behold, I will bring again the shadow of the degrees, which is gone down in the sun dial of Ahaz, ten degrees backward. So the sun returned ten degrees, by which degrees it was gone down. (Isaiah 38:8 AV)

NIV



I will make the shadow cast by the sun go back ten the ten steps it has gone down on the stairway of Ahaz. So the sunlight went back the ten steps it had gone down. (Isaiah 38:8 NIV)

Because the NIV bible translators do not believe God's word, they have changed the passage in Isaiah 38:8 to state that "sunlight" went back ten steps on the "stairway," rather than what actually happened, that the sun itself returning ten degrees. Simply stated, they have changed the verse to comport with a heliocentric view of the universe. By changing the passage to say that the sunlight went back instead of the sun, the NIV translators have removed the fact that the sun is moving and have allowed for an explanation that the earth reversed its rotation, thus causing the sunlight to move back. Furthermore, they have removed the miracle of the event entirely by stating that the shadow went back ten steps on a stairway, rather than ten degrees on a sundial. A shadow cast by a pillar can go up and then back down steps due the ordinary travel of the sun across the sky, however, the shadow cast upon a sundial cannot move backwards unless the sun moves backwards.

The publishers of the new bible versions claim that their bibles are based on the oldest available manuscripts. First, the oldest available manuscripts are available because they were not used. The reason they were not used is because they were obviously corrupt, and God's church refused to use them.

The manuscripts during the early church era were used, and consequently they wore out, necessitating that they be freshly recopied. Because they were needed by the early church, they were duplicated and disseminated. The number of the available accurate New testament transcripts outnumber the corrupt version by approximately 100 to 1. The accurate manuscripts are frequently oft used text. There has been a recent discovery of a small fragment of the earliest known New Testament manuscript. That manuscript was dated 66 A.D. using a

high magnification device
and the epifluorescent confocal laser scanning technique. The fragment
contains Matthew 26:22
with the Greek phrase “kekastos auton” which is accurately translated into
English in the King
James Holy Bible as “every one of them.” The NIV and NASB bibles used
a corrupt Greek
manuscript that has the Greek phrase “heis hekastos,” which is translated
“each one” in the NASB
or “one after the other” in the NIV.

Again, the evidence proves the accuracy of the King James Holy Bible.
Eternal Punishment For Tampering With God’s Word
God takes the misuse of his name very seriously, but it is even more serious
to tamper with God’s word.

God’s name is so exalted that one should not even say his name unless one
is talking about
him or praying to him.

Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain; for the LORD
will not
hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain. (Exodus 20:7 AV)

God’s name is so precious that the biblical penalty for blaspheming his
name is death.

And he that blasphemeth the name of the LORD, he shall surely be put to
death, and
all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger, as he that
is born
in the land, when he blasphemeth the name of the LORD, shall be put to
death. (Leviticus 24:16 AV)

God, however, holds his word in even higher esteem than even his name.
[T]hou hast magnified thy word above all thy name. (Psalms 138:2 AV)
God has warned us not to tamper with his Holy word.

Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye
diminish
ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God
which

I command you. (Deuteronomy 4:2 AV)

What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add
thereto, nor
diminish from it. (Deuteronomy 12:32 AV)

Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in
him. Add

thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.
(Proverbs 30:5-6 AV)

If the penalty for blaspheming God's name is death, what do you suppose the penalty for altering God's word would be? The Bible tells us that it is eternal damnation in hell.

For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. (Revelation 22:18-19 AV)

The writers and promoters of the new bible versions should reflect on what God has said in the above passage, their eternal souls are at stake.

Adding Man's Tradition to God's Word

Not only has Satan written his own bibles and passed them off as the word of God, but he has added traditions of men to the bible. In his Roman Catholic Church he has called that combination of man's tradition and God's word "the word of god." Satan wants people to consider him God so he has grafted his words, which he calls tradition, onto the word of God. With this slight of hand he has deceived people into following his devilish doctrines. Sacred Tradition and Sacred Scripture make up a single sacred deposit of the Word of God. CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, § 97, 1994. [T]he church, to whom the transmission and interpretation of Revelation is entrusted, does not derive her certainty about all revealed truths from the holy Scriptures alone. Both Scripture and Tradition must be accepted and honored with equal sentiments of devotion and reverence. Id. at § 82 (emphasis added). Recall, that to add tradition to God's word is rebellion against God's command that nothing

be added or taken away from his words. Revelations 22:18-19.

The Holy Bible warns us about those who would attempt to turn us away from Christ to follow the traditions of men.

Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

(Colossians 2:8 AV)

Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as

though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (Touch not; taste not;

handle not; Which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying

of the flesh. (Colossians 2:20-23 AV)

He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as

it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.

Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments

of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. And

he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep

your own tradition. (Mark 7:6-9 AV)

Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have

delivered: and many such like things do ye. (Mark 7:13 AV)

Jesus said: "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that

believeth on me shall never thirst." (John 6:35 AV) Very simply, Jesus promised salvation to all

who believed on him. Adding any other requirement to faith in Jesus corrupts the gospel, resulting

in the bread of death rather than the bread of life.

Jesus warned his disciples to beware of the doctrine of the religious leaders of their time.

Jesus compared their doctrine to leaven. Only a little leaven of man made rules works its way

through the whole loaf and corrupts God's pure doctrine. The leaven of today's religious leaders is no different, the leaven of tradition corrupts God's pure word. Man's tradition has turned the Bread of Salvation into spiritual poison killing the souls of those who eat of the corrupted loaf.

Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. And they reasoned among themselves, saying, It is because we have taken no bread. Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread? Do ye not yet understand, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. (Matthew 16:6-12 AV)

A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. (Galatians 5:9 AV)
God wants us to purge out the leaven of man's tradition. Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. (1 Corinthians 5:6-8 AV)

Man's tradition requires works to earn salvation. Salvation, however, is by God's Grace through faith alone on the completed work of Jesus Christ, who paid for all of our sins on the cross. Good works flow from salvation, good works cannot earn salvation.

For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. (Ephesians 2:8-10 AV)

DIVINE INSPIRATION

Millions of Christians believe, and rightly so, in the **divine and verbal inspiration of the Bible**: that the Holy Ghost motivated the minds of the prophets and apostles of old to pen every word of Scripture. Our faith in **divine inspiration** is based on Bible texts such as:

- *All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. (2 Timothy 3:16)*
- *19: We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: 20: Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. 21: For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. (2 Peter 1:19-21)*

PROVIDENTIAL PRESERVATION

Millions also believe in the **providential preservation** of the Bible: that **JEHOVAH**, the Holy One of Israel has also **preserved** His Word down through the ages; and that His work of **preservation** is every bit as important as His initial work of **inspiration**. After all it would have been of limited value if the original inspired Scriptures were lost to posterity a few decades after being penned. **Providential preservation**, in other words, is as essential a work as that of **divine inspiration**. Our faith in **providential preservation** is based on Bible texts such as:

- *The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever. (Psalm 12: 6-7)*
- *Psalm 119:89 For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven... 111: Thy testimonies have I taken as an heritage for ever...152: Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast*

*founded them **for ever**.*

- *I know that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall **be for ever: nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it:** and God doeth it, that men should fear before him. (Ecclesiastes 3:14)*
- *Heaven and earth shall pass away, **but my words shall not pass away.** (Matthew 24:35)*
- *Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever... **The word of the Lord endureth for ever.** (1Peter 1:23-25)*

Concerning **Providential Preservation** the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (17th century) says this on page 23:

*"The Old Testament in Hebrew, and the New Testament in Greek, 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."*

In the past most Christians accepted these facts, but of late there are a growing number who have strong reservations about **divine preservation**. They will allow that the **original autographs**, which of course are no longer available, were inspired. But they have strong reservations about **divine preservation**. They believe that much of Scripture is in need of update, because some of the oldest manuscripts were not available to the 17th century translators of the **King James Version (KJV)**. That is why, they maintain, the **Revised Version** of 1881 and its many descendants became necessary; and how that each new English translation (well over 100 at the present count) is an improvement on the one that went before. In other words, the Bible is also **evolving** and each new version brings us one step nearer the original.

This is an extremely disturbing development: for when we examine modern translations, which are all based on the **Revised Version**, we find they do not simply use modern language, which, arguably, may have been in order; but they say things entirely different from the early **English and foreign language** versions of the Scriptures, which in past centuries God used to further His work. In this article you are about to learn many startling facts about the modern English translations of the Bible, that they:

- All present conflicting messages with the **King James Version (KJV)** and even with each other.
- Omit many words, verses and passages of Scripture.

- All cast doubt on the accuracy of the **KJV** and several fundamental doctrines taught in it, such as the virgin birth of Jesus Christ, his divinity, his miracles, his bodily ascension to heaven and his second coming.
- All disagree on major doctrinal points with other early **European versions** of the Bible which triggered the great Protestant Reformation and for which tens of thousands of true believers died during the dark ages.
- Are warmly welcomed by the **Roman Catholic Church** which has long considered the King James Bible its number one enemy.

These discoveries are disturbing to say the least and should cause true believers around the world to ask: *Is all this true? Are these allegations justified? And if so, what spirit is behind the deception and confusion caused by the modern translations? Visit any Bible study group where believers are using a variety of modern "Bibles" and comments such as these are common:*

- *'My Bible puts it this way.'*
- *'My Bible doesn't even have that verse.'*
- *'Listen to this Note about ancient and more reliable manuscripts.'*
- *'My Bible says something totally different.'*
- *'My Bible says the very opposite.'*

The question is: **Which English Bible is the real Word of God?** Anyone can see that they cannot all be the **Word of God** if they are saying different things. After all, God doesn't contradict Himself and is certainly not the author of confusion. (1Corinthians 14:33) **Scores of conflicting translation, all claiming to be His Word, cannot possibly be the work of the Spirit of Jehovah.** Besides, would the Almighty flood the English-speaking world with well over 100 conflicting translations of the whole Bible and over 300 translations of the New Testament? Of course not: the very idea is ludicrous if not blasphemous. Something is terribly wrong somewhere and it's time to find out.

The Original Autographs

As most believers know, the Bible is often referred to as '**the Holy Scriptures.**' It is made up of two parts, the Old and the New Testaments. The Old Testament is a collection of 39 books which were originally penned mostly in the Hebrew language. The New Testament is a collection of 27 books, written originally in Greek; though some portions were

probably written in Hebrew or Aramaic, a north Semitic language. **The original autographs (masters) were the hand-written scrolls penned by the inspired prophets and apostles.** They were written on **vellum** (the skins of clean animals, such as calf or antelope) or **papyrus**. Vellum is more durable and costly than papyrus; but an entire antelope skin would only furnish two or three pages of a manuscript. Because of this fact the vast majority of manuscripts were written on papyrus. Papyrus is a reed-like water plant with thick fibrous stems from which a kind of paper was made in ancient times. The average papyrus scroll was about ten inches in width and about thirty feet in length. After years of constant use, being rolled and unrolled, the original autographs (**master scrolls**) especially those of papyrus, became worn and began to fall apart.

Master Copies

Before the **original masters** completely disintegrated they were carefully copied. The Almighty, who had initially **inspired** their production, then moved His faithful followers, first the **Aaronic Priests** and later the **Masorites**, to make copies of the originals. Thus began the work of **providential preservation**. After all, it would have been short-sighted of God to **infallibly inspire** the Scriptures only to have them discarded after a few decades. **Jehovah** must needs, as promised, **preserve His Word** in accurate copies for the following statements to be true.

Divine Preservation

- *The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. **Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.** (Psalm 12: 6-7)*
- *Heaven and earth shall pass away, **but my words shall not pass away.** (Matthew 24:35)*
- *The word of the Lord endureth for ever (1Peter 1:25)*

A Divine Warning

The God of Israel anticipated Satan's intended attack on the Scriptures: and how the enemy of souls would seek to frustrate His work of **preservation** and cause unbelieving scribes to add to, delete and distort the sacred writings. That is why this solemn, yea frightening, warning appears at the end of the Bible. It not only addresses copyists and translators who intentionally corrupt **Jehovah's Word**, but also those who knowingly promote their corrupted publications.

Rev. 22:18- *For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the*
19 *prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these*
things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are
written in this book: And if any man shall take away from
the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take
away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy
city, and from the things which are written in this book.

I repeat: to **preserve** His word, **JEHOVAH** the LORD God of Abraham, Isaac and Israel must needs ensure that **accurate copies** of the inspired masters be made, else His promise that *'the Word of the Lord abideth forever'* was meaningless - if not false. Consequently the Almighty caused **faithful believers** to copy His Word. This is how He organised that work.

The Masorites & Masoretic Text

The **Masorites** were Jewish scholars who, like their predecessors the **Aaronic Priests**, had the sacred task of copying the Old Testament Hebrew Scriptures. In his book **Story of Our English Bible**, W Scott wrote, over a hundred years ago, concerning the reliability of the copies made by these **faithful** priests and scribes.

Scott *"It is well known that among the Jews it was the profession of*
wrote: the Masorites, or doctors of tradition, to transcribe the
scriptures. We know to what extent these indefatigable
scholars carried their respect for the letter; and when we read
the rules under which their labours were carried on, we
understand the use that the providence of God (who had
'confided his oracles to the Jews') *made of their superstition.*
They reckoned the number of verses, words, and letters in
each book. They tell us, for instance, that the letter A occurs
forty-two thousand three hundred and seventy-seven times in
the Bible; the letter B thirty-eight thousand two hundred and
eighteen times; and so on to the end. They were scrupulous of
changing the position even of a letter, though evidently
misplaced, but limited themselves to noting in the margin,
supposing some mystery was involved. They tell us which is
the middle letter of the Pentateuch, as well as of each of the
books of which it is composed.

They never allowed themselves to correct their manuscript;

and if any mistake escaped them, they rejected the papyrus or the skin which they had blemished, and recommenced upon a fresh one; for they were equally interdicted from even correcting one of their own errors, and from retaining for their sacred volume a single parchment or skin in which an error had been made...

*"These facts, we repeat it, together with the astonishing **preservation** of the Hebrew text (1200 years more ancient than that of the Septuagint), plainly tell us how the intervention of the mighty hand of God was needed in the destinies of the sacred book."*

In his book **God Wrote Only One Bible**, Jasper James Ray confirms this fact about the faithfulness displayed by these ancient scribes in copying the Scriptures.

He *"In making copies of the original manuscripts, the Jewish scribes exercised the greatest possible care. When they wrote the name of God in any form they were to reverently wipe their pen, and wash their whole body before writing "**Jehovah**" lest that holy name should be tainted even in writing. The new copy was examined and carefully checked with the original almost immediately, and it is said that **if only one incorrect letter was discovered the whole copy was rejected**. Each new copy had to be made from an approved manuscript, written with a special kind of ink, upon skins made from a 'clean' animal. The writer had to pronounce aloud each word before writing it. In no case was the written word to be written from memory."*

It is a sad fact that the Gentiles who copied the New Testament Scriptures were not as diligent as the ancient Aaronic scribes and Masorites. Therefore it is in the New Testament texts where most errors are found.

Original Manuscripts

A '**manuscript**' is a **hand-written document, not one that is typed or printed**. The word '*manuscript*' is often abbreviated as MS or ms (singular) and MSS or mss (plural). Currently there are between **5250** and **5309** extant (existing) manuscripts of the Scriptures or parts of it. Manuscripts fall into two categories:

- **Masters:** These were the original autographs. *There are currently no*

original autographs or masters in existence. They have all long since been replaced by copies.

- **Copies:** These are hand-written copies of the masters or hand-written copies of earlier copies. Some 5000+ hand-written copies of the whole or parts of Scripture are still in existence.

Manuscripts produced by the early Christians fall into three categories:

1. **Copies** of masters or of earlier copies.
2. **Versions** : These are translations of Scripture made directly from the original languages. For example from Hebrew or Greek into Syriac, Latin, German, English or French. A **translation** from Latin into English, or from English into Chinese, cannot strictly be called a '**version**.' It is simply a translation of a translation: whereas a '**version**' must be a translation from the original. Bear this important fact in mind.
3. **Church Fathers:** *"Our third group is the early church fathers. These are the men who led the Christians in the first few centuries after the New Testament was completed. We have record of their early sermons, books and commentaries. They will be able to provide us with much information on disputed passages. Many may have seen the original autographs."* (Ref:B1)

As regards the **format** of ancient manuscripts, they are often described as:

- **Uncial or Majuscules:** written in capital letters with no spaces: e.g. NOMANHATHSEENGD.
- **Cursives or Miniscules:** written in small letters and later with spaces: e.g. No-man-hath-seen-gd.

Early Church Fathers

Before the art of printing was known (before AD 1450) the church fathers of the early Christian era wrote - **by hand** - their letters, sermon notes, commentaries and books. Their manuscripts contain many quotations from the **original autographs** or the **earliest copies**. Some fathers had actually seen the New Testament autographs or very early copies; and had personally hand-copied large portions of Scripture. The writings of these early elders help verify the original text and form a valuable source of information as to what the first apostles wrote. Scripture tells us that Satan began his attack on the New Testament Scriptures very early, even before

the first apostles died. Listen to Paul's testimony concerning this matter about corrupting of the **Word of God**; and of some who even wrote letters as though they were composed by the apostle himself.

Paul writes:

2 Cor.2:17 *For we are not as many, **which corrupt the word of God:** but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.*

2 That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by
Thess.2:2 *spirit, nor by word, **nor by letter as from us,** as that the day of Christ is at hand.*

During the latter part of his life the apostle John strongly defended the **Word of God**. Being an eye-witness of many events involving the ministry of **Yeshua the Messiah (Jesus Christ)**, John was well qualified to refute written or spoken error and to put the record straight. The enemies of truth had this reliable eye-witness banished to the island of Patmos.

John writes:

Revelation *I John, who also am your brother, and companion in
1:9 tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus
Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, **for the word
of God,** and for the testimony of Jesus Christ.*

There were many church fathers who hand-copied the whole or portions of Scripture. Let me mention a few who greatly influenced the church, particularly in Europe.

In his book **Story of Our English Bible**

W Scott *"Crysostom, the most eloquent of the fathers, spoke of them wrote: (the Scriptures) as The Divine Books, Polycarp, who lived at a still earlier date, having been personally instructed by the Apostle John, spoke of the Bible as The Sacred Scriptures, as also the Oracles of the Lord. Clement of Rome, whom Paul styles his 'fellow-labourer' (Phil. IV.3), termed the Scriptures The True Sayings of the Holy Spirit. Irenaeus, of the second century, makes about 1200 citations or references from the New Testament; Tertullian, also of the second century refers to or quotes from the New Testament about 2500 times; Clement of Alexandria, another of the second century Fathers, cites from or refers to the New Testament 800 times; and Polycarp, already referred to, in a brief epistle addressed to the Philippians, quotes from the New Testament about 50 times."*

Lucian of Antioch

Lucian (AD 250-312) was born in Antioch in Syria where the early believers in Jesus were first called Christians. (Acts 11) In his book **Truth Triumphant** Benjamin George Wilkinson Ph.D writes this about Lucian:

Quote: *"Lucian founded a college at Antioch which strove to counteract the dangerous ecclesiastical alliance between Rome and Alexandria. How bitter the situation became and how it finally split West and East will be clarified by the following four facts: **First**, the original founders of the ecclesiastical college at Alexandria strove to exalt tradition. Justin Martyr, as early as 150, had stood for this. **Second**, Clement, most famous of the Alexandrian college faculty and a teacher of Origen, boasted that he would not teach Christianity unless it was mixed with pagan philosophy. **Third**, Victor I, bishop of Rome, entered a compact with Clement, about 190, to carry on research around the Mediterranean basin to secure support to help make Sunday the prominent day of worship in the church. Sunday was already a day exalted among the heathen, being a day on which they worshipped the sun; yet Rome and Alexandria well knew that most churches throughout the world sanctified Saturday as the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. **Fourth**, when Victor I, in lordly tones, pronounced excommunication on all the churches of the East who would not*

with him make Easter always come on Sunday, Alexandria supported this exhibition of spiritual tyranny by the bishop of Rome. Lucian opposed Alexandria's policies and for this has been bitterly hated and his name kept in the background."

Patrick in Ireland

Patrick belonged to the Celtic race. Tradition has it that he was born about **AD 360** in the kingdom of **Strathclyde in Scotland**. Wilkinson writes of Patrick:

Quote: *"Patrick preached the Bible. He appealed to it as the sole authority for founding the Irish Church. He gave credit to no other worldly authority; he recited no creed. Several official creeds of the church of Rome had by that time been ratified and commanded, but Patrick mentions none. In his Confession he makes a brief statement of his beliefs, but he does not refer to any church council or creed as authority. The training centres he founded, which later grew into colleges and large universities, were all Bible schools. Famous students of these schools - **Columba, who brought Scotland to Christ, Adrian, who won pagan England to the gospel, and Columbanus with his successors, who brought Christianity to Germany, France, Switzerland and Italy - took the Bible as their only authority, and founded renowned Bible training centres for the Christian believers. One authority, describing the hand-written Bibles produced at these schools, says, 'In delicacy of handling and minute but faultless execution, the whole range of palaeography offers nothing comparable to these early Irish manuscripts... Patrick, like his example, Jesus, put the words of Scripture above the teachings of men. He differs from the papacy, which puts church tradition above the Bible. In his writings he nowhere appeals to the church of Rome for the authorization of his mission. Whenever he speaks in defence of his mission, he refers to God alone, and declares that he received his call direct from heaven... Patrick believed that Christianity should be founded with the home and the family as its strength. Too often the Christian organisations of that age were centred in celibacy. This was not true in the Irish church and its Celtic daughters in Great Britain, Scotland and on the continent. **The Celtic Church, as organized and developed under Patrick, permitted its clergy to marry.**"***

Columba in Scotland

Quote: "**Columba**, an Irishman, was born in Donegal in 521, and both his parents were of royal stock. He founded a memorable college on the small island of **Iona** which was a lighthouse of truth in Europe for centuries. That the Celtic, not the Latin, race populated the British Isles was a determining factor, for the Christian churches in which Patrick had been reared received their doctrine, not from Rome, but from their brethren of the same faith in Asia Minor. Here was the link which connected the faith of Patrick and Columba with primitive Christianity. The farthest lands touching the Atlantic saw the rise of a vigorous apostolic Christianity not connected with the Church of Rome, but independent of it... **Columba** possessed a superior education. He was familiar with Latin and Greek, secular and ecclesiastical history, the principals of jurisprudence, the law of nations, the science of medicine, and the law of the mind. He was the greatest Irishman of the Celtic race in mental powers; and he founded in **Iona** the most learned school in the British Islands, and probably in Western Europe for a long period..."

Comparatively few Christians know that **Columba** kept the seventh day of the week (Saturday) as the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. Wilkinson writes about this little known fact.

Quote: "*The last hours of Columba are recorded as follows: Having continued his labours in Scotland thirty four years, he clearly and openly foretold his death, and on Saturday, the ninth of June, said to his disciple Diermit: 'This day is called the Sabbath, that is the day of rest, and such will it truly be to me: for it will put an end to my labours.'*"

We in Scotland are greatly indebted to **Columba**, who founded many churches in this country. He is credited with having hand-copied the New Testament **300 times!** His writings show that he used the **Itala** version of the Bible. In **Stewarton** there is a church called **St Columba's Church**.

Ancient Versions

Bear in mind that a **version** is a translation made directly from the original Hebrew or Greek: i.e. from Hebrew or Greek into Syriac, Latin or English: whereas a translation of a version into yet another language is simply called a **translation**. Bible versions were made in several languages within a few

years of the New Testament's creation. This was a rarity in the ancient world for any book.

Josh McDowell writes on pages 16-17 of his book **Answers to Tough Questions**.

Quote: *"...Translation of a document into another language was rare in the ancient world, so this is an added plus for the New Testament. The number of copies of the versions is in excess of **18,000**, with possibly as many as **25,000**. This is further evidence that helps us establish the New Testament text. Even if we did not possess the **5,500** Greek manuscripts or the **18,000** copies of the versions, the text of the New Testament could still be reproduced within 250 years from its composition. How? By the writing of the early Christians. In commentaries, letters, etc., these ancient writers quote biblical text, thus giving us another witness to the text of the New Testament.*

***John Burgon** has catalogued more than **86,000** citations of the New Testament in the writings of the early church fathers who lived before A. D.325. Thus we observe that there is so much more evidence for the reliability of the New Testament text than any other comparable writings in the ancient world."*

In his book **Final Authority** William P Grady quotes John Burgon on pages 33-34 concerning the reliability of a version over any single manuscript.

Quote: *"I suppose it may be laid down that an ancient Version outweighs any single Codex, ancient or modern, which can be named: the reason being, that it is scarcely credible that a Version - the **Peshitto** , for example, an Egyptian or the Gothic - can have been executed from a single exemplar (copy). A second reason for the value of ancient versions is in their ability to exhibit a text which antedates the oldest Greek manuscripts. **Readings which are challenged in the Authorized Version for their non-existence in the 'two most ancient authorities' (Codex Sinaiticus or A; and Codex Vaticanus, or B, fourth century) are frequently discovered in the Syrian and Latin translations of the second century.**"*

In the course of time many versions (translations from the original language) of Scripture were made. Let us now consider a few.

The Peshitta Version (AD 150)

The Peshitta was the first Syrian translation from the original languages. Even to this day there are around **350 copies** of the Peshitta (or Peshitto) version in existence. In his book **Which Bible?** David O Fuller writes this of the Peshitto:

Quote: *"It was at Antioch, capital of Syria, that the believers were first called Christians. And as time rolled on, the Syrian-speaking Christians could be numbered by the thousands. It is generally admitted that the Bible was translated from the original languages into Syrian about **150 AD**. This version is known as the **Peshitto** (the correct or simple). This Bible even today generally follows the Received Text. One authority tells us this - 'The **Peshitto** in our days is found in use amongst the Nestorians, who have always kept it, by the Monophysites on the plains of Syria, the Christians of St. Thomas in Malabar, and by the Maronites on the mountain terraces of Lebanon.' "*

The Old Latin Vulgate (AD157)

The word '*vulgate*' is Latin for *vulgar* or *common*. The Old Latin Vulgate is a version. It was used by early believers in Europe when Latin was in popular use. It was sometimes referred to as the **Itala** version.

The Old Latin Vulgate must not be confused with Jerome's Vulgate, which was produced over 220 years later in AD 380. Jerome's Vulgate (also written in Latin for the Roman Church) was rejected by the early Christians for almost a millennium. The **Waldenses, Gauls, Celts, Albigenses** and other groups throughout Europe used the **Old Latin Vulgate** and rejected Jerome's Vulgate. In his book **An Understandable History of the Bible** Rev. Samuel Gipp Th.D confirms this fact. He writes:

Quote: *"The Old Latin Vulgate was used by the Christians in the churches of the Waldenses, Gauls, Celts, Albigenses and other fundamental groups throughout Europe. This Latin version became so used and beloved by orthodox Christians and was in such common use by the common people that it assumed the term 'Vulgate' as a name. Vulgate comes from 'vulgar' which is the Latin word for 'common' It was so esteemed for its faithfulness to the deity of Christ and its accurate reproductions of the originals, that these early Christians let Jerome's Roman Catholic translation 'sit on the shelf.' Jerome's translation was not used by the true Biblical Christians for almost a millennium after it was translated from corrupted manuscripts by Jerome in 380 A.D. Even then it only came into usage due to the death of Latin as a common language, and the violent, wicked persecutions waged against true believers by Pope Gregory IX during his reign from 1227 to 1242 A.D."*

David Fuller confirms this fact: *"It is clearly evident that the Latin Bible of early British Christianity was **not** the Latin Bible (Vulgate) of the Papacy."*

The Italic Bible (AD157)

*"Italy, France and Great Britain were once provinces of the old Roman Empire. Latin was then the language of the common people. So the first translations of the Bible in these countries were made from the Greek Vulgate into Latin. One of the first of these Latin Bibles was for the **Waldenses** in northern Italy, translated not later than 157 AD and was known as the **Italic Version**. The renowned scholar Beza states that the Italic Church dates from 120 AD. Allix, an outstanding scholar, testifies that enemies had corrupted many manuscripts, while the Italic Church handed them down in their apostolic purity."*

The Waldensian (AD 120 & onwards)

*"The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed a Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution ... Here for a thousand years, witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith... In a most wonderful manner it (the **Word of Truth**) was **preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness.**"*

The Gallic Bible (Southern France) (AD177)

The Gothic Bible (AD 330-350)

The Old Syriac Bible (AD 400)

The Armenian Bible (AD 400) There are **1244 copies** of this version still in existence.

The Palestinian Syriac (AD 450)

The French Bible of Oliveton (AD 1535)

The Czech Bible (AD 1602)

The Italian Bible of Diodati (AD 1606)

The Greek Orthodox Bible: Used from Apostolic times to the present day by the Greek Orthodox Church.

All the above mentioned Bibles and the vast majority (about 99%) of the **5200 extant New Testament MSS** are in agreement with the text now known as **Textus Receptus**; the Text which underlies the **Authorized King James Bible**.

ENGLISH BIBLES

John Wycliffe's Translation (1380-82). This was the first manuscript (hand-written) Bible in the English language. Strictly speaking, it was not a **version**, but a translation into English from the Old Latin Vulgate.

Wycliffe, often described as the '*Morning Star of the Reformation*,' was an able Latin scholar. Alas! so hated was he for making Scripture available to the common man that some 44 years after his death his bones were dug up and burned, and his ashes cast into the river Swift.

William Tyndale's New Testament (1526) was the first printed Testament in the English language. Unlike Wycliffe's translation, Tyndale's New Testament was translated directly from the Greek, from the **Majority Text**, now known as **Textus Receptus**. More about this Text later. Tyndale's work, in other words, was a '**version**.' The first printings of Tyndale's version were burned at St Paul's Cross (London). At that time it was a grievous offence, punishable by fine, imprisonment or death to even possess a copy of Tyndale's New Testament. It was said of William Tyndale that he was:

"A man so skilled in the seven languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English and French, that which ever he spake, you would suppose it his native tongue."

He it was who said to the ignorant clerics of his day that he would '*cause the boy who driveth the plough to know more of the Scriptures than*

them.'

Quote: *"Before **Tyndale's** day the English versions of the Bible had been translations of a translation, being derived from the Vulgate or older Latin versions. Tyndale, for the first time, went back to the original Hebrew and Greek. And not only did he go back to the original languages seeking for the truth, but he embodied that truth when found in so noble a translation that it has ever since been deemed wise by scholars and revisers to make but a few changes in it; consequently every succeeding version is in reality little more than a revision of Tyndale's. It has been truly said that 'the peculiar genius which breathes through the English Bible, the mingled tenderness and majesty, the Saxon simplicity, the grandeur - unequalled, unapproached in the attempted improvements of modern scholars - all are here, and bear the impress of the mind of one man, and that man is **William Tyndale.**"*

But alas! Tyndale was to suffer the wrath of blind ecclesiastical authority. He was burned at the stake!

Quote: *"The martyr was first confined in the castle of Filford, about 20 miles from Antwerp. He was taken from prison on Friday, October 6th 1536, fastened to the stake, strangled, and his body burned to ashes. The fervent prayer of the martyr Tyndale, when bound to the stake, '**Lord, open the King of England's eyes,**' was about to be answered shortly."*

David Fuller writes of Tyndale:

Quote: *"In the Reformation period the Church of Rome sought to maintain its dominant position by burning not only the copies of the bible, but also those who recognized the supreme authority of God's word. **Tyndale** was burned at the stake at Vilvorde outside Brussels in Belgium on August 6, (October according to some historians) 1536. His great offence was that he had translated the scriptures into English and was making copies available against the wishes of the Roman catholic hierarchy."*

Miles Coverdale's Bible (1535). This was the first complete Bible in the English language. Coverdale was not the scholar Tyndale was, for his translation relied heavily on Tyndale and Luther's German Bible. It was

printed just one year before his friend Tyndale was martyred.

Matthew's Bible (1500-1555). This was the first Bible issued with the king's license. It was mostly taken from Tyndale's and Coverdale's work which had gone before. It was printed in Hamburg by the king's printer John Rogers and was dedicated to Henry VIII by Rogers under the name Thomas Matthew, hence its name.

The Great Bible (1539). This Bible was printed in large folio (15x9 inches) hence its name. It was printed in Paris and was mostly a revision of Tyndale's and Matthew's work which went before.

The Geneva Version (1560). During the reign of the Catholic Queen Mary many Protestant believers from Britain fled to the Continent. The Scot **John Knox** was one. The Geneva Bible is a true '**version**' having been translated from the original Hebrew and Greek throughout.

Quote: *"A number of these intellectual pilgrims rendezvoused in Geneva (known as the Holy City of the Alps) to form the first committee to attempt a translation of the Bible. Such men as Theodore Beza, **John Knox**, William Whittingham and Miles Coverdale laboured six years to produce the celebrated **Geneva Bible** in 1560. Although this Bible was the first to feature numbered verses and italics, its main achievement was the Hebrew to English rendering of Ezra through Malachi, **thus representing the first English Bible translated entirely out of the original languages.**"*

*"The **Geneva Bible** was the first complete translation into English from the originals throughout. It was addressed to 'the brethren of England, **Scotland**, and Ireland,'... There were two Bibles at this time in general use in England. The Geneva Bible was the more popular of the two, and was generally read in the household and in private study of the Word by the people. The Cranmer or Bishops' Bible was the one, however, which obtained most favour amongst the clergy and was read in the churches."*

The Bishops' Bible (1568). *"Archbishop Parker was the master mind in the preparation of this new edition of the Holy Scriptures, assisted by about 15 scholarly men. He distributed the '**Cranmer Bible**' into parts, assigning portions to various learned bishops, the whole being subject to his own personal supervision. The large number of the revisers being from the Episcopal bench gave the name and character to this bible. It was printed*

*in large size, and beautifully executed. It was adorned with numerous cuts; its notes were brief, and, like the 'Geneva Bible,' was divided into verses. It was used in the Churches for about 40 years. Various revised additions of the **Bishops' Bible** were published. Soon after the appearance of the **Authorized Version of 1611**, the **Bishops' Bible** - the last edition of which was published about five years before its noble successor - fell into general disuse..."*

The King James Version (1611) This is the Real Word of God for our generation. The Almighty has used it to further His work for coming on 400 years. See Section 10 for further details of this Bible.

The Majority Text - Textus Receptus

Before we consider the **King James Version (KJV)** and a few of the modern translations in use today, let us first consider certain Greek texts from which all New Testament translations are derived. Foremost amongst these is the **Traditional Received Text (Textus Receptus)**, also called the **Byzantine Text** or the **Majority Text** because it is based on the **vast majority** of manuscripts still in existence. These extant manuscripts (MSS) were brought together by various editors such as **Lucian** (AD 250-312), **Erasmus**, **Stephanus**, **Beza** and the **Elzevir brothers** to form the text known as **Textus Receptus**, the name given to the Majority Text in the 17th century. The most notable editor of all was **Desiderius Erasmus** (1466-1536) one of the greatest scholars the world has ever known. When the early Protestant Reformers of the 16th and 17th centuries decided to translate the Scriptures directly from Greek into the languages of Europe, they selected **Textus Receptus** as their foundation Greek document. It is vitally important to understand why they did so.

Wilkinson writes in his book **Truth Triumphant**:

Quote: *"The Protestant denominations are built upon that manuscript of the Greek New Testament sometimes called **Textus Receptus**, or the **Received Text**. It is that Greek New Testament from which the writings of the apostles in Greek have been translated into English, German, Dutch and other languages. During the dark ages the Received Text was practically unknown outside the Greek Church. It was restored to Christendom by the labours of that great scholar **Erasmus**. It is altogether too little known that the real editor of the Received Text was **Lucian**. None of Lucian's enemies fails to credit him with this work. Neither Lucian nor Erasmus, but rather the apostles, wrote the Greek New Testament. However, Lucian's day was an age of apostasy when a flood of depravations was systematically attempting to devastate both the Bible manuscripts and Bible theology. **Origen**, of the Alexandrian college, made his editions and commentaries of the Bible a secure retreat for all errors, and deformed them with philosophical speculations introducing casuistry and lying. **Lucian's** unrivalled success in verifying, safeguarding, and transmitting those divine writings left a heritage for which all generations should be thankful."*

Two Bibles

In his book **Which Bible?** David Otis Fuller says this about **Textus Receptus**. Carefully note Fuller's first point that all churches (we could now add all Bible students) fall into one of two basic study categories:

- Those who use a variety of Bibles influenced by the **Minority Text** (the Nestle/Aland Text). For 45 years I was in this camp: but I thank God I had my eyes opened.
- Those who only study Bibles based on the Received Text (**Textus Receptus**). I have now joined this camp.

Fuller writes :

Quote: "*First of all, the **Textus Receptus** was the Bible of early Eastern Christianity. Later it was adopted as the official text of the **Greek Catholic Church**. There were local reasons which contributed to this result. But, probably, far greater reasons will be found in the fact that the Received Text had authority enough to become, either in itself or by its translation, the Bible of the great **Syrian Church**; of the **Waldensian Church** of northern Italy; of the **Gallic Church** in southern France; and of the **Celtic Church** in Scotland and Ireland; as well as the official Bible of the **Greek Catholic Church**. All these churches, some earlier, some later, were in opposition to the Church of Rome and at a time when the Received Text and these Bibles of the Constantine type were rivals. They, as represented in their descendants, are rivals to this day. **The Church of Rome built on the Eusebio-Origen type of Bible; these others built on the Received Text.** Therefore, because they themselves believed that the Received Text was the true apostolic Bible, and further, because the Church of Rome arrogated to itself the power to choose a Bible which bore the marks of systematic depravation, we have the testimony of these five churches to the authenticity and the apostolicity of the Received Text."*

Why did the early churches of the 2nd and 3rd centuries and all the Protestant Reformers of the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries choose Textus Receptus in preference to the Minority Text? The answer is because:

- **Textus Receptus** is based on the vast majority (90%) of the 5000+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the **Majority Text**.
- **Textus Receptus** is not mutilated with deletions, additions and amendments, as is the Minority Text.
- **Textus Receptus** agrees with the earliest versions of the Bible: **Peshitta** (AD150) **Old Latin Vulgate** (AD157), the **Italic Bible** (AD157) etc. These Bibles were produced some 200 years before the minority Egyptian codices favoured by the Roman Church. Remember this vital point.
- **Textus Receptus** agrees with the vast majority of the 86,000+ citations from scripture by the early church fathers.
- **Textus Receptus** is untainted with Egyptian philosophy and unbelief.
- **Textus Receptus** strongly upholds the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith: the creation account in Genesis, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the virgin birth, his miracles, his bodily resurrection and

literal return.

- **Textus Receptus** was - and still is - the enemy of the Roman Church. This is an important fact to bear in mind.

Reverend Gipp comments further:

Quote: *"The **Majority Text** has been known throughout history by several names. It has been known as the **Byzantine text**, the **Imperial Text**, the **Traditional Text** and the **Reformation Text** as well as the **Majority Text**. This text culminates in the **TEXTUS RECEPTUS** or **Received Text** which is the basis for the **King James Bible**, which we know also as the **Authorized Version**.... We describe this text with the term "**Universal**," because it represents the majority of extant MSS which represent the original autographs. **Professor Hodges** of Dallas Theological Seminary explains, "The manuscript of an ancient book will, under any but the most exceptional conditions, multiply in a reasonable regular fashion with the result that the copies nearest the autograph will normally have the largest number of descendants."*

Continuing from page 66 in Gipp's book:

Quote: *"Professor Hodges concludes, 'Thus the Majority text, upon which the King James Version is based, has in reality the strongest claim possible to be regarded as an authentic representation of the original text. This claim is quite independent of any shifting consensus of scholarly judgment about its readings and is based on the objective reality of its dominance in the transmissional history of the New Testament text.' "*

In his book **God Wrote Only One Bible**, Jasper J Ray pens the following testimony about **Textus Receptus**:

Quote: *"Wonder of wonders, in the midst of all the present confusion regarding manuscripts, we still have a Bible we can trust. **The writing of the word of God by inspiration is no greater miracle than the miracle of its preservation in the Textus Receptus. All criticism of this text from which was translated the King James Bible, is based upon an unproved hypothesis: i.e. that there are older and more dependable copies of the original Bible manuscripts. No one in nineteen hundred years, has been able to prove that one jot or tittle has been inserted or taken out.**"*

In his book **Final Authority**, William P Grady provides further interesting details about **Textus Receptus**, the Received Text:

Quote: *"For instance, over **5,000 Greek manuscripts** of the New Testament exist today ranging from small fragments containing two or three verses to nearly entire Bibles. Their ages vary from the second to the sixteenth century; the manuscripts are ending with the arrival of printing. By comparison, there exist only ten quality manuscripts of Caesar's Gallic War composed between 58-50BC... **"Once again, the outstanding features of the Received Text is its high percentage of agreement among so many thousands of independent witnesses. This agreement is often placed at about 90 percent; in other words, 90 percent of all existing manuscripts agree with one another so miraculously that they are able to form their own unique text...***

*If the critic of your King James Bible is correct in his rejection of the underlying **Textus Receptus**, then he is also under the greatest pressure to account for its existence. To complain of fabrication is one thing, but to account for its universal prevalence is quite another. Whenever a large body of ancient documents are seen to be in agreement, this inexplicable harmony becomes their greatest evidence for legitimacy. Simple arithmetic confirms that the nearer a particular reading is to the original, the longer the time span will be for descendants to follow. The longer the family is, the older the original source must be."*

The Minority Texts

There are other extant Greek texts which are referred to as the '**Minority Texts**' simply because they represent only about 5% of existing manuscripts. Another 5% are **Neutral Texts**: sometimes agreeing with the majority and at others with the minority. The '**Minority Texts**' are also

known as the **Alexandrian Texts** because they were produced in Alexandria in Egypt. The Minority Texts were rejected by the **early Christians** and also by all the **Protestant Reformers** of the 16th and 17th centuries. The Reformers, who were well aware of the existence of the Minority Texts, considered them unfit for translation purposes. These are very important points to bear in mind. **Why did the early Christians and the Protestant Reformers reject the Minority Texts?**

The answer is:

- The **Minority Texts** were the work of unbelieving Egyptian scribes who did not accept the Bible as the **Word of God** or **JESUS as the SON of GOD!**
- The **Minority Texts** abound with alterations, often a single manuscript being amended by several different scribes over a period of many years: something the Aaronic priests and Masorites would never have tolerated when making copies of the Scriptures.
- The **Minority Texts** omit approximately **200 verses** from the Scriptures. This is equivalent to 1st and 2nd Peter.
- The **Minority Texts** contradict themselves in hundreds of places.
- The **Minority Texts** are doctrinally weak and often dangerously incorrect.

Proof of these astonishing allegations will follow in **Part Two** where we will take a close look at some 80+ Bible verses corrupted by the Minority Text.

Yet, startling as it may sound, **every modern English Bible relies on the Minority Text as its underlying New Testament text in preference to Textus Receptus!** Isn't that an amazing revelation? What brought about this almost incredible switch from the reliable **Textus Receptus**, beloved by the early Christian church and the **Protestant Reformers**, to the corrupt minority text favoured by the Roman Catholic Church? **It is important that you find out soon: because the modern "Bible" you may be faithfully studying every day is really nothing more than a counterfeit posing as the Word of God!** If it is any consolation to you, do remember that I was equally in the dark and totally devastated by my findings.

Misleading Footnotes

Modern translations abound with misleading footnotes, which do little else but cast doubt on the King James Version. Examples are:

- *The Hebrew of this line is obscure.*
- *The meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain - or unknown.*
- *Other ancient mss add ...*
- *Other ancient mss omit...*
- *Other ancient mss read ...*
- *Other ancient mss insert...*
- *Some early mss read...*
- *The most ancient authorities omit John 7:53 - 8:11*
- *The best manuscripts omit this verse. (e.g. Matt.17:21, 18:11, 23:14, Mark 7:16, John 5:4)*
- *Some of the most ancient authorities bring the book (Mark) to a close at the end of Mark 16:8*
- *Many mss do not contain the remainder of this verse. (e.g. Acts 8:37)*
- *Many ancient authorities read...*
- *Not found in most of the old mss.(e.g. John 7:53-8:11)*

These footnotes **ALL cast doubt on the accuracy of the Authorised King James Bible!** By implication they all claim to be more accurate and reliable than the King James Version. In the preface of the Revised Standard Version (RSV) we read this misleading statement. "**Yet the King James Version has grave defects.**" Oh how subtle is Satan, how evil and how sinister! The stunning fact is: the very opposite is true. **The King James Version is infinitely more accurate and reliable than ANY modern English translation on the market today.** And that is why for the past 386 years it has had - and continues to have - the blessing of the Almighty God upon it: something no modern version or translation can come anywhere near. Most, after a decade or two, disappear from the book shops, only to re-appear some years later with a few alterations under a new name.

How did it happen that the **Minority Text** supplanted the trustworthy and respected **Textus Receptus** which triggered the great **Protestant Reformation** during which tens of thousands of true believers perished by flame, famine and torture? Who is behind this dangerous deception that has engulfed the Christian Church? Do you know? Do you care? Is it important? Does it really matter?

I most certainly didn't know. But I do believe that it is vitally important that every believer know that **Satan** is behind it: not any particular Church, its leaders or its members - but the great **enemy of souls!** He is behind every deception ever aimed at the human race: and millions, in and out of the church, believe his lies. I for one had been living in blissful ignorance of the danger for many years: till a massive heart attack laid me flat on my back

and I was moved - yea inwardly compelled - to make a deep study of the **History of God's Word** and how He has **providentially preserved it till today**.

Now let us turn our attention to the **Minority Text's** two most prominent manuscripts on which most modern translations of the Bible heavily rely. They are called **Codex Sinaiticus (ALEPH)** and **Codex Vaticanus (B)**. The word '**codex**,' incidentally, means that the manuscript is in book form, with pages, as opposed to being a scroll. But first a little about the man whom God raised up over 150 years ago to expose the errors of the Minority Texts. His name is **John Burgon**.

John William Burgon

John Burgon was undoubtedly one of the greatest defenders of the Greek text of the New Testament. He exposed the hundreds of amendments, deletions and additions in the Minority Text and defended the reliability of **Textus Receptus** till the day of his death. Unlike most Bible students, Burgon was a Greek scholar of the highest rank who spent much of his life browsing through the museums and libraries of Europe examining the ancient Greek manuscripts. He had first hand experience examining the **Vatican** texts whilst he ministered to a congregation in Rome. His findings are of utmost value in these days of wilful, spiritual ignorance and sin. I will quote a few extracts about this magnificent warrior from **David O Fuller's** book **Which Bible?**

Quote: "**John William Burgon** was born August 21, 1813. He matriculated at Oxford in 1841, taking several high honours there, and his B.A. 1845. He took his M.A. there in 1848...the thing about **Burgon**, however, which lifts him out of the nineteenth century English setting and endears him to the hearts of earnest Christians of other lands and other ages is his steadfast defence of the Scriptures as the infallible Word of God. He strove with all his power to arrest the modernistic currents which during his lifetime had begun to flow within the Church of England, continuing his efforts with unabated zeal up to the very day of his death. With this purpose in mind he laboured mightily in the field of New Testament textual criticism.

In 1860, while temporary chaplain of the English congregation at Rome, he made a personal examination of Codex B (Vaticanus), and in 1862 he inspected the treasures of St. Catherine's Convent on Mt. Sinai. Later he made several tours of European libraries,

*examining and collating New Testament manuscripts wherever he went... Of all the critics of the nineteenth century **Burgon** alone was consistently Christian in his vindication of the **Divine inspiration** and **providential preservation** of the text of Holy Scripture...*

***Burgon** regarded the good state of preservation of B (Codex Vaticanus) and ALEPH (Codex Sinaiticus) in spite of their exceptional age as proof not of their goodness but of their badness. **If they had been good manuscripts, they would have been read to pieces long ago.** We suspect that these two manuscripts are indebted for their preservation, solely to their ascertained evil character; which has occasioned that the one eventually found its way, four centuries ago, to a forgotten shelf in the **Vatican Library**; while the other, after exercising the ingenuity of several generations of critical Correctors, eventually (viz. in A.D. 1844) got deposited in the wastepaper basket of the Convent at the foot of Mount Sinai.*

*Had B (Vaticanus) and ALEPH (Sinaiticus) been copies of average purity, they must long since have shared the inevitable fate of books which are freely used and highly prized; namely, they would have fallen into decadence and disappeared from sight. **Thus the fact that B and ALEPH are so old is a point against them, not something in their favour. It shows that the Church rejected them and did not read them. Otherwise they would have worn out and disappeared through much reading.***

*For an orthodox Christian **Burgon's** view is the only reasonable one. If we believe that God gave the Church guidance in regard to the New Testament books, then surely it is logical to believe that God gave the church similar guidance in regard to the text which these books contained...*

Who but those with Roman Catholic sympathies could ever be pleased with the notion that God preserved the true New Testament text in secret for almost one thousand years and then finally handed it over to the Roman pontiff for safekeeping?

*Surely every orthodox Protestant will prefer to think with **Burgon** that God preserved the true text of the Greek New Testament in the usage of the Greek-speaking Church down through the centuries and then delivered it up intact to the Protestant reformers."*

CODEX SINAITICUS (ALEPH)

This codex was produced in the 4th century. In his book **Let's Weigh the Evidence**, Barry Burton writes of **Codex Sinaiticus**:

Quote: *"The Sinaiticus is a manuscript that was found in 1844 in a trash pile in St. Catherine's Monastery near Mt. Sinai, by a man named Mr Tischendorf. It contains nearly all of the New Testament plus it adds the 'Shepherd of Hermes' and the 'Epistle of Barnabas' to the New Testament. The Sinaiticus is extremely unreliable, proven by examining the manuscript itself. John Burgon spent years examining every available manuscript of the New Testament. He writes about Sinaiticus...*

'On many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through very carelessness. Letters, words or even whole sentences are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately cancelled; while that gross blunder, whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament.

THAT'S NOT ALL!

On nearly every page of the manuscript there are corrections and revisions, done by 10 different people. Some of these corrections were made about the same time that it was copied, but most of them were made in the 6th and 7th century. ... Phillip Mauro, a brilliant lawyer who was admitted to the bar of the US Supreme Court in April 1892, wrote a book called "Which Version " in the early 1900s. He writes concerning the Sinaiticus... 'From these facts, therefore, we declare: first that the impurity of the Codex Sinaiticus, in every part of it, was fully recognized by those who were best acquainted with it, and that from the very beginning until the time when it was finally cast aside as worthless for any practical purpose.' "

In his excellent book **An Understandable History Of The Bible**, Rev. Samuel Gipp writes of

Codex Sinaiticus: "One of the MSS is called *Sinaiticus* and is represented by the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, **Aleph**. This MS from all outward appearances looks very beautiful. It is written in book form (codex) on vellum. It contains 147 1/2 leaves. The pages are 15" by 13 1/2" with four columns of 48 lines per page. It contains many spurious books such as the '*Shepherd of Hermes*,' the '*Epistle of Barnabas*' and even the *Didache*. The great Greek scholar, Dr Scrivener, points this out in his historic work *A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus*. He speaks of correctional alterations made to the MS: '*The Codex is covered with such alterations... brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of them systematically spread over every page, others occasional or limited to separated portions of the MS, many of these being contemporaneous with the first writer, but the greater part belonging to the sixth or seventh century.*' "

CODEX VATICANUS (B)

The second major manuscript of the Minority Text is known as **Codex Vaticanus**, often referred to as '**B**'. This codex was also produced in the 4th century. It was found over a thousand years later in 1481 in the **Vatican library in Rome**, where it is currently held. It is written on expensive vellum, a fine parchment originally from the skin of calf or antelope. Some authorities claim that it was one of a batch of 50 Bibles ordered from Egypt by the **Roman Emperor Constantine**: hence its beautiful appearance and the expensive skins which were used for its pages. But alas! this manuscript, like its corrupt Egyptian partner **Sinaiticus (Aleph)** is also riddled with omissions, insertions and amendments.

Of **Codex Vaticanus** Samuel Gipp writes on

page 72: *"This codex omits many portions of Scripture vital to Christian doctrine. **Vaticanus** omits Genesis 1.1 through Genesis 46:28; Psalms 106 through 138; Matthew 16:2,3; Romans 16:24; the Pauline Pastoral Epistles; Revelation; and everything in Hebrews after 9:14.*

It seems suspicious indeed that a MS possessed by the Roman Catholic church omits the portion of the book of Hebrews which exposes the 'mass' as totally useless (Please read Hebrews 10:10-12). The 'mass' in conjunction with the false doctrine of purgatory go hand-in-hand to form a perpetual money making machine for Rome. Without one or the other, the Roman Catholic Church would go broke! It also omits portions of the Scripture telling of the creation (Genesis), the prophetic details of the crucifixion (Psalm 22), and, of course, the portion which prophesies of the destruction of Babylon (Rome), the great whore of Revelation chapter 17.

***Vaticanus** , though intact physically, is found to be in poor literary quality. Dr Martin declares, 'B' exhibits numerous places where the scribe has written the same word or phrase twice in succession. Dr J Smythe states, 'From one end to the other, the whole manuscript has been travelled over by the pen of some... scribe of about the tenth century.' **If Vaticanus was considered a trustworthy text originally, the mass of corrections and scribal changes obviously render its testimony highly suspicious and questionable.**"*

Rev. Gipp continues on page 73:

Quote: *"The corrupt and unreliable nature of these two MSS (**Sinaiticus** and **Vaticanus**) is best summed up by one who has thoroughly examined them, John W Burgon: 'The impurity of the text exhibited by these codices is not a question of opinion but fact...**In the Gospels alone, Codex B(Vatican)** leaves out words or whole clauses no less than **1,491 times**. It bears traces of careless transcriptions on every page...*

***If we are to be thorough and discriminatory in our evaluation of the true New Testament text, then we must not -- we cannot -- overlook these facts.'** How did these MSS come into being? How did it happen that they should be beautiful to the eye, yet within contain such vile and devastating corruption? It seems that these uncial MSS along with the papyrus MSS included in this category all resulted from a revision of the true, or Universal Text. This*

revision was enacted in Egypt by Egyptian scribes! "

Rev. Gipp

continues: *"So we see that once a pure copy of the Universal Text (**Textus Receptus**) had been carried down into Egypt, it was recopied. During the process of this recopying, it was revised by men who did not revere it as truly the **Word of God**. This text was examined by the critical eye of Greek philosophy and Egyptian morals. These men saw nothing wrong with putting the Book in subjection to their opinion instead of their opinion being in subjection to the book. This process produced a text which was local to the educational centre of Alexandria, Egypt. This text went no further than southern Italy where the Roman Catholic Church found its unstable character perfect for overthrowing the true Word of God which was being used universally by the Christians."*

The **Westminster Dictionary of the Bible** has this to say about **Codex Vaticanus** on page 624 under the article **Versions**.

Quote: *" It should be noted, however, that there is no prominent Biblical MS. in which there occur such gross cases of misspelling, faulty grammar, and omission, as in B."*

Barry Burton comments further:

Quote: *"For one thing...Vaticanus and Sinaiticus disagree with each other over 3000 times in the gospels alone... **Facts about the Vaticanus**. "It was written on fine vellum (tanned animal skins) and remains in excellent condition. It was found in the **Vatican Library in 1481 AD**. In spite of being in excellent condition, it omits Genesis 1:1-Gen.46:28, Psalm 106-138, Matt.16:2-3, the Pauline pastoral Epistles, Hebrews 9:14-13:25, and all of Revelation. These parts were probably left out on purpose."*
*"Besides all that - in the gospels alone it leaves out 237 words, 452 clauses and 748 whole sentences, which hundreds of later copies agree together as having the same words in the same places, the same clauses in the same places and the same sentences in the same places... **The Vaticanus was available to the translators of the King James Bible, but they did not use it because they knew it***

is unreliable."

Dean Burgon comments on Codices Sinaiticus (Aleph) and Vaticanus (B).

Quote: *"Compromise of any sort between the two conflicting parties, is impossible; for they simply contradict one another. Codd.B and Aleph are either amongst the purist of manuscripts,- or else **they are among the very foulest.** The Text of Drs. Westcott and Hort is either **the very best which has ever appeared,- or else it is the very worst; the nearest to the sacred Autographs,- or furthest from them.**"... "There is no room for both opinions; and there cannot exist any middle view."*

Oldest and Best

Bible students are often told that Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are older and better than other manuscripts: the implication being that they must, therefore, be **more accurate**. But this conclusion is wrong. We have already seen how Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are corrupt beyond measure. To be sure they are '**better**' in appearance, but certainly not in their content. Remember they are written on expensive vellum; so they ought to be in good shape. They are older, but older than what? They are older than other Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. But they are not older than the earliest versions of the Bible: the Peshitta, Italic, Waldensian and the Old Latin Vulgate: versions which agree with the Majority text. **These ancient versions are some 200 years older than A and B.** Yes A and B are older than other Greek mss, but for anyone to suggest that they are **more accurate** is absurd. It is like someone saying '*You will find the greatest TRUTH being preached in the oldest and most beautiful cathedrals of the world,*' or, '*the most beautiful women have the best characters.*'

In his masterful book **Revision Revised** Dean Burgon wrote, over a hundred years ago, concerning the ages of Codices Vatican (B) and Sinai (Aleph):

Quote: *"Lastly, - We suspect that these two Manuscripts are indebted for their preservation, solely to their ascertained **evil character**, which has occasioned that the one eventually found its way, four centuries ago, to a forgotten shelf in the **Vatican library**; while the other, after exercising the ingenuity of several generations of critical Correctors, eventually (viz. in A.D. 1844) got deposited in the **waste-paper basket** of the Convent at the foot of mount Sinai. Had B and Aleph been copies of average purity, they must long since have shared the inevitable fate of books which are freely used and highly prized; namely, they would have fallen into decadence and disappeared from sight."*

In short these two codices are old simply because:

- **First:** They were written on extremely expensive and durable antelope skins.
- **Second:** They were so full of errors, alterations, additions and deletions, that they were **never** used by true believers and **seldom** even by their own custodians. Thus they had little chance of wearing away.

Can any true believer imagine **JEHOVAH, the Holy One of Israel**, hiding Codex Vaticanus away for over 1000 years in the **Vatican Library** till 1481? Or prompting the deeply religious monks of **St Catherine's Monastery** to dump Sinaiticus into a waste basket? The very idea is ridiculous.

A vital fact to remember is that though codices Aleph and B (produced in the 4th century) are older than other Greek manuscript copies of the Scriptures, they are not older than the Peshitta, Italic, the Old Latin Vulgate and the Waldensian versions which were produced 200 years earlier in the 2nd century. All these versions, copies of which are still in existence, agree with Textus Receptus, the underlying text of the King James Bible. I repeat: these ancient versions are some **200 years older** than Vaticanus and Sinaiticus: so the '**oldest is best**' argument should not be used. All Bibles fall, basically, into one of two categories.

- Those based on the **Majority Text**.
- Those based on the **Minority Text**.

Which Bible you select for study each day is going to have an enormous effect on your spiritual growth and well being. Bear this vital fact in mind.

The Invention of Printing

The invention of the printing press in the 15th century was a giant step forward in the circulation of the Bible. The printing press reduced the time taken to produce a Bible from about nine or ten months to a few hours: and once proof reading had been done, every copy was as good as the master. Printing also greatly reduced the price of a Bible.

Quote: *"In the reign of Edward 1 of England, about 1272, the price of a complete (hand-written) Bible was from £30 to £37, and occupied a careful scribe in his scriptorium about ten months, while the days wage of a working man only averaged 1.5 pennies. When it is borne in mind that it only cost £25 to build two arches of London Bridge in 1240, while the price of a complete Latin Bible was considerably more, it will readily be allowed that only the rich and scholarly had access to the Word of God."*

"While Martin Luther called the art of printing 'the last and best gift of providence' the Catholic Rowland Phillips, in a sermon preached at St. Paul's Cross, London in the year 1535, frightfully remarked:

*'We must root out printing
or printing will root us out.' "*

The King James Version

Now that we have learned something about the **majority** and **minority texts**, let us turn our attention to the history of the King James Version (KJV) which is based on Textus Receptus. **The King James Version was translated directly from the original languages:** though it owes its style and biblical language to versions which went before. I now invite you to imitate the believers of Berea mentioned in the book of Acts.

Acts These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they 17:11 received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.

Archaic Language

Many maintain that the KJV uses **archaic language**. Is this objection

justified? Pause awhile and consider this well known fact: every department of human learning uses language peculiar to that particular discipline: language which novices could easily refer to as being **archaic**. Biology, botany, geology, physics, chemistry, mathematics, music, medicine, law etc., all use strange sounding words, phrases and expressions which a novice will find difficult to understand. The study of the **Word of God** is similar in this respect. It also uses words and expressions which a new believer will find hard to comprehend. Words like **sin, repentance, baptism, atonement, sanctification, justification, resurrection** etc. These words often baffle a new believer: but he/she must learn them in order to progress spiritually; because they are explicit **Biblical terms** which uniquely express vital spiritual concepts and processes. They are not archaic words and we dare not get rid of them or simplify them to such a degree that the Word of God becomes a paraphrase, a commentary. Can you imagine a novice biology, science or law student objecting to the strange sounding words or old-fashioned expressions in his text books?

In his book **The King James Version Defended** Edward F Hills says this concerning the language of the KJV:

Quote: *"Not only modernists but also many conservatives are now saying that the King James Version ought to be abandoned because it is not contemporary. The Apostles, they insist, used contemporary language in their preaching and writing, and we too must have a Bible in the language of today. **But more and more it is being recognized that the language of the New Testament was biblical rather than contemporary. It was the Greek of the Septuagint, which in its turn was modelled after the Old Testament Hebrew.** Any biblical translator, therefore, who is truly trying to follow in the footsteps of the Apostles and to produce a version which God will bless, must take care to use language which is above the level of daily speech, language which is not only intelligible but also **biblical and venerable.** Hence in language as well as in text the **King James Version** is still by far superior to any other English translation of the Bible."* (Ref:G1)

Thees and Thous

We also hear a lot about the words '**ye,**' '**thee**' and '**thou**' in the King James Version: and that these should all be replaced by the word '**you**'. Everyone knows that the word '**you**' is a uni-plural word like '**sheep**' or '**fish.**' It may refer to one or many depending on the context. Believe it or not the word

'you' is used many times in the KJV - but not exclusively. Why not? The answer is because of the vital difference between 'you' (plural) and 'thee' (singular) and there are times when it is necessary to make the difference. The word 'thee' refers to a single person, church, town or nation: whereas the word 'you' is the second person plural: it refers to many persons. To understand what I mean we will need to look at a few examples.

Just before the Saviour's crucifixion he warned his disciples - particularly Peter - of Satan's intended plan to test them **all**. These are the Master's words:

Luke 22:31- *And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath
32 desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: But I
have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou
art converted, strengthen thy brethren.*

In this passage the Saviour used the word 'you' to mean **all the disciples**. But when he used the words 'thee' and 'thou' he meant Simon Peter alone. By replacing the 'thee' and 'thou' in this passage with 'you,' the Saviour's explicit warning to Simon Peter is considerably weakened. As for his warning to all the other disciples, that Satan wanted to sift them **all**, that warning is completely lost. Here are two more examples where the plural word 'you' and the singular words 'thee' or 'thou' are used.

- In this example Festus speaks to king Agrippa and Bernice concerning the Apostle Paul. Here the word 'you' refers to Agrippa and Bernice: whereas the word 'thee' specifically addresses king Agrippa. Acts 25:26: *Of whom I have no certain thing to write unto my lord. Wherefore I have brought him forth before you, and specially before thee, O king Agrippa, that, after examination had, I might have somewhat to write.*
- In the following example two towns are initially addressed individually, therefore the word 'thee' is used. But when referred to together the word 'you' is used.
- Luke 10:13: *Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes.*

Other examples where 'you' is plural and 'thou' or 'thee' is singular are found in Deut. 4:3; 1 Kings 9:5-6; Matthew 5:39-44; 6:4-7; 11:23-24; 18:9-10; 23:37-38; Mark 14:37-38; Luke 5:4-5; 6:30-31; 9:41; 16:25-26; John

1:50-51; James 2:16. These texts, and there are many more, prove that the word '**you**' was well known by the translators of the King James Version. If you consult a concordance you will discover that it was used **hundreds of times** in that version: but not exclusively as in modern translations. In short, when the Saviour addresses a particular individual, church or town he uses the words '**thee**' or '**thou**' simply because these words are more explicit and personal than the uni-plural word '**you**.' The Bible, remember, is the **Word of God**: explicit in every sentence - yea in every word!

ALLEGED KJV ERRORS: Easter/Passover

Many claim that the King James Version has serious '**errors**' in it. The most quoted '**error**' concerns the use of the word **Easter** in Acts 12:1-4. The original word, these believers maintain, should have been translated as **Passover** - not **Easter**! Let us now examine the passage concerned and see if that argument holds water.

*Acts 12:1- Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands 4 to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also. (Then were the **days of unleavened bread.**) And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; **intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people.***

To properly understand the sequence of events described above I will briefly explain some facts about the sacred calendar.

- The first **Passover** occurred in ancient Egypt when **Jehovah, the God of the Hebrews** spared the lives of Israel's eldest sons and slaughtered the firstborn of Egypt. That event took place on the evening (night) of the 14th Abib (Nisan), the first month in the sacred calendar. The Passover, which is an event rather than a day, is now commemorated each year on the evening of the same date. The story is well known and is recorded in Exodus chapters 11 and 12.
- **After the Passover came the seven days of Unleavened Bread.** The week of unleavened bread begins on the evening of the 14th Abib and finishes on the evening of the 21st Abib. This whole week is sometimes referred to as the *Passover week*: but, strictly speaking, its proper name is **Week of Unleavened Bread**. When the **Passover** and the **days of unleavened bread** are mentioned in the same

passage, as in Acts 12:1-4, we can be certain that the **Passover** refers to the **event** which occurs on the evening of the 14th Abib and the **days of unleavened bread** refer to the week that follows. (i.e. 15-21st Abib or Nisan).

The events recorded in Acts 12:3-4 *occurred during the days of unleavened bread*. In other words, the Passover in that particular year had passed: it was history: it had gone. Why, then, would Herod wait for an **event** which had already passed? Surely Herod knew that the Passover had passed and that the days of unleavened bread were in progress.

What, then, was Herod really waiting for before releasing Peter? The answer is: **Herod was waiting for Easter to come and go - just as the King James Version says**. We can be confident that the translators of the KJV knew full well why in this passage they rendered the word '**Pesah**' as '**Easter**' and not '**Passover**' as at other times. Their combined knowledge of Hebrew and Greek and the vast amount of manuscript evidence before them (thousands of copies, versions, and church-father citations etc.) were all used to arrive at **every word** in the King James Version. Are we, whose knowledge of these languages is microscopic by comparison, to challenge their judgment? The fact is that Herod, **during the days of unleavened bread**, was not waiting for the Passover - which had come and gone: he was waiting for **Easter** just as the KJV says.

The events in our story tell us that:

- The **Passover** in that particular year was history.
- The **Days of Unleavened Bread** (15th - 21st Abib) were in progress.
- And **Easter** was approaching: after which Herod planned to bring out Peter.

The question now arises: Was the pagan festival of **Easter** known at that time? And were the Romans keeping Easter? The answer is - **yes**. The pagan festival of **Easter**, with its hot cross buns and Easter Sunday sunrise services was well known in ancient Babylon and Rome centuries before the events recorded in Acts 12. Let me quote a short passage about **EASTER** from Alexander Hislop's book **The Two Babylons**. (ISBN 0 7136 0470 0)

Quote: *"Then look at **Easter**. What means the term **Easter** itself? It is not a Christian name. It bears its Chaldean origin on its forehead. **Easter is nothing else than Astarte, one of the titles of Beltis, the QUEEN OF HEAVEN**, whose name, as pronounced by the people of Nineveh, was evidently identical with that now in common use in this country. That name, as found by Layard on the Assyrian monuments, is **Ishtar**. The worship of Bel and **Astarte** was very early introduced into Britain, along with the Druids, "**the priests of the groves**" (page 103)*

No scholar doubts the fact that **Easter** is a pagan festival which came down from ancient times, long before the Christian era. The next question is: **Did some Israelites keep Easter and worship the QUEEN OF HEAVEN?** Did they bake hot cross buns for **Ishtar - Easter**? The answer, surprisingly, is again - **yes!** Ancient Israel worshipped the **Queen of Heaven - ISHTAR** and they honoured her each year with special cakes (buns) and drink offerings. I quote Scripture:

Jeremiah 7:18 *The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough, to **make cakes to the queen of heaven**, and to pour out drink offerings unto other gods, that they may provoke me to anger.*

Jeremiah 44: *But since we left off to burn incense to the **queen of***
18 ***heaven**, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and by the famine. 19: And when we burned incense to the **queen of heaven**, and poured out drink offerings unto her, did we make her **cakes to worship her**, and pour out drink offerings unto her, without our men? 20: Then Jeremiah said unto all the people, to the men, and to the women, and to all the people which had given him that answer, saying, 21: The incense that ye burned in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem, ye, and your fathers, your kings, and your princes, and the people of the land, did not the LORD remember them, and came it not into his mind? 22: So that the LORD could no longer bear, because of the evil of your doings, and because of the abominations which ye have committed; therefore is your land a desolation, and an astonishment, and a curse, without an inhabitant, as at this day.*
23: *Because ye have burned incense, and because ye have sinned against the LORD, and have not obeyed the voice*

*of the LORD, nor walked in his law, nor in his statutes, nor in his testimonies; therefore this evil is happened unto you, as at this day. 24: Moreover Jeremiah said unto all the people, and to all the women, Hear the word of the LORD, all Judah that are in the land of Egypt: 25: Thus saith the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel, saying; Ye and your wives have both spoken with your mouths, and fulfilled with your hand, saying, We will surely perform our vows that we have vowed, to burn incense to the **queen of heaven**, and to pour out drink offerings unto her: ye will surely accomplish your vows, and surely perform your vows.*

Oh yes, many ancient Israelites kept **Easter**. Modern Israelis still do. In summary we can say that when Herod, after the Passover and during the days of unleavened bread shut up Peter intending to bring him out **after Easter**, Herod meant exactly what the King James Version is saying. He meant **Easter not Passover** which had already come and gone. This means that every translation which uses the word **Passover** in Acts 12:3-4 is, strictly speaking, incorrect. **Easter** is the correct word, and the King James Version uses it.

The Protestant Reformers:

When the early Protestant Reformers of Europe (German, Dutch, French and English etc.) began to translate the Old and New Testaments into their native languages, they first had to decide which Hebrew and Greek Text they were going to use.

Hebrew

For the Old Testament, the King James translators used the traditional **Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text**. This text was produced under the strict Masoretic rules mentioned earlier. Besides it was the only trustworthy Hebrew Text available. Do not the Scripture teach in:

*Romans 3: What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of 1 circumcision? 2: Much every way: **chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.***

Greek

For the New Testament, the Protestant translators of the King James Bible

had a choice between two vastly different Greek texts:

1. The **Received (Majority) Text** favoured by the early churches of Christendom (The Greek, Waldensian, Albegensian, Gauls and Celtic churches).
2. Or the **Minority Text** favoured by the Roman Catholic Church.

Wisely they settled for the **Received (Majority) Text**. No doubt the **Spirit of God** was guiding their minds and **providentially preserving His Word**. It is a grave error to think that the early Protestant Reformers of the 16th and 17th centuries were unaware of the Minority Texts produced in the 4th century. They were well aware of them. They had before them copies of the **Majority, Minority and Neutral** texts. In addition they had many **ancient versions** of the Scriptures: the Peshitta, Old Latin Vulgate, Italic, Waldensian, Albegensian, Gaul and Celtic Bibles. They also had before them **thousands of scriptural citations of the early Church Fathers**, which date back to the 2nd and 3rd century. They were also well aware of the fact that the Roman Church used a *Eusebio-Origen type* of Bible based on the Minority Text. What did these great men of God do? The answer is: in making their translations they set aside the **Minority Text** and chose to produce versions of the Bible which were all based on the **Majority Text**, the text used by the early Christian Church. The following quotation will help fix this fact in the reader's mind.

Quote: *"Unquestionably, the leaders of the Reformation -German, French, and English - were convinced that the **Received Text** was the genuine New Testament, not only by its own irresistible history and internal evidence, but also because it matched with the **Received Text which in Waldensian form came down from the days of the apostles.**"*

The King James Version Translators:

When the LORD God of Israel chose the prophets and apostles of old to pen the Scriptures, He made His selection with the utmost care. **Faith, holiness, a love for truth and inherent ability** were the deciding qualities He looked for. In other words the Most High looks within when selecting His servants. That is how He always judges men.

1 Samuel *But the LORD said unto Samuel, Look not on his
16:7 countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have
refused him: for the LORD seeth not as man seeth; for man
looketh on the outward appearance, but **the LORD looketh
on the heart.***

The Protestant translators of the King James Version were providentially chosen by God in exactly the same way: firstly for their **faith, holiness and love of truth**, and secondly for their linguistic abilities. In other words, they were **TRUE BELIEVERS**. At their centre some 47 pious scholars were involved. In addition many hundreds of Protestant ministers and believing linguists throughout the UK assisted in the great work. I cannot over stress the importance of that fact: that **FAITH IN GOD** was the first and overriding reason why the Almighty chose the KJV translators for their sacred task. It is totally inconceivable that the Almighty, who initially inspired "*faithful, holy men of God*" to write the Scriptures in the first place, would then - centuries later - hand over the translating of those selfsame Scriptures to **unbelievers and sceptics**. So I repeat: **the translators of the King James Version were men of FAITH, who believed that the text they were translating was, in fact, the WORD OF GOD!**

Quote: "*Thus started the greatest writing project the world has ever known, and the greatest achievement of the reign of James I - the making of the English Bible which has ever since borne his name.*"

W Scott writes as follows:

Quote: "*King James named **54 pious and scholarly** persons - and who were empowered to communicate with 'all our principal learned men within this our kingdom,' so that the scholarship of the country was consecrated to the noblest work which could engage the heart, the mind, and the pen of men - the production of our admirable English Bible. Seven of the number, through death and other causes, were unable to serve, so that the list was reduced to **47**. It may be interesting to know how and to whom the work was distributed. There were six committees chosen, two of which sat at Westminster, two at Cambridge, two at Oxford. The whole were presided over by **Bishop Andrews**, who, besides possessing an intimate knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, Chaldee, and Syriac, was familiar with 16 other languages. As each set or committee of translators finished the particular part assigned to them, it was*

*then subjected to the criticism of the other five sets in order; so that each part of the Bible came before the whole body of the translators. When the 47 finished their work it was then carefully reviewed by the final committee. **Dr Miles Smith**, Bishop of Gloucester, wrote the preface."*

Always bear in mind the spiritual qualifications of these great men of God. They were

- **Pious Christians who believed that the text they were handling was the very Word of God!**
- They had absolutely no doubt in their minds that the Genesis account of creation was true.
- They never for a moment doubted the miracles of Jesus or that he was born of a virgin, lived a sinless life, was crucified for the sins of mankind and that he rose from the dead and ascended to heaven.
- They were **pious Protestants** who saw through the errors of the Roman Catholic Church.
- They were **scholars of the highest order**. Few - if any - of today's scholars come anywhere near them in their understanding of the original languages; let alone their faith, piety and commitment to truth above tradition.

Here are a few quotes about some of these great men of God from Rev. Gipp's book entitled **An Understandable History of the Bible..**

- **Lancelot Andrews:** *"As a preacher, Bishop Andrews was right famous in his day. He was called the 'star of preachers...Dr Andrews was also known as a great man of prayer...But we are chiefly concerned to know what were his qualifications as a translator of the Bible. He ever bore the character of a 'right godly man,' and a 'prodigious student.' One competent judge speaks of him as 'that great gulf of learning'! It was also said, that 'the world wanted learning to know how learned this man was.' A brave, old chronicler remarks, that such was his skill in all languages, especially the Oriental, that had he been present at the confusion of tongues at Babel, he might have served as the Interpreter-General! In his funeral sermon by Dr. Buckridge, Bishop of Rochester, it is said that Dr. Andrews was conversant with fifteen languages." (page 186)*
- **John Overall :** *He was chosen for his expertise in the writings of the early church fathers. " Dr. Overall was vital to the translation*

because of his knowledge of quotations of the early church fathers." (page 186-187)

- **Robert Tighe:** *" an excellent textuary and profound linguist." (page 189)*
- **William Bedwell :** *" an eminent Oriental scholar. His epitaph mentions that he was 'for the Eastern tongues, as learned a man as most lived in these modern times.'" (page 189)*
- **Edward Lively:** *" One of the best linguists in the world...Much dependence was placed on his surpassing skill in Oriental languages." (page 190)*
- **Lawrence Chaderton:** *" He made himself familiar with the Latin, Greek and Hebrew tongues and was thoroughly skilled in them...Dr Chaderton was a powerful preacher who lived to the age of one hundred and three. A preaching engagement in his later years was described as follows: 'Having addressed his audience for full two hours by the glass, he paused and said, 'I will no longer trespass on your patience.' And now comes the marvel; for the whole congregation cried out with one consent 'For God's sake, go on!' "* (page 191)
- **Francis Dillingham :** *"was so studied in the original languages that he participated in public debates in Greek." (page 191)*
- **Thomas Harrison :** *Vice-Master of Trinity College in Cambridge. "On account of his exquisite skill in the Hebrew and Greek idioms, he was one of the chief examiners in the University of those who sought to be professors of these languages." (page 192)*
- **John Harding :** *"At the time of his appointment to aid in the translation of the Bible, he had been Royal Professor of Hebrew in the University for thirteen years." (page 192)*
- **John Reynolds :** *"Determined to explore the whole field and make himself master of the subject, he devoted himself to the study of the Scriptures in the original languages, and read all the Greek and Latin fathers, and all the ancient records of the Church." (page 193)*
- **Dr. Henry Saville :** *"was known for his Greek and mathematical learning. He was so well known for his education, skilled in languages and knowledge of the Word, that he became Greek and mathematical tutor to Queen Elizabeth during the reign of her father, Henry VIII." (page 195)*
- **Dr. Miles Smith :** *"the man responsible for the preface of the King James Bible. The preface is no longer printed in present copies of the Book. He had a knowledge of Greek and Latin fathers, as well as being an expert in Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. 'Hebrew he had at his finger's end.' And so was the Ethiopic tongue." (page 195)*

"It should be noted that these men were qualified in the readings of the church fathers which prevented them from being 'locked' to the manuscripts, causing earlier readings to be overlooked. This is vastly better than the methods used by modern translators. It should also be recognized that these men did not live in 'ivory towers.' They were men who were just as renowned for their preaching ability as they were for their esteemed education. It is a lesson in humility to see such men of great spiritual stature call themselves 'poor instruments to make God's Holy Truth to be yet more and more known.' "

William Grady backs up this evidence:

Quote: *"The men on the translation committee of the King James Bible were, without dispute, the most learned men of their day and vastly qualified for the job which they undertook. They were overall both **academically qualified** by their cumulative knowledge and **spiritually qualified** by their exemplary lives... William John Bois was only five years old, when his father taught him to read Hebrew. By the time he was six, he could not only write the same, but in a fair and elegant character. At age fifteen, he was already a student at St John's College, Cambridge, where he was renowned for corresponding with his superiors in Greek."*

Why the King James Version Should be Retained:

This is so important an issue that I will again quote from Edward F Hills' book **The King James Version Defended** pages 218-219

Quote: *"But, someone may reply, even if the King James Version needs only a few corrections, why take the trouble to make them? Why keep on with the old King James and its 17th century language, its thee and thou and all the rest? Granted the Textus Receptus is the best text but why not make a new translation of it in the language of today? In answer to these objections there are several facts which must be pointed out.*

***In the first place** , the English of the King James Version is not the English of the early 17th century. To be exact, it is not the type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. **It is biblical English**, which was not used on ordinary occasions even by the translators who produced the King James Version. As H Wheeler Robinson (1940) pointed out, one need only compare the preface written by the translators with the text of the their translation to feel the*

*difference in style. And the observations of W A Irwin (1952) are to the same support. The King James Version, he reminds us, owes its merit, not to 17th century English - which was very different - but to its faithful translation of the original. **Its style is that of the Hebrew and of the New Testament Greek.** Even in their use of **thee** and **thou** the translators were not following 17th century English usage but **biblical usage**, for at the time these translators were doing their work these singular forms had already been replaced by the plural **you** in polite conversation.*

***In the second place**, those who talk about translating the Bible into the **language of today** never define what they mean by their expression. What is the language of today? The language of 1881 is not the language of today, nor the language of 1901, nor even the language of 1921. In none of these languages, we are told, can we communicate with today's youth. There are even some who feel that the best way to translate the Bible into the language of today is to convert it into folk songs. Accordingly, in some contemporary youth conferences and even worship services there is little or no Bible reading but only crude kinds of vocal music accompanied by vigorous piano and strumming guitars. But in contrast to these absurdities the language of the King James Version is enduring diction which will remain as long as the English language remains, in other words, throughout the foreseeable future.*

***In the third place**, the current attack on the King James Version and the promotion of modern-speech versions is discouraging the memorization of the Scriptures, especially by children. Why memorize or require your children to memorize something that is out of date and about to be replaced by something new and better? And why memorize a modern version when there are so many to choose from? Hence even in conservative churches children are growing up densely ignorant of the holy Bible because they are not encouraged to hide its life-giving words in their hearts.*

***In the fourth place**, modern-speech Bibles are unhistorical and irreverent. The Bible is not a modern, human book. It is not as new as the morning newspaper, and no translation should suggest this. If the Bible were this new, it would not be the Bible. On the contrary, the Bible is an ancient, divine Book, which nevertheless is always new because in it God reveals Himself. Hence the language of the Bible should be **venerable** as well as **intelligible**, and the*

King James Version fulfils these two requirements better than any other Bible in English. Hence it is the King James Version which converts sinners soundly and makes of them diligent Bible students.

*In the fifth place, modern-speech Bibles are unscholarly. The language of the Bible has always savoured of the things of heaven rather than the things of earth. It has always been **biblical** rather than **contemporary** and **colloquial**. Fifty years ago this fact was denied by E J Goodspeed and others who were publishing their modern versions. On the basis of the papyrus discoveries which had recently been made in Egypt it was said that the New Testament authors wrote in the everyday Greek of their own times. This claim, however, is now acknowledged to have been an exaggeration. As R M Grant (1963) admits, the New Testament writers were saturated with the Septuagint and most of them were familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures. Hence their language was not actually that of the secular papyri of Egypt but **biblical**. Hence New Testament versions must be **biblical** and not contemporary and colloquial like Goodspeed's version.*

*Finally in the sixth place , the King James Version is the historic Bible of English-speaking Protestants. Upon it God, working providentially, has placed the stamp of His approval through the usage of many generations of Bible-believing Christians. **Hence, if we believe in God's providential preservation of the Scriptures, we will retain the King James Version, for in doing so we will be following the clear leading of the Almighty.**"*

Most, if not all, modern translations are based on the **Revised Version** (1881-5) which, as we have already learned, was influenced throughout by the Alexandrian manuscripts **Sinaiticus** and **Vaticanus**. In effect there really are only **Two English language Bibles** to choose from.

- **The King James Version:** which is based on the Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Majority Greek Text.
- **The Revised Version:** which is based on the Minority Text. This version has spawned a whole generation of inaccurate translations: which, like their unholy mother the RV, all rely heavily on the Minority Text.

I list a few of the **100+ modern Bibles** which followed in the trail of the Revised Version of 1881-5:

- The American Standard Version (1901)
- The Moffatt Bible (1935)
- The Revised Standard Version (1952)
- The Amplified Bible (1958-64)
- The Jerusalem Bible (1966)
- The New International Version (1966)
- The New English Bible (1970)
- The New American Bible (1970)
- J B Phillips' New Testament (1972)
- New American Standard Version (1971)
- Good News Bible (1976 and 1994)
- The New International Version (1978)
- New Jerusalem Bible (1985)
- The New King James Version (1984)

As **Samuel Gipp** so succinctly puts it:

Quote: *"All modern translations, such as the New American Standard Version, are linked to the Revised Version of 1952, which is a revision of the American Standard Version, an American creation growing from the English Revised Version of 1881."*

The Revised Version Committee

It is true that many of the Revised Version's (RV) committee members were godly scholars: but they cannot be compared with the King James Version's committee when it comes to **extreme reverence for the Word of God**. W Scott, writing over 100 years ago, makes this enlightening comment concerning the RV committee.

Quote: *"The movement for a revision of the authorised version of the Holy Scriptures commenced on May 6, 1870, in the Convocation of Canterbury. An influential committee was at once formed, consisting mainly of distinguished scholars and divines within the pale of the Established Church, but with power to consult or add to their number eminent Biblical scholars of all denominations. Many of its members were truly eminent for godliness and of distinguished ability, but it may be gravely questioned whether the constitution of the Committee as a whole may be compared with that nominated by King James, for piety and extreme reverence for the Word of God."*

Sad to say the revision committee when faced with a choice between **Textus Receptus** and the corrupt **Sinaiticus** and **Vaticanus**, usually chose the Egyptian manuscripts. To be sure the Egyptian codices, written on vellum, were in far better **physical condition** than the papyrus or parchment MSS. But beauty, as pointed out earlier, is no indication of character. In **Part Two** we will examine some 80+ texts which have been seriously corrupted by these Egyptian codices. Two of the revision committee's most prominent translators were:

- **Brooke Foss Westcott**
- **Fenton John Anthony Hort**

Brooke Foss Westcott

Westcott was a Cambridge scholar who played a leading role in the production of the Revised Version. A very brief look at this man's spiritual standing is sufficient to tell us that the Almighty would never have used him in the **preservation** of His Word. Before anyone blindly accepts **Westcott's** decisions, he/she should consider what this man believed. The following statements by Westcott, (from the book **Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott**) are quoted in William Grady's book **Final Authority**:

- *"I never read of the account of a miracle but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability, and discover some want of evidence in the account of it." (page 216)*
- *"Oh the weakness of my faith compared with that of others! So wild, so sceptical am I. I cannot yield." (page 217)*
- *"O Marie , (his wife's name) as I wrote the last word, I could not help asking what am I? Can I claim to be a believer?" (page 217)*
- *"It seems as if I am inclined to learn nothing; I must find out all myself, and then I am satisfied, but that simple faith and obedience which so many enjoy, I fear will never be mine." (page 217)*
- *"What a wild storm of unbelief seems to have seized my whole system." (page 217)*
- *"If you make a decided conviction of the **absolute infallibility of the N.T.** practically a sine qua non for co-operation, **I fear I could not join you**, even if you were willing to forget your fears about the origin of the Gospels." (page 230)*

Rev. Gipp has this to say about Westcott:

Quote: *"We have in Brooke Foss Westcott a man who believed in communal living; a man who believed that the second coming of Christ was spiritual, heaven was a state of the mind, prayers for the dead were permissible in private devotions, and that Christ came to bring peace through international disarmament. He believed in purgatory and admiration for Mary, and he thought the Bible was like any other book.*

This is the man who walked into the Revision Committee and sat in judgement of our Bible. He thought he saw room for improvement in the Authorized Version and offered a pro-Roman Greek text with which to correct it.

The ironic thing is that Bible-believing Christians, educators and preachers, who would never agree with his theology, have for years exalted his opinion of the Greek as nearly infallible. These facts alone should be reason enough to condemn Westcott and Hort, their Greek Text and the MSS which they used to arrive at such a text. But let us look at their actions concerning the molesting of the pure words of the King James Bible, in favour of Rome. Saddest of all, we have in Brooke Foss Westcott a man who neither believed in salvation by grace nor ever experienced it. There is no record in his 'Life and Letters' that he ever accepted Christ as his personal Saviour."

We can see from these quotations that **Brooke Foss Westcott wasn't really a believer in the Almighty or in His inspired Scriptures.** By his own admission he was a **sceptic** who doubted the infallibility of the New Testament and the miracles of Jesus. He was unable to give up the scepticism and unbelief that stormed his mind. He totally rejected the infallibility of Scripture and confessed that simple faith would never be his. These are warning signals! You ignore them at your peril!

Fenton John Anthony Hort

Hort was another leading translator of the Revised Version. Most of the other committee members were unfamiliar with the methods of textual criticism and dynamic equivalence which Westcott and Hort introduced to get their way. Besides, and this is a fact we all do well to remember, Westcott and Hort were **theistic evolutionists**. To them the Genesis account of creation was absolutely unacceptable. Darwin's book on the **Origin of the Species** was more to their liking.

David Fuller writes:

Quote: *"Textual criticism cannot be divorced entirely from theology. No matter how great a Greek scholar a man may be, or no matter how great an authority on the textual evidence, his conclusions must always be open to suspicion if he does not accept the Bible as the very Word of God."*

A quick look at what Hort wrote will leave one in no doubt but that he disbelieved the most basic Bible doctrine, that the **universe was created by God in six literal days**. He was also an ardent admirer of the Roman Church. Indeed only recently (October 1996) **Pope John Paul 11** declared that *"Today new discoveries lead one to acknowledge in the theory of evolution more than a hypothesis... The convergence, of results of work done independently one from the other, constitutes a significant argument in favour of this theory."* However, he added, *"The soul was created directly by God."* You may be sure that very soon the entire Roman Catholic Church will be following the Pope's lead in rejecting the Biblical account of the creation.

Hort believed in the evolutionary theory over a century ago. Here are a few statements of his from the *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort* taken from page 223 of the book **Which Bible?**

- *"Have you read Darwin? How I should like to talk with you (Westcott) about it! In spite of difficulties, I am inclined to think it unanswerable. In any case it is a treat to read such a book."*
- *"But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with. I must work out and examine the argument more in detail, but at present my feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable."*
- Dr Frederick Maurice was an avowed heretic who instilled in Hort a love for the homosexual Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle. Hort writes of Maurice as follows: *"He urged me to give the greatest attention to the Plato and Aristotle, and to make them the central points of my reading."*
- *"...Anglicanism, though by no means without a sound standing, seems a poor and maimed thing beside great Rome."*

In his book **Defending the King James Bible** Rev.D.A. Waite, Th.D, Ph.D writes on page 41 as follows:

Quote: *"The Westcott and Hort Text changes the Textus Receptus in over 5,600 places...My own personal count, as at August 2, 1984, using the Scrivener's GREEK NEW TESTAMENT referred to above, was 5,604 changes that Westcott and Hort made to the Textus Receptus in their own Greek New Testament text. Of these, 5604 alterations, I found 1,952 omissions (35%), 467 to be additions (8%), and 3185 to be changes (57%). In these 5604 places that were involved in these alterations, there were 4,366 more words included, making a total of 9970 Greek words that were involved. This means that in a Greek Text of 647 pages (such as Scrivener's text) this would average 15.4 words per page that were changed from the Received Text."*

Dr Henry M Morris, a founding father of the **Institute for Creation Research, USA**, made these telling comments concerning modern translators.

Quote: *"As far as the Hebrew text developed by **Rudolph Kittel** is concerned, it is worth noting that Kittel was a German **rationalist higher critic, rejecting Biblical inerrancy and firmly devoted to evolutionism**. The men most responsible for alterations in the New Testament text were B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, whose Greek New Testament was largely updated by Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland. **All these men were evolutionists**. Furthermore, Westcott and Hort denied Biblical inerrancy and promoted spiritism and racism. Nestle and Aland, like Kittel, were German theological **sceptics**.*

Westcott and Hort were also the most influential members of the English revision committee which produced the English Revised Version of the Bible. The corresponding American revision committee which developed the American Standard Version of 1901 was headed by another liberal evolutionist, Philip Schaff. Most new versions since that time have adopted the same presuppositions as those of the 19th century revisers...

*So one of the serious problems with most modern English translations is that they rely heavily on Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Bible developed by **liberals, rationalists and evolutionists, none of whom believed in the verbal inspiration of the Bible**. Is this how God would preserve His word? Would he not more likely have used devout scholars who believed in the absolute*

inerrancy and authority of the Bible?...

I believe therefore, after studying the, teaching and loving the Bible for over 55 years, that Christians - especially creationists - need to hang on to their old King James Bibles as long as they live. God has uniquely blessed its use in the great revivals, in the world-wide missionary movement and in the personal lives of believers, more so than He has with all the rest of the versions put together, and 'by their fruits ye shall know them' (Matthew 7:20). It is the most beautiful, most powerful and (I strongly believe), the most reliable of any that we have or ever will have, until Christ returns.

"

The Revised Standard Version Committee:

Few Protestants know that the Revised Standard Version (RSV) committee had Roman Catholic members on it: or that the RSV is the preferred choice of the Roman Church. I quote from the preface of this Bible:

Quote: *"The Revised Standard Version Bible committee is a continuing body, holding its meetings at regular intervals. It has become both ecumenical and international, with Protestant and Catholic active members who come from Great Britain, Canada and the United States."*

Since most of the citations in the 1994 *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, the first update of this catechism in some 400 years, are from the RSV, we can safely say that this translation has virtually become the official version of the Roman Church. In effect, the aim of the translators is **ecumenical**. They want all the churches, yea all religions, to unite under one supreme authority - the **Pope!** Several on the RSV committee regard the Scriptures as being on an **equal footing as church TRADITION:** for this is - and always has been - the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. The RSV committee, in other words, is vastly different from the Protestant committee which produced the King James Version. They are as different as chalk is from cheese. A brief look at some of the members of the RSV committee is startling to say the least. The following quotes are taken from Rev. Gipp's book **An Understandable History of the Bible:**

- *"Edgar Goodspeed was on the Revised Standard committee. Goodspeed did not believe in the deity of Jesus Christ. He looked at Jesus as a social reformer who gave his life as a martyr for a*

'cause...' Goodspeed called Genesis the product of an 'Oriental story teller at his best.' " (page 197-198)

- **"Julius Brewer**, another reviser, stated, 'The dates and figures found in the first five books of the Bible turn out to be altogether unreliable.' " (page 199)
- **"Henry Cadbury**, another member of the Revised committee, believed that Jesus Christ was a just man who was subject to story telling. 'He was given to overstatements, in his case, not a personal idiosyncrasy, but a characteristic of the Oriental world.' " (page 199)
- **"Walter Bowie** was another revisor who believed that the Old Testament was legend instead of fact. He says in reference to Abraham, 'The story of Abraham comes down from ancient times; and how much of it is fact and how much of it is legend, no one can positively tell.' " (page 199)
- **"Clarence Craig** was one of the revisers who denied the bodily resurrection of Christ. 'It is to be remembered there were no eye witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus. No canonical gospel presumed to describe Jesus emerging from the tomb. The mere fact that a tomb was found empty was capable of many explanations. The very last one that would be credible to a modern man would be the explanation of a physical resurrection of the body.' " (page 200)
- **"William Sperry** shows his dislike for the gospel of John in the following statement. 'Some of these sayings, it is true, come from the Fourth Gospel (John), and we do not press that gospel for too great verbal accuracy in its record of the sayings of Jesus.' " (page 201)
- **"William Irwin** believed that the Jewish prophets inflated the position of God in the Bible. 'The prophets were forced by the disasters that befell to do some hard, painful thinking. They were forced by the history of their own times to revise their messages again and again in order to keep up with the progress of the age. The Assyrians and the Babylonians forced them to revise their conception of Yahweh from time to time until they finally made Him God of the universe.' " (page 201)
- **"Fleming James** doubted the miracle of the Red Sea crossing. 'What really happened at the Red Sea WE CAN NO LONGER KNOW; but scholars are pretty well agreed that the narrative goes back to some striking and pretentious event which impressed Moses and the people with the belief that Yahweh had intervened to save them. The same may be said of the account of the plagues.' Concerning Elijah's action in 2 Kings 1:10, he said, 'The narrative of calling down fire from heaven upon soldiers sent to arrest him is plainly legendary.' " (page 201-202)

Some Christians flatly refuse to take account of these facts. They contemptuously brush them aside as false or irrelevant. But these are facts which can be proved and should not be ignored. They are well documented statements and they are vital. In them we can see, and that very clearly, that the leading and most influential members of the Revision committee were **confessed unbelievers**.

- They did not believe in the very fundamentals of the Christian faith: the **creation** account in Genesis, the account of the **Exodus**, the **miracles** of the prophets, the **divinity of Jesus and his resurrection etc.**
- They selected hopelessly corrupt manuscripts which cast doubt on the time-honoured King James Version.
- They have conflicting religious beliefs: some are Protestants and others are Roman Catholics
- They have **one** aim - to unite all the churches.

How should **Protestants** who believe in the divine **inspiration** and **preservation** of Scripture evaluate this committee's work? I answer without hesitation: With grave suspicion!

JEHOVAH the Holy One of Israel, who initially gave us the Scriptures through His prophets and apostles of old, who carefully selected the King James Version translators on the basis of their **faith** and **linguistic ability** and has since blessed His Word for some 400 years, would certainly never, never change His methods and use translators who reject basic Bible doctrines such as the **creation account in Genesis**. Would the Almighty, who claims never to change (Malachi 3:6), now use **unbelievers** to re-translate the Bible? The very idea is preposterous, if not blasphemous. I am still aghast that it took me so long to learn these facts. I am even more astounded when Christians, who are given this information, continue to hold to their modern Bibles.

Dangerous Changes

Quote: *"Even the **jots** and **tittles** of the Bible are important. God has pronounced terrible woes upon the man who adds or takes away from the volume of inspiration. The Revisers apparently felt no constraint on this point, for they made 36,000 changes in the English of the King James Version, and very nearly 6,000 in the Greek Text. Dr Ellicott, in submitting the Revised Version to the Southern Convocation in 1881, declared that they had made between eight and nine changes in every five verses, and in about every ten verses three of these were made for critical purposes. And for most of these changes the Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts are responsible. As Canon Cook says: 'By far the greatest number of innovations, including those which give the severest shocks to our minds, are adopted on the authority of **two** manuscripts, or even on **one** manuscript, against the distinct testimony of all other manuscripts, uncial and cursive'...**The Vatican Codex ... sometimes alone, generally in accord with the Sinaitic, is responsible for nine-tenths of the most striking innovations in the Revised Version...***

*There is a case where a little means much. 'If one wonders whether it is worth while' says Dr Robertson, speaking of the Revision, 'he must bear in mind that some of the passages in dispute are of great importance.' The Bible should more probably be compared to a living organism. Touch a part and you spoil it all. **To cut a vital artery in a man might be touching a very small point, but death would come as truly as if he were blown to pieces.**"*

Every Word

Every word in Scripture is important: infinitely more important than a bolt or rivet in a jet airliner; or a line of code in a life-saving computer program. If His Father's words were that important to our Saviour, yea **every jot and tittle**, how much more should they be to us in these end times.

Matthew 4:4 *But he (Jesus) answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by **every word** that proceedeth out of the mouth of God..*

Matthew *For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, **one** 5:18 **jot or one tittle** shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*

Rev.22:18- *For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the*
19 *prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these*
things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written
in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words
of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part
out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the
things which are written in this book.

Yes, God's words are important - vitally important. A translator must, therefore, translate **God's words - all of them** - and not assume that he understands the Almighty's thoughts and can change or delete the divine words to reflect what *he thinks* God meant. The King James Version translators employed a '**word for word**' translation technique. That is, they translated each Hebrew and Greek word as closely as possible into its English equivalent. Modern translators chose a vastly different method called '**dynamic equivalence.**' using this method the translator primarily endeavours to carry forward '**God's thoughts and intentions**' without paying too much attention to His actual words. Using '**dynamic equivalence**' in hundreds yea thousands of places, the modern translators have changed the very '**words of God**' and replaced them with what, *they think*, **God meant.** In effect, **dynamic equivalence is not true translation, but interpretation or paraphrase.**

Writing in his highly recommended book **Defending the King James Bible**, Rev. D.A.Waite writes on page 105: "*A paraphrase makes no effort to carry over or translate the **words** of one language into the **words** of another language but rather to '**re-state, interpret or translate with latitude.**' Since this is the object of a paraphrase there's no assurance of fidelity in carrying-over exactly what is there in one language - no more and no less - into the other language, no more and no less. Therefore, **paraphrase takes great liberty** in doing any of these three things or all of them: **ADDING** words, phrases, ideas, thoughts or meanings; **SUBTRACTING** words, phrases, ideas, thoughts or meanings; or **CHANGING** words, phrases, ideas, thoughts or meanings. That is the essence of paraphrase, **that is the essence of dynamic equivalence. So it is commentary, it is interpretation, it is not translation.**"*

SPIRITUAL POLLUTION

We have seen that Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are corrupt and unholy manuscripts; that they were the work of unbelieving Egyptian scribes who amended, added to and deleted many portions of the true text

and then palmed off their work as the **Word of God**. These manuscripts were then taken up by **sceptical translators**, who didn't believe that the Bible is the **inspired Word of God**, to spawn a whole generation of new translations.

With these sobering facts in mind let us now consider a Biblical principle of which comparatively few Christians know anything. It concerns ***SPIRITUAL POLLUTION, of how something unholy can pollute everything it touches***. This little-known principle is described in the following passage:

Haggai *Thus saith the LORD of hosts; Ask now the priests concerning 2:11 the law, saying,*
12 If one bear holy flesh in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any meat, shall it be holy? And the priests answered and said, No.
13 Then said Haggai, If one that is unclean by a dead body touch any of these, shall it be unclean? And the priests answered and said, It shall be unclean.

What does this symbolic drama, involving dedicated meat, bread and wine becoming unclean if touched by an unclean person, mean? What spiritual truth is the Almighty trying to put across in this passage? The answer, I believe, is as follows:

At its **basic physical level** it means that if an ancient Israelite believer, whilst carrying his consecrated tithes (flesh, bread, wine or oil) to the Temple, happened to come in contact with an unclean person (a leper or corpse for example) his offering would lose its holiness and would become unacceptable to God. It's like pure meat being infected with a disease virus: or like a cup of tea being polluted by a fly: or a computer hard disk being infected by a virus-laden floppy. In other words: **unclean and unholy people or things pollute whatever they touch**.

At its **higher spiritual level** it means that any sacred offering (prayer, charitable gift or act of worship) becomes unacceptable to God if the **unholy element of unbelief motivates it**.

Does this spiritual principle, that diseased things pollute everything they touch, apply to Bible translations? I'm certain it does. **The Bible is the Bread of Life, the strong spiritual meat for the soul**. It can also become spiritually unholy, unclean and unacceptable to God if its words are infected

by the unbelief of a scribe or translator or twisted out of context by the leprous spirit of Satan. That is exactly what happened to the holy manuscripts which were carried down to Egypt.

- **First: the holy texts were corrupted by unbelieving scribes who did not recognise their divine origin** . As far as they were concerned the Scriptures were merely the writings of a religious group called Christians based initially in Jerusalem and Antioch. Thus, in the process of copying, Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were **corrupted** in hundreds of places with deletions, additions and alterations, till they themselves became unholy, unclean and unacceptable to God.
- **Second: we see many unbelieving translators daring to use those corrupt codices to translate the Word of God:** men who rejected the fact that **every word of Scripture** is God-breathed and, therefore, absolutely true. Always bear in mind that **these men were professed unbelievers and evolutionists.**

And so the high-level spiritual lesson of Haggai 2:11-13 has become a living reality in these last days. **First:** the sacred texts were corrupted by unbelieving Egyptian copyists and **Second:** unbelieving modern translators used those corrupt manuscripts to complete their work. The end product was a deluge of unholy modern Bible versions. That is why we should never refer to modern translations as "**Holy Bibles**" because they are far from holy: and most certainly the **Spirit of the Holy One of Israel** was not involved in their production. **They are unholy counterfeits posing as the Word of God!** We ignore those two facts at our peril. Indeed, these are the two main reasons why I have set aside all modern English translations of the Bible and have returned to the **King James Version.**

FAMINE OF THE WORD OF GOD

Bible prophecy never ceases to amaze me. I used to wonder how come the Bible predicted a famine in the last days for the **Words of the Lord**, when there are still millions of "**Bibles**" being printed every year. Are not Christian shops, churches and homes bursting with Bible translations and paraphrases to suite every taste? What does this prophecy mean?

Amos *Behold, the days come, saith the Lord GOD, that I will send a 8:11 famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the LORD .*

I wonder no longer, because now I know that the predicted famine of the **Word of God** has already begun. The **Real Bible** is fast disappearing from Christian churches and homes. To be sure there are scores of modern translations available: but the **Real Word of God**, the **King James Bible**, is comparatively hard to find and seldom used. Soon it will be as scarce as is bread during a literal famine.

A Solemn Warning

In the closing chapter of his book **The King James Version Defended**, Edward F Hills pens this solemn warning. We all do well to take heed.

Quote: *"In regard to Bible versions many contemporary Christians are behaving like spoiled and rebellious children. They want a Bible version that pleases them no matter whether it pleases God or not. 'We want a Bible version in our own idiom,' they clamor. 'We want a Bible that talks to us in the same way in which we talk to our friends over the telephone. We want an informal God, no better educated than ourselves, with a limited vocabulary and a taste for modern slang.' And having thus registered their preference, they go their several ways. Some of them unite with the modernists in using the **R.S.V.** or **N.E.B.** Others deem the **N.A.S.V.** or the **N.I.V.** more evangelical. Still others opt for the **T.E.V.** or the **Living Bible**.*

*But God is bigger than you are dear friend, and the Bible version which you must use is not a matter for you to decide according to your whims and prejudices. It has already been decided for you by the workings of God's special providence. If you ignore this providence and choose to adopt one of the modern versions, you will be taking the first step in the logic of unbelief. For the arguments which you must use to justify your choice are the same arguments which unbelievers use to justify theirs, the same method. If you adopt one of these modern versions, you must adopt the naturalistic New Testament textual criticism upon which it rests. In other words, naturalistic textual criticism regards the special, **providential preservation** of the Scriptures as of no importance for the study of the New Testament text. But if we concede this, then it follows that the **infallible inspiration** of the Scriptures is likewise unimportant. For why is it important that God should **infallibly inspire** the Scriptures, if it is not important that He should **preserve them by His special providence?***

Where, oh where, dear brother or sister, did you ever get the idea

*that it is up to you to decide which Bible version you will receive as God's holy Word? As long as you harbour this false notion, you are little better than an unbeliever. As long as you cherish this erroneous opinion, you are entirely on your own. For you the Bible has no authority, only that which your rebellious reason deigns to give it. For you there is no comfort, no assurance of faith. Cast off, therefore, this carnal mind that leads to death! Put on the spiritual mind that leads to life and peace! Receive by faith the true Text of God's Holy Word, which has been **preserved** down through the ages by His special providence and now is found in the **Masoretic Hebrew text, the Greek Textus Receptus, and the King James Version and other faithful translations.**"*

Concerning the peculiar, yea dangerous, mind-set of the Westcott and Hort followers both past and present, **Dean Burgon** wrote:

Quote: "*Phantoms of the imagination [That's where they begin.] henceforth usurp the place of substantial forms. Interminable doubts, - wretched misbelief, - childish credulity, -judicial blindness, - are the inevitable sequel and penalty. The mind that has long allowed itself in a systematic trifling with Evidence, is observed to fall the easiest prey to Imposture. It has doubted what is demonstrably true: has rejected what is indubitably Divine. Henceforth, it is observed to mistake its own fantastic creations for historical facts; to believe things which rest on insufficient evidence, or on no evidence at all.*"

Martyrs for the Word of God

Multiplied millions of true believers in ages past have died for the **Word of God**. Publishing the Bible was a major crime. To possess a Bible, or even portions of one, placed a Christian in a very dangerous position. During the dark ages the situation was immeasurably worse. One has only to study the history of the **Waldensian Church** to see how dangerous it was for true believers to possess the Scriptures. Multitudes perished by sword, famine, beatings, burning, hangings and torture. Many were slain with Bibles tied around their necks. One of the greatest Christian classics on this subject is **Fox's Book of Martyrs**: a book which in ancient days was chained - alongside the Bible - to the reading desks in many British churches. Make time to study this book. It tells of martyrs who died in their tens of thousands - yea millions - all because they lived and loved the teachings of the **Real Word of God**. Here is a quote from page 179 of this masterpiece

concerning **William Tyndale**, the first man to translate the Bible into English from the original languages:

Quote: "...Tyndale thought with himself no way more to conduce thereunto, than if the Scripture were turned into the vulgar speech, that the poor people might read and see the simple plain Word of God. He perceived that it was not possible to establish the lay people in any truth, except the Scriptures were so plainly laid before their eyes in their mother tongue that they might see the meaning of the text; for else, whatsoever truth should be taught them, **the enemies of the truth would quench it, either with reasons of sophistry, and traditions of their own making, founded without all ground of Scripture; or else juggling with the text, expounding it in such a sense as it were impossible to gather of the text, if the right meaning thereof were seen.**"

In the book of Revelation we read that the Apostle John was banished to the island of Patmos for the **Word of God!**

Reb.1:9 *I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the **WORD OF GOD**, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ.*

The prophecy of the Revelation goes on to tell of a great company of believers who would live and die for the **WORD OF GOD!** a martyrdom which is to be repeated in these last days. I will not exhaust the reader with frightening details: but this is what the prophecy says. Note carefully that these martyrs and their **end-time** kinsman were - and still are to be - slain for the **WORD OF GOD!** The main themes of the Word of God are the **Son of God** (Yeshua the Messiah) and the **Law of God** (the Torah). These martyrs, past and future, are slain because they loved the living and written **Word of God** and kept the commandments recorded in it.

- Revelation 6: 9: *And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar **the souls of them that were slain FOR THE WORD OF GOD**, and for the testimony which they held: 10: And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? 11: And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, **until their fellow servants also and their brethren, that should be killed AS THEY WERE, should be fulfilled.***

- Revelation 12: 17: *And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, **which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.***
- Revelation 22: 14: *Blessed are they that **do his commandments**, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.*

A Basic Bible Study

" The textual critic J. Harold Greenlee has said, 'New Testament textual criticism is, therefore, the basic Bible study, a prerequisite to all other Biblical and theological work.'

Quote: *This is not an overstatement of the importance of this issue. As believers we have the responsibility in our day and age of proclaiming the Gospel, the pure Gospel, the undiluted Gospel. We also have the right and privilege of being the next in the line of protecting God's Word and proclaiming it. Each individual Christian will make a decision on this matter, of which text is correct. Unmistakably, this decision will be made, consciously or unconsciously, by every single believer.*

This decision is made when the believer decides which edition of the Bible he will use to read and study; and if he chooses a translation based upon corrupted manuscripts which reflect views which omit the deity of Christ, His blood atonement, His virgin birth, then the decision has been made to extend this error to the next generation.

If, however, today's Christian chooses a translation of the Word of God which is translated from the Traditional Text of the New Testament, the decision has been made to continue to see God's working through His providence in providing His Word in its complete form, not only for this generation but for those to come."

New Testament textual criticism is, therefore, the BASIC BIBLE STUDY, a prerequisite to all other Biblical and theological work.

If you stop to think about it, you will see how true this is: that before we even begin to study any book claiming to be '**The Holy Bible**' we should

check to see if that really is the case. I must confess that, like multiplied millions of other Christians, I just didn't do that. I blindly accepted every modern translation as the **Word of God**; some better or worse than others: but all equally holy. How wrong I was! How terribly wrong! But I thank the Almighty that He mercifully pardoned my ignorance, allowed me to live through a massive heart attack and then opened my eyes to the error of my ways - before it was too late! I could so easily have died on the operating table. God knows the surgeon warned me of that possibility. But **JEHOVAH** answered my prayer and allowed me to live and even to place this article on the **Internet**. Praise His holy name!

1. Two great deceptions have now overtaken mankind. The first is the unproved **Theory of Evolution** and the second is the **Counterfeit Evolving Bibles** that are currently flooding the market. Both cast doubt on the accuracy of the **Real Word of God, the King James Bible**. Unbelievers and believers alike are in grave danger of being taken in by one or the other of these deceptions. But the Almighty is faithful. He who **inspired the Bible** in the first place is well able to **preserve His Word**. Indeed He has preserved it down through the ages as promised: **The Word of the Lord abideth forever!**
2. The original inspired autographs (Masters) which were penned by the **prophets** and **apostles** of old, have long since disappeared. They literally fell apart through constant use and are no more. There are none in existence today.
3. Before the Old Testament Masters were buried, they were **copied by faithful scribes**. The Old Testament scribes were the **Aaronic priests** and later the **Masorites**. They took the utmost care to insure that every copy was as perfect as humanly possible: and even a single error was enough to have an entire manuscript rejected.
4. Sad to say the New Testament copyists were not nearly as meticulous as their Old Testament counterparts. Nevertheless this deficiency was amply compensated by the vast number of copies made: many thousands of which are still in existence. So the truth can easily be detected in the **majority of texts**.
5. There are currently in excess of **5250** Greek manuscripts in existence. They are held in various museums and libraries of the world.
6. If we add the **1800+ copies of the versions** and the **86,000 scriptural citations of the Church Fathers**, we have a sizeable body of documentary evidence to prove the accuracy of the Scriptures. These ensure that small errors are soon detected. Bear in mind that the Almighty promised to **preserve His Word forever!** He is doing just that and is fulfilling His promise which says: *the*

Word of the Lord abideth forever!

7. A version is a translation made directly from the original **masters**: not to be confused with a **translation**, or a translation of a translation. There are many foreign language versions of the Scriptures. To name a few: the Peshitta, Old Latin Vulgate, Italic, Gothic, Old Syriac, Armenian, Waldensian, Luther's German Bible and the Authorised King James Version.
8. **Textus Receptus** (the Received Text), also known as the **Byzantine Text** or **Majority Text**, is the most reliable Greek text in existence. It is based on the **vast majority** of extant Greek manuscripts. That is why it is often called the Majority Text. **Textus Receptus** does not add to, omit or mutilate the Scriptures as does the Minority Text. All the versions mentioned at point 13.7 are in line with Textus Receptus. **Because of its purity, the Majority Text was used by all the 15th, 16th and 17th century Protestant Reformers of Europe to make their translations.** Their choice of Textus Receptus attracted the wrath of the Roman Church and tens of thousands of true believers who studied and published the real Bible were martyred as a result.
9. **The Minority Text, by comparison, is dangerously corrupt!** The two most prominent codices in this group are Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus. These two manuscripts are beautiful to look at and are in excellent condition simply because they are written on vellum and were seldom used, even by their custodians. **But they are dangerously corrupt!** They are covered with hundreds of amendments made over a long period; amendments which prove that even their owners knew they were hopelessly inaccurate. They omit scores of words, verses and passages of Scripture. **They are totally unreliable** and for this reason were rejected by discerning believers down through the centuries. These two manuscripts outlasted the earliest papyrus copies of the Scriptures. But to suggest that they are accurate is absurd. Remember that early versions of the Scriptures, such as the Peshitta and Italic, are some 200 years older than these two codices. So the '**oldest is best**' argument doesn't apply here. **John Burgon** was a Greek scholar who personally examined these early codices and exposed their deficiencies in no uncertain terms. The Christian church would do well to read what Burgon has written. The **Misleading Footnotes** that appear in most modern translations **ALL** cast doubt on the accuracy of the King James Version. But these footnotes are themselves dangerously misleading.
10. **The Authorised King James Version is based on the Hebrew Masoretic Text and the Greek Textus Receptus.** It is a version in the true sense of the term, being based on the original languages. Its

style is biblical rather than contemporary. It is infinitely more accurate than any modern translation on the market today.

Remember that the translators of the King James Version were men of **faith, piety and learning**. They firmly believed that the text they were translating was the very **Word of God!** Their like has seldom - if ever - been equalled, let alone surpassed. The Almighty brought together this team of faithful, holy and capable linguists to produce the greatest classic in the annals of English literature - the **King James Bible**. It is the version that God has endorsed and blessed for well nigh 400 years. It should be kept. It is, in fact, the **Real Word of God - the HOLY BIBLE!**

11. By comparison Modern Versions of the Bible cannot be trusted. **They are dangerously corrupt!** Their renderings are influenced by the distorted codices **Sinaiticus** and **Vaticanus**, which were the product of **unbelieving scribes**. Moreover, many of the most prominent RV and RSV translators, Westcott and Hort in particular, were **professed unbelievers - evolutionists!** They rejected the creation account in Genesis, the Exodus story, the crossing of the Red sea account, the miracles of Elijah, the virgin birth, the miracles of Jesus, his resurrection and his promised second advent. Their colossal unbelief was only matched by that of the **unbelieving Egyptian scribes** who, in the first place, produced codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. These two facts: the **unbelief of the scribes** and the **unbelief of the modern translators** are warning signals! Heed them.
12. **SPIRITUAL INFECTION / FAMINE:** The RV committee's choice of corrupt manuscripts, and the unbelief of its most prominent members (Westcott and Hort), infected their work and has resulted in scores of **Unholy Bibles** flooding the market and the churches. I honestly believe that Christians who knowingly continue to study these **counterfeit Bibles** are condoning the errors they contain. By doing so they not only place themselves in grave moral danger, but also **encourage spiritual deception!** The Bible says: *Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!* (Isaiah 5:20)
13. The twin moral onslaught of the **theory of evolution** and the **counterfeit Bibles** have made havoc of billions of souls. Together they have resulted in **outright atheism** on the one hand and an **enfeebled Christianity** on the other. Be warned by these revelations! They are placed on the **Internet** to reach millions. Do not be slow to take the warning! Currently the world is in the grip of a mighty spiritual famine: a famine of the **REAL WORD OF GOD!**

History tells us that countless thousands of true believers in centuries past were martyred for their love and loyalty to the **WORD OF GOD**. Prophecy tells us that another end-time persecution is due to occur and for the selfsame reason - **the WORD OF GOD!** We all have a responsibility to ourselves and others to believe, study and live by the teachings found in the **REAL WORD OF GOD, THE AUTHORISED KING JAMES VERSION**. My sincere prayer is that "The Almighty will grant you the understanding, the humility, the courage and the power to escape the deceptions of the Devil and to stand up for the Truth!" Amen.

Some 80+ texts in **the King James Version** which have been corrupted in the **Revised Version** upon which most modern '*Bibles*' are based. You are now invited to check the particular translation you are using against these texts. To appreciate this exercise, carefully note the words printed in **bold text**. They will highlight the:

- **Missing words** in the modern translations.
- **Missing verses** in the modern translations.
- **[Bracketed verses or passages]** with
- **Misleading Notes which all cast doubt on the KJV.**
- **Critical Mistranslations.**

Following some of the texts below is a brief **Comment**. You should, however, also pause at texts which are not commented on and think about the effect of the error being pointed out.

THE PROOF

- Genesis 12:18 *And Pharaoh called Abram, and said, What is this that thou hast done unto me? why didst thou not tell me that she was thy wife? 19 Why saidst thou, She is my sister? so **I might have taken her to me to wife.***

Comment: Modern translations say: '*Why did you say she is my sister, so that **I took her to be my wife.***' This is a serious mistranslation. It implies that Pharaoh had sexual intercourse with Sarah and that the plagues that the Almighty had sent on Pharaoh's household to prevent just such an occurrence, had proved futile.

- Genesis 49: 10 *The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until **Shiloh** come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.*

Comment: The word Shiloh, referring to Christ the Peacemaker, is

missing.

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

Commenting on this amazing error, Jasper Ray writes: "*Here we have 'virgin' versus 'young woman.'* In the Septuagint, the Bible of the Greeks, the word 'almah' in Isaiah 7:14 is translated virgin, as in the King James. Almah is used seven times in the Old testament, and always means virgin. In the RSV the words 'or virgin' being added in the footnote, could easily lead one to believe the term 'young women' was inserted in the text for a subtle purpose, thus making it possible for the orthodox, virgin birth believers, and those who deny the virgin birth to come together. In this way the 'ground' is being prepared for the progress of the Ecumenical Movement (i.e. the plan to unite all religious systems into one great body)." (Ref: D4)

- Matthew 6:13 ... *And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: **For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever.***

Comment: This last part (**in bold type**) of the Lord's prayer is either [bracketed] as though the phrase should not be there, or the phrase is left out altogether, which is even worse. Remember the warning in Revelation 22:18-19.

- John 3:16 *For God so loved the world, that he gave his only **begotten** Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*

Comment: The word **begotten** is also omitted in the following texts: John 1:14, 1:18, 3:18.

- Matthew 17: 21: ***Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.***

Comment: [Whole verse missing]

- Matt. 18: 11: ***For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.***

Comment:[Whole verse missing]

- Mark 7:16: **If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.**

Comment: [Whole verse missing]

- Mark 15:28 ***And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.***

Comment: The whole verse is missing or bracketed, thereby casting doubt on the fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah 53:12 which tells of the Saviour's crucifixion with transgressors.

- Romans 16: 24: ***The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.***

Comment: [Whole verse missing]

- Acts 10:30 and 1 Corinthians 7:5.

Comment: the requirement to 'fast' is omitted. Hills comments further: *'These omissions are probably due to the influence of Clement of Alexandria and other Gnostics, who interpreted fasting in the spiritual sense and were opposed to literal fasting.* (page 138)

- **Mark 16:9-20. Comment:** These 12 verses are all omitted in many modern translations; or they are **[bracketed]** and noted that they are *'not included in the oldest and best manuscripts;'* or *'some ancient authorities bring the book to a close at the end of verse 8.'* The fact is, the very opposite is true. These 12 verses are all included in the oldest and best manuscripts: best that is, not in appearance, but in **telling the truth!** These 12 verses are also present in ancient Bible versions (the Old Latin Bible, the Waldensian Bible, the Sahidic and the Gothic versions) which are all older than codices **Sinaiticus** and **Vaticanus**. These 12 verses are quoted by the ancients such as: Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian and even by Jerome! So to say that they *'do not appear in the best manuscripts,'* or *'in the most reliable early manuscripts'* is untrue.

- Matthew 19:9 *And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and **whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.***

Comment: Pause awhile, dear reader, and try to imagine the effect this deletion has already had on the morals of our society. It has already opened the floodgates of adultery. See SBS articles on Adultery, Marriage and Divorce for more detail.

- Matthew 20: 16: *So the last shall be first, and the first last: **for many be called, but few chosen.***
- Matthew 27: 35: *And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: **that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.***

Comment: A powerful Messianic prophecy is here chopped to pieces. Fulfilled prophecy is the strongest evidence that the Bible is the Word of God. By failing to link this verse with Psalm 22:18 that link is broken.

- *Mark 1.14: Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel **of the kingdom** of God.*

Comment: The Saviour's main work in coming to earth was to preach the **gospel of the kingdom;** to invite mankind to enter the

Kingdom of God. His life, death, resurrection and second coming will climax when ransomed believers enter the Kingdom of God. By deleting the words '*of the Kingdom*' the whole objective of the Messiah's coming is missed.

- Mark 2: 17: *When Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.*

Comment: **Repentance** is not a popular word these days. It means being sorry for committing sin, for breaking God's law. Is repentance important? Certainly it is. Jesus said: '*I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.*' (Luke:13:3) *And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent.* (Acts 17:30) Failure to **repent** will lead to eternal death! Why was this important word omitted?

- Mark 6:11 And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. **Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrhah in the day of judgment, than for that city.**

Comment: Leaving out this reference to Sodom is obviously a very serious omission!

- Mark 9: 24: *And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, **Lord**, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.*

Comment: Most modern translations leave out the word **Lord**. Others, posing as translations read: **Sir**, I believe...

- Mark 9:44 and 46 ***Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.***

- Mark 11:10 *And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh **in the name of the Lord:***

- Mark 13: 14: *But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, **spoken of by Daniel the prophet**, standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in Judaea flee to the mountains.*

Comment: This vital pointer to the prophecy of Daniel is deleted. Comparatively few Christians know that Daniel wrote several end-time prophecies. The prophet Daniel is mentioned only twice in the New Testament: in this verse and in Matthew 24:15. Of these two pointers to Daniel the prophet, one has been deleted.

Comment: Whole verse is missing.

- Luke 2:33 *And **Joseph** and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.*

Comment: Note the subtle change in many translations of the name

Joseph to father. It reflects disbelief of the fact that the Father of our Saviour Jesus Christ is in fact **the Almighty God of Israel**, not Joseph.

- Luke 4:4 *And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, **but by every word of God.***
Comment: Another dangerous deletion which robs God's Word of its vital role in life. Also note the special reference to '*every word.*'
- Luke 4: 8: *And Jesus answered and said unto him, **Get thee behind me, Satan:** for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*
- Luke 23:38 *And a superscription also was written over him **in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.***
- Luke 23:42 *And he said unto Jesus, **Lord,** remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.*

The Messiah's Ascension to Heaven

Many translations (we can hardly call them versions for they are merely revisions of the Revised Version) reflect disbelief in the **resurrection and bodily ascension to heaven of Jesus Christ; or even that he came from heaven in the first place.** Consider the next few verses.

- Luke 24 :6 ***He is not here, but is risen:** remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee.*
- Luke 24:12 ***Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass.***
Comment: [Whole verse missing]
- Luke 24:51 *And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and **carried up into heaven.***
- John 3:13 *And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man **which is in heaven.***
- John 3:15. *"That whosoever believeth in him **should not perish, but have eternal life.**"*
Comment: Do you know what the "B" (Vaticanus) and "Aleph" (Sinaiticus) manuscripts do to the three words, "**should not perish**"? They omit them. Try finding those three vital words in the NASV.
- 1 Cor.15:47: *The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is **the Lord** from heaven.*
- John 16:16: *A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little*

while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.

- Acts 2: 30: *Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne.*

Comment: Here we have an extremely corrupt rendering in many modern translations. God swore an oath to king David that from his loins would come the **Christ the Anointed One - the Messiah!**

What have the modern translators done with this divine oath? They have changed it to '*God would seat (or place) one of his (David's) descendants on his throne.*' Pause dear reader and consider this error. I ask, why did God bother with an oath, when the likelihood of one of David's descendants sitting on his throne was inevitable? There was absolutely no need for an oath to a man who had so many sons. But to promise that one of David's sons would be **the resurrected Messiah** and would sit on David's throne is an entirely different matter. The divine oath has now become tremendously meaningful. But alas! the modern translators have made God's oath into something quite unnecessary by changing the word **Christ** to a *descendant*.

- John 4: 42: *And said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed **the Christ**, the Saviour of the world.*
- John 6: 47: *Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth **on me** hath everlasting life.*

Comment: Those two vital missing words '*on me*' have been left out of most modern translations. The corrupted text now implies that all who believe - whatever or whoever they believe - will have everlasting life. A greater falsehood is hard to imagine. Pause and think about it!

- John 7:8 *Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up **yet** unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come.*

Comment: By removing the word '**yet**' the NASV has turned Jesus into a liar: for in it he said *he was not going to the feast*, but went. Other modern translations [bracket] the word '**yet**' and add the note '*Some early manuscripts do not have 'yet.'*' This Note, by implication, means that, at best, the Saviour didn't know what he was doing, or, at worst, was telling a blatant lie.

- John 7:53-8:11 **All 12 verses are [bracketed]** and/or noted as '*not being in the best manuscripts.*'

Comment: Another untruth! These 12 verses are all in the best ancient versions; which are some 200 years older than codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.

- Acts 7:37 *This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel,*

*A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; **him shall ye hear.***

The Divinity of Jesus Christ

- Acts 8: 37: *And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, **I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.***

Comment: It is virtually impossible to attribute the omission of this vital statement to anything else than disbelief in the fact that **Jesus Christ is the Son of God**. The divinity of Jesus is a foundation doctrine of the Christian Church. To attack this doctrine is heresy of the most serious order. Every modern translation that omits this vital fact (that **Jesus is the Son of God** or brackets this confession), regardless of its other merits, is unworthy of study. It should be set aside by all seekers of Truth.

- 1 Tim.3:16 ... **God** was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

Comment: Modern translations have here substituted the word **God** with **he**: thereby undermining the greatest truth in all the Bible: that the Almighty God actually came down to earth in the person of **Jesus Christ**.

Yes, Jesus Christ is God in a human body, God incarnate, God manifest in the flesh! This is the foundation truth of the Christian faith that God actually came down to earth in the person of Jesus Christ. But alas! the modern translators have either left the word **God** out or changed the word to **he**; all because they did not really believe that Jesus Christ is God manifest in human flesh. Pause dear reader and consider that enormous error. That single mistranslation should be enough to set aside any book posing as the Word of God.

- Romans 14:10: ...*for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ..*

Comment: Here again the disbelief of the modern translators that Christ is the One before whom all the world will stand at the Judgement. They have replaced Christ with God.

- John 9: 35: *Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe on the **Son of God?***

Comment: Many translations have changed this to read: Dost thou believe in the Son of Man? Once again, this is evidence of doubt that **Jesus is the Son of God!**

- Acts 16: 31: *And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus **Christ**, and*

thou shalt be saved, and thy house.

- Acts 17: 26: *And hath made of one **blood** all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation..*
Comment: Most modern translations have either omitted the word '**blood**' or replaced it with the word '**man**.' I ask you, how is it possible for any translator to confuse the word **blood** with **man**? Any translator who confuses these two words has obviously opted for a corrupt manuscript. He may not have known it, but that act has made his work totally unacceptable to God. In the **Good News for Modern Man Bible** the word '**blood**' is omitted 15 times. (Matthew 27:4, 27:25, 27:25, Acts 5:28, Acts 20:28, Romans 3:25, Romans 5:9, Ephesians 1:7, Ephesians 2:13, Colossians 1:14, Colossians 1:20, Hebrews 10:19, 1 Peter 1:9, Revelation 1:5, Revelation 5:9). Bear in mind that it is the **blood of Jesus** that makes atonement for our souls. (Leviticus 17:11)
- Acts 20: 25: *And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching **the kingdom of God**, shall see my face no more.*
- Acts 23: 9: *And there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the Pharisees' part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, **let us not fight against God.***
- Romans 9: 28: *For he will finish the work, and cut it short **in righteousness**: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth.*
- Romans 13: 9: *For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, **Thou shalt not bear false witness**, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.*
Comment: Of the four commandments Jesus quoted, one has been left out.
- 1 Cor.7: 39: *The wife is bound **by the law** as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.*
Comment: The law of the Almighty has always been under attack, even within the church. This is another example where God's law is ignored.
- 1 Cor.10: 28: *But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake: **for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.***
- 1 Cor.11:24: *And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said,*

Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.

Comment: The new covenant Passover (communion) service is one of the most sacred in all the year: where the **bread** and the **wine** represent the body and blood of Jesus Christ - **Yeshua the Messiah**. Pause awhile dear reader and try to consider the danger this omission (**take, eat**) represents.

Missing Name or Titles

Many texts in the modern translations omit the Saviour's name (**Jesus**) or **Christ**, which means the **Anointed One - the Messiah**. Is it important? Very important; because by omitting such information the specific person being referred to and his mission are not identified. Scores of men in the Saviour's day were called **Jesus**. It was a common name. By omitting the word '**Christ**' the one specific Jesus being referred to - the **Messiah** - is missed. By omitting the word '**Lord**' his title is ignored. Here are a few examples of where such specific details are missing:

- Romans 1:16: *For I am not ashamed of the gospel of **Christ**: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.*
Comment: The title Christ (the Anointed One, the Messiah) is here missing in most modern translations. The word gospel, as most believers know, means 'good news.' And who can possibly be ashamed of bringing good news to anyone? But being '*ashamed of the gospel of Christ*' is quite another matter: millions of Christians are secretly ashamed of the gospel: all the while forgetting that it is the '*gospel of Christ*' which is '*the power of God unto salvation.*'
- Galatians 4:7: *Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God **through Christ**.*
- Galatians 6:15: *For **in Christ Jesus** neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.*
- Ephesians 3: 9: *And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things **by Jesus Christ**:*
- Ephesians 3: 14: *For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of **our Lord Jesus Christ**,*
- 1 Cor.16:22-23 *If any man love not the Lord **Jesus Christ**, let him be Anathema Maranatha. The grace of our Lord Jesus **Christ** be with you.*
- 2 Cor.4:6: *For God, who commanded the light to shine out of*

*darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of **Jesus Christ**.*

- *2 Cor.4:10: Always bearing about in the body the dying of **the Lord Jesus**, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.*
- *Galatians 3:1: O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, **that ye should not obey the truth**, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?*
- *Colossians 1: 2: To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father **and the Lord Jesus Christ**.*
- *Colossians 1: 14: In whom we have redemption **through his blood**, even the forgiveness of sins.*
- *Hebrews 1: 3: Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he **had by himself** purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.*
- *Hebrews 7: 21: (For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever **after the order of Melchisedec**:)*
- *1 Peter 1: 22: Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth **through the Spirit** unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently.*

Comment: Without the **Holy Spirit** it is absolutely impossible to purify one's soul or obey the truth with unfeigned love. In the rendering of this verse the modern translators have removed the Master Key to all spiritual achievement - **the Holy Spirit**.

- *1 Peter 4: 1: Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered **for us** in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin.*
- *1 John 5:7 For there are three that bear **record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one**.*
- *James 5:16 Confess your **faults** one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.*

Comment: The Greek word for 'faults' is **praptomata**. The Greek word for 'sins' is **hamartias**. The word 'sins' in most modern versions is therefore a mistranslation - an error! It supports the dubious practice of sinners confessing sins to a priest; who has absolutely no authority whatsoever to listen to, let alone forgive, another person's sins. It is one thing to confess your '**faults**' (*praptomata*) to someone you've wronged: but quite another to confess your '**sins**' (*hamartias*) to a priest. **Faults** are vastly

different from sins. Impatience, a short temper, a weakness for drink etc. are faults. Whereas the sins these faults may lead to are: violence, revenge, drunkenness. According to Scripture it is blasphemy to attempt to forgive another's sins: as only God (and Jesus is God) can do that. (Mark 2:7) To be sure a **victim** can forgive a **sinner**, if forgiveness is requested; but an uninvolved third party has absolutely no right to forgive the sins of another.

- Rev.1: 8: *I am Alpha and Omega, **the beginning and the ending**, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.*
- Rev.1: 9: *I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus **Christ**, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus **Christ**.*
- Rev.1: 11: *Saying, **I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and**, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia...*
Comment: Ten words are missing!
- Rev.2: 13: *I know **thy works**, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is...*
- Rev.2:15: *So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, **which thing I hate**.*
- Rev.5:14: *And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped **him that liveth for ever and ever**.*
Comment: By leaving out the words 'him that liveth for ever and ever' the text allows the worship of any God.
- Rev.11: 17: *Saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, **and art to come**; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned.*
- Rev.12: 12: *Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the **inhabiters of the earth and of the sea!** for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath.*
- Rev.12: 17: *And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus **Christ**.*
- Rev.14: 5: *And in their mouth was found no guile: for they are without fault **before the throne of God**.*
- Rev.16: 17: *And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple **of heaven**, from the throne, saying, It is done.*
- Rev.20: 9: *And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down **from God** out of heaven, and devoured them.*

- Rev.21: 24: *And the nations **of them which are saved** shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it.*

Comment: By leaving out the words '**of them which are saved**' the RSV and many modern translations imply that the saved and unsaved of all nations will enter the New Jerusalem: which, of course, is not the case. Here we have 12 verses from the Book of Revelation that have been corrupted. Let no one foolishly suppose that the following divine warning will not apply to those who countenance these deletions. *Revelation 22:18: For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall **add** unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: 19: And if any man shall **TAKE AWAY** from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.*

THE APOCRYPHA

The following quotation is taken from the **Westminster Dictionary of the Bible** page 33, article **Apocrypha**.

Quote: " *The [Greek word **apokrypha** means hidden or secret things, used by ecclesiastical writers for: 1) matters secret or mysterious. 2) of unknown origin, forged, spurious. 3) unrecognised, uncanonical.] The name generally given to the following 16 books: 1 and 11 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, the Rest of Esther, The Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch with The Epistle of Jeremy, The Song of the Three Holy Children, The History of Susanna, Bel and the dragon, The Prayer of Manasses, 1, 11, 111 and IV Maccabees being omitted.*"

*"Unlike the books of the Old Testament, which are in Hebrew, with some portions in Aramaic, the apocryphal productions are in Greek... **The Jewish Church considered them uninspired, and some of their writers disclaim inspiration,** (prologue to Ecclesiasticus; 11 Macc.2:23; 15:38). The Apocrypha and Pseudopigrapha were produced between about 250 BC and somewhere in the early Christian centuries. **They are not found in the Hebrew canon: they are never quoted by Jesus; and it cannot with certainty be affirmed that the apostles ever directly allude to them...**"*

"The Church of England in the 6th of the Thirty-nine Articles published in 1562 calls the apocryphal treatises books which the 'Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners: but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine.' The Westminster Confession of 1643 declares, as a matter of creed, that 'the books, commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of Scripture, and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, or to be any otherwise approved or made use of than other human writings.'"

*"The Council of Trent at its sitting on April 8th, 1546,... pronounced an anathema against anyone who ventured to differ from it in opinion. This has since regulated the belief of the **Roman Catholic Church.**"...*

"A controversy on the subject was carried on between the years 1821 and 1826, which resulted in the exclusion of the Apocrypha from all Bibles issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society."

We can see from the above that neither the Saviour, the Apostles, the Jewish Nation nor the Protestant Church reckoned that the Apocrypha was inspired. The only major group which currently holds to the Apocrypha is the Roman Church. In view of these facts, Stewarton Bible School's advice is that you look upon the Apocrypha as the writings of **uninspired men** and certainly of no use whatsoever when deciding doctrine.

NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION (NIV)

This version is gaining in popularity. Strictly speaking it is not a version, but a **revision** like most of the other modern translations: which can all be traced back to the **Revised Version**. I, personally, in my ignorance have given away scores of copies of the NIV. May the Almighty pardon me.

As Edward F Hills says in his book **The King James Version Defended:**

He "Modern versions are rich in omissions. Time and again the reader searches in them for a familiar verse only to find that it has been banished to the footnotes. And one of the most familiar of the verses to be so treated is Matthew 6:13, the doxology with which the Lord's Prayer concludes."

Try finding these verses in the NIV

- Matthew 17:21 *Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.*
- Matthew 18:11 *For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost.*
- Matthew 23:14 *Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.*
- Mark 9:44 *Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*
- Mark 11:26 *But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.*
- Mark 15:28 *And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.*
- Luke 17:36 *Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.*
- Luke 23:17 *For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.*
- John 5:4 *For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.*
- Acts 8: 37 *And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*
- Acts 15:34 *Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still.*
- Acts 24:7 *But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands.*
- Acts 28:29 *And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.*
- Romans 16:24 *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.*

Bear in mind that the earliest versions of the Bible (the Peshitta, Italic and Old Latin Vulgate etc.) have all these verses: but the NIV leaves them out! Isn't that a serious string of omissions? Obviously the translators of the NIV are ignoring the command in Deuteronomy 4:2. and the awesome warning in Revelation 22:18-19 For more about this translation see The New International Version.

- *Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, **neither shall ye diminish ought from it**, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.*
- *For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man **shall add** unto these things, God shall add*

unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

It is vital that you check these verses in the modern version you are using to see if these **words, verses** or **passages** are either missing or mistranslated. Once again I invite you to imitate the believers of Berea mentioned in the book of Acts.

*Acts These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, **in that they** 17:11 **received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.***

God knows that after reading this article you can never say 'I didn't know.'

THE NEW KING JAMES VERSION of 1984

The title of this version is extremely deceptive and positively dangerous; because the unsuspecting believer will purchase it not knowing that he/she is getting an unholy counterfeit of the **real Bible - the King James Version**. In his book **Final Authority** author William P Grady says this concerning the NKJV.

Quote: "*From 1611 to 1881, God's foot soldiers wielded KJV swords while defending spiritual barley fields against Jesuits armed with Douay-Rheims Versions. Their grip grew tighter from 1881-1974 as one Alexandrian impostor after another was driven from the field. Suddenly, a profit-oriented corporation (the same crown who manufactured the enemies swords) would prevail upon the church to believe that the Holy Spirit had abruptly ordered a weapon change - **in the very heat of the battle!** Their corrupt rendering of Romans 1:25 says it best. Instead of KJV's **changed** we read, **'exchanged the truth of God for a lie.'** A true believer will never exchange his KJV for a NKJV. The reason for this resistance is the same today as it was in Bible days. With his very life at stake, the grip of the ancient warrior was so intense that warm water was often needed at battle's end to literally pry the weapon from his cramped hands. A person with an ounce of spiritual discernment can see that He **who is not the author of confusion** would never pick such timing to introduce yet another English revision! The outstanding distinction of a spiritual warrior will always be that, his hand clave unto the sword...*

*The truth of the matter is that the New King James Version represents Satan's ultimate deception to oppose God's remnant in the closing days of the New Testament age . Having enlisted the lukewarm materialist with his NIV, the devil sets a trap for the diligent soul winner with the NKJV. Although his worldly counterparts embraced the **oldest is best** theory of manuscript evidences, the true Bible believer refused to abandon the **Majority Text**, retaining the Divine commendation of, 'thou has kept my word.' Thus we find Satan attempting to wean him away from his Authorised Version with the deceitful half-step of a generic look-alike, **TRANSLATED FROM THE TRUSTWORTHY TEXTUS RECEPTUS! ...***

*Conservative estimates of the total translation changes in the NKJV are generally put at over 100,000! This is an average of 82 changes for each of the 1219 pages in the NKJV...Along this line of abuse, the most shocking revelation about the 'New' King James Version is that it is literally laced with 'old' readings from the **Revised Standard and New American Standard Versions**. This revival of Alexandrian readings is one of the best-kept secrets of the decade. Whenever there is a marked departure from the text of the **KJV**, the alternative reading is frequently taken from either the **RSV, NASV, or oftentimes, both**. For instance, in the first chapter of John's Gospel, there are 51 verses. Of this total, 45 (or 88%) have been altered by the **NKJV**. Among this number, 34 (75%) exhibit a distinct **RSV or NASV** reading while 6 show a partial reading. Only 5 (15%) appear unique to the **NKJV**." (Ref:E2)*

No doubt very soon another counterfeit Bible will make its appearance. Perhaps it will be called the **New Authorized Version**. All I can say to the Christian world is - **BEWARE!**

Comparisons with the KJV

In his book **God Wrote Only One Bible** Jasper Ray compares some **162 verses** in 46 different Bible translations with the KJV which is based on Textus Receptus, the text used by the early churches and Protestant Reformers. His findings make the purchase of his book an absolute must. Very briefly here are a few of his findings:

VERSION.....CHANGES

- Luther's New Testament (1522).....0
- King James Version (1611).....0
- Revised Version (1881-5)..... 135
- American Standard Version (1901).....135
- Good News Bible (1976).....144
- New American Standard Version (1971).....147
- Revised Standard Version (1952).....158
- New International Version (1978).....160

Notice how each new translation contains more errors than the one that went before. Are you, dear reader, willing to recognise such error; and how Satan is gradually weakening the very foundation of Christian doctrine - the **Holy Bible**? Bear in mind that every verse, every word, every jot and tittle of Scripture is eternal: it will outlast the present universe!

Matt.5:18 For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

How presumptuous, then, for puny man to attempt to delete, amend and corrupt the sacred Scriptures. I tremble to think of the fate of those who are responsible. Believe it or not, when I learned these facts I was stunned, flabbergasted and ashamed all at the same time. To think that I had been taken in so easily - for so long! But once I saw the light I determined that if God would allow me to live after my heart attack and triple bypass operation - I would tell the world! The **Internet** is allowing me to do so. I pray that in the course of time millions will find out what I have learned these past months. You too may have a part in exposing the corruption in the modern translations of the Bible. The question is: Do you have the humility and the courage to face up to these facts? Have you the spiritual eyes to see that the **real Bible** for the English-speaking world is still the **King James Version**?

VITAL QUESTIONS

Now that you know these facts, and you ought to examine this issue till you are fully convinced in your own mind, several unavoidable questions will present themselves.

- **Question One:** In future which Bible should I study?
Answer: In my opinion you should revert to the **real Word of God**,

the **King James Bible**; simply because all modern translations of the Bible are infected with error and therefore **unholy**. Their underlying text is dangerously corrupt and many of their leading translators were/are unbelievers! By continuing to study their unholy output you will be aligning yourself with them: siding with the **unbelieving Egyptian scribes** who produced their erroneous manuscripts and also with the **unbelieving translators** who later built on their errors.

- **Question Two:** What shall I do with all the modern translations of the Bible I currently possess?

Answer: You have two options. a) Throw them all away. b) Or keep them just for reference in case you need to prove your stand for the King James Bible. This is the option I have settled for. I have in my possession a CD with some 50 Bibles on it: one of which is the King James Bible. I have kept this CD.

- **Question Three:** I am a preacher, what about quoting from modern translations of the Bible?

Answer: In the past I have quoted extensively from modern translations. You only have to read SBS articles written before March 1997 to realize this. But I will never again quote from a modern translation; simply because it would give the impression that I considered it to be the **Word of God**, which it isn't! I repeat: modern translations of the Bible are not the Word of God! They are unholy counterfeits!

- **Question Four:** I am a writer, what should I do with the literature I have already produced and in which I have quoted from modern translations of the Bible?

Answer: This was the foremost question I had to answer for myself. I had two options. a) Throw away all SBS publications printed before March 1997 and reprint the lot. b) Or exhaust SBS stocks and correct all future reprints; making sure meanwhile that I offered a full explanation to my readers of my change of course. I settled for this option. Indeed, this article is part of that explanation.

- **Question Five:** What about my Christian friends who do not agree with me on this Versions issue?

Answer: In spiritual matters, no mortal can open the eyes of another. My advice is, tell your Christian friends what you now know about this **Version issue** and, after praying for them, leave it at that. You would be guilty before God if you kept quiet. Your responsibility is to tell your Christian friends. What they do with the information is

up to them.

These are vital questions all informed believers have to answer for themselves. We cannot ignore them. Should we continue to daily study corrupt "**Bibles**" and risk the wrath of the Almighty God? Eating infected meat, by comparison, is of minor importance when we consider the awesome spiritual issue before us. Would you **knowingly** eat infected or unclean meat once it has been brought to your notice? Surely no one would **knowingly** eat polluted food, however attractive, appetising or nourishing it may otherwise be. The recent **CJD** or **E-Coli** outbreaks in Britain caused by eating infected meat are simply low-level illustrations of how easily infection can spread and cause death. How much more serious do you suppose is this matter of eating **unholy spiritual meat!**

The Bible tells us that God overlooks people's ignorance; but once they know the truth, they are held accountable.

...the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commands all men every where to repent: (Acts 17:30)

The Translation Question

There are two primary methods that are used to translate scripture.

- 1) Formal Equivalency
- 2) Dynamic Equivalency

The Formal Equivalency method seeks to translate scripture literally (word for word). The Dynamic Equivalency method seeks to translate scripture by paraphrasing (put it into your own words). Which is the proper translation method? Even apt translators using an "inferior" method of translation, can only produce an "inferior" translation. In order to determine the proper method of translation, we must first understand the doctrine of verbal inspiration.

The Doctrine of Verbal Inspiration

The Bible teaches that God worked in such a way that the writers of scripture wrote exactly what He wanted them to write;

All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for

doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 2 Timothy 3:16

Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. 2 Peter 1:20-21

If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord. 1 Corinthians 14:37

*For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the **word of God** which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the **word of God**, which effectually worketh also in you that believe. 1 Thessalonians 2:13*

We must also keep in mind that this inspiration extended to the very words.

*Which things also we speak, not in the **words** which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth... 1 Corinthians 2:13*

*And Moses wrote all the **words** of the LORD... Exodus 24:4*

*Thus speaketh the LORD God of Israel, saying, Write thee all the **words** that I have spoken unto thee in a book. Jeremiah 30:2*

The Translation Question Answered

As I stated earlier, the Formal Equivalency method seeks to translate scripture literally (word for word) while the Dynamic Equivalency method seeks to translate scripture by paraphrasing (put it into your own words). Which is the proper translation method? The Doctrine of Verbal Inspiration taught us that God inspired the very words of scripture. Since words were the unit of inspiration, words should also be the unit of translation. Let's see what God thinks about people changing His words;

*For I testify unto every man that heareth the **words** of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him*

*the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the **words** of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. Revelation 22:18-19*

So we know that the Formal Equivalency method is the proper method of translation.

Translations produced by the "inferior" Dynamic Equivalency method are "inferior" translations. More than that, they are very displeasing to God, who does not like his words to be changed.

Which Bible is God's Word ?

Part 3 of 3

The Manuscript Question

Now, let's deal with the manuscript question. When it comes to the Old Testament, virtually all translations come from the same Masoretic Hebrew texts (although some versions alter these texts in a number of places).

When we come to the New Testament, there are primarily two types of Greek texts that are used.

- 1) The Textus Receptus
- 2) The Modern Critical texts

Which of these texts are the correct texts? Even apt translators working from "inferior" texts can only produce an "inferior" translation. In order to determine which manuscripts are the correct manuscripts, we must first understand the doctrine of providential preservation.

The Doctrine of Providential Preservation

The Bible not only teaches that God inspired the words of scripture. It also teaches that God would preserve the words of scripture.

*The **words** of the LORD are pure **words**: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shall keep them (**God's Words**), O LORD, thou shall preserve them from this generation for ever. Psalm 12:6-7*

*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but **my words** shall not pass away. Matthew 24:35*

*Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the **word** of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the **word** of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the **word** which by the gospel is preached unto you. 1 Peter 1:23-25*

Notice that God said that he would preserve both his word and his words. God's word refers to the whole Bible. God's words refer to the individual words in the Bible.

The Manuscript Question Answered

The doctrine of Providential Preservation taught us that God would "Preserve" his words. Since God promised to preserve his words, upon which of these texts do we see the hand of God's Providential Preservation?

- 1) The Textus Receptus texts are based upon manuscripts that have been in continuous use in the church from the earliest days until now.
- 2) The Modern Critical texts are based upon manuscripts that were lost to the church for a period of over 1000 years.

So we know from The Doctrine of Providential Preservation that The Textus Receptus texts are the correct manuscripts.

Other Reasons for Rejecting the Modern Critical Translations

Not only do the modern critical texts show the lack of providential preservation, they also have other problems as well;

(1) They are Based upon only 1% of the Manuscript Evidence

Here is the manuscript evidence. These figures are from 1992 and may have changed slightly. (Figures from "Defending The King James Bible" by D.A. Waite page 57.)

Manuscripts Supporting the Textus Receptus and the KJV

Papyrus Fragments .	68
Uncials	258
Cursives	2741
Lectonaries	2143
Total	5210

Manuscripts Supporting the Modern Critical Texts and the New Versions

Papyrus Fragments . . .13

Uncials 9

Cursives 23

Lectonaries 0

Total 45

The Final Score is:

KJV - 5210 -vs- NIV - 45

KJV - 99% -vs- NIV - 1%

Why would anyone want a translation that is supported by only 1% of the manuscript evidence, when they can have one that is supported by 99% of the manuscript evidence?

(2) The Corrupt Nature of the Manuscripts Upon Which They are Based

The Modern Critical texts are based primarily upon two manuscripts. These manuscripts are often referred to, in the footnotes of modern translations, as "the oldest and best". The two so-called "oldest and best" manuscripts are Codex Vaticanus (B) and Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph).

Herman C. Hoskier, who collated these two manuscripts, gives 924 pages of documentation in "Codex B and It's Allies, A Study and An Indictment" that these two manuscripts are two of the most corrupt manuscripts on the face of the earth. Aleph and B disagree with each other in over 3,000 places in the 4 gospels alone! What do others who have examined these manuscripts have to say about them?

Dr. Scrivener writes of Sinaiticus:

"The Codex is covered with such alterations – i.e., alterations of an obviously correctional character - brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of them systematically spread over every page..."

Dean J. W. Burgon writes of Sinaiticus.

"On many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through very carelessness. Letters and words, even whole sentences, are written twice over, or begun and immediately cancelled; whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament." Dr. Scrivener (citing Dr. Dobbin) writes of Vaticanus: "He calculates that Codex B leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 330 times in Mathew, 365 in Mark, 439 in Luke, 357 in John, 384 in the Acts, 681 in the surviving Epistles; or 2,556 in all."

Dean J. W. Burgon writes of Vaticanus:

"Matthew 21:4, five words written twice over; Matthew 26:56-57, six words; Luke 1:37, three words or one line; John 17:18, six words. These however, are but a few of many."

(Quotes taken from "Final Authority" by William P. Grady pages 103-105.)

"These are the so-called "older and best" manuscripts. They are not worth the paper that they are written on."

Putting It All Together

In the beginning of this article we set out to answer two questions.

- 1) Which are the correct manuscripts?
- 2) Which is the proper translation of those (the correct) manuscripts?

After looking to scripture for the answer to these questions we have learned the following:

- 1) We know from the doctrine of Providential Preservation that the Textus Receptus texts are the correct manuscripts.

The following translations however are not based on the Textus Receptus. They come from the incorrect modern critical texts and should, therefore, be rejected.

Examples of Modern Critical Translations

The New International Version (NIV)
Today's English Version (TEV)
The New Living Translation (NLT)
The Contemporary English Version (CEV)
The New American Standard Version (NASV)
The New Revised Standard Version (NRSV)

2) We know from the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration that the Formal Equivalency method is the proper translation method.

The following translations are not translated according to the Formal Equivalency method. They are translated by the incorrect dynamic equivalency method and should, therefore, be rejected.

Examples of Dynamic Equivalent Translations

The New International Version (NIV)
Today's English Version (TEV)
The New Living Translation (NLT)
The Contemporary English Version (CEV)

Of all the "Bibles" that are readily available today there is only one that comes from the Textus Receptus manuscripts and is translated according to the Formal Equivalency method - the Authorized Version (KJV).

The New King James Version (NKJV)

Although it claims to be a "Formal Equivalent" translation, it contains many (over 2000) instances of "Dynamic Equivalency". In the preface, (the NKJV) *claims* to be essentially the same as The Authorized King James Version (KJV) except that the language has been updated. Instead, it has thousands of changes that have nothing to do with updating the language at all. Where the language is updated, it is often updated incorrectly or in ways that change the entire meaning of a passage.

Many modern translations today, although they may contain some of the words of God, are not the word of God (in its entirety). Since they are based upon corrupt manuscripts and/or incorrect translation methods, many of God's words have been changed, removed, or added to. These "Bibles" are not the word of God! God's true word (Bible) contains all of God's words.

And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God." Luke 4:4

Various Contradictions and Omissions

This table compares various verses in the KJV, NIV, NASB, and NWT. The term "OMITTED" is used when either the phrase *or* the verse in question is omitted. This table is a very small sampling of contradictory verses, not an exhaustive one.

Some people have objected to me comparing the NWT with the NIV and NASB. They complain that the NWT is an "obvious" corruption of Scripture on the part of the Jehovah's Witness cult. Instead of complaining about the comparison, they should be wondering why the NIV and NASB so frequently agree with the NWT.

I have noticed that in some cases, different editions may not treat a verse the same way. This table represents the verses as I have them in my printed editions (NIV 1984, NASB 1977, NWT 1984).

	AV (King James)	New International	New American Standard	New World Translation
Mt 9:13	for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.	For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners.	For I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners.	For I came to call, not righteous people, but sinners.
Mt 18:11	For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.	OMITTED	footnote casts doubt	OMITTED
Mt 19:17	Why callest thou me good?	"Why do you ask me about what is good?"	"Why are you asking me about what is good?"	"Wny do you ask me about what is good?"
Mt 25:13	Ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.	You do not know the day or the hour.	You do not know the day nor the hour.	You know neither the day nor the hour,

Mk 10:24	.how hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!	.how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!	.how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!	.how difficult a thing it is to enter into the kingdom of God!
Lk 2:33	And Joseph and his mother,,,	The child's father and mother.	His father and mother.	its father and mother.
Lk 4:4	Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.	Man does not live on bread alone.	Man shall not live on bread alone.	Man must not live by bread alone.
Lh 4:8	Get thee behind me, Satan.	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED
Jn 6:47	He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.	He who believes has everlasting life.	He who believes has eternal life.	He that believes has everlasting life.
Jn 8:9	And when they heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out.	.those who heard began to go away.	.when they heard it, they began to go out one by one.	OMITTED
Jn 9:4	I must work the works of him that sent me.	We must do the work of him who sent me.	We must work the works of Him who sent Me.	We must work the works of him that sent me.
Jn 10:30	I and my Father are one	I and the Father are one.	I and the Father are one.	I and the Father are one.
Ac 2:30	that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;	.he would place one of his descendants on his throne.	.to seat one of his descendants upon his throne.	.he would seat one from the fruitage of his loins upon his throne.

Ac 8:37	If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.	OMITTED	footnote casts doubt (some editions just omit it)	OMITTED
Ac 23:9	Let us not fight against God.	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED
Rom 13:9	Thou shalt not bear false witness.	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED
Co 1:14	In whom we have redemption through his blood , even the forgiveness of sins.	In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.	In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.	By means of whom we have our release by ransom, the forgiveness of our sins.
1Ti 3:16	God was manifest in the flesh.	He appeared in a body.	He who was revealed in the flesh.	He was made manifest in the flesh.
1Ti 6:5	Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.	"from such withdraw thyself" is omitted	"from such withdraw thyself" is omitted	"from such withdraw thyself" is omitted
1Pe 1:22	Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit.	you have purified yourselves by obeying the truth.	Since you have in obedience to the truth purified your souls.	Now that you have purified your souls by your obedience to the truth.

1Jo 4:3	And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God.	But every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God.	And every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God.	But every inspired expression that does not confess Jesus does not originate with God.
Re 5:14	Four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever.	.the elders fell down and worshipped.	.the elders fell down and worshipped.	.the elders fell down and worshipped.
Re 20:9	Fire came down from God out of heaven.	Fire came down from heaven.	Fire came down from heaven.	Fire came down out of heaven.
Re 21:24	And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it.	The nations will walk by its light.	And the nations shall walk by its light.	And the nations will walk by means of its light.

Would you take a magic marker to your Bible and cross out words from passages?

This chart illustrates what was done when the text used by Christianity for 1800 years was replaced with a text assembled by Westcott and Hort in the nineteenth century and used as the basis for the English Revised Version, which nearly all modern translations closely follow.

The text shown here is the King James Version. Words, sentences, or entire verses in **strikethrough** illustrate portions that have been removed from the text underlying the KJV New Testament. **Not all modern versions are the same.** Sometimes the NASB will include a word the NIV doesn't, or the NRSV might omit a phrase the NIV and NASB both retain, etc... but for the most part, the examples below represent nearly all of the popular modern versions. (Psudeo-KJV versions such as the NKJV are far more subtle and are a different case. See the articles section for NKJV examinations.)

Compare your modern version and see what the KJV has that yours doesn't. *This list is not comprehensive, it is just a sample!* **The modern critical text that forms the basis for**

nearly all modern versions omits the equivalent of the entire books of 1st and 2nd Peter.

Critics commonly charge that the traditional Bible text used by believers for 1800 years *adds* material, and that we should be thankful for Westcott and Hort who came along in the 19th century to restore the text of the New Testament that had been corrupt for 1800 years and during the entire reformation. This charge is of course made *against evidence to the contrary*, as you will find if you research the text lines (read other articles on this website). Further, it is interesting to note that one of these verses is this:

Romans 13:9: For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, **Thou shalt not bear false witness**, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

The phrase "thou shalt not bear false witness" is missing from the modern critical text (and therefor most modern versions). Now I ask you: is it reasonable to assume that a scribe *added* a self-incriminating phrase to the passage? Isn't it more likely that "those who corrupt the word of God" (2 Cor. 2:17, KJV) *removed* the phrase which indicted them?

Now on to Westcott and Hort's Magic Marker Binge!

Matthew	
1:25	And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.
5:44	But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you , do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;
6:13	And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.
6:33	But seek ye first the kingdom of God , and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.
8:29	And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus , thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?
9:13	But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance .

12:35	A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things.
13:51	Jesus saith unto them , Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him, Yea, Lord .
15:8	This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth , and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me.
16:3	And in the morning, It will be foul weather to day: for the sky is red and lowring. O ye hypocrites , ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?
16:20	Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.
17:21	Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.
18:11	For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.
19:9	And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.
19:17	And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God : but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.
20:7	They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive.
20:16	So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen.
20:22	But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able.
23:14	Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.
25:13	Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.
27:35	And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet , They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.

28:9	And as they went to tell his disciples , behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him.
Mark	
1:14	Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God,
1:31	And he came and took her by the hand, and lifted her up; and immediately the fever left her, and she ministered unto them.
2:17	When Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance .
6:11	And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrhah in the day of judgment, than for that city.
6:16	But when Herod heard thereof, he said, It is John, whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead .
7:8	For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups : and many other such like things ye do.
7:16	If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.
9:24	And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord , I believe; help thou mine unbelief.
9:42	And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me , it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea.
9:44	Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.
9:46	Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.
9:49	For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.
10:21	Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross , and follow me.
11:10	Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord : Hosanna in the highest.

13:14	But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet , standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in Judaea flee to the mountains:
13:33	Take ye heed, watch and pray : for ye know not when the time is.
14:68	But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. And he went out into the porch; and the cock crew.
15:28	And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.
16:9-20	Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not. After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen. <i>(typically marginalized or set in brackets. Footnotes in NIV are patently false.)</i>
Luke	
1:28	And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women.
4:4	And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.
4:8	And Jesus answered and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan : for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

4:41	And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he rebuking them suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ.
7:31	And the Lord said , Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation? and to what are they like?
9:54-56	And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did ? But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village.
11:2-4	And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven , Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.
11:29	And when the people were gathered thick together, he began to say, This is an evil generation: they seek a sign; and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of Jonas the prophet.
17:36	Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.
21:4	For all these have of their abundance cast in unto the offerings of God : but she of her penury hath cast in all the living that she had.
22:31	And the Lord said , Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat:
22:64	And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face , and asked him, saying, Prophecy, who is it that smote thee?
23:17	(For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)
23:38	And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew , THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.
23:42	And he said unto Jesus, Lord , remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.
24:6	He is not here, but is risen : remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee,
24:40	And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet.

24:49	And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem , until ye be endued with power from on high.
24:51	And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven.
John	
1:14	And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.
1:27	He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me , whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose.
3:13	And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.
3:15	That whosoever believeth in him should not perish , but have eternal life.
4:42	And said unto the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ , the Saviour of the world.
5:3-4	In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.
6:47	Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.
6:69	And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.
11:41	Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me.
16:16	A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.
17:12	While I was with them in the world , I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled.

Acts

2:30	Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;
7:30	And when forty years were expired, there appeared to him in the wilderness of mount Sina an angel of the Lord in a flame of fire in a bush.
7:37	This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear.
8:37	And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.
9:5-6	And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.
10:6	He lodgeth with one Simon a tanner, whose house is by the sea side: he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do.
16:31	And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ , and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.
17:26	And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;
20:25	And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God , shall see my face no more.
20:32	And now, brethren , I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified.
23:9	And there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the Pharisees' part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God.
24:6-8	Who also hath gone about to profane the temple: whom we took, and would have judged according to our law. But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands, Commanding his accusers to come unto thee: by examining of whom thyself mayest take knowledge of all these things, whereof we accuse him.

24:15	And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead , both of the just and unjust.
28:16	And when we came to Rome, the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard: but Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him.
28:29	And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.

Romans

1:16	For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ : for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.
1:29	Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication , wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers,
8:1	There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.
9:28	For he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness : because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth.
10:15	And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace , and bring glad tidings of good things!
11:6	And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.
13:9	For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness , Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.
14:21	It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.
15:29	And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ.
16:24	The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

1 Corinthians

1:14	I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius;
------	--

5:7	Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us :
6:20	For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's .
7:5	Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency.
10:28	But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake: for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof :
11:24	And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat : this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.
11:29	For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.
15:47	The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.
16:22-23	If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ , let him be Anathema Maranatha. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

2 Corinthians

4:6	For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.
5:18	And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;
11:31	The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ , which is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.

Galatians

1:15	But when it pleased God , who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace,
3:1	O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth , before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?

3:17	And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ , the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.
4:7	Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ .
6:15	For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.
6:17	From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.

Ephesians

3:9	And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ :
3:14	For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ ,
5:30	For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones .
6:1	Children, obey your parents in the Lord : for this is right.
6:10	Finally, my brethren , be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.

Philippians

3:16	Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing .
------	---

Colossians

1:2	To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ .
1:14	In whom we have redemption through his blood , even the forgiveness of sins:
1:28	Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus :
2:11	In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ:
3:6	For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience :

1 Thessalonians

1:1	Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians which is in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.
2:19	For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?
3:11	Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ , direct our way unto you.
3:13	To the end he may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.

2 Thessalonians

1:8 In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus **Christ**:

1 Timothy

1:17 Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only **wise** God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

2:7 Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle, (I speak the truth **in Christ**, and lie not;) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.

3:16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: **God** was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

4:12 Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, **in spirit**, in faith, in purity.

6:5 Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: **from such withdraw thyself.**

2 Timothy

1:11 Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher **of the Gentiles.**

4:1 I charge thee therefore before God, and the **Lord** Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom;

4:22 The Lord **Jesus Christ** be with thy spirit. Grace be with you. Amen.

Titus

1:4	To Titus, mine own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour.
Philemon	
1:6	That the communication of thy faith may become effectual by the acknowledging of every good thing which is in you in Christ Jesus .
1:12	Whom I have sent again: thou therefore receive him , that is, mine own bowels:
Hebrews	
1:3	Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;
2:7	Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands :
3:1	Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus;
7:21	(For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec .)
10:30	For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord . And again, The Lord shall judge his people.
10:34	For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.
11:11	Through faith also Sara herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised.
1 Peter	
1:22	Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently:
4:1	Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin;

4:14	If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you: on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified.
5:10-11	But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus , after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you. To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.
2 Peter	
2:17	These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever.
1 John	
1:7	But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.
2:7	Brethren, I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word which ye have heard from the beginning.
4:3	And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.
4:9	In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.
4:19	We love him , because he first loved us.
5:7-8	For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.
5:13	These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.
Jude	
1:25	To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.
Revelation	

1:8	I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending , saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.
1:11	Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and , What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia ; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.
2:13	I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is: and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth.
5:14	And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever .
6:1	And I saw when the Lamb opened one of the seals, and I heard, as it were the noise of thunder, one of the four beasts saying, Come and see .
11:17	Saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come ; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned.
12:12	Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.
12:17	And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ .
14:5	And in their mouth was found no guile: for they are without fault before the throne of God .
16:17	And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven , from the throne, saying, It is done.
20:9	And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them.
21:24	And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it.

"And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

Revelation 22:19

KJV or *New* King James Version (NKJV)?

*"The WORDS of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt **PRESERVE** them from this generation for ever." (Psalm 12:6-7) (Emphasis mine)*

In our previous editorials, we sought to prove that the King James Version (**KJV**) is the *preserved* Word of God in English today. But what about the New King James Version (**NKJV**)? Isn't it based on the same Greek text as the **KJV**?

Almost all modern versions of the Bible are based on the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament. To see what is *wrong with*:

- The Alexandrian manuscripts of Westcott and Hort, you can read our [March/April Editorial](#)
- The men (Westcott and Hort) you can read our [May/June Editorial](#).

But the **NKJV** claims to be based on the same Textus Receptus that underlies our King James Version. It is *not* based on the corrupt Westcott and Hort text.

Some good men would argue that the **NKJV** simply uses Modern English, rather than the archaic English of the **KJV**. Therefore, they say, the **NKJV** is more easily understood by today's average reader.

Are the supporters of the **NKJV** correct? Should we abandon the **KJV** in favor of the **NKJV**, since both are based on the same Textus Receptus? To answer that, we need to uncover some little known facts.

FACT #1 – NKJV MAKES *THEOLOGICAL* CHANGES TO THE TEXT

As we mentioned in an earlier editorial, the **NKJV** *drops the word "God"* sixty-six times, according to G.A. Riplinger. There is no warrant in the Greek text to do this. Nor is "*God*" an archaic (old, out of date) word.

Therefore, this is a *theological change*, made by the translators of the **NKJV**. There are many other such changes in the **NKJV**. In a presentation to the Berean Baptist Church of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, G.A. Riplinger said:

- There are **1100** places where the **NKJV** differs from the Textus Receptus.
- *“Repent”* is omitted **44** times.
- *“Blood”* is omitted **23** times.
- *“Hell”* is omitted **22** times.
- *“Damnation”* is omitted entirely.

In addition, the Deity of Christ and of the Father is watered down in dozens of places. Consider this:

	NKJV	KJV
Matt. 18:26	Master	Lord
Luke 13:8	Sir	Lord
Acts 3:26	Servant	Son

Moreover, the **NKJV** agrees with the Jehovah’s Witness New World Translation in removing the Deity of the Spirit of God. Both the **NKJV** and the New World Translation call him a *“helper”*.

How can this be, if the **NKJV** is based on the same Textus Receptus as the **KJV**?

FACT #2 – THE HEBREW TEXT OF NKJV IS NOT THE TEXT OF THE KJV

The **KJV** Old Testament is based on the Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text. But the **NKJV** is based on the Biblia Hebraica.

According to the Encyclopedia Judaica (1971) its author, Rudolph Kittel, was an anti-Semite and a believer in Hellenistic mystery religions. His son, Gerhard Kittel, was tried and convicted at Nuremburg as a Nazi war criminal.

Gerhard Kittel gave open theological support for Hitler's extermination of the Jews during the Nazi Holocaust. He also authored The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament that bares his name. Many seminaries use it today.

His father's Hebrew text, known as the Biblia Hebraica, is based on the Leningrad B 19a manuscript of the Old Testament. The Catholic-led translation committees for several other modern versions of the Bible use it also.

The Textus Receptus follows the Masoretic text. Rudolph Kittel's Biblia Hebraica does not. Therefore, the **NKJV** Old Testament does *not* truly follow the Textus Receptus.

Here we have an unsaved father and son, both anti-Semitic, handling the Word of God with *unwashed hands*. They give us their slant on what it says.

FACT #3 – THE KJV IS *EASIER* TO UNDERSTAND THAN THE NKJV

Supporters of the **NKJV** argue that it is easier to understand than the **KJV** because the **NKJV** does not use archaic words like "*thee*" and "*thou.*" At first glance, this argument seems to be plausible.

But upon further examination, we find that this argument is faulty. The Flesch-Kincaid research company's Grade Level Indicator places the **KJV** at a 5th grade reading level. The same standardized test places both the **NKJV** and the **NASB** at 6th grade level and the **NIV** at an 8th grade level.

The chapters compared were Genesis 1, Malachi 1, Matthew 1 and Revelation 1. The test formula is: (.39 x average number of words per sentence) + (11.8 x average number of syllables per word) – (15.59) = grade level.

Why is the **KJV** easier to read? The **KJV** uses many one or two syllable words. But the **NKJV** (and both the **NASB** and the **NIV**) substitute complex, multi-syllable words and phrases. Consider the following contrast between the **NKJV** and **KJV**:

HARD WORD – NKJV

EASY WORD – KJV

1 Kings 10:28

Keveh

linen yarns

Lamentations 5:3

waifs

fatherless

Ezekiel 31:4

rivulets

little rivers

John 18:28	Praetorium	judgment hall
Acts 17:22	the Areopagus	Mars Hill
Acts 27:17	Syrtis Sands	quicksand
Luke 16:23	hades	hell

On the last substitution (“*hades*” for “*hell*”) keep this in mind. Virtually no angry sinner tells someone else to “*go to hades*”. Rather, they normally say in their anger, “***go to hell!***” Even unsaved people know the meaning of “*hell*”.

To use “*hades*” instead of “*hell*” (as the **NKJV** does) is to associate it with ancient, pagan Greek mythology as a place of the departed souls. This fits in nicely with the modern day revival of paganism in the New Age movement.

Now consider the complex phrases of the **NKJV** when contrasted with the simpler phrases of the **KJV**:

	COMPLEX PHRASE – NKJV	SIMPLE PHRASE –
	KJV	
Psalms 40:9	I have proclaimed the good news of	I have preached
1 Cor. 3:3	behaving like mere men	walk as men
2 Cor. 11:29	do not burn with indignation	burn not

FACT #4 – THE NKJV IS **NOT GOD’S WORD**

One reason the publishers of the *new* Bible versions change words is to obtain a copyright. In order to obtain a copyright, one must produce a *substantially new work*. It cannot be just a minor updating of someone else’s original work.

The **NKJV** publisher (Thomas Nelson Publishers) cannot produce a substantially new work from the same Textus Receptus on which the **KJV** is based *without making substantial changes in the words and phrases used*.

In order to obtain a copyright on their **NKJV**, Nelson made substantial changes to the text of God’s Word. Nelson substituted complex, multi-syllable words and phrases in place of the simple language of the **KJV**.

These man-made changes not only made the **NKJV** more *difficult* to read than the **KJV**. They also *perverted* the pure Word of God.

There is no copyright on the **KJV** (except for a possible copyright on the maps and notes used). You *can't* copyright God's Word. But there *is* a copyright on the **NKJV**.

To earn money through a copyright, Thomas Nelson, Inc. made substantial changes to the **KJV** in creating the **NKJV**. Nelson's **NKJV** perverted the Word of God to make it a substantially new work of man, which could then qualify for a copyright.

The **NKJV** is the copyrighted word of man. The **KJV** is the Word of God.

God of the New Versions/New Age

vs.

God of the Bible & Christianity

NASB, NIV, et al.:	Verse:	King James Bible
morning star	Is. 14:12-15	Lucifer
The Christ	Acts 5:42	Jesus Christ
divine being	Acts 17:29	The Godhead
divine nature	Rom. 1:20	The Godhead
a God	Acts 14:15	God
The Lord	Ex. 6:3	JEHOVAH
The Lord	1 Cor 16:22	Lord Jesus Christ
The Spirit	Acts 8:18	The Holy Ghost
The One	John 4:42	God, Christ, the Son
Only One	Matt. 19:17	God
The Mighty One	Josh. 50:1	The LORD GOD
a son of the gods	Dan. 3:25	Son of God
Son of Man	John 9:35	Son of God
OMITTED	I John 5:7,8	For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.
visions he has seen fruit of the light and the nations shall walk by its light	Col. 2:18 Eph. 5:9 Rev. 21:24	visions he has not seen fruit of the Spirit and the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it.
king of nations	Rev. 15:3	King of saints
end of the age	Matt. 28:20	And of the world

I can do everything Phil 4:13 I can do all things
 through him who through Christ which
 gives me strength strengtheneth me.
 He who was re- 1 Tim. 3:16 God was manifest in the
 vealed in the flesh flesh
 he Luke 24:36 Jesus
 He Matt. 4:18 Jesus
 He Mark 2:15 Jesus
 Him Mark 10:52 Jesus
 His Kingdom Matt. 6:33 The Kingdom of God
 He Rev. 21:4 God
 He 1 Tim 3:16 God
 He Gal. 1:15 God
 He Matt. 22:32 God
 his spirit 1 Cor. 14:2 the spirit
 His name Acts 22:16 the name of the Lord
 His name. . . in Rev 14:1 his father's name in
 their foreheads their foreheads
 (see Rev. 14:11!)
 (image worshippers Acts 17:2 (image worshippers
 are) very religious are) too superstitious
 worship (see Rev. 9, Phil. 3:3 worship God
 13, 14, 16)

The "New" Christianity
 vs.
 First Century Christianity

NASB, NIV, Verses King James Bible

Then come, follow me Mark 10:21 and come, take up the
 cross and follow me
 heart 1 Pet. 1:22 pure heart
 adequate 2 Tim 3:17 perfect
 prosperity Prov. 21:21 righteousness
 prosper Jer. 29:11 peace
 godliness actually is 1 Tim. 6:6 godliness with contentment
 a means of great gain is great gain
 wisdom brings success Eccl. 10:10 wisdom is profitable to
 direct
 boast Heb. 3:6 rejoicing
 be proud 2 Cor 1:14 your rejoicing
 take pride in James 1:9 rejoice

proud confidence 2 Cor. 1:12 rejoicing
 furthering the 1 Tim. 1:4 godly edifying
 administration
 Thou hast made him a Ps. 8:5 thou hast made him a
 little lower than God little lower than the angels
 I retract. . . Job 42:6 I abhor myself
 Our humble state Phil. 3:21 our vile bodies
 man shall not live on Luke 4:4 That man shall not live
 bread alone by bread alone, but by
 every word of God

Salvation by Works

vs.

Salvation through faith in Jesus Christ

NASB, NIV . Verses King James Bible

Children, how hard it Mark 10:24 Children, how hard it is
 is to enter the for them that trust in
 kingdom of God riches to enter into the
 kingdom of God

By standing firm you Luke 21:19 in your patience possess
 will save yourself ye your souls

obey Eph. 2:8 believe

faithfulness Gal. 5:22 faith

OMITTED Rom. 11:6 But if it be of works then
 it is no more grace:

the gospel Rom 1:16 the gospel of Christ

in whom we have Col. 1:14 in whom we have redemption
 redemption through his blood

faith Rom. 3:25 through faith in his blood

who believes Mark 9:42 believe in me

whosoever believes John 3:15 whosoever believeth in him

he who believes has John 6:47 He that believeth on me
 everlasting life hath everlasting life

calling on His name Acts 22:16 calling on the name of the
 Lord

Neither is circumcision Gal. 6:15 For in Christ Jesus

anything neither circumcision

availeth any thing

I bow my knees before Eph 3:14 I bow my knees unto the
 the Father Father of our Lord Jesus

Christ
 an heir of God Gal. 4:7 an heir of God through
 Christ
 God who created all Eph. 3:9 God who created all things
 things by Jesus Christ
 the Father Eph. 3:11 our Father of the Lord
 Jesus Christ
 every spirit that does 1 John 4:3 And every spirit that
 not acknowledge Jesus confesseth not that Jesus
 is not from God Christ is come in the
 flesh is not of God: and
 this is that spirit of
 antichrist.

Let no one forget the fact that **EVERY WORD in the Holy Bible is vitally important.**
 So important is this fact that the following warnings are given by the Almighty God
 concerning His Word.

Deut.4: 2 *Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall
 ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the
 LORD your God which I command you.*

Revelation *For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy
 22:18 of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add
 unto him the plagues that are written in this book:
 19: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of
 this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life,
 and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this
 book.*

It is absolutely impossible for me to over emphasise the gravity of the above warning. Let
 all who read it - beware!

3. CORRUPT MANUSCRIPTS

As mentioned above the NASV draws heavily from two of the most corrupt Greek
 manuscripts ever found, **Codex Sinaiticus** and **Codex Vaticanus**. This fact alone, when it
 is brought to one's attention, should cause discerning Bible students to stay clear of the
 NASV. To be sure that translation contains many passages which are **identical** to the KJV
 (as do all SBS Sermon Notes and Bible Lessons) but that does not make the NASV (or my
 own writings) the very **Word of God!** In my opinion the **NASV** is a clever and extremely

dangerous counterfeit; a **Bogus Bible** posing as the very **Word of God!** It must be exposed for what it really is - the **Work of Satan!**

In the 70+ verses that follow I have **highlighted in bold type** the words, phrases and verses which have been **changed** or **deleted** in the **NASV**. In a few instances I have included a **COMMENT**; but where I have not, the reader is advised to pause and consider the gravity of the corruption of which the **NASV** is guilty.

4. DOUBT-LADEN FOOTNOTES

The **NASV** like many other modern translations contains many doubt-laden footnotes such as:

- *'Many mss.(manuscripts) do not contain this verse.'*
- *'The earliest mss read.'*
- *'Some ancient mss add.'*
- *'Many ancient authorities read.'*
- *'Not found in the most of the old mss.'*
- *'Some mss insert.'*
- *'Some ancient mss do not contain.'*

Unlike a good Chain-Reference Bible that points the reader to other texts on the same subject, these footnotes clearly show that the **NASV** translators, **whilst putting on a show of apparent fairness**, are really unsure of their own product. *'Is the NASV God's Word for Today or Not?'* They obviously **don't know** or **don't believe**, else they would not insert so many conflicting footnotes; which not only cast doubt on the **King James Bible**, but also on their own version which within 28 years of its publication in 1971 is now being phased out.

These dubious **footnotes** impliedly teach that since there are so many disagreeing manuscripts no one can be certain as to which is the **real Word of God**. In effect they say: *'Take your pick, decide for yourself which manuscript or version you want to accept; for the fact is, no one can be certain what God actually said.'*

***'Yea hath God said?'* (Genesis 3:1)**

was, and still is, Satan's main weapon against truth. He deceived **Eve** in the Garden of Eden by planting **doubt about God's Word** in her mind. Satan is doing the very same thing with the modern translations of the Bible. **They all cast doubt on the real Word of God (the KJV)**; and those **insinuating footnotes** are the latest Satanic way of saying: ***'Hath God said?'***

With these thoughts in mind we will now turn our attention to the actual verses which

have been corrupted in the NASV. Remember that these texts are from the KJV and the words or phrases in **bold type** indicate where the NASV has twisted or deleted God's Word.

- Luke 4: 4: And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, **but by every word of God.**
- Luke 4: 8: And Jesus answered **and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan:** for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.
- Matt.25: 13: Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour **wherein the Son of man cometh.**
- Matt.27: 35: And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: **that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.**
- Mark 6: 11: And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. **Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrhah in the day of judgment, than for that city.**
- Mark 13: 14: But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, **spoken of by Daniel the prophet,** standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in Judaea flee to the mountains.
- John 7: 8: Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up **yet** unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come.
COMMENT: By omitting the word '**yet**' the NASV makes the Saviour a liar, because he did **later** go up to the feast. (John 7:10)
- John 3: 15: That whosoever believeth in him **should not perish,** but have eternal life.
COMMENT: This is an extremely powerful verse. It guarantees that whoever believes in Jesus (identified in verse 14) **should not perish but have eternal life.** But what do the NASV translators make of this verse? They mutilate it by deleting the words '**should not perish.**' Then they inject uncertainty by using the word '**may.**' There is no assurance here, no divine guarantee or promise. Instead, '*the believer... MAY in him have eternal life;*' implying thereby that he '**May Not!**'
- Rom.14: 10: But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat **of Christ.**
- Col.3: 6: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh **on the children of disobedience.**
- 1 Tim.3: 16: And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: **God** was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.
COMMENT: The word **God** has been changed to **He.** This is an attack on a cardinal truth namely that Jesus Christ is **God incarnate;** that is, **God in human flesh!** To replace the word **God** with **He** is a corruption of the text. It casts doubt

on the divinity of Jesus Christ.

- 1 John 4: 3: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus **Christ is come in the flesh** is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

COMMENT: the word **Christ** means '*the anointed One, the Messiah!*' In this verse the NASV omits the fact that **Jesus was indeed the Messiah, the anointed of God, the Christ!** Indeed whenever the word '*Christ*' is omitted from its rightful place in a modern translation, the fact that He is the **Messiah, the anointed of God**, is being silently denied.

- 1 Cor.5: 7: Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed **for us**.
- Col.1: 14: In whom we have redemption **through his blood**, even the forgiveness of sins:
- 1 Peter 4: 1: Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered **for us** in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin.

In Me / On Me / Of Christ / In Christ / Through Christ

- Mark 9: 42: And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe **in me**, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea.
- John 6: 47: Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth **on me** hath everlasting life.
- Rom.1: 16: For I am not ashamed of the gospel **of Christ:** for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.
- Gal.3: 17: And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God **in Christ**, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.
- Gal.4: 7: Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God **through Christ**.
- Gal.6: 15: For **in Christ Jesus** neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

Denial of a Literal Heaven

The NASV translators have a strange aversion to **heaven**. Notice how in the following six verses the references to **heaven** have been removed.

- Luke 11: 2: And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, **Our Father which art in heaven**, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. **Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth**.

COMMENT: The NASV translators have mutilated this verse, which has **32**

words, by deleting **14 of them!** Another **5 words** from this famous prayer have been deleted in the next verse:...And lead us not into temptation; **but deliver us from evil.**

- Heb.10: 34: For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have **in heaven** a better and an enduring substance.
- 1 John 5:7: For there are three that bear record **in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.** 8: **And there are three that bear witness in earth,** the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

COMMENT: Here is another example of massive mutilation.

- Luke 24: 51: And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and **carried up into heaven.**
- Rev.16: 17: And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple **of heaven,** from the throne, saying, It is done.
- John 3: 13: And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man **which is in heaven.**
- Luke 2: 33: And *Joseph* and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

COMMENT: The name **Joseph** has been changed to *His father*, thereby denying that God was the Saviour's Father not Joseph.

- John 8: 59: Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, **going through the midst of them, and so passed by.**
- Phil.4: 13: I can do all things **through Christ** which strengtheneth me.

COMMENT: As stated previously, the word **Christ** means the **anointed One, the Messiah.** The NASV replaces this powerful title with the word Him, which could mean anyone or any God for that matter.

- Rev.21: 24: And the nations **of them which are saved** shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it.

COMMENT: Deleting words from the Bible, especially from the book of **Revelation**, carry an extremely heavy penalty (Rev.22:18-19). The NASV translators by deleting the words '*of them which are saved*' have removed a vital proviso and allowed all nations to enter the new Jerusalem. It's not just '*the nations*' but rather '*the nations of them which are saved.*'

- 2 Cor.4: 14: Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also **by** Jesus, and shall present us with you.

COMMENT: The word **by** has been changed to **with!** This change makes the whole sentence nonsense; because this letter to the Corinthians was written over **25 years after** the resurrection of Jesus. So how could any believer at that time be resurrected '*with*' Jesus?

- Eph.3: 9: And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things **by Jesus Christ.**

COMMENT: The Bible plainly teaches that Jesus Christ (the living Word of God) created the universe. His Father was the architect, but the Son was the builder. The NASV translators deny this fact in the above verse by deleting the words *'by Jesus Christ.'*

- James 5: 16: Confess your **faults** one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.
COMMENT: The word *'faults'* has been changed to *'sins.'* There is a subtle difference between a *'fault'* and a *'sin.'* A *'fault'* is a defect or weakness (i.e. a short temper, an inclination to over drink, over eat etc.) A *'sin'* is a direct transgression or violation of a divine command. *'Faults'* may lead to sin if no control is exercised. But *'faults'* are not *'sins.'* *'Faults'* are weaknesses which could result in *'sin'* if not controlled; but faults are not sins.
However, the main danger of the change in this verse is that it raises the issue of *'Christians confessing their sins to a priest?'* Is that what the Bible teaches?
Confession.
- Acts 2: 30: Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, **according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne.**
- Rev.1: 8: I am Alpha and Omega, **the beginning and the ending**, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.
- Rev.1: 11: Saying, **I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last:** and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.
- Rev.2: 9: **I know thy works**, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.
- Rev.2: 20: Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants **to commit fornication**, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols.
COMMENT: The term *'acts of immorality'* have been substituted for *'fornication.'* *'Acts of immorality'* mean different things to different people. Any solicitor will tell you that God's warning about *'fornication'* in this verse has been considerably weakened; especially in view of the specific instruction about *'fornication'* given in Acts 15:20 to the newly converted Gentiles.
- Rev. 2: 15: So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, **which thing I hate.**
- Rev.5: 14: And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped **him that liveth for ever and ever.**
- Rev.11: 17: Saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, **and art to come;** because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned.
- Rev.16: 5: And I heard the angel of the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord,

which art, and wast, **and shalt be**, because thou hast judged thus.

The Title LORD, which identifies the Saviour's Deity is repeatedly left out in the NASV.

- Matt.13: 51: Jesus saith unto them, Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him, Yea, **Lord**.
- Mark 9: 24: And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, **Lord**, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.
- Luke 9: 57: And it came to pass, that, as they went in the way, a certain man said unto him, **Lord**, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.
- Luke 22: 31: **And the Lord said**, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat.
- Luke 23: 42: And he said unto Jesus, **Lord**, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.
- Rom.6: 11: Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ **our Lord**.
- 1 Cor.15: 47: The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is **the Lord** from heaven.
- 2 Cor.4: 10: Always bearing about in the body the dying of **the Lord** Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.
- Gal.6: 17: From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of **the Lord** Jesus.
- 1 Tim.1: 1: Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour, and **Lord** Jesus Christ, which is our hope.
- 1 Tim.5: 21: I charge thee before God, and the **Lord** Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.
- 2 Tim.4: 1: I charge thee therefore before God, and **the Lord** Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom.
- Titus 1: 4: To Titus, mine own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and **the Lord** Jesus Christ our Saviour.
- 2 John 1: 3: Grace be with you, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and from **the Lord** Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love.
- John 6: 69: And we believe and are sure that thou art that **Christ, the Son of the living God**.

COMMENT: This vital verse which identifies Jesus as the '*Messiah*,' the '*Christ*,' the '*Son of the living God*' has been changed to read: the '*holy one of God*;' a term which could apply to any prophet or godly person. Pause dear reader and try to take in what that means.

MY Father changed to THE Father.

The NASV casts doubt on the fact that GOD not Joseph was the Father of Jesus Christ.

Notice how in the following four verses **my Father** is changed to **the Father**.

- John 8: 28: Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as **my Father** hath taught me, I speak these things.
- John 10: 32: Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from **my Father**; for which of those works do ye stone me?
- John 14: 28: Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for **my Father** is greater than I.
- John 16: 10: Of righteousness, because I go to **my Father**, and ye see me no more.
- Col.1: 2: To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father **and the Lord Jesus Christ**.
- Luke 24: 52: And they **worshipped him**, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy.

5. BRACKETED VERSES

Bracketed verses in the NASV are accompanied with Misleading Notes which, as pointed out previously, all cast doubt on the veracity of the King James Version.

- Matt.18: 11: [For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.]
COMMENT: The following dubious Note appears at the foot of the page: *'Most ancient mss. (manuscripts) do not contain this verse.'*
- Mark 16:9-20 **COMMENT:** These 12 verses are [bracketed] and the following misleading note appears at the foot of the page: *'Some of the oldest mss. do not contain vv 9-20.'*
- Luke 9: 56: [**For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.**] And they went to another village.
- Luke 24: 40: [**And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet.**]
- John 7:53 - 8:11 **COMMENT:** As in the above verses this entire passage is also [bracketed] and its authenticity questioned by the dubious Note: *'John 7:53-811 is not found in most of the old manuscripts.'*
- Mark 15: 28: [**And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.**] **COMMENT:** As in the above passages this verse is also [bracketed] and its authenticity questioned by the dubious Note: *'many mss. Do not contain this verse.'*
- Luke 24: 12: [**Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass.**] **COMMENT:** As in the above cases this verse is also [bracketed] and its authenticity questioned by the dubious Note: *'Some ancient mss. Do not contain verse 12.'*
- Acts 8: 37: [**And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.**]

6. NO DOCTRINAL DIFFERENCES?

Some believers claim that, even allowing for the above changes, **no doctrinal differences** can be found in the NASV. Is this the case? Are we making a mountain out of a molehill? The reader will have noticed that in the passages already quoted many basic Christian doctrines are affected. To name a few:

- **Is Christ the Creator?** Did he actually make **all** things?
- **Is Jesus God?** Should he be called **Lord**? Is He the **Son of God**? Is He God incarnate, God in human flesh? Or was Joseph His father?
- **The Saviour's Title:** Is Jesus the **Christ**, the **Messiah**, the promised Anointed One?
- **Was Jesus a liar, or was He sinless?**
- **Is Jesus the Alpha and Omega? Or is he deceiving Himself and us?**
- **The Resurrection:** Did the Lord Jesus Christ actually come from heaven and did He return to heaven after His resurrection? Is he in heaven? Is there a Temple in Heaven?
- And lastly are the translators of the NASV confident that their work is indeed the **Word of God**? Or are those numerous **footnotes** evidence of their colossal doubt; evidence that they themselves do not believe that there is any such thing as the **real WORD OF GOD** in existence today!

It is poor reasoning to justify a missing doctrine in one text by claiming that it can be found in another part of the Scriptures. Who are we to decide or judge how often God specifies a doctrine? If He chooses to repeat anything, be it a command or a doctrine, let us beware of amending His work! There is absolutely no excuse for altering God's Holy Word. As Rev. Samuel C Gipp once said

'Cut just one vein and you could kill a man as surely as if you had blown him to pieces!' If Satan had altered every text concerning a single doctrine his deception would have been soon discovered by even the casual Bible student. All he needed to deceive God's people was to alter a word or sentence here and another word or sentence there. That was all that was necessary; and that is what he has so successfully done with **every modern translation** which is based on corrupt manuscripts. He has deceived millions of sincere Christians and **I was one of them!**

In his book **Missing In Modern Bibles - Is the Full Story Being Told?** Pastor Jack Moorman has actually counted every word in the New Testament Greek Texts, both of the **Received Text - (Textus Receptus)** and the **Revised Text**. He found that of the **140,521 Greek words** in the **Received Text**, a total of **2,886 words** were omitted from the **Revised Text** of Nestle-Aland and Westcott and Hort. These **2,886 words** have affected **356 doctrinal passages!** Pause and take note of that astonishing fact!

Pastor Moorman reviews these **356** passages in another of his books entitled **Early Manuscripts and The Authorized Version --- A Closer Look**. If you really want to ensure that the Bible you are studying every day is the very **Word of God**, then take steps to obtain these books and study them. Another highly recommended book is by Rev. D.A. Waite entitled **Defending the King James Bible**. These books, and many, many others on this same subject of Bible Versions, are published by **The Bible For Today Press**: 900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, New Jersey 08108. U.S.A.

SUMMARY

1. Though this article deals exclusively with textual corruption found in the **New American Standard Version (NASV)**; the reader may compare **any** modern translation against the texts listed in this article.
2. **Every single word in the Bible is vitally important**. Any attempt to add, delete or change a word or text in the Bible, especially in the book of **Revelation**, will attract the wrath of God and could result in the loss of eternal life. (Rev.22:18-19)
3. The NASV is strongly influenced by two corrupt manuscripts: **Codex Sinaiticus** and **Codex Vaticanus**. These have defiled the entire publication.
4. **Doubt-laden Footnotes** in the NASV cause one to conclude that the translators themselves do **not believe** the NASV (nor indeed any other translation) is the **Word of God!**
In other words they are not sure. They don't know. They don't believe!
5. **Bracketed Texts** are also evidence that the translators do not believe that the Almighty has preserved His Word. So they include these verses - just in case.
6. **The idea that Vital Doctrines are unaffected in the NASV is a fallacy**. Some **2,886 words** are missing from the Greek text that underlies the NASV. These words affect **356 doctrinal passages!** Dare anyone accuse God of unnecessarily repeating three, four or five times the same doctrine!

It is no secret that the **Protestant Reformation** was greatly accelerated by the publication of the **Authorised King James Version (AV or KJV)** in the year **1611**. Since that time well over **800,000,000** copies of this sacred book have been printed in some 800 languages and dialects. The **KJV** is still the accepted **Holy Bible** in many countries of the world and hymns based on its verses are still sung by believers everywhere. The **KJV** is of course, **'the' Protestant Bible**. Because of this fact, during the dark ages, many millions of Protestants were persecuted for possessing, reading and believing its sacred pages. No one knows the exact number of Bible-believing Christians who were martyred over the centuries, but the number certainly runs into many millions. It is also a well known fact that the **KJV** has never been accepted by the **Roman Catholic Church**. The reasons go far deeper than any of us can remotely imagine. In this article I will briefly point out why Christians should return to the study of the **Authorised Version (AV)**.

1. PROVIDENTIAL PRESERVATION

The first reason is because the **AV is the providentially preserved Word of God**; divinely preserved through the ages in direct fulfilment of **Jehovah's** promises to do so. Our faith in **providential preservation** is based on Bible texts such as:

- *The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever. (Psalm 12: 6-7)*
- *Psalm 119:89 For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven...*
- *Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. (Matthew 24:35)*
- *Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever... The word of the Lord endureth for ever. (1Peter 1:23-25)*

The Textus Receptus

The **Authorised Version**, like all the early Protestant Bibles of countries such as Switzerland, Germany, Holland, France, Spain, Italy etc. was translated from a Text called in the early Reformation days the **Received Text (Textus Receptus)**. Before that time this Text, also known as the **Majority Text**, was used by the early church in Israel, the Middle East, Asia Minor and Greece. In those lands we see the Almighty preserving His inspired Word as He promised to do. Because of its purity the **Received Text** was then used by all the early Protestant Reformers of Europe for their translations. **Textus Receptus** also became the basis of the **Authorised Version**.

The Westcourt / Hort / Nestle / Aland Greek Text

But a strange and dangerous development began to occur towards the end of the 19th century. New translations of the Bible, based on a vastly different Greek text, known initially as the **Westcourt/Hort (W/H) Greek text**, began to appear. This text later became the basis of the **Nestle/Aland Text** which underlies virtually every modern translation of the Bible published since 1881.

According to the Rev. Jack. A. Moorman's book **Missing in Modern Bibles - Is the Full Story Being Told?** the *Nestle/Aland Greek Text* is shorter than *Textus Receptus* by **2886 words!** Those 2886 words are equivalent to the books of 1st and 2nd Peter. Pause and consider that stunning fact!

Rev. D.A. Waite writes the following on page 42 of his masterful book **Defending the King James Bible**: (ISBN #1-56848-000-8).

"No matter how you try to translate the New International Version, let us say, or the New American Standard Version, since they're based on in the New Testament on the Nestle/Aland Text that differs from the Received Text in over 5,600 places, involving almost

10,000 Greek words -there's no way in the world you could make them equal to the King James Bible which is based on the **Received Text**. **The NIV and NAS are perversions of the Word of God** because they are based upon a Greek text that is false to the truth and improper in every way. **The FOUNDATION IS FAULTY.**"

The **Nestle/Aland Greek Text** is, I understand, now in its 26th edition. Roman Catholic Cardinal **Carlo M. Martini**, who many believe may be the next Pope, was a member of its editorial committee!

From the above we can see that **W/H Nestle/Aland Greek Text**, which is now gladly accepted by the Roman Catholic Church, differs greatly from the **Textus Receptus** on which the Reformation Bibles were based. Keep these facts in mind as we now turn our attention to the **New International Version (NIV)** which is based on the **W/H Nestle/Aland Greek Text**.

What's The Difference?

The difference between **Textus Receptus (TR)** and the **W/H Nestle/Aland** texts is caused by two ancient manuscripts (**Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph)** and **Codex Vaticanus (B)**). The TR excludes these two manuscripts. The Nestle/Aland text includes them. **Codex Sinaiticus** was retrieved from a wastepaper basket in a convent at the foot of Mount Sinai in A.D.1844. **Codex Vaticanus**, a 4th century document, was found in 1481 in the **Vatican library in Rome**, where it had lain virtually unused for over a thousand years. These two ancient manuscripts, both of which were considered unfit for use even by their own custodians, were seized upon in the later half of the 19th century and foisted on the unsuspecting Christian church in place of the trusted **Textus Receptus**. The following reference from page 554 of G.A.Ripplinger's book **New Age Versions** (ISBN 0-9635845-0-2) refers:

1. *"Metzger says that Sinaiticus and Vaticanus do not agree with the majority of manuscripts.*
2. *Not only do they disagree with the Majority of manuscripts , but they do not agree with each other. The 8000 changes in B and the 9000 changes in Aleph are not the same changes. When their changes are added together, they alter the Majority text in about 13,000 places. This is two changes for every verse. Together they omit 4000 words, add 2000, transpose 3500, and modify 2000.*
3. *They disagree with each other a dozen times on every page.*
4. *Colwell says they disagree 70% of the time and in almost every verse of the gospels. Burgon says: 'It is easier to find two consecutive verses in which these manuscripts differ than two in which they agree.'*

The NIV, as do most modern translations, draws heavily from Codices **Sinaiticus** and **Vaticanus**, hence its corrupt character.

2. A DIVINE WARNING

No one will doubt but that it is an extremely dangerous thing to produce counterfeit bank notes; because **both** the **printer** and those who *knowingly* trade with counterfeit currency could face severe sentences. Tampering with the **Word of God** is infinitely more dangerous, both for the **publishers** and the *informed users* of counterfeit Bibles. Let all who read this article pay close attention to the following divine warnings:

Deuteronomy 4: *Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.*

Revelation 22:18 *For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: 19: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.*

It is absolutely impossible for me to over emphasise the gravity of the above warning. Let all who read it - beware!

3. DOUBT-LADEN FOOTNOTES

The NIV, like many other modern translations, contains many doubt-laden footnotes such as:

- *'Many mss.(manuscripts) do not contain this verse.'*
- *'The best manuscripts read.'*
- *'The earliest mss read.'*
- *'Some ancient mss add.'*
- *'Some mss insert.'*
- *'Many ancient authorities read.'*
- *'Not found in most of the old mss.'*
- *'Some late manuscripts.'*
- *'Some manuscripts and certain Jews.'*
- *'Some manuscripts do not have...'*

These footnotes clearly show that the NIV translators, **whilst putting on a show of apparent fairness**, are really unsure of their product; they doubt whether the NIV is God's Word for today. The editors obviously **don't know** or **don't believe it is**, else they would not insert so many conflicting footnotes; which not only cast doubt on the **King James Bible**, but also on their own version. These dubious **footnotes** all imply that since there are so many disagreeing manuscripts, no one can be absolutely certain as to which is the

real Word of God. In effect they say: *'Take your pick, decide for yourself which manuscript or version you want to believe; for the fact is, no one can be certain what God actually inspired His prophets and apostles to write.'*

'Yea hath God said?' (Gen.3:1) was, and still is, Satan's main weapon against truth. He deceived **Eve** in the Garden of Eden by planting **doubt concerning God's Word** in her mind. Satan is doing the very same thing with the modern translations of the Bible. **They all cast doubt on the real Word of God (the KJV);** and those **insinuating footnotes** are the latest Satanic way of saying: *'Hath God said?'* Is it any wonder there are so few Christians who really believe the Bible is the infallible **Word of God!**

4. THE PROOF

With these thoughts in mind we will now turn our attention to the actual verses which have been corrupted in the NIV. Remember that these texts are from the **Authorised Version (AV)** and the words in **bold type** indicate where the **NIV** has omitted or corrupted the text.

- Genesis 12:18 *And Pharaoh called Abram, and said, What is this that thou hast done unto me? why didst thou not tell me that she was thy wife? 19 Why saidst thou, She is my sister? so **I might have taken her to me to wife.***
Comment: The NIV says: *'Why didn't you tell me she was your wife? Why did you say she is my sister, so **that I took her to be my wife.**'* This is a serious mistranslation. The NIV implies that Pharaoh had already taken Sarah as his wife and had sexual intercourse with her; which was not the case.
- Genesis 49: 10 *The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until **Shiloh** come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.*
Comment: The title **Shiloh**, referring to Christ the Peacemaker, is missing.
- **LUCIFER:** Isa:14:12: *How art thou fallen from heaven, O **Lucifer**, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!*
Comment: In the book **New Age Bible Versions**, G A Ripplinger writes on page 43 concerning this passage: *"The ultimate blasphemy occurs when the '**morning star**' takes **Lucifer's** place in Isaiah 14. Jesus Christ is the '**morning star**' and is identified as such in Revelation 22:16 and 2Peter 1:19. With this slight of hand switch, Satan not only slyly slips out of the picture but lives up to his name '**the accuser**'" (Revelation 12:10) by attempting to make Jesus Christ the subject of the diatribe in Isaiah 14." Modern Reference books also do not include the name **Lucifer**. As Ripplinger puts it: *"The trend to ignore the KJV's Lucifer/Satan connection is shared by Luciferians and new version editors."**
- Luke 4: 4: *And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, **but by every word of God.***
Comment: Note the importance of *'every word of God.'* Dare we ignore the

Saviour's answer to Satan by omitting hundreds of words from Scripture as do the NIV translators?

- Luke 4: 8: And Jesus answered **and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan:** for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.
- Luke 9: 56: **For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.** And they went to another village.
Comment: This vital passage in bold type is [bracketed] in the NASV which was printed some seven years before the NIV. In the NIV this passage is deleted. Notice how step by step modern translations are becoming more and more corrupt! First comes a [bracketed] verse with an insinuating footnote. Then in the next version the text is **omitted**, but the footnote remains. Finally the text and the footnote will be omitted; and the poor, unsuspecting Christian who doesn't know what the AV says will be none the wiser.
- Matt.25: 13: Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour **wherein the Son of man cometh.**
- Matt.27: 35: And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: **that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.**
- Mark 6: 11: And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. **Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrhah in the day of judgment, than for that city.**
- Mark 13: 14: But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, **spoken of by Daniel the prophet**, standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in Judaea flee to the mountains.
- Luke 24: 52: And they **worshipped him**, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy.
- John 3: 15: That whosoever believeth in him **should not perish**, but have eternal life.
Comment: This is an extremely powerful verse. It guarantees that whoever believes in Jesus (identified in verse 14) **should not perish** but have eternal life. But what do the NIV translators make of this verse? They mutilate it by deleting the words '**should not perish.**' Then they inject uncertainty by using the word '*may.*' There is no assurance here, no divine guarantee or promise. Instead, '*the believer... MAY in him have eternal life;*' implying thereby that he '**May Not!**'
- Rom.14: 10: But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat **of Christ.**
- Col.3: 6: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh **on the children of disobedience.**
- 1 Tim.3: 16: And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: **God** was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.
Comment: The word **God** has been changed to **He**. This is an attack on a cardinal

truth, namely that *Jesus Christ is God incarnate*; that is, *God in human flesh!* To replace '**God**' with '**He**' is a serious corruption of the text. It casts doubt on the divinity of Jesus Christ.

- 1 John 4: 3: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus **Christ is come in the flesh** is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

Comment: the word **Christ** means '*the anointed One, the Messiah!*' In this verse the NIV omits the fact that **Jesus is the Messiah, the anointed of God, the Christ!** Indeed whenever the word '*Christ*' is omitted from its rightful place in a modern translation, the fact that He is the **Messiah, the anointed of God who has come in the flesh,**' is being silently denied. That denial is itself clear evidence that the spirit of Antichrist is at work!

- 1 Cor.5: 7: Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed **for us.**
- Col.1: 14: In whom we have redemption **through his blood,** even the forgiveness of sins:
- 1 Peter 4: 1: Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered **for us** in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin.

In Me / On Me / Of Christ / In Christ / Through Christ

- John 6: 47: Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth **on me** hath everlasting life.
- Rom.1: 16: For I am not ashamed of the gospel **of Christ:** for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.
- Gal.3: 17: And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God **in Christ,** the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.
- Gal.4: 7: Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God **through Christ.**
- Gal.6: 15: For **in Christ Jesus** neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

Denial of a Literal Heaven

The NIV translators also have a strange aversion to '*heaven.*' Notice how in the following four verses the references to **heaven** have been removed.

- Luke 11: 2: And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, '*Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth.* 3: Give us day by day our daily bread. 4: And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into

temptation; but deliver us from evil.

Comment: In the NIV this prayer has 34 words. In the KJV it has 58! That's mutilation in any language.

- Heb.10: 34: For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have **in heaven** a better and an enduring substance.
- 1 John 5:7: For there are three that bear record **in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.** 8: **And there are three that bear witness in earth,** the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

Comment: Here is another example of massive mutilation.

- Rev.16: 17: And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple **of heaven**, from the throne, saying, It is done.
- Luke 2: 33: And **Joseph** and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

Comment: The name **Joseph** has been changed to *His father*, thereby denying that God was the Saviour's Father not Joseph.

- Phil.4: 13: I can do all things **through Christ** which strengtheneth me.

Comment: As stated previously, the word **Christ** means the **anointed One, the Messiah**. The NIV replaces this Messianic title with the pronoun **Him**, which could mean anyone.

- 2 Cor.4: 14: Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also **by** Jesus, and shall present us with you.

Comment: The word **by** has been changed to **with!** This change makes the whole sentence total nonsense; because this letter to the Corinthians was written over **25 years after** the resurrection of Jesus. So how could any believer at that time be resurrected *'with'* Jesus?

- Eph.3: 9: And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things **by Jesus Christ.**

Comment: The Bible plainly teaches that Jesus Christ (the living Word of God) created the universe. His Father was the architect, but the Son was the builder. The NIV translators deny this fact in the above verse by deleting the words *'by Jesus Christ.'*

- James 5: 16: Confess your **faults** one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.

Comment: The word *'faults'* has been changed to *'sins.'* There is a big difference between a *'fault'* and a *'sin.'* A *'fault'* is a defect or weakness (i.e. a short temper, an inclination to over drink, over eat etc.) A *'sin'* is a direct transgression or violation of a divine command. *'Faults'* may lead to sin if no control is exercised. But *'faults'* are not *'sins.'* *'Faults'* are weaknesses which could result in *'sin'* if not controlled; but faults are not sins. The practice of confessing sins to a priest is not Bible-based. Should Christians confess their sins to a priest? For the answer see

Confession.

- Acts 2: 30: Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, **according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne.**

Comment: The NIV renders this part of God's oath as *'he would place one of his descendants on his throne.'* Doesn't that make a mockery of God's oath? After all why did the Almighty bother to make an oath when in virtually every kingdom *'one of the king's descendants'* succeeds him. That's the normal procedure anyway; there's no need to make an oath about it. But when the Almighty promised king David that *'He would raise up Christ to sit on David's throne'* that is totally different; because it contains the promise that the **Messiah** would come from David's line and; more importantly, that the Messiah would be *'raised up,'* that is, *'resurrected from the grave'* to sit on David's throne for all time!

DELETIONS FROM THE BOOK OF REVELATION

Though the divine warning in Rev.22:18-19 applies to the whole Bible, it is **particularly applicable** to the book of Revelation when the book itself would be understood. The NIV editors have ignored the divine warning by omitting the words or phrases in **bold type**:

- Rev.1: 8: I am Alpha and Omega, **the beginning and the ending**, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.
- Rev.1: 11: Saying, **I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last:** and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.
- Rev.2: 9: I know **thy works**, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.
- Rev.2:13: I know **thy works**, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is...
- Rev.2: 20: Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants **to commit fornication**, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols.
Comment: The word *'astray'* has been substituted for the word *'fornication.'* Any solicitor will agree that God's warning about *'fornication'* in this verse has been blurred and weakened; especially in view of the specific instruction about *'fornication'* given in Acts 15:20 to the newly converted Gentiles.
- Rev. 2: 15: So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, **which thing I hate.**
- Rev.5: 14: And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped **him that liveth for ever and ever.**
- Rev.11: 17: Saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, **and art to come;** because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast

reigned.

- Rev.16: 5: And I heard the angel of the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, **and shalt be**, because thou hast judged thus.
- Rev.16: 17: And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple **of heaven**, from the throne, saying, It is done.
- Rev.21: 24: And the nations **of them which are saved** shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it.

Comment: As mentioned above, deleting words from the Bible, especially from the book of **Revelation**, carry an extremely heavy penalty (Rev.22:18-19). In this verses the NIV translators by deleting the words '**of them which are saved**' have removed a vital proviso and allowed all nations to enter the new Jerusalem.

The title Lord identifies Jesus as God Incarnate!

This title is repeatedly omitted in the NIV. This is an inexcusable error. It dare not be overlooked or excused as an irrelevance, because that title Lord identifies Jesus as **God!**

- Matt.13: 51: Jesus saith unto them, Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him, Yea, **Lord**.
- Mark 9: 24: And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, **Lord**, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.
- Mark 11:10 *Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh **in the name of the Lord**: Hosanna in the highest.*
- Luke 9: 57: And it came to pass, that, as they went in the way, a certain man said unto him, **Lord**, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.
- Luke 22: 31: **And the Lord said**, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat.
- Luke 23: 42: And he said unto Jesus, **Lord**, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.
- Rom.6: 11: Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ **our Lord**.
- 1 Cor.15: 47: The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is **the Lord** from heaven.
- 2 Cor.4: 10: Always bearing about in the body the dying of **the Lord** Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.
- Gal.6: 17: From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of **the Lord** Jesus.
- Col.1: 2: To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father **and the Lord Jesus Christ**.
- 1 Tim.1: 1: Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour, and **Lord** Jesus Christ, which is our hope.
- 1 Tim.5: 21: I charge thee before God, and the **Lord** Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.

- 2 Tim.4: 1: I charge thee therefore before God, and **the Lord** Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom.
- Titus 1: 4: To Titus, mine own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and **the Lord** Jesus Christ our Saviour.
- 2 John 1: 3: Grace be with you, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and from **the Lord** Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love.
- John 6: 69: And we believe and are sure that thou art that **Christ, the Son of the living God.**

Comment: This vital verse which identifies Jesus as the '*Messiah,*' the '*Christ,*' the '*Son of the living God*' has been changed in the NIV to read: the '*holy one of God;*' a term which could apply to any prophet or godly person. Pause dear reader and try to take in what that means.

MY Father changed to 'the' Father.

The NIV casts doubt on the fact that GOD, not Joseph, was the Father of Jesus Christ. In the following four verses **my Father** is changed to **the Father**.

- John 8: 28: Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as **my** Father hath taught me, I speak these things.
- John 10: 32: Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from **my** Father; for which of those works do ye stone me?
- John 14: 28: Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for **my** Father is greater than I.
- John 16: 10: Of righteousness, because I go to **my** Father, and ye see me no more.

5. BRACKETED VERSES

[Bracketed verses] in other modern translations (i.e. NASV) are usually accompanied with misleading footnotes. In the NIV some texts are simply omitted and a footnote appears explaining why. However in large passages involving many texts, such as the two given below, brackets are not used. Instead the passage is simply separated from the main text by a bold line and noted.

- Mark 16:9 *Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. 10: And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. 11: And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not. 12: After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. 13: And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. 14: Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. 15: And he said*

unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. 16: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. 17: And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; 18: They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. 19: So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. 20: And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.

Comment: Believe it or not the validity of this entire passage of 12 verses is doubted by the editors of the NIV. Unlike in the NASV these 12 verses are not [bracketed]. Instead they are separated from the normal text by a bold line and accompanied by an insinuating and totally false Note which reads as follows: *'The most reliable early manuscripts and other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 16:9-20.'*

John Burgon's book **The Last 12 Verses of Mark** proves without a shadow of doubt that these verses, which contain many basic Christian **doctrines**, were all part of Mark's Gospel. To suggest that they were not is to cast doubt on Mark's Gospel and the entire New Testament.

- A similar Note and bold line separates the 12 verses between John 7:53 and John 8:11 from the main text. They are all doubted by the NIV editors.

6. NO DOCTRINAL DIFFERENCES?

The dictionary defines the word '**doctrine**' as '*a principle or set of principles and beliefs held by a religious or other group.*' The NASV and NIV have replaced this meaningful word '**doctrine**' with '**teaching**;' a word which considerably detracts from the meaning God intended and which is a poor substitute for the '**doctrine**.' In the following passages the meaningful noun '**doctrine**' has been replaced by the nebulous word '**teaching**.'

Matt.7:28, Matt.15:9, 16:12, 22:33, Mark 1:22, 1:27, 4:2, 7:7, 11:18, 12:38, Luke 4:32, John 7:16-17, 18:19, Acts 2:42, 5:28, 13:12, 17:19, Rom.6:17, 16:17, 1 Cor.14:6, 14:26, 1 Tim.1:10, 4:16, 5:17, **2 Tim.3:10, 3:16, 4:3**, 2 John 1:9, Rev.2:14, 15, 24.

How true were the Apostles words when he wrote:

2 Tim.4:3 *For the time will come when they will not endure sound **DOCTRINE**;
but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves **TEACHERS**, having itching ears;*

Some believers claim that, even allowing for the above changes, **no doctrinal differences** can be found in the NIV. Is this the case? Are we making a mountain out of a molehill? I think not. The reader will have noticed that in the passages already quoted many basic Christian doctrines are affected. To name a few:

- **Is Jesus Christ the Creator?** Did he actually make **all things**?
- **Is Jesus God?** Should he be called **Lord**? Is He the **Son of God**, God incarnate, God in human flesh? Or was the carpenter **Joseph** His father?
- **Is Jesus the Messiah, the Promised Anointed One, the Christ?** If so, then why has His title '**Christ**' been omitted so often?
- **The Resurrection:** Did the Lord Jesus Christ actually come from **heaven** and did He return to **heaven** after His resurrection? Is he in **heaven**? Is there a Temple in **heaven**? If you answer '*Yes*' to these questions, then why has the NIV omitted the word **heaven** so often?
- **Is Doctrine Important?** If so then why has the robust and meaningful noun '**doctrine**' been almost phased out of the NIV and NASV? Perhaps it is because the **doctrines** themselves are slowly but surely being eroded by misguided **teachers**!
- And lastly, are the translators of the NIV confident that their product is indeed the **Word of God**? Or are those numerous **footnotes** evidence of their colossal doubt; evidence that they themselves do not believe that there is **any such thing today as the infallible WORD OF GOD!**

It is poor reasoning to justify a missing doctrine in one text by claiming it can be found in another part of the Scriptures. Who are we to decide or judge how often God specifies a doctrine? If He chooses to repeat a statement, even in the very next verse as in 1 John 4:2-3, let us beware of deleting one occurrence. There is absolutely no excuse for altering God's Holy Word.

As **Rev. Samuel C Gipp** once said

'Cut just one vein and you could kill a man as surely as if you had blown him to pieces!'

If Satan had altered every text concerning a single doctrine his deception would have been soon discovered by even the casual Bible student. All he needed to deceive God's people was to alter or delete a word or sentence here and another word or sentence there. That was all that was necessary; and that is what he has so successfully done with **every modern translation**. He has deceived millions of sincere Christians.

In his book **Missing In Modern Bibles - Is the Full Story Being Told?** Pastor Jack Moorman has actually counted every word in the New Testament Greek Texts, both of the **Received Text** and the **Revised Text**. He found that of the **140,521 Greek words** in the **Received Text**, a total of **2,886** words were omitted from the **Revised Text** of Nestle-Aland and Westcott and Hort. These **2,886 words** have affected **356 doctrinal passages!** Pause and take note of that astonishing fact!

Pastor Moorman reviews these **356** passages in another of his books entitled **Early Manuscripts and The Authorized Version --- A Closer Look**. If you really want to ensure that the Bible you are studying every day is the very **Word of God**, then take steps to obtain these books and study them. Another highly recommended book is by Rev. D.A. Waite entitled **Defending the King James Bible**. These books, and many, many others on

this same subject of Bible Versions, are published by **The Bible For Today Press**: 900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, New Jersey 08108. U.S.A. See also Reference Books on Bible Versions.

7. MISSING TEXTS

Not content with amending scores of texts and tagging them with misleading footnotes, the editors of the NIV have omitted many entire verses from their work. Here is a list of missing verses:

- Matthew 17:21 *Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.*
- Matthew 23:14 *Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.*
- Mark 9:44 *Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*
- Mark 9:46 *Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*
- Mark 11:26 *But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.*
- Luke 17:36 *Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.*
- Luke 23:17 *For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.*
- John 5:4 *For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.*
- Acts 15:34 *Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still.*
- Acts 24:7 *But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands.*
- Acts 28:29 *And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.*
- Romans 16:24 *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.*
- Matthew 18:11 *For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost.*
- Mark 15:28 *And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.*
- Acts 8: 37 *And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*

SUMMARY

1. Though this article deals exclusively with textual corruption found in the **New International Version**; the reader may compare **any** modern translation against the texts listed in this article. The **Authorised King James Version** on the other hand, is the **inspired, preserved and infallible Word of God** for today; just as it has been for generations of Protestants for nearly 400 years.
2. **Every single word in the Bible is vital.** Any attempt to add, delete or change the text, especially in the book of **Revelation**, attracts the wrath of Almighty God and

could even result in the loss of eternal life. (Rev.22:18-19) Alas, modern man has ignored this awesome warning and produced scores of counterfeit bibles based on corrupt manuscripts. The NIV is one of these counterfeit bibles. It is strongly influenced by the two impure manuscripts: **Codex Sinaiticus** and **Codex Vaticanus**. These have defiled the entire publication.

3. **Dubious Footnotes** in the NIV cause one to conclude that the translators themselves do **not believe** the NIV (or any other translation) is the infallible **Word of God!** In other words they do not believe the Almighty **providentially preserved** His Word as He promised He would. In their opinion even the Bible is evolving; with each new translation coming somehow nearer to the inspired Masters penned by the prophets and apostles.
4. **In over 80 passages** listed here, **11 of which are from the book of Revelation**, the NIV translators have corrupted the Scriptures! God alone knows how disastrous their act of literary vandalism will turn out to be! Their guilt is great; but so is the guilt of Christians who, after being told the facts, continue to treat the NIV as the very Word of God, which it most certainly isn't.
5. **Bracketed Texts** in other translations such as the NASV are simply omitted in the NIV. When they are included, as in Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53- John 8:1-9, they are separated from the main body of text with a **bold line** and commented upon in a totally false and misleading way.
6. **The idea that Vital Doctrines are unaffected in the NIV is a total fallacy;** which only the naive will continue to believe. The fact is some **2,886 words** that affect **356 doctrinal passages** are missing from the Greek text that underlies the NIV! To suggest that these omissions make no **doctrinal difference** is as foolish as a mechanic suggesting that a bicycle wheel would be unaffected and remain true even were you to remove 6 of its 36 spokes! Or a space programmer claiming that deleting a few lines of computer coding would not affect the shuttle's performance; or supposing that miss-keying one alpha-character in a computer password would make no difference. The fact is, the Word of God is an infinitely precise and delicately balanced document. It is a **living, spiritual entity**, with which mankind interferes at its peril. Anyone who has studied *Michael Drosnin's* book **The Bible Code** will realise how important every letter and word in Scripture is. Remove just one alpha-character and a thousand meaningful sequences and links are affected. The NIV translators have chosen to infect their version with corrupt manuscripts and **Christians who knowingly feed on their polluted product will not escape the consequences!** Pause and take note of that terrifying prospect!
7. The foundation text of the NIV (the NASV and most other modern translations) is the **Nestle/Aland Greek Text**, which is **2886 words** shorter than the ancient **Textus Receptus** on which the KJV is based. The NIV, to my knowledge, totally omits 15 Bible texts. This is in flagrant defiance of the divine threat in Revelation 22:18-19. In the book of Revelation, with full knowledge of the warning in Chapter 22:18-19, the NIV editors omit **45 words** that I know of. Pause and think about these stunning facts!