

The Blood of Jesus

The omission of the ‘blood of Jesus’ showing how the editors of the Greek used for modern bibles were Antichrists.

Note: The word ‘covenant’ is used sometimes instead of ‘testament’ in referenced to what the Blood of Jesus did. This used only by people who were not apostles unless it referred to Israel and The Law. The apostles always used ‘testament’ in reference to the Blood of Jesus and what He did.

AV Matt 26:28 For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins	RV Matt 26:28 for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins.	Sinaiticus Matt 26:28 for this is my blood of the New Covenant, that is shed for many for remission of sins.
---	--	--

RV and Sinaiticus have ‘*covenant*’ and not *testament*. A testament is left by someone who died. A covenant is an agreement between two people. So the New Testament is described as an agreement between God and man (Covenant) and not something God was able to give us because of the death of Christ (Testament).

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;	Acts 17:26 and he made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined <i>their</i> appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation;	Acts 17:26 he also made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having fixed the times before appointed, and the limits of their habitations,
---	--	---

They have omitted the fact that what Jesus did at Calvary will unify all nations so that man alone is left to unify all nations (and so far man has not done a good work of this).

Whom God hath set forth <i>to be</i> a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;	whom God set forth <i>to be</i> a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to shew his righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God;	25 whom God set forth as a propitiatory sacrifice through faith in his blood, for a manifestation of his righteousness, because of the passing by of past sins
---	--	--

There is a difference between remission of something so it is as if it never occurred and the ‘passing over (overlooking something)’ as if it still applied but was ignored. His blood in this verse is shown as not being sufficient to remit our sins but God overlooks them and does not deal with His requirements of them.,

<u>1 Cor 10:16</u> The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of	<u>1 Cor 10:16</u> The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion	<u>1 Cor 10:16</u> 16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion
---	--	---

Christ?	of the body of Christ?	of the body of Christ?
---------	------------------------	------------------------

Westcott and Hort ignored the Sinaiticus and the Authorised version and changes the text to express their belief that Jesus was not divine and His death on the Cross accordingly could not redeem us. The AV Sinaiticus make communion something special by using ‘the’ Westcott and Hort change ‘the’ to ‘a’ implying there were other communions and that it was one of these and not something special.

1 cor 11:25 After the same manner also <i>he took</i> the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink <i>it</i> , in remembrance of me.	1 cor 11:25 In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink <i>it</i> , in remembrance of me.	1 cor 11:25 In like manner also the cup, after he had supped, saying: This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.
--	--	--

Once again ‘covenant’ instead of ‘testament’. It is not something Jesus did by His Blood but something we have agreed to enter into and we are reminded of this by ‘The Cup’.

The focus is shifted from what Jesus did to what we have to do – enter into an agreement with God when God does not need us to do anything.

In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;	in whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace,	7 in whom we, have redemption through his blood, the remission of offenses, according to the riches of his grace,
--	--	---

The Sinaiticus is more correct than the AV as it has remission and not forgiveness resulting from the ‘blood’, However, like the RV it has trespasses instead of sins. You can theoretically trespass or offend and not sin. Sin is a deliberate action and you can trespass or offend unintentionally so that it is not a sin.

<u>COL 1:14</u> In whom we have redemption through his blood, <i>even</i> the forgiveness of sins:	<u>COL 1:14</u> in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins:	<u>COL 1:14</u> 14 in whom we have redemption, the remission of sins,
--	--	---

Here the RV follows the Sinaiticus in omitting that the blood of Jesus resulted in our redemption. This could only be because they believed Jesus was not divine at birth and as a human He could not redeem us.

<u>Heb 9:18</u> Whereupon neither the first <i>testament</i> was dedicated without blood.	<u>Heb 9:18</u> Wherefore even the first <i>covenant</i> hath not been dedicated without blood.	<u>Heb 9:18</u> Whence, not even the first covenant was inaugurated without blood blood.
---	---	--

Note 'covenant' and not 'testament'.

Heb 9:14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?	Heb 9:14 how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?	Heb 9:14 14 how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.
--	---	---

The AV has 'purge' and not 'cleansed'. If you purge something you remove all traces of it so it cannot contaminate you again. But if you cleanse something it can be recontaminated again. We were remade spiritually when we came to Jesus so that none of our old self and its attitudes are there unless we allow to be there. This implies the work of Christ at Calvary was not complete and we had to complete it by doing what was necessary to purge it from us.

In Heb 9: 'Covenant' is used instead of 'testament'. But this is considered not to have been written by an apostle.

1 Jn 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.	1 Jn 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 his Son cleanseth us from all sin.	1 Jn 1:7 but if we walk in the light as he himself is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin.
--	---	---

This verse shows a typical thing Westcott and Hort did in that the full title of Jesus is not used to show He is the chosen one of God and not just another human. The term 'Son of God' was used for others but Jesus was the Messiah, the anointed one. (The Christ) The Son of God and they left this title out implying Jesus was just another Son of God.

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.	7 And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth. 8 For there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and the three agree in one.	7 For they that testify are three, 8 the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, and the three are one. (Testify the same thing)
---	--	---

The divinity of Jesus was removed from The Trinity implying He was not God. This alteration alone should show that Westcott and Hort were antichrist (against Christ).

Rev 1:5 and from Jesus Christ, <i>who is</i> the faithful witness, <i>and</i> the first begotten of the dead, and the	Rev 1:5 and from Jesus Christ, <i>who is</i> the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the	Rev 1:5 5 and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, the first-born of the dead and the prince of the
---	--	--

prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood,	kings of the earth. Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood;	kings of the earth. To him that loves us and that washed us from our sins in his blood,
---	--	---

This shows Westcott and Hort used the Sinaiticus when it suited them. The AV and Sinaiticus used ‘washed’ implying we were cleansed from them. Westcott and Hort did not believe Jesus could redeem us so used ‘loosed’ which means the spiritual consequences of our sins were not removed but did not affect us so that we had to remove them ourselves because Jesus did not do this..

Rev 5:9 And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;	Rev 5:9 And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood <i>men</i> of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation,	Rev 5:9 9 And they sing a new song, saying: Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open its seals, because thou wast slain and didst redeem to God in thy blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation,
--	---	--

The AV and Sinaiticus used ‘redeem’ but Westcott and Hort used ‘purchase’. You can be purchased and still have the punishment on record but if you are redeemed it is as the offence never happened.

Rev 19:13 And he <i>was</i> clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God.	Rev 19:13 And he <i>is</i> arrayed in a garment sprinkled with blood: and his name is called The Word of God.	Rev 19:13 13 And he was clothed with a garment dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God.
---	---	---

Here the word ‘baptism (dipped = immersed in something)’ is replaced by ‘sprinkled’. They did not believe in baptism by immersion as they were Catholics at heart who consider sprinkling is sufficient so ignored the Sinaiticus and interposed their own translation.

Closing comments

It can be seen Westcott and Hort did not follow the Sinaiticus when it suited them so that their belief system was expressed in the text showing that their Greek is not based on the Sinaiticus but is of their own devising so that all modern Bibles based on their Greek text really have error throughout of all them and cannot really be used as a basis to study the bible.