

The Blood of Jesus and how it is affected by the 'new 'Greek' text

Acts 17:11 (ISV) These people were more receptive than those in Thessalonica. They were very willing to receive the message, and every day they carefully examined the Scriptures to see if those things were so.

When you have teaching you are uncertain of you do what The Bible says. You examine the Bible and the sources of the teaching to see if it is correct.

All the sources listed below are readily available but may take a little searching to find.

As with all my books on modern bible problems I offer the above suggestion if you are uncertain about a teaching.

Preface

The Shed Blood of Jesus is the evidence of the victory of Jesus over Satan which gave Jesus the right to command Satan and destroy his plans and activities as well it is the witness that redemption is completed. This is why Mark 16:17-18, where this delegation is given to the followers of Jesus, was removed from modern bibles by implying it was not in the originals and so was placed there by a person after the Gospel of Mark was written to hide the victory of Jesus over Satan which has been delegated to us to help us defeat Satan.

This passage was actually in what they consider to be the best Greek texts but was removed before these Greek texts were published so that statement about them not in what they consider to be the better Greek texts is misleading but few, if any modern bible translators know this or the agenda behind the attacks on The Blood.

Satan needed to remove the Authority of Christ over him and has done this by removing the Victory of Christ over him at Calvary by removing the effects of this victory in the life of a Christian, from the Christian faith, and managed to find two people who would make a Greek text that would do this.

Westcott and Hort did not believe in this victory so when they were asked to update the language in the King James Bible, they made a new Greek which reflected their heresies and were able to use the Sinaiticus as a basis, changing the Greek in it to suit their heretical viewpoints. I have shown this in my book of the effects of the New Greek on the Bible.

When you study their life, you will see they believed in their Roman Catholic and new age type activities which modified their beliefs in The Bible and is reflected in their Greek used as the basis of modern bible translation.

In this document I will show how they subtly altered The Bible to reflect their wrong views on whom Jesus was and His Victory over Satan at Calvary.

Introduction

I have used for this discussion the King James Bible, The Westcott and Hort Revised Version, The Translations of the Sinaiticus by Townsend and Farrer Fenton. Tischendorf's own Translation is similar to Anderson's so I have not included that but have addressed this in another book of mine on 'The Humanisation of Jesus in Modern Bibles' (which is one reason 1 Jn5:7-8 and Mark 16:9-21 were removed from modern bibles and other verses were omitted or altered in a major way),

The translation by Farrer Fenton of the Greek text of Westcott and Hort used as the basis of modern bibles is superior to their as he has corrected errors they made. This means The Revised Version has errors in it from the translation of Westcott and Hort, either accidental or purposeful.

I will show the differences between them as appropriate.

The actual commentary

what follows are examples of 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 is 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.

<p>AV Matt 26:28 For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins</p>	<p>RV Matt 26:28 for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins. Farrer For this is my blood, that of the New Covenant which is shed for the removal of many sins.</p>	<p>Sinaiticus Matt 26:28 for this is my blood of the New Covenant, that is shed for many for remission of sins.</p>
--	---	---

RV, Farrer 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).

Note that Westcott and Hort left out it was a new covenant and not the old covenant which ‘blood of the covenant’ does not say it is not the Old Testament shedding of blood.

<p>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;</p>	<p>RV 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; Farrer Because He made by One every race of men to dwell upon the whole earth having provided proper methods and guidelines for their researched in seeking God!</p>	<p>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,</p>
--	--	--

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). Farrer states one person unified everyone but does not say it was Jesus.

<p>Rom 3:25 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;</p>	<p>Rom 3:25 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;</p> <p>Farrer Whom God has set forward as a Mercy-seat through faith in His Blood, to show His Righteousness through the pardon of past sins by the gentleness of God</p>	<p>Rom 3:25 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</p>
---	--	---

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.

Farrer uses ‘pardon’ except of ‘remission. There is a difference. Pardon does not remove the offence but remission does. ‘Propitiation’ is an act. A ‘Mercy-seat’ is a place.

You wonder if Westcott and Hort and Farrer are translating the same text. If Farrer’s translation is correct then Westcott and Hort’s translation must have real problems.

<p><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 Christ?</p>	<p><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 of the body of Christ?</p> <p>(Farrer) The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? The loaf which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ.</p>	<p><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 of the body of Christ?</p>
--	---	---

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

If Farrer is correct, and it appears he is, then Westcott and Hort purposely changed the text to suit their heresy. It is not the only time Westcott and Hort changed the text to promote their heresies.

<p>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.</p>	<p>RV 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.</p> <p>Farrer After supper He took the ‘cup’ and said: “This cup is the new settlement in My Blood. Do this often as you drive it, in remembrance of me” .</p>	<p>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.</p>
--	--	---

Once again ‘covenant’ instead of ‘testament’ is used implying that 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.

Farrer uses ‘settlement’ which is different to ‘covenant’ and ‘testament’. If he is correct Westcott and Hort once again either mistranslated the Sinaiticus either in error or purposely.

<p>Eph 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;</p>	<p>Eph 1:7 in whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace,</p> <p>Farrer By which we have redemption through His Blood, the release from sins coming from the rich gift Which He poured into us.</p>	<p>Eph 1:7 in whom we, have redemption through his blood, the remission of offenses, according to the riches of his grace,</p>
---	---	--

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.

Note Farrer agrees with the KJV and Anderson’s translation which once again shows Westcott and Hort deliberately mistranslated Sinaiticus to back up their heresies.

<p><u>COL 1:14</u> In whom we have redemption through his</p>	<p><u>COL 1:14</u> in whom we have our redemption, the</p>	<p><u>COL 1:14</u> 14 in whom we have redemption, the</p>
---	--	---

blood, <i>even</i> the forgiveness of sins	forgiveness of our sins: Farrer In who we have the redemption - the release from sins.	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. Farrer is strange here, Anderson, Farrer and Westcott and Hort do not agree in what happened but all omit The Blood as the cause of it.

<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. Farrer Whence not the former was renewed without blood (Farrer stated this was the literal translation of the Sinaiticus)	<u>Heb 9:18</u> Whence, not even the first covenant was inaugurated without blood.
---	--	--

Note 'covenant' and not 'testament'.

If Farrer is correct the Sinaiticus got it completely wrong which means Westcott and Hort translated what people expected to be there and once again mistranslated the Sinaiticus.

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? Farrer How much rather can the Blood of The Messiah who through an eternal spirit offered Himself spotless to God cleanse our conscience from dead rituals to serve a 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 (Titus 3:5) so that none of our old self and its attitudes are there unless we allow to be there. The use of cleanse 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 book is considered not to have been written by an apostle.

Farrer does not identify the Holy Spirit but implies it using ‘an eternal spirit’ and not specifically ‘the eternal spirit’.

Which translation do you believe: Anderson’s, Farrer’s or Westcott and Hort’s? How can you use the Sinaiticus when a translation of it cannot be agreed upon unlike the translations of The KJV which agree if properly translated.

<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Farrer But if, on the other hand, we follow the light (as He Himself is in the light) we are in union with each other and the Blood of Jesus, His Son, purifies us from all sin.</p>	<p>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.</p>
---	--	--

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 other men who were also deified after death 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.

Farrer leaves out ‘Christ’ but uses ‘purifies’ and not ‘cleanses’. There is basically no difference in the effect of the words but purifies means the object has all the uncleanness removed while cleanse means it can be contaminated again. The word more correctly gives the meaning of how ‘cleanses’ is used in the King James.

<p>1 Jn 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.</p>	<p>1 jn 5:7 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.</p> <p>Farrer And the Spirit is witness, The Spirit who is The Truth: that there are three who give evidence - The Spirit, the water and the blood, and the three are unanimous.</p>	<p>1 jn 5:7 For they that testify are three, 8 the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, and the three are one. (Testify the same thing)</p>
--	--	--

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).

The signs of The Spirit, Water and Blood are what people look for instead of Jesus

The filling of The Spirit, Water Baptism, Remembrance of Calvary so that the focus is on the signs He did and not on Jesus.

<p>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 prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood,</p>	<p>Rev 1:5 and from Jesus Christ, <i>who is</i> the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood;</p> <p>Ferrar And from Jesus Christ, The True witness and the Bringer-forth from the dead, and the Commander of all kings of the earth: To Him that loved us and released us from our sins by His Blood.</p>	<p>Rev 1:5 5 and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, the first-born of the dead and the prince of the kings of the earth. To him that loves us and that washed us from our sins in his blood,</p>
--	---	---

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 as much as before so that we had to remove them ourselves because Jesus did not do this.

Ferrar has ‘released’ which is almost as bad as ‘loosed’ but at least this implies the punishment is also gone unlike the word ‘loosed’. This shows how the same verse can be interpreted differently by two different people. I like the way Ferrar has ‘Commander of all the kings’ and not just ‘prince of the kings’.

<p>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;</p>	<p>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,</p> <p>And they sang a new song saying: “You are worthy to take the book and open its seals and You have purchased</p>	<p>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,</p>
---	---	---

	by your Blood for God from every tribe and language and people and nation.	
--	--	--

The AV and Sinaiticus used 'redeem' but Farrer, 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.

By this redemption is hidden even though 'purchased' is technically what redemption is.

So, the truth is stated but in a form that is hidden.

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. Ferrar And was sprinkled in a robe sprinkled with blood and His appointed title is - 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.

Once again Farrer uses a phrase I prefer to the King James – 'His Appointed title'.

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.

The problem of using the Sinaiticus for Bible translation

I have examined three English translations of the Sinaiticus:

That of Westcott and Hort's has major problems:

They altered the Sinaiticus to promote their heresies.

They worshipped Mary

Believed the Catholic sacraments

Were members of the new age type spiritualists society, a forerunner of societies like the Theosophical Society

Westcott and Hort's translation were used as the basis of the Greek used for modern Bibles.

Townsend's more accurate English translation using Christian type language. Tischendorf's translation is similar to Townsend's.

Ferrar Fenton's translation is a literal one actually saying what He believed what the Sinaiticus said.

Which is the correct translation because they translate the same verse differently at times so it says three different things or two different things where Westcott and Hort have corrupted the text of Sinusitis.

Which translation is the best one?

Westcott and Hort's was used as the basis for modern bibles but as it can be seen theirs was not a strict translation as they altered it to justify their heresies. So perhaps is not a good translation to use as the basis of modern bibles seeing it was influenced by their Roman Catholic and New Age beliefs.

Townsend's translation is more accurate but was ignored, even though it was available to the editors of the Greek used for the Revised Version.

Is Fenton's literal translation even more correct, which means modern bibles are based on an inferior translation of the Sinaiticus?

There is also the problem that The Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are proven fakes and should not have been used for Bible translation.

The King James Bible has none of these problems Which is why I use it and the more accurate Syriac Peshitta

Neville Salvetti.