

## **The Guidelines for revising the KJV were not followed**

In other words the translators rebelled against the authority selecting them to do that translation. This alone shows Satan was involved as he is the author of rebellion so that the translation was not guided by God (or they would have followed the guidelines given to them) but was organized by Satan so that he could destroy Christianity with an apostate text that dehumanizes Jesus so that He cannot be saviour or redeemer.

## **Preface**

In 1881 the Revised Version Bible was produced amidst great controversy about its apparent rewriting of The Bible Text.

The controversy raged for years and still is occurring today.

Many great minds gave themselves to the discussion both for and against the Revised Version and what follows is from the dissertations of these people. People like, Philip Mauro, Dean Burgeon, Dr Scrivener, Bullinger and many others.

What follows in this document is based on their scholarship which is far greater than I and many others can ever aspire to.

I examine the evidence for and against the credulity of the choice of only five manuscripts as the basis for the Revised Version as against the thousands of manuscripts that state these five are in error and should not have been used as this is the argument against them.

The two most important manuscripts are the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, which have both been shown to be forgeries and are therefore no basis to make the New Greek used for modern versions.

## **Why need a new version?**

### **The terms of reference of the Revised Version Committee**

In May of 1870, the Convocation of Canterbury laid down some basic rules which were to be observed by the translation groups. These rules were as follows:

To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorised Version.

To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorized and earlier English Versions.

Each company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided.

That the Text that is to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the Text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorised

Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin.

To make or retain no change in the Text on the second final revision by each Company, except **two thirds of those present** approve of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.

In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereupon till the next meeting, whensoever the same shall be required by **one third of those present** at the meeting, such intended vote to be announced in the notice for the next meeting.

To revise the headings of chapters and pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuations.

To refer, on the part of each Company, when considered desirable, to Divines, Scholars, and Literary Men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions.

## THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY

In addition to the rules just mentioned, the Convocation also passed five resolutions that were to govern the actions of the translation Committees. These resolutions are as follows:

That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.

That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorised Version.

That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where in the judgment of the most competent scholars such change is necessary.

That in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing Version be closely followed.

That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the cooperation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.

### **How Faithful were they to what they were appointed to do?**

#### **WHAT WAS INTENDED WAS NEVER DONE!**

The editors of the new Greek text completely disregarded these guidelines and wrote a new Greek text that backed up their heretical beliefs.

What the Convocation set out to do, and what was finally published have some grave differences, which will be pointed out in the pages to follow.

First of all, it should be noted that Bishop Westcott did not conform to the desires of the Convocation, in that he insisted upon one particular Text to the exclusion of the Texts used by the translators of the KJV. That Text, he frankly admitted, was Codex Aleph, or Sinaiticus. The other manuscript which was highly esteemed by Westcott and Hort was Code B, or Vaticanus. This Text (Codex Aleph) is a single Greek manuscript which was copied after 440 A.D. and **is not** the best available Scriptural evidence.

Read the words of Prebendary Scrivener, who was also on the Revision committee, as he writes of this choice of manuscripts. “..entirely destitute of historical foundation..” Westcott made the assumption that “oldest” was “best”, which, in the case of Biblical manuscripts, is simply not so! Upon making this decision, he and Hort set aside a mountain of evidence that had come to light since the 1611 Authorized Version, and had this material been consulted they would have found that most of the intrusions into the Text were unwarranted, unnecessary and unscriptural! In addition: by inserting the words “many ancient authorities omit...” or “the best manuscripts read thus...” they automatically put themselves in the place of judge as to what actually constituted God’s Word, and in many cases, they chose an inferior reading to that which is in the Authorized Version. What the Convocation desired, and explicitly stated in both the resolutions and rules portion, was simply set aside or excused, and insertions were made into the text which were based upon manuscript evidence that was less reliable than the Textus Receptus.

The RV was born in rebellion to the guidelines given it and was published deceitfully in that no one was told it was a new translation and that the Greek behind it was not published until after

the Bible Translation was published so no one was able to determine the accuracy of the Greek until it was too late.

God cannot bless that which was deceitfully made and as this Greek is the basis of all modern Bibles then it can be seen that the confusion that results and the errors in them are a result of being born in deceit and not in accordance with the guidelines of the authority that appointed them to revise the King James and not use a different Greek, rejected by many, and make a New translation from this Greek text.

The workers of darkness hide their deceit and by this principle it can be seen that Westcott and Hort were not serving God but Satan.

The Greek for the King James was accepted by all. The Greek for the Revised Version is rejected by many.

### **What guidelines did they ignore?**

In May of 1870, the Convocation of Canterbury laid down some basic rules which were to be observed by the translation groups.

The Committees were ruled by two men who said what was to be in there and had the majority follow their rebellion against the guidelines given them. So modern bibles are based on the incorrect doctrine held by two men who ran the revision committee.

The difference to the King James were not told so that no one knew for a while how different the Revised Version was to the King James text. The marginal notes were actually used to cast doubt on the King James Text and not to show its supposed errors.

Another guideline was to make or retain no change in the Text on the second final revision by each Company, except **two thirds of those present** approve of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.

As the committee was run by two people this requirement was immaterial. What Westcott and Hort wanted was passed. Besides they fed the new Greek text a bit at a time to the committee so that no one saw it in its fulness and realised its differences to the King James text they were supposedly Revising.

They ignored the requirement to ask scholars outside the revision committee for advice because if this was not done as there would have been an outcry by many of these scholars over what was being translated. And the heresies in their revision would have been noticed before the new text as published.

### **Whose authority was rejected?**

God had placed on the hearts of the Bishops of The Anglican Church to update the King James words so it was more easily understood by the ordinary people. God placed in their hearts the guidelines for the revision committee which was communicated by the bishops to that committee.

So, the committee did not rebel against the bishops but against God, who gave the bishops the authority to do this revision and had told them how it was to be done.

### **In conclusion**

It can be seen the whole process was deception and rebellion against the guidelines given them and God does not come from a process where evil permeates its beginning. This is one reason to avoid translation on the modern Greek. A Greek text was used that was rejected by who were far better scholars than those on the Revised Version committee.

You wonder why people would sneak in a Greek text, Publish a bible on it against the guidelines of the committee that appointed them and then afterwards show the world the Greek text they based their new translation on.

Given the fact it uses a vastly different Greek text and translates the Bible differently 20% of the time, it is not a version, so even the name is deceitful, but a new translation similar in some ways to The King James but completely different in its honesty and integrity of publication and translation.

### **THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY**

In addition to the rules just mentioned, the Convocation also passed five resolutions that were to govern the actions of the translation Committees. These resolutions are as follows:

That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.

That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorised Version. So that the changes of 20% not pointed to in the margins definitely is rebellion against this point

That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where in the judgment of the most competent scholars such change is necessary. They made a translation 20% different to the King James and not a revision of the King James using a completely different Greek text.

That in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing Version be closely followed. This was ignored when it did not convey what they wanted to teach thorough their translation.

That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the cooperation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong. Only the viewpoint of those who agreed with the new translation were if accepted and overruled those that did not agree with the changes the new Greek made to the Biblical text so that this point was ignored.

You must be concerned about the motives of a translation so deceitfully made and so different to what the people making it were appointed to do.

### **The rules of HISTORICAL evidence**

These were made to show what could be considered to be truth and acceptable to a court of law as well as what was considered to inaccurate or untruthful to be admitted as reliable for evidentiary purposes.

The following is from an excellent history of The Bible whose source I have lost unfortunately but whose contents can easily be verified from other sources.

It is to be noted That the Textus Receptus was not used by The KJV translators as the Greek text it referred to ( based on Erasmus, Stephanus and Beza) was not published until 1633, after the KJV was published.

As it can be seen the KJV translators did not mention a Greek text so no Greek can be said to be the one used by them but Beza's 1589 edition 3 and 4 appear to be the most likely one referred too but that is because It and the KJV Translators used the same sources to make their translation.

In other words they looked at what the global church accepted as the true text and worked with that possibly using Beza's text as a basis. But they examined not just Greek, but Spanish, Aramaic, Latin, Syriac and other languages that traced their lineage back to the apostles. There was another centre of Greek learning in Alexandria. This was controlled by heretics who translated the Greek in a way to suit their beliefs. Unfortunately, The Roman Catholic Church used their Greek and tried to erase The original Latin Vulgate by writing their own version in 380 and calling it the Latin Vulgate.

Christians avoided this translation and used The original vulgate so in 1280 The catholic Church used force to make people use their inferior translation. The original Latin Vulgate Bibles were burnt along with their owners until people stopped using them out of-fear and started using the inferior Latin Vulgate of Rome.

The Vaticanus which was based on Jerome's vulgate and used its official Latin names in its Greek text which shows it was not written by a Greek but by a Catholic translator after the new vulgate was written (between 440 and 464 AD)..

The KJV is said to be based on the Textus Receptus, which is incorrect. Its brief was to use the Bishops Bible as its base and to correct any errors in it, The Translators used many vernacular Bibles and the Greek based on Erasmus so to attack the Textus Receptus as the basis for the KJV is incorrect. The detractors of the KJV, which promote this newer 'better' Greek text need to show that its sources which trace back unbroken to the originals (mostly non-Greek) are inaccurate. This they have not done and cannot do.

So we have a new Greek text provided with no continuity of translations to the originals, based on the edits of heretics, firstly when the Greek originals were written when and then alterations of (Westcott and Hort, the sole editors of this new Greek) when this new 'improved' Greek was slipped secretly to the translators of the RV.

Using the historical method to examine the three following sources

Source Criticism

Rules of Evidence	King James source documents from	Revised Version Greek Text	Syriac Peshitta Text (probably based on
	all the known Christian world		early Aramic spoken by Jesus and apostles)
When was the source written	Earliest fragments 70AD Multiplex sources from before 200 AD	Unknown based on earlier manuscript or copies sources unknown	Before 150 AD original compiled from Source documents and possibly before 100 AD

Where was it produced	Judea original sources and other cities where Apostles were	Alexandria modified by heretics to suit their beliefs	Judea original sources and other cities where Apostles were
	Used through east, west and Asia minor and translated in to various languages used by many nations (according to a church father).	Used only in Alexandria area, translated from Greek to Latin which Christendom ignored because of its corruptions until the Pope forced this translation on Christians.	Used in Asia minor, Aramaic speaking countries and Northern Africa
	Property of many nations who were able to discredit any corruptions of the text	Property of one Sect who wrote what they wanted too without anyone	Property of many nations who were able to discredit any corruptions of the text

		criticising what they wrote in a way to be able to correct it	
By whom was it produced	Original by Apostle's and associates	Original by Apostle's and associates but modified to suit beliefs	Original by Apostle's and associates

From what preexisting material was it produced	Originals of New Testament documents	Originals of New Testament documents that fell in line with beliefs of the heretics	Originals of New Testament documents
What is the credibility of the contents	Because all nations were able to monitor it the true text cannot have been corrupted very much if at all	Because the editors are their own witness to the documents accuracy it is unreliable as you cannot be a witness to yourself. Also the Sinaiticus is a proven forgery so cannot be used to evidence the accuracy of this 'new' Greek Text	Because many nations were able to monitor it cannot have been corrupted very much if at all

How credible is it	There are a great many witnesses to its accuracy and it is able to be reconstructed from the writings of early Christians	It is its own witness so not credible. Found in the writings of Gnostics and those showing the errors of Gnostic writings	Great many witnesses to its accuracy. Able to be reconstructed from the writings of early Christians
--------------------	---	---	--

<b>Procedures for Contradictory sources</b> - If the sources agree about an event then it is considered proven	All sources for the King James are in agreement in all important points	99% or more Greek texts are in disagreement with these two texts	All sources for the Peshitta are in agreement in all important points
Sources that have outside confirmation can be trusted	Many sources outside the originals evidence the texts used for the King James	Relatively few texts witness to the accuracy of these two codices and these are from fellow heretics	Many sources outside the originals evidence the texts used for the Peshitta
Eyewitnesses to an event confirm the accuracy of the record	the King James Committee is based on people who saw Jesus of those who knew of Jesus	The editors of the Vaticanus lived hundreds of years after Jesus so were not using close historical sources for their text .	The texts use by the Peshitta compilers is based on people who saw Jesus or who knew of Him
If two sources agree then their edibility is enhanced	Thousands of documents agree with the King James Text	Few back up these two codices	Thousands of documents agree with the Peshitta Text



When two sources disagree then common sense dictates which to follow	Common sense dictates the sources of the King James are more reliable than the limited sources of these two manuscripts	Common sense dictates the sources of these two codices are unreliable because of the few documents that back them up before they were written	Common sense dictates the sources of the Peshitta are more reliable than the limited sources of these two manuscripts
Earliest document test	The Sources for the King James run from 70 AD to 300 AD if not earlier	These two codices were written after 300 AD and have no obvious predecessor codex as their basis.	The Sources for the Peshitta are all before 150 AD

It can be seen that the evidence that the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were not generally accepted as scripture except by an heretical sect of Gnostics and do not provide a good witness to what the Scriptures should say having been edited to back up the Gnostic errors about who Jesus was.

Proof the Vaticanus and Siniaticus from Alexandria is a gnostic edited text

<http://www.kjvtextualtechnology.com/essay-3--evidence-of-text-tampering-by-gnostics.p>

Hp .

by Dr L Bednar

To quote Dr Bednar

*“Tampering of types favorable to Gnostic dogma potentially accounts for much of the difference between Greek Alexandrian texts and the Traditional-Text ancestor of the Received Text. A substantial number of Traditional-Text passages hostile to Gnosticism are absent in Alexandrian texts, and Alexandria, Egypt was an active center of Gnostic heresy in the first few centuries.*

*Now most anti-Gnostic teaching remains intact in most Traditional-Text manuscripts, likely due, in part, to the eastern region responsible for maintenance of the Traditional Text being generally located beyond the direct influence of Gnostics, preventing easy access to most copies.*

*What is perhaps most important is that the extent of tampering in any manuscript would be limited by a likely desire of this false cult to achieve a sense of authenticity by minimizing disagreement with the popular New Testament, many true passages being susceptible to distorted verbal interpretation that might seem to harmonize them with Gnosticism. Only certain types of passages could not be interpreted in such fashion, leading to efforts to remove them when.*

*The main thrust of Gnostic tampering is aimed at Christology, likely because satan covets the position of Christ as the prince of heaven, as we see in Isa.14:13-14, where he says, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars (angels) of God.....I will be like the most High" (a title reserved for the Son of God)."*

*This is the period in which the Vaticanus and Siniaticus were copied in Alexandria and altered to reinforce the credibility of Gnostic beliefs. This is also why the new versions make Christ more like a new age master than God and saviour using new age terminology to describe Him and removing all they God to hide that He is God, Saviour and King of all."*

Dr L Bedner gives examples and I can recommend his website and writings on the subject as amongst the best. not all his examples are given.

### ***Variants in Critical Greek Texts Supportive of Gnostic Dogma***

#### ***A. Gnostic-Type Dogma on the Deity Of Jesus Christ***

##### ***1. Acts 8:36-38 Baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch***

*KJV*

*36...See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? (spoken by the eunuch)*

*37: And Philip said, if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he...said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*

*38...they went down both into the water...and he baptized him.*

*NIV*

*36..the eunuch said, "Look here is water. Why shouldn't I be baptized?"*

*37:*

*38: And he gave orders to stop the chariot. Then both Philip and the eunuch went down into the water and Philip baptized him.*

*The KJV verse 37 shows undeniable evidence that it's genuine, for in its absence there is no answer by Philip to the eunuch's question on what hindered his baptism. Absence of the verse denies the doctrine of limiting baptism to all who believe in Jesus as God's Son so that readers may think baptism, rather than belief, is the important factor, a popular modern notion, and they may never see the vital need to believe in God's Son.*

*The KJV verse 37 has just minor Greek manuscript support, and is omitted in modern English versions on this basis. Regarding a cause of omission of the verse in the NIV critical Greek text, the eunuch's confession of Jesus as God's Son refutes the dogma of Cerinthian Gnostics who said Jesus was born of a human father, a mere man indwelt temporarily by the divine Christ to impart a temporary deity, and removing verse 37 would serve their dogma.*

*(Editors note: Babies and demons can be baptised according to the modern versions as no confession of faith is required.)*

##### ***2. Luke 2:33 Joseph is not the father of Jesus!***

*KJV: And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him (spoken by Simeon of Christ).*

*NASV: And his father and mother were amazed at the things...*

*NIV: The child's father and mother marveled at what was said...*

*In Lk.2:33 NIV & NASV critical Greek texts call Joseph the father of Jesus, thus denying Jesus' deity. But Joseph was just a foster-father, the Holy Ghost being the true father of the earthly form of Christ. The error relates to Alexandrian manuscripts that scholars say are the best, but*

*tampering by Cerinthian-type Gnostics is indicated. As we noted, they denied Jesus was God in the flesh, saying He was born of a human father and had a temporary deity by union with the divine Logos at the baptism in the Jordan. They believed the divine nature vanished on the cross and Jesus supposedly died a mere man.*

#### **4. 1 Timothy 3:16 God manifest in the flesh**

*KJV....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.*

*NIV...the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in a body...*

*NASV...mystery of godliness: He who was revealed in the flesh...*

*The concept of Jesus as God in the flesh was contrary, not only to Cerinthian-Gnostic dogma, but also to that of Docetist Gnostics, the latter suggesting Jesus was merely a phantom spirit manifested as the divine Christ, and only seemed to have a body. Greek manuscripts containing this verse on Jesus in His earthly history as God...in the flesh would displease Gnostics. To remove their problem, all they needed to do was remove The from Theos (God) to produce os (who), adding a vowel breathing mark. The texts of modern versions replace God with who (resultant language is awkward, and certain manuscripts have which, increasing the evidence of tampering).*

*He gives many other examples that show the deity and virgin birth of Christ were edited out of their gospel texts as well as Him being Lord of all!*

***Gnostic differentiation of Jesus from names for God:*** *In numerous passages of the Alexandrian texts, the name Jesus or the term Son of man is disassociated from terms such as Christ, Lord or Son of God. This reflects Cerinthian dogma on a human Jesus who supposedly was temporarily indwelt by the divine Christ. We note below some of the many examples of this.*

#### **16. Mk.16:9-20 12 final verses of Mark on Resurrection morning lost?**

*16:8 And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid.*

*Some scholars think verse 8 ends Mark's Gospel, saying the last 12 KJV verses are not genuine, even though most events of those verses are in other gospels. They think that Mark's gospel omits events that center on Resurrection-Day events of the divine Jesus Christ, not only the actuality of the Resurrection, but the report of Mary Magdalene to the disciples, the meeting with Jesus on the Emmaus Road, the great commission, the Ascension and the error of disbelieving in Christ. That would make the Gospel of Mark incomplete in the extreme, and would have it terminate on a note of the fear of certain women entering the sepulcher, rather than a note of Resurrection triumph. Some say Mark ended his gospel here, which would make it abnormally different, but most say there's a lost true ending different from that of the KJV. Such theories arise since two favored Alexandrian manuscripts, a Latin one and an old Syriac version omit the 12 verses. But a great majority of Greek manuscripts, Old Latin manuscripts, translations and commentaries have the verses. The Latin manuscript omitting them shows evidence of Docetist tampering, indicating deliberate omission. Scholars have no justification for ignoring this Traditional-Text passage, and the biblical church and others have retained it for centuries. To justify their negative view, scholars offer only their manuscript preference and imaginative arguments like a writing style of the 12 verses supposedly different from the normal one of Mark. \* Thus the laity are taught that the 12 verses of God's Word are not genuine through the use of improvised arguments of style and grammar.*

*Resurrection of the divine Jesus Christ was viewed by Gnostics as spiritual, instead of physical, and the Cross as the occasion to discover the inner divine self and impart the hidden knowledge to men. With the scriptures plainly revealing the Resurrection as a physical event, with the purpose of sin remission for mankind, Gnostics would see the gospel accounts of Resurrection morning as a major hindrance to the teaching of their dogma. But tampering aimed at altering this teaching would be difficult to achieve since the matter is so basic to Christianity and well known to Christians. Any success of the effort could never be more than very minor, so it is no surprise that so few texts were affected, just the two main Alexandrian manuscripts and a few versions, and even this was achieved in just one of the four gospels. Indicated tampering in the Resurrection account of Mark also eliminated various other teachings disliked by Gnostics, such as Christ's Ascension in bodily form, the importance of belief, and damnation for disbelief, in Christ's gospel, all of these denying the Gnostic concept of hidden knowledge as the basis of salvation. They would dislike the teaching on the miraculous empowerment of men in their earthly bodily form for the work of ministry, miraculous signs that would attend the bodily ministry of the gospel by the early believers, and the importance of bodily baptism. Further, the finale of this gospel would be the part most easily omitted from the textual standpoint since this omission would least likely interfere with various other aspects of this gospel.*

As it can be seen that the variances and readings of these two codices can easily be explained if they were the result of editing by a heretical sect which would also explain the 20% difference they have to most traditional texts.

### **The Best Copies to use**

Modern theologians believe we do not have the original documents of scripture which are alone inspired so we need to look for the best earliest manuscripts and use those as a basis for working out what God wanted to say in His Bible. The problem they have is given they do not have the earliest manuscripts they have nothing to compare their text with so have no basis for saying it is correct so we are back to a situation of having a text that may be in error like the one they are supposedly correcting.

The Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are supposed to be the best codices to use as they are supposedly the earliest remaining ones we have. They ignore the reason for these still remaining, that they were so bad no one used them while the good copies fell apart from use.

They assume these are the most accurate having fewer scribes to copy them and ignore the hundreds of documents found that are earlier than these two codices and which back up the Textus Receptus and not the New Greek text that was based on these two codices.

They ignore the following problems with these two codices:

There are no other early manuscripts or earlier translations of the bible that back up what these two codices write so that they do not have the acceptance of the church as being accurate Scripture because they were considered so erroneous in their text.

They were only used in one area and had been rewritten to reflect the heretical beliefs of that area so were grossly modified copies to reflect the beliefs of the heretics in that one area

They were still copies and not close ones to the originals and so could not be said to be the best unless backed up by what was generally accepted on the church, which they were not and so only had themselves to witness to their accuracy (you cannot be your

own witness to the accuracy of what you say and they would not be accepted because of this as evidence or reliable in a court of law).

The two codices disagree with each other in over 3000 places and as there are no other codices to compare them to you cannot reliably use them to make a translation as you do not know which difference is error or correct. Besides one was corrected over 8 times by different people and filed away as being worthless after all these attempts to correct it. The corrections were actually made to bring the codex in to agreement with the Textus Receptus and so in a sense is a witness to the accuracy of this text and actually speaks against the accuracy of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

Man has to work out what the correct Greek text is because they believe we do not have the originals and copies do not accurately reflect the originals so they have to work out what God said. The finite mind of man without the help of God, who was such a weak God He could not preserve what He said so man had had to tell Him what should have been said in the Greek text and work it out for Him

It can be seen that these two codices are not exactly good ones and that what they say are the reasonings of men and not God, who did not help them as He no longer inspires writings according to them, inspiration applying only to the original writings we do not have.

It can also be seen that these codices go against all that was accepted for 1700 years as being the correct Greek text, which was evidenced by its usage in different languages and by churches throughout the world. None of this can be said of these two manuscripts so that they lack one of the criteria used to evaluate the accuracy of manuscripts.

When all is considered, it can be seen that the two codices are unreliable and not really usable for the purposes of making an accurate translation of The New Testament and would only be used if you ignored all the errors that made it unusable and inaccurate and the fact they were for the use of a localised sect in Egypt and not considered scripturally accurate by the rest of Christendom.

When all is considered, it can be said that no scholar in his right mind would rely on them or use them for anything except to show how not to make reference material unless they were deluded, or had pride in what they did or had a hidden agenda to water down The Bible and make it more acceptable to all religions as is happening now.

### **The seven tests of truth**

Dean Burgan was one of the greatest Biblical scholars of all time. He examined the controversy over these two texts (the received text and the erroneous eclectic critical text) and defined seven tests to determine which was the true Greek text and thus the one to use for the purpose of Bible translations.

### **The Test of Antiquity**

Which text is the oldest.

Being the oldest text does automatically make it a better text. Even though the critical text has supposedly two codices that are 1600 years old, the received text is mentioned in documents that are just as old if not older. The fact that they are quotes from the Bible and not actual codices like the Sinai and Vatican Codices does not invalidate their witness to the antiquity of the received text. In fact the writings of the church 'fathers' were written well before these two eclectic codices were written are 2 or more to 1 in favour of The traditional received Greek test. In fact this supposedly better Greek has had to be adjusted many times to bring it back in line with the Greek behind the Authorized Version.

### **The Test of Numbers**

How many copies are there surviving of each text?

This not a good test today with the advent of printing but in the days when documents were hand written (as these were), people only copied that which was best. The test of numbers in regards to existing documents goes to the received text where, at the time of Dean Burgin, 5210 of the 5255 manuscripts were of the received text. One wonders why modern translators have limited themselves to such a small body of evidence (45 Manuscripts roughly) to use as a basis of the sacred text of The Bible.

### **Variety as a test of truth**

Are there many different variations in the existing texts.

The received text is found throughout the Roman world and mainly agree with each other while the critical text (which reflect the bias of their writers and which differ appreciably from each other at times) is found only on texts from Egypt which would indicate it was a local phenomenon attached to the beliefs of people in a specific area unlike the received text which was accepted throughout the rest of Christendom. On this basis the received text wins again.

### **Respectability or weight of truth**

How reliable is the text?

The Sinaiticus and Vatican codices fail this Test as they disagree with each other in over 3000 places in the Gospels alone. They cannot both be right so one has to be a false witness and possibly both, depending on how much error is them. There is little or no problem with the receive text in this area. As evidence of the correctness of the received test is its uniformity in spite of the number of manuscripts available and it is to be noted that it has been used from the time of the apostles till now while the critical text disappeared for 1450 years and was ignored by the majority of Christians.

The critical text loses again.

### **Continuity as a test of truth**

The received text has continuity from the time of when the Gospels were first being written to the time the King James Translation was made and later. The Vaticanus was written between 440 and 464 AD used for two- three centuries then forgotten for over 1100+ years.

The Sinaiticus is a proven forgery from the early 1800's.

These two codices are the main documents for the critical test used in modern versions. They fail the continuity test which shows the Byzantine texts on which the received texts were based were considered scripture from the writings of the apostles until the King James was published and through this translation are still continuing on unbroken till the current date.

The Critical text fails again

### **Content as a test of truth.**

Is the text true to the doctrinal meaning of the passage or does it translate differently in different passages, according to what the translator or editor believes should be there. Because of its omissions the critical text is not doctrinally sound at times as a result of words, phrases or passages partly omitted, left out, altered or translated unusually. It fails this test while the received text is consistent in its usage and translation.

Internal evidence as a test of truth

The received text has no need to be corrected and so you will not find manuscripts it is

based on which need doctrinal corrections. There are adjustments to correct a spelling or miscopied word and the correction will agree with the other Byzantine manuscripts. There are also no verses that contradict each other as there are in every bible version based on the erroneous modern Greek text of Westcott and Hort or on Greek texts developed from it.

### **The Old Testament**

The changes made to the old testament by the translators of the Revised Version have no real rationale or basis to be so extreme at times and so different. There is only one Old Testament text and that was also used by the King James translators. So, the changes to the Old Testament Text are inexplicable and cannot have been because the text translated had errors in them. There should have been little difference to the text of the King James with just modernisation of the words used being the main change. But this is not so and you wonder what agenda they had to make the changes to the old testament that they did.

I mention two but there are others and all are well documented if you are interested in them. Because of their belief that Biblical texts do not reflect the originals because they are copies they have altered Ps 12:5-7 to change the preservation from God's Bible instead to refer to God's people.

The Old Testament text has the following:

*Psa 12:5 For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith the LORD; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him.*

*Psa 12:6 The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.*

*Psa 12:7 Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.*

Note that The text of the Bible is referred to as being kept by God. But in modern versions we have the following:

*Psa 12:6 The LORD'S words are true and pure, like silver purified by fire, like silver melted seven times to make it perfectly pure.*

*Psa 12:7 LORD, take care of the helpless. Protect them forever from the wicked people in this world.*

Note that now the people are preserved. This never happened so is incorrect so that their bible has error in it so cannot really be used.

The rewriting of these verses allows the modern editors to change the Bible anyway they desire and condone because they are trying to find the original meaning of the Bible.

The other alteration of concern is almost blasphemous:

(ASV) How art thou fallen from heaven, O day-star, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, that didst lay low the nations!

This talks about Satan falling from heaven but uses a title of Jesus.

*2Pe 1:19 (KJV) 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:*

*2Pe 1:19 (ASV) And we have the word of prophecy made more sure; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts:*

They know it is a title of Jesus and translate it such here but use it for Satan.

It is blasphemous to translate the word which means 'Lucifer' as 'day star' (morning star) which is a title of Jesus. Unfortunately, modern Greek lexicons are designed to back up the new translations so it will tell you it can also mean daystar. So the question arises why change the name of Satan for one that is used to describe Jesus?

### **Examples of the corruption of the Gnostic Vaticanus and Sinaiticus**

Not believing any part of The Bible

If you do not believe in Six Day Creation, The Fall of Mankind or The Biblical Flood, then you cannot believe any other part of the Bible including how to obtain Salvation. If God was not able to preserve His Word so that these three untruths, either in part or in whole were written, what else is written that is not from Him.

You do not believe in the God of The Bible who said He did these things or you do not believe The Bible tells you what God says in which case you cannot use it for anything as it all may be wrong.

### **The Modern Greek text and Bibles based on it**

Scholars believe we do not have the original text and that we have to work out what God said. They use a 4th century text which cannot be guaranteed to say what God wanted said, which is their first problem.

The second problem is that man is reasoning out what God said and has not got His Mind's way of thinking so that there is no guarantee that what they said is correct so you cannot trust any Bible based on this 'better' Greek as man determined what was in it and not God according to the editors of it. They believe God just had it badly transmitted by those who copied it so that errors crept in which scholars have to correct.

Not having the originals that were inspired, how do the scholars know that what they assumed God said is correct?

The problem is their starting manuscripts are copies so have errors and how do they know that what they fix actually says what God wanted to say or is actually making the text more inaccurate as they have no reference to go back to, to determine what God actually said.

Either we have what God said, as those of The King James say or we do not, like those of The Modern Greek and if we do not no amount of educated guessing (and it is guessing as we do not have the originals) scholars can actually be said to be what God wanted to say.

### **Some examples of the corruption**

#### **Mark 16:9-21**

I have shown earlier how the Gnostics needed to remove this passage for their belief system. I know add some more information.

Modern Bibles imply this passage is not original through implying it is in few old manuscripts. This is the first lie as there are 1750 that have in and five that do not have it in and these are the five they use to judge the rest.

Of these five, one has a space to place it in and another, the Vaticanus had it removed and replaced by a different write to the one who originally copied it so that it appeared that Mark 16:9-21 was not in the original. The new writer wrote only three columns on the page he used to replace the last page of Mark and it is in three columns. The rest of the codex is in four columns.

Also, the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus had this passage in them but it was deleted before their texts were published.



So, it can be seen that both manuscripts were edited to comply with the belief of the Gnostic heretics in Alexandria.

Now why would Satan want it removed so badly that he left most of what it said in other gospels?

In this section is the only delegation we have from Jesus to control Satan. By removing this section and implying it is not original Satan has removed the Authority to attack him and his plans and cast (remove) him out in the Name of Jesus.

But then Satan is to be expected to influence a text that was begun in rebellion against the authority that commissioned it.

Like in the Garden with Adam and Eve, the writers of the Greek text thought they were finding and revealing truth for people to know, but in reality, they were guided by Satan to rebel against authority and do these corruptions to the traditional texts.

This alone would warn you of the dangers of the modern Greek text that Satan has influenced and which has been reasoned out by man supposedly pursuing the best available version of what God originally said.

I will show more of Satan's Influence.

### **Acts 8:37**

This has been mentioned earlier in the section on gnostic influence.

This verse had to be left out by Gnostics who could not make the declaration in it.

Leaving it allowed anyone to be baptised, Gnostics, children and even demons masquerading as Christians without having to declare wholeheartedly that Jesus was Human, God and Saviour (Son of God being a term applied to The Messiah/Saviour who was born a human).

So, this allows almost anyone to say they are a baptised Christian if they acknowledge Jesus but not His divinity or Redemption (that He is saviour).

Only Satan would want to hide these things and needed to use reputable people to do this (liberal theological Scholars who were not recognised and so would not be argued with).

### **According to the new Greek Jesus sinned**

*Mat 5:22 (RV) but I say unto you, that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment;*

Jesus was angry twice so twice He sinned according to this verse and this means He cannot be saviour/Messiah and redeem us. This would suit Satan who would wipe out all a Christian believed in redemption if they believed this verse was true. There would be no redemption or salvation and not mansion in heaven. All would belong to Satan's Kingdom. It can be seen why Satan promoted this translation of this verse.

The original King James said the following"

*Mat 5:22 (KJV) But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment:*

The editors of the new Greek left out 'without a cause' and the cause is the purpose of God where you express the anger of God towards a matter.

Once again it can be seen Satan influenced the editors of the new Greek

### **Apparently Jesus Lied**

*Joh 7:8 Go ye up unto the feast: I go not up yet unto this feast; because my time is not yet fulfilled.*

*Joh 7:10 But when his brethren were gone up unto the feast, then went he also up, not publicly, but as it were in secret.*

Jesus lied, saying He was not going up to the feat but did so secretly. This is of course not what happened as the King James has the following:

*Joh 7:8 Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come.*

*Joh 7:10 But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.*

As it can be seen the word 'yet' was left out by the editors of the new Greek who must have known Jesus would be made to appear to lie if they did this.

If Jesus lied, we have the same situation as in Matt 5:22 that if they believed this verse was true. There would be no redemption or salvation and not mansion in heaven. All would belong to Satan's Kingdom. It can be seen why Satan promoted this translation of this verse.

### **1 John 5:7**

1 John 5:7 of the received text is left out of the critical text and v6-8 are combined to form a new v7 in the NIV. This rearrangement of verses implies the omitted v7 is not The Word of God.

The omitted verse is as follows:

*For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.*

This had to be removed by Gnostics who did not believe Jesus was god.

### **James 5:16**

Another passage that shows they do not know doctrine or are deliberately ignoring it is

James 5:16 The NIV has 'sins' while the KJV has 'faults'. Which is correct?

According to the Bible our sins were dealt with at Calvary and were forgiven there. They are forgiven before we sin so we do not need to confess them to anyone. All God requires of us now is repentance from the sinful act. We are told admit our weaknesses (faults) so we can be helped to overcome them but we do not need to confess any sins resulting from them but acknowledge we have done them so we can avoid doing them again.

However, if you believe someone apart from God has the authority to forgive sin then you would translate this passage as 'sins;' and not 'faults'. The editors of this new Greek believed this and so translated the word as 'sins' and not 'faults.'

### **1 Tim 3:16**

In 1 Tim 3:16 the word 'God' is replaced by 'He' and by this the divine nature of Jesus is attacked. 'He' refers to a human nature. 'God' refers to a divine nature. This verse was necessary to be altered by Gnostics to remove the divinity of Jesus.

### **In Phil 4:13**

In Phil 4:13 Christ is removed as our strength and a mysterious person strengthens us called 'him', who could be anyone. This removes the divine help God gives us in Jesus and replaces it with man. 'Him' could be Satan, your brother a friend and not necessarily Jesus.

A non-Christian reading this verse would not know who you were talking about and could assume it was their own god. Why do the editors of these two texts want to remove this witness of The Word to Jesus unless it was not part of Gnostic belief?

People do not understand how much New Age type thinking is allowed by changes like this so that the Bible becomes more palatable to New age and other religions as they can substitute,

Satan, Buddha, Gaia or whoever they want for the word 'him'. This problem does not arise with the KJV as it specifically mentions Jesus is our strength.

Jesus was humanised by the Gnostics and made a lesser deity so that He is equal to or less in stature than other deities. This is what the New age teaches and Satan desires this for His worshippers so that he is apparently greater than Jesus in the spiritual hierarchy.

### **Jesus**

An example of how a modern version treats Jesus is the NIV.

In the NIV Lord is omitted 39 times, Jesus is omitted 87 times and Christ is omitted 39 times and more worldly and new age friendly titles are sometimes substituted.

The problem with the NIV is that at times it changes the Name of Jesus to generic one and does not capitalise these generic names. Anyone who was not a Christian would not know these names referred to Jesus so would not have a reason to believe in Him. The NIV would not lead them into faith in Jesus (Rom. 10:17). It would also allow people to substitute their own god for Jesus and by this generic use of names for Jesus set the basis for a one world bible where the generic names of Jesus could be applied to their own god.

Christians would automatically substitute Jesus but those outside the church would not and so evangelism would be hindered as you could not point to Jesus because the Bible used would have generic names and not promote the divinity of Jesus.

In his book "Serious omissions in the NIV Bible", Keith Piper lists 30 ways the NIV attacks Jesus, 17 ways it downgrades Jesus and 10 ways it alters the requirements for Salvation. Why would a Bible attack Jesus. Why would the translators and editors use a critical text that attacks and downgrades the divinity of Jesus as well as hiding salvation. It may not be intentional and a result of the Gnostic editing of what was considered by them to be the best texts usable for Bible translation not realising it had been heavily edited by Gnostics to remove Jesus as divine.

Surely God would not change His Bible in such a way that reduces the chance for people to see Jesus and have faith in Him and which also allows his enemy to use it for his own purposes!

### **The results of the modern texts in the church**

*"By their fruits you shall know them"* said Jesus so let us look at the fruits of the received text and the critical text.

The received text resulted in the Reformation. In the translation of the KJV from it, England became a great nation and started to decline after the publication of the Revised Version in 1881 which was based on the critical text. When the NIV was published in 1970 the western churches started their major decline. It too was based on the critical text.

There are other evidences of the effect of the critical text on the Church

There is confusion in translations based on the critical text where modern versions do not agree with each other in the way passages are translated. This causes problems in Bible studies as people with different versions try to work out which is the correct text as well as what The Bible actually says.

Copyright means you cannot use the same words as another translation which means overall that no two bibles can really say the same thing which is why modern bibles are so different at times..

There is confusion in doctrine as things left out or questioned in modern versions conflict with the doctrines of yesteryear as expounded in the received text (used by the translators and editors of the KJV). The problem of doctrinal conflict in the text behind the Bible only occurred after the critical text was used to replace the received text

The church has little fruit to be seen by society so has become irrelevant or a mystery to many.

There is a worldliness in the church as The Word is not affecting the people in the way it used to. Miracles and gifts (the demonstration of The Kingdom) are no longer visible in the majority of western churches.

More people are liberal in their theology both in the congregation and ministry leadership because the modern versions are not as condemning of sin as the received text was so tolerate sin that would not have been accepted in the time when the received text was used as the basis of Bible translations. So, we have same sex marriages tolerated and homosexual ministers in churches. The New bibles allow this while the KJV condemned this. If the new bibles did not allow these things, then why do denominations tolerate these things?

Churches no longer does the work of Jesus and many are social clubs that do not offer the world anything that would attract them to Jesus.

The fruit of the critical text does not recommend it as being a dynamic, Spirit Filled, powerful Greek Text in a way the received text is.

**They also hide the test for an Antichrist.**

*1 Jn 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.*

The fruit of the translators and editors of the modern bible versions is such that they do not want you to identify Antichrist by the omission of “*Christ is come in the flesh*”. This omission also allows anyone to be a Christ for the purposes of their belief system as you do not need them to have a virgin birth.

Any bible removing this verse or phrase must also be an Antichrist as it does not confess (preach) that Christ has come in the flesh but hides it from people.

Why do they hide the Antichrist test and remove the need to declare Jesus is The Christ requiring only to confess Jesus and even then it can be their Jesus and not the Jesus of the KJV. According to this verse in modern bibles you can be a heretic, believe in Jesus and not be an Antichrist (against Christ) which means any liberal editor or translator of the modern bibles is not an Antichrist even though they may reject Jesus is the Christ (anointed one). This lack of belief in The Christ opens the way to a one world faith based in a belief in Jesus (whoever you make Him out to be) and a bible that allows you to believe what you want about Jesus and allows you to adapt it to your particular faith.

If you Look hard you will find other signs of the decline in the Church as a result of the usage of the so called better critical text.

I am no scholar so I have drawn on the work of others more knowledgeable than myself but Just looking at how the critical text treats Jesus and the confusion of Bible translations that has resulted I find it difficult to see the hand of God on these translations especially with some of the glaring heresies they have unlike the text behind the KJV which Glorifies Jesus and results in cohesiveness in the Bibles translated from it.

**A Warning**

The Bible was written by men inspired by The Holy Ghost, If you attack the Bible you attack the Holy Ghost. If you knowingly call into question the Bible in any way you are demeaning the Holy Spirit as He is the writer of it (Job 32:8, 1 Pet 2:21). This is really

Blaspheming The Holy Spirit for which you lose your salvation and are unable to repent (Heb 6:4-6).

To doubt parts of the Bible as being accurate also questions the Holy Spirit's credibility and demeans Him resulting in Blaspheming Him.

Woe to the Bible translators who deliberately write what they believe should be there, ignoring what God had said already because they are wiser in their own eyes than God. They have their reward on earth and will have none after death except hellfire in the days of eternity!

They blasphemed the integrity of The Holy Spirit and will not be able to repent.

Woe to the churches that blindly accept their writings as truth. They will be blind guides leading the blind sheep and will go the way of the world in what they do. Unless they repent, they will not demonstrate The Kingdom and may end up not being a part of it being candidates for the lukewarm church Jesus will spew out of His mouth in the end times.

*Mat 18:6 But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.*