

Modern Bible Versions

Preface

To set up his one world religion Satan needs all faiths to have similar beliefs. There will not be a 'bible' that all will be able to believe in but a belief system that all religions can agree with so can gather in unity, even though they are of different religious systems. This is why ecumenicism is so important to Satan.

He is preparing this and is nearing his goal. The 'new, improved' Greek used for today's bibles, was organised him using liberal and apostate Christians and is continued as a result of the modern bible versions as liberal theologians use the modern Greek, translating to back up their beliefs and not translating it as God intended.

When Jehovah Witnesses prefer The New International Version to their own bible for evangelism and Satanist can use parts of it for their own worship, you know something or wrong.

This booklet aims to show you some of the errors of modern version.

Introduction

This document was originally in my book on The Kingdom of God. Why did I have a chapter on modern bibles in a book on The Kingdom of God? The Bible is the handbook of The Kingdom so Satan has used liberal theologians to attack it because:

It tells us type of faith required to enter The Kingdom

It tells us about Jesus, who He is and what He has done for us

It tells us how to obtain eternal life

It tells us what God requires of us as His Citizens

It tells us how to defeat Satan

Satan has to remove its message in important ways and he uses liberal theologians to attack The Bible. It is only as they are able to modify the Bible to reinforce their liberal stance on doctrine can they succeed with their heresy and replace The Kingdom of God with their idea (really Satan's) of God and His kingdom.

Heresy and Modern Bible Versions

Noah Webster, in his 1828 American Dictionary of the English Language gives a definition of heresy (which I have paraphrased as follows):

The original meaning was to take hold of something. The word, in his days meant a fundamental error in the Christian faith or untenable or unsound opinion or doctrine.

Heresy is perhaps too general a word as the person you are calling a heretic also calls you one. The same with apostasy so that is also not a good word to use. An absolute reference is needed and I propose the KJV and the traditional received Greek text is used to define that

which is in error as this translation sits on over 1800 years of continuous Bible Theology unlike the two codices that form the basis of modern UBS Greek (one of which were unused for 1400 years and lately taken up again because it was such a bad text and the other is a proven forgery) and both of which have no continuous historical transmission of theology. These two codices were used as they were still in one piece and were considered to be the oldest extant Biblical text available so theologians declared these were the most accurate texts.

It is said the Vaticanus survived because its text was so corrupted no one bothered to use it while the good texts were worn out from use. The Sinaiticus was forged in the early 1800's. There are the quotes from writers before these codices were written which in the majority support the Greek text used for the KJV. So, the assumption that these two codices are the oldest and thus the most accurate text is not correct. But more on this later.

Heresy is the alteration of doctrine to accommodate or reinforce your incorrect beliefs (doctrinal position). If you alter scripture to support your erroneous belief of doctrine then it means you do not serve the same God as the Bible or you would accept what God says in it and not have to alter it in any way.

It is to be noted that The Catholic Church did not themselves use the Vaticanus but left it gathering dust for 1200+ years in their library, so one wonders why it was suddenly found and used by them and given to Westcott and Hort. If it was a good Greek text, fundamental Catholic and Protestant scholars would have used it for their Bibles instead of gathering dust so who suddenly discovered it and why?

Given the Catholic Church always used Latin for their Bible translations and not Greek I wonder if Westcott and Hort saw the Vaticanus as a tool and it was not given to them by The Catholic Church but used because it suited their agenda

To identify heresy, you need too:

Have a reference to show the error or heresy against. (The Greek and Hebrew of the King James is proven as being the yardstick for measuring scripture translations and will be used for the purposes of establishing a standard by which to reveal error or heresy in other bibles.

Know The Bible truths so that the error or heresy is clearly understood.

Need to hear The Holy Spirit to be guided by Him in understanding the error or heresy and showing the heresy for what it is

You need to observe the fruit of the liberal belief to see if it is Godly or not.

Heretics attack the truths of the Bible in a way that backs up their teaching and beliefs so that their heresy is supported by their version of the bible either by what they make it say or the way they comment on it.

The heretics who destroyed the modern Bibles

In 1881 the Revised Version of the Bible (I use the term 'bible' loosely) was published. This

was based on a 'revised' Greek text resulting from two codices that had been discovered as well as from a few other existing documents that agreed in some way with these codices.

This 'revised' Greek text used as the basis for the RV was created by the two editors, Bishops Hort and Westcott, both 'liberal' at heart, into spiritism and other occultic and esoteric knowledge who changed the traditional; text to agree with their beliefs and had to secretly smuggle in this 'improved Greek' to the translators of the RV so that these people did not realise what they were doing. It was by stealth they substituted their Greek for the traditional Greek Text because to do so openly would have caused it to be rejected.

I cannot believe The Catholic church knew the true liberal nature of these two heretics or they may not have given them their Codex to use.

The Catholic church has a great love for Jesus and will die for Him as well as suffer privation and hardship to do His work so to give their codex to someone who was to attack Jesus does not seem to be something they would do.

I believe they gave what they thought was the most accurate codex to these two heretics and did not expect the emasculation of the divinity of Jesus that subsequently occurred from the apostate Greek text these two liberal bishops provided to the committee preparing the Revised Version. They did not realize that Westcott and Hort would place their own liberal views on the Greek text and change it to suit their liberal faith.

The 1899 Douay-Rheims Catholic Bible does not have the flagrant errors I list later that the Greek text of Westcott and Hort has, so it can be assumed that the Greek text of Westcott and Hort was a surprise to The Catholic Church as the resultant RV Bible was different to their own Douay-Rheims Bible in important ways.

Hort and Westcott avoided over 5300 Greek manuscripts that agree with the KJV and used 44 Greek manuscripts from an erroneous school of belief that debase Jesus. They ignored an unbroken tradition of textual preservation for 1800 years to use texts that had been ignored over 1400 years because they were considered useless for Bible translation.

The above two authors of the 'New' Greek text used for most versions of bible (small 'b') translations after 1881 were spiritist who could not believe in the blood sacrifice of Jesus, who accepted salvation by works as well as certain new age beliefs, and who were involved with contacting the dead as well as other non-Christian activities and beliefs.

They formed a club called The Ghostly Guild which later became the Society for Psychical Research and were the fathers of the Current New Age channelling movement.

They altered the original Greek text in such a way as to bring praise upon them by the then leaders of the liberal, modernistic theological thinking, who applauded their New Greek text as at last it brought the Bible into agreement with their liberal, modern and/or occultic thinking.

Their attack on the traditional Greek test is not surprising as they hated it and condemned it and saw a chance to promote something more acceptable to their erroneous beliefs in the Greek text when they were asked to prepare for the Revised Version of The Bible. No man

rejects or hates the truth (The Bible) so in doing this they showed their true spiritual colours. The god of their bible was not The God of The Bible!

Why would these people who 'slept with the devil' be allowed to introduce into Christianity a text that was erroneous, that denied the divinity of Jesus and promoted salvation that was not completely by faith in Jesus. Why were they allowed to prepare the text unsupervised by anyone else so that they could do what they wanted to with it.

These two editors altered the text in such a way as to remove or alter many basic doctrines and reduce the status of Jesus from 'The Son of God' to 'a son of god'. They altered the Greek text in such a way that all religions could use all or parts it as it suited them too. When Satanists can use the Lord's Prayer in Luke and claim it as fitting their beliefs and cults use a translation based on their erroneous Greek text for their witnessing you know something is rotten!

When Unitarians, Jehovah's Witnesses, Satanist and The New Age adherents can also use this text or parts of it you know there are real problems with it. When some Jehovah's Witnesses prefer the NIV to their own bible for the purposes of witnessing to Jesus then you know the NIV has serious problems.

Perhaps a comment by one of the critics of the new versions summarises the situation. He stated that the editors of modern versions place their bias and the doctrines they espouse in the text even to the alteration of the traditional text so that this 'new, so called scholarly improved' text says what they believe it should say and not what was originally written there.

Ps 11:3 If the foundations be destroyed what can the righteous do?

You wonder why the church has declined after these modern Bibles were published after 1881? It was because these translations were from a man-made text and not the one God had sanctioned for 1800 years.

This will be seen by the discussion that follows that examines how this erroneous Greek text treats Jesus.

How do people alter The Bible?

They interpret it according their theology (belief system) and not actually what it says. They do this by:

Changing the meaning of the translation of the Greek Text:

They make words mean what they want them to mean so that the word is translated differently in different places even though there is no rationale for doing that.

The leave verses out or change them to mean something different to what they originally meant

They add, alter or remove words or phrases to give verses the sense they want

They add footnotes that question the validity or accuracy of verses or promotes their interpretation of their doctrine behind a verse

Mythologize Genesis or other parts of The Bible to say these things never really happened

Make up theories such as the Gap theory to make their beliefs more palatable in regard to sin and creation

Rationalising parts of the Bible to remove the need for faith (miracles are an example of this)

They denounce the KJV as being incorrect and needing to be corrected through the so called better critical Greek Text and use this to justify their corruption of doctrine

By doing these they remove The God of The Bible who is All Powerful and Almighty and create a new god that is not like the God of The Bible. This shows they worship a different God to that of The Bible.

It is obvious they do not know or fear The God of The Bible so they would not have altered The Bible the way they do.

If you add to the Bible (like the Gap theory), Mythologist Gen Ch. 1 to 11 or declare miracles are not real, you cannot really trust The Bible and it becomes useless as a Guide to redemption, salvation, trusting God and learning about Him. Not believing Gen 3 literally removes the need for Jesus and makes The New Testament and Jesus irrelevant.

Rationalising Miracles also removes the need for faith in God's power to do Miracles and calls God, Jesus and the Bible liars and again you cannot trust anything That particular Bible says. You have no place to go to find out about God, redemption and salvation and must rely on what can be seen in His creation and listening to your conscience to get to heaven as well as what they consider necessary to salvation.

The two Greek texts

One of the major differences between the Received Text and the erroneous Greek Text that is used for the modern versions is the language they were written in.

The Received Text was written in koine Greek, the language of the first century and was written by eyewitnesses to the events in The New Testament because they wrote when the koine Greek was used for everyday writing.

The Erroneous Greek used in modern versions was written in Attic Greek and was written by people based on writings in the second century, after the last of the eyewitnesses had died. The Attic Greek also is more concise because it implies things rather than actually saying them so that the new Greek text is the equivalent of being two books of the Bible shorter (about the size of 1 and 2 Peter). It was written also, by people who did not believe fully in the divinity of Jesus and who reflected their viewpoint which the Attic Greek facilitated (as it implied things rather than saying them so could be altered to their advantage) but the received text of the Greek did not imply things as it did not allow implied words in its structure so it stated everything clearly and could not be used by these two liberal bishops.

This reflection in their writing by the authors of the modern erroneous Greek of their bias

against Jesus is why modern versions do not reflect the divinity of Jesus as they should.

Unfortunately, modern scholarship is behind the Greek used in Bible translations today ignoring the 1850+ years of continuous received Greek text that is available to them and which has an unbroken doctrine for these 1850+ years from the apostles until the new critical text was used to replace the received Greek text.

The two approaches to interpreting The Bible

There are two approaches to translating biblical Greek: formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence is when the text is translated and says what the text actually means. This is the approach behind the King James Translation. Dynamic equivalence means that you translate passages in such a way so it says what you believe should be there. This means you alter the text as you think you should so what the text says is in a way secondary to what the Greek text actually says. As each translator and editors of each version sees things differently you have the same words translated differently in the various versions which is why there is such a difference between modern translations.

This mistranslation of dynamic equivalence is compounded in modern versions as they use the liberal Greek text based on what Hort and Wescott gave to the RV translators so they are already going to translate the bible wrongly even before they place their own doctrinal bias on it.

Another problem is that in terms of copyright law, new Bible versions can only be copyrighted as 'derivative works.' Words must be changed whether or not they need to be changed. Editors and translators may update one archaic word in eight thousand in the KJV, but modern bible editors must change many other words, so the new translations are materially different to the KJV and at times to each other.

This problem of difference in texts because of copyright occurs amongst modern bibles so that they can never completely agree as they must use many different words to say the same thing and words and phrases that are substituted for another do not always say the same thing or have the same meaning. This is another reason modern bibles are different to each other.

God is not the author of confusion so cannot be behind the confusion of interpretation in modern bibles. This only leaves Satan as the cause of this confusion as confused, incorrectly translated bibles would suit his purposes well.

The problem with dynamic translation is that each translator imprints their own doctrinal belief on the translation and if they are liberal Christians then their translation will be liberal. Unfortunately, many of the editors and translators of the modern versions are liberal (heretical) in some way in their beliefs or have compromised them in some way so they are not following Jesus as Lord and translate accordingly so that their beliefs are not threatened.

Sadly, many Christians do not know the errors in the beliefs of many translators and editors and of modern-day bibles and many leading theologians believe modern bibles are trustworthy, not realising the error in the Greek behind them.

Remember that Satan will do anything to stop you reading and understanding The Bible

correctly in your own language so that you will not read the truths that will set you free and help you to fight him. If he cannot stop you reading it, he will corrupt the translation so the truths are hidden or missing.

To change the Bible, one needs to remove the fact that God has said He would preserve its words (truths). The KJV quotes this preservation statement by God as follows:

Psa 12:5 (KJV) 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.

If you examine a modern version, you will note it is no longer the Bible that is preserved but the people in the preceding verse.

ESV Psa 12:5 "Because the poor are plundered, because the needy groan, I will now arise," says the LORD; "I will place him in the safety for which he longs."

Psa 12:6 The words of the LORD are pure words, like silver refined in a furnace on the ground, purified seven times.

Psa 12:7 You, O LORD, will keep them; you will guard us from this generation forever.

This allows translators and editors to take liberties to make their translation say what they want it to say so that they can modify, leave out and/or change words, phrases or verses to suit their doctrine (belief system) and as many of the translators and editors were liberal in some of their beliefs, they passed these erroneous doctrine and beliefs onto the version they were on the translating or editing panel of, corrupting the text with their incorrect doctrine.

The problem with translating verse 7 as referring to the people is that it states that that Israel would be preserved. As we know Israel was restored a few times so this passage has to be an erroneous translation as history shows it is wrong. If Israel was preserved the nation would not have disappeared.

The KJV does not have this error.

There are over 5300 surviving Greek manuscripts that contain all or part of the New Testament. These manuscripts agree together 95% of the time. The other 5% are of no real doctrinal significance..

The two main texts used today

I propose to comment more on the two Greek texts used as the basis for Bible translations so the differences between them can be seen and so that people are encouraged to examine further the issues of possible corruption by the critical text used for the translation of modern bible versions,

There are two Greek Texts used for translation purposes: The traditional text called the *textus receptus* (received text) and the other is called the *critical text*. The critical text is eclectic, being based on a few handpicked manuscripts ignoring the remaining 5300 manuscripts that do not support their position of doctrine. In other words, you pick what you want to use for translation purposes rather than look at all the established literature used for over 1800 years. This is only done if you reject established translation of the text and want to make one according to your unconventional interpretation of these texts (which is what liberal theologians have done to justify their heretical doctrine and view of Jesus..

The received text was used for the King James Bible. The greater number of manuscripts and similar support this text. Over 5300 of the 5339+ Greek manuscripts of the Bible agree over 95% of the time with the received text.

The received text is also called a Byzantine text as it is based on manuscripts from all over the Christian world (except Egypt, where these erroneous manuscripts come from) and is the main type of text used by early church fathers when they quoted scripture.

The modern critical text is an eclectic text based on a handful of carefully chosen Greek manuscripts and is the basis of the Greek text used in modern Bibles starting with the Revised Version (1881) and later. Their main two Greek texts (codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) are both proven forgeries and are called an Alexandrian Text because their origin is Egypt. They were used mainly in Egypt because they were edited to agree with the beliefs of the people in that area who did not believe in the divinity of Jesus. Unfortunately, as I will show later, this lack of belief in the Divinity of Jesus has carried over into modern versions like the NIV.

Because of their doctrinal differences the two texts (received and critical texts) are not reconcilable.

An illustration will show the difference between these two Greek texts.

Imagine a country is invaded. The invader wants to write a history of the country. He can do two things:

Select books or sources of information that are favourable to their regime and use carefully chosen resources that tell the effect on the invaded people in a way favourable to the invaders (Critical text).

Use all resources that show the truth about the invasion; and its effect on its inhabitants and give an unbiased account of what happened (Byzantine text).

The eclectic critical text is like the first example. Manuscripts are chosen that suit their doctrinal belief system, The Received text tells it as it is and favours no doctrinal viewpoint.

At the core of the eclectic critical text are two main codices: the Sinai and the Vatican codices. The Vatican codex lay on a shelf in the Vatican library for over 1450 years ignored by the Catholic church and the editors of the received text, because it was not a good text to translate from. It was ignored by the translators of the King James Bible it was so corrupted. The codex from Sinai is a proven forgery. Yet these two codices are the basis of The New Testament translations of all modern versions.

So, we have as the basis of the modern Greek text two codices. One so bad it was going to be used or fuel. Another so bad it was ignored by all responsible bible translators, apparently including its owners The Catholic Church, and had been edited by 10 different people to try and bring it to an acceptable state but was discarded as being useless even after all these edits to it.

These two erroneous codices disagree with each other in at least 3000 places in the Gospels alone so are not a good source to form a common Greek text to translate from. Of Concern is how the translators and editors using these codices managed to make a unified text from them to use as the basis of translation of a New Testament. One also wonders whether the editors that compiled the modern critical Greek text used the original of the Vaticanus codex, the corrections of it or whatever of either fitted their doctrinal belief system.

It is also a concern that Unitarians (who do not believe in the divinity of Jesus) were on the editorial panel of the RV and ASV. It is a concern as they accepted the Greek text (the critical text) use for these versions because it agreed with their theology. They were also able to influence changes to the text of the RV and ASV to make them agree with their liberal theology. The NIV and modern versions use this same critical text that the Unitarians approved the theology of.

I will discuss the relevance of the ages of the manuscripts later but will comment that these Alexandrian manuscripts were still there because no one used them as they were erroneous while the Byzantine codices were worn out from use and no longer exist because of their being copied so often as they had the true Greek text in them.

Why is preservation and constancy of translation being important

We need The Bible so we can know what God requires of us. It also needs to be preserved (as to content) so that people of all periods have the same standard and one period is not required to obey a different standard to another age.

God has to preserve His Bible for this to happen so the people of 100 AD have the same Bible as the people of 2000 AD. This means you do not have to rediscover what God has said to us in His Bible, removing a major foundation of modern theology.

We do not need the original or oldest documents of the Old or New Testament as God has preserved what He wants us to know in the copies of the Scripture we have had passed down from our ancestors to use and which we can trust because of unbroken history of constant transmission of the received text. The evidence for this is the constancy of translations over the last 1800 years while the modern versions over the last 120 years are not even consistent with each other.

We do not need theology that says men have to find out what God really meant (which is coloured by their belief system) and then who edit the Bible according to what they believe it means or believe it should say (as modern translators of the Bible do).

If these translators had truly trusted God, they would have accepted what was revealed in the scriptures handed down to them without having to edit the Bible to suit their belief system, bringing in any errors they had and which are now in these modern bibles.

I have mentioned Ps12:7 and how the modern versions change this so they can edit their translation as they need to back up their theology with a bible translation that states what they believe. But God states this preservation also elsewhere (Mat 5:18).

It can be seen that Ps 12:5-7 and Math 5:18 contradict each other in the modern Bibles. This means they are in error in some way and cannot be trusted as you do not know what else is in error.

If God did not preserve His word, how would we know what He requires of us. So, it is necessary for Him to preserve His word so people throughout all time will clearly know His requirements of them and so that His requirements are standardised for each generation because they have not changed in any way.

It cannot be said that modern bible translations continue this clear line of telling us what God requires of us and so show they are not of the lineage of the original bible writings.

Preservation of The Bible

To say God did not preserve His Word is to call Him a liar and hypocrite asking us to obey His Word but not preserving it so we would not know all or part of the guidelines we needed to obey Him.

This divine preservation by God means that there is an unbroken line of the transmission of His Words and doctrine (theology) from Creation to now. This we find in the received text but not in the critical text, which was laid aside and ignored by the church for 1450+ years. God did not preserve its teachings (words) and put it aside for 1400 years as if He did not want to preserve it in any way.

If God had not preserved His principles and Words no one for 1450 years would have known what it was until 'rediscovered' by modern theologians so these people would have had no idea what God wanted of them.

The critical text fails the test of divine preservation which is why the theologians have to devise a reason to ignore this text.

I will show some doctrinal differences in the translations made from these two different texts using the NIV and KJV, the best-known representative of each of the critical and received Greek texts. The KJV is based on the received text and the NIV on the critical text. I have already mentioned the change made in Ps 12:7 which was made so modern translators could justify what they wrote and do what they wanted with their translation.

In Job 32:8 we are told The Holy Spirit gives us understanding of the things of God. The modern versions debase Jesus and so are not Spirit inspired as The Spirit always exalts Jesus. This means modern translations are the efforts of men and do not say what God wants to say to us as it should be said.

Some worrying interpretation in modern bibles

Some worrying differences between these two Greek texts are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

I deal with mark 16:9-19 first

The NIV has a note to imply the passage is not the Word of God. The note goes something like this:

“The earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 6:9-19)”

This is a blatant lie! There are over 1640 manuscripts and similar extant with this part of this chapter of Mark. Only five do not have this passage and even then, one of them still has space for it. These five are among the ones chosen to be the basis of the Greek used in modern New Testament Translations. They have ignored 1635+ texts to imply this passage should not belong to The Bible. This passage is the only place we have been delegated authority to do the Miracles Jesus did as well as to attack and defeat Satan.

This passage was in the Codexis before they were printed but was removed from them when they were printed. As it can be seen there was deliberate manipulation of the text so that the original meaning of it was not present ed but what the editors wanted presented was translated. Why did they want hidden our delegated authority over Satan,. God would not do that but Satan would which shows the spirit behind t he translation of modern bibles.

If God is behind this note in the NIV He is a hypocrite saying we will do greater works than Jesus then casting doubt on our authority to do these. Jesus is also cast as a liar for saying something He did not mean or for requesting us to do something we are not able to do.

In the Gospels Jesus said we would do greater works (in quantity) that He did. Removing this passage makes Jesus out to be a liar and a hypocrite and unable to be our redeemer. Why would theologians support this note that implies these things? God would not. If Jesus did not say this, how can we believe anything placed in these Bibles as being what Jesus said or accept their veracity and truthfulness and faithfulness to the originals.

If modern Bibles leave such an important passage as this out how or imply it is not in the originals how can we believe modern bibles say, especially when it helps Satan by leaving out our delegated authority over him and his works. Why would theologians want to help Satan?

I would definitely say the note is not inspired by God and would cause me to be concerned at the translators and editors and their motives implying Jesus is a liar and God a hypocrite. The fact is that all these signs were done by the Christians in the book of Acts and in some modern-day churches evidence this passage is confirmed as scripture. This ‘error’ also means you cannot trust the rest of a Bible that has this error in as you do not know what else they have corrupted.

The KJV and (DRB) do not have this error.

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.

Why would the translators and editors purposely leave out a verse that proves The Trinity and the Divinity of Jesus? God would not do that. This omission shows the influence of the Unitarians in the choice of the text for the Greek promoted by The Bible Society in England and later overseas.

The KJV and (DRB) do not have this error.

Blasphemy occurs in Is 14:12 of such a horrendous nature that it calls into question the faith of the translators of the NIV.

The translators of the modern New Testaments know the Names of Jesus and have used them in the following verses: 2 Pet 1:19, Rev 2: -28 and Rev 22:16. The Title of Jesus I am referring to is where Jesus is called “the morning star”

Why then do they alter the text of Is 14:12 to replace the name of Satan with that of Jesus. Is 14:12 in the KJV reads as follows:

How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!

The NIV reads as follows:

*How have you fallen from heaven, O morning star (=Jesus), so of the dawn!
You have been cast down to the earth, you who once laid low the nations.*

Notice how Jesus has replaced Lucifer (Satan) and that the fall was after the nations were established.

God would not replace a name of Satan with that of Jesus. The translators of the modern Bible do not know Satan from Jesus it appears or there is a hidden Agenda in their translation. Remember 95% of manuscripts have Lucifer and not Jesus so why have the translators and editors ignored this? It is almost as if the translators and editors of the modern versions have turned their back on the KJV and its doctrine.

According to modern translators Jesus:

Was cast out and did not voluntarily come to earth

Was proud and sinned

Wanted to be like God

Implied He cannot be redeemer so that Calvary was a wasted effort by God and achieved nothing.

Their defence is that this title is for the King of Babylon but if that is the case why not say his name like The Bible does elsewhere in respect of other people it writes about. This defence is very weak. The only conclusion being they have purposely put the Name of Jesus there to remove Him as God and redeemer.

The KJV and (DRB) do not have this error.

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. Is it possible the translators and editors do not believe in the forgiveness of sin we were given at Calvary? Why do they think we need to confess our sins to someone other than Jesus?

The KJV) does not have this error.

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. Why would the translators remove the divinity of Jesus unless they did not believe He was God? God would not do that!

The NIV is so strong in humanising Jesus and removing His Divinity that its attitude to Jesus has been questioned at times!

The KJV and (DRB) do not have this error.

According to the modern versions Jesus sinned

Mat 5:22 But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment;

The NIV says if you are angry you sin. Anger is a sin as it is against God's Law of Love. Jesus was angry at the moneylenders in the Temple. According to modern Bibles Jesus sinned and cannot be our redeemer. In the text used for this verse in the KJV the problem does not arise. The NIV left out the phrase '*without a cause*' and the only cause can only really be to defend the things of God (Which Jesus was doing). Why do they not want you to defend the things of God as Jesus was doing.

This verse in the modern versions remove the righteous anger we can have to fight for the things of God. According to this verse you cannot be angry at people who mock The Father, Jesus, The Holy Spirit or the things of God as you will sin if you are angry. It leads to a toothless, inoffensive faith that cannot criticise anything that opposes it.

Why did the editors remove from the Bible the allowance of righteous anger at people abusing the things of God? This would hinder attacks on the modern bible translators as you would be in sin if you were angry at their heresy according to their bibles. Even if it was in standing up for the things of God or against the error and heresy of other faiths and religions you would be in sin according to the modern Bible. This attitude would make ecumenicism and inter faith worship easier as you could not (according to modern bible versions) stand for the things of God in an angry or forceful manner.

The KJV does not have this error.

In Col 1:14 the words 'through his Blood'. have been let out. Why leave out the important

point that Redemption is only through the Blood of Jesus shed at Calvary. God would not as it removes the purpose of Jesus dying. So why do the translators and editors of modern versions believe Calvary is not important?

The KJV and (DRB) do not have this error.

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 want to remove this witness of The Word to Jesus and to non-Christians?

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.

The KJV does not have this error.

In the NIV Lord is omitted 39 times, Jesus is omitted 87 times and Christ is omitted 39 times and more world 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.

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!

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? These questions need a satisfactory answer.

In the New Age and other cults or religions Jesus is not God, just another master and by removing or changing His divine titles to more human, generic ones the Bible is made more user friendly to other faiths and religions as the problem of Him being God's Son is no longer there. This problem does not arise with the KJV.

Why are the translators making modern translations more user friendly with other religions and cults? I cannot imagine God doing that.

Maybe these modern versions are not liberal but are correct in which case the doctrine of

1800 years has been incorrect. I cannot imagine God allowing error in His people for over 1800 years.

I have difficulty in trusting the NIV Bible which implies God is a hypocrite, Jesus is a liar and sinner and which implies Jesus is just another man. As all modern Bibles are based on the critical text used by the NIV so I also have difficulty in trusting them.

The Catholic church is unfortunately following the critical Greek text in the belief it is the best not realising how Westcott and Hort perverted the Vatican Codex so that it is far removed from their Douay Reheims Bible and faith.

I do not believe that the erroneous verse in the Douay Reheims Bible are the because Catholics understand their implications as their faith upholds Jesus unlike the liberals and apostates behind the critical Greek text that use that is used by liberal editors of modern versions. The Catholics saw a chance to have the true Greek text, as far as they were concerned, used for the RV not realising in whose hands they had committed their cause.

Nearly all the errors in Catholic belief are not in their Bible but a result of tradition and the errors in them that demean Jesus and I believe would be fixed if they realised the implications of these verses.

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.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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. **4. Respectability or weight of truth**

4. How reliable is the text?

The Sinai 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.

5. 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

The Critical text fails again

6. 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, 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.

7. Internal evidence as a test of truth

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

If modern versions translated the critical text similarly in all their translations, then they could have some credibility. But they do not do so as each editor and translator stamp their own belief (doctrine) on what they believe the version should contain and how it should be expressed. This has resulted in disorder and confusion. Why are there so many modern translations? They cannot all be correct especially when they say different things because they use different words to express what they believe the critical text says.

God is not a God of confusion so who is behind this confusion in the modern versions? God cannot be behind this confusion and inconsistency!

It can be seen that the critical text does not do too well in these tests but that the received Greek text used for the KJV does.

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 on 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.

Anyone willing to examine these tests for themselves and who open mindedly does the research will reach the same conclusions I have.

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 them 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.

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 confesses 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.

The Number of alterations made to the KJV

Strong in one of the editions of his concordance details the differences between the KJV and the RV (the first really modern version using the critical text). There are 264 and 1/4 pages of 8-point type with 8 columns to a page (60,000+ alterations some very major and not doctrinally changing). The critical test is not a Greek text that is a correction of the received text but a whole new Greek text designed to replace the received text for reasons unstated publicly by the editors of the RV.

The liberal nature of modern Bible translations

Anything that modifies doctrine or denigrates Jesus is heretical. The critical text does this so it is heretical and the modern Bible versions based on this text as a result must be heretical. It only requires one thing for it to be heretical like substituting Jesus for Satan in Is 14:12 so Jesus has now fallen from heaven and not Satan (and implies Jesus came to earth involuntarily) or changing Ps 12:7 implying the Bible is no longer preserved by God, or the

changing of the Names of Jesus so He is less Divine. This is heresy at its worst and these changes can only have been deliberate by people who did not accept the divinity of Jesus and so could not be God sanctioned.

It only takes one doctrinal change to make a bible untrustworthy and useless for the purposes of the Christian faith but I have shown modern versions have numerous doctrinal errors as a result of following the critical Greek text.

Given the liberal nature of the critical text it can only be assumed that the translators and editors do not know their doctrine or have modified these modern versions to suit an agenda or liberal doctrine they have. They are not judged by man but by the words they write and claim to be from God which conflict with the Words God has preserved for over 1800 years.

In these last days when the Lukewarm Church is to be revealed for what it is and a one world religion formed in preparation for the Antichrist, the critical text has appeared in time for it to be prepared to be the Text of the one world religion and in the process of becoming this create a lukewarm faith and resulting lukewarm Church.

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.

more information from:

The Dean Burgin Society: <http://www.deanBurginsociety.org/>

The Bible for Today: <http://www.biblefortoday.org/>

Way of Life Literature on Bible Corruptions: <http://www.wayoflife.org/>

AV Publications: <http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html>

Trinitarian Bible Society was formed in 1830 when Unitarians took over the Bible Society in

England and also have good material on Bible corruption:

<http://www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/>

Chick Publications also has some good thought-provoking material on their web site:

<http://www.chick.com/information/bibleversions/>

This has information on the KJV amongst other things <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/#kjb>