

The Philosophical basis behind the New Greek text

The purpose of this document is to show the heretical beliefs of the two authors of the Greek behind modern Bibles as well as their hatred of the King James Version which drove them to rebel against the authority commissioning them to update the King James and make a completely new Greek and Translation that followed their heretical beliefs.

A Philosophy is a way of viewing things and to see how the traditional Greek text (the Textus Receptus) was ignored so that they could make the modern Greek text used for modern Bible translations you need to look at the belief system of its two chief proponents who manufactured this new Greek text, who doctored texts to achieve this, Drs. Westcott and Hort!

After examining all these changes, I still have one question unanswered: Why would God make all these changes that attack the divinity of Jesus and make salvation dependent on something we do? Which is what the New Greek text implies.

So I will examine their own words to determine their viewpoint on The Textus Receptus and its doctrinal content.

Jesus as a human made divine

Before I do this I will explain why the divinity of Jesus was not promoted by Westcott and Hort and other modern theologians.

In the 1700's scientific rationalism was in vogue and people to look to history and fact to determine things. At the time of Jesus were others who were born a human but made a God after they died. (a list may be found here at Wikipedia https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_people_who_have_been_considered_deities).

So they considered Jesus to be born of actual sex between God and Mary so not divine at birth. This is why He was excluded from The Trinity (1 John 5:7) and Mark 16:9-21 was removed because they did not believe He was divine so could not delegate to us authority over Satan.

Now to the main topic of this document.

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

Because of their influence on modern Biblical translations, it is important to know their attitudes to The Bible given the fact that they believed we needed to find out what God thought or said in The Bible and so influenced their translation by their attitudes.

So it is necessary to examine what is known about these men and their theories concerning the text of the Bible.

You cannot blindly accept the finding of any scholar without investigating what their beliefs are concerning the Bible and its doctrines. Scholarship alone makes for an inadequate and dangerous authority, because it is based on the reasonings of men that may or not may not be what God is thinking about what they are reasoning about.

This is worrisome because God says His ways of thinking are so far above anything we can think or imagine so either Westcott and Hort were deceived or were able to understand what God meant, (or in otherwords, know the mind of God which He says is impossible) or

possibly God lied about this depth of thinking so that we cannot believe what He wrote in the Bible, which means Westcott and Hort cannot really use the Bible as a starting point, (which they did) because they did not believe it was accurate!

Whatever the case we cannot accept their translation because it has no basis to work being based on forged texts (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) and also because they believed there was no real accurate text to work from so that they did not have a text to compare the accuracy of their translation too. So they really cannot say what they wrote is correct!

If you do not think the Textus Receptus was correct and you really cannot fathom out what God meant to say so that we really do not have anything to base our faith on except what we want to make it to be, which is what Westcott and Hort did! They made a translation that said what their heresies believed it should be and not what was acceptable at that time as truth.

Westcott and Hort were responsible for replacing the Greek text behind the King James version with a text based on only 45 of the over 5200 Greek manuscripts available of which over 5200 backed up the Greek behind the King James Bible.

Why did they ignore what was acceptable for 1700 years and replace it with texts that were forgeries being based on the writings of people who did not believe Jesus was divine.

Hort's viewpoint about the Bible and its contents

A comment by Hort shows they hated the Textus Receptus (the Greek Text accepted for over 1700 years) and when given the chance to change it in a small way replaced it with a Greek text based on manuscripts that mainline church ignored as not suitable for translation purposes.

Hort wrote:

"I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of text, having read so little Greek Testament, and dragged on with the villainous Textus Receptus ... Think of the vile Textus Receptus leaning entirely on late MSS; it is a blessing there are such early ones."

Westcott and Hort built their own a New Greek text based primarily on a manuscript (The Sinaiticus) which was a proven forgery and of which there is no record before 1820 when it miraculously appeared.

These heretical manuscripts (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) do not even agree among themselves in very many places. It is easier to find two consecutive verses between them that do not agree than find two consecutive verses that agree. The ironic thing is that Westcott and Hort knew this when they formed their new Greek text!

The two main manuscripts used by them, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus alone differ over 3000 times in the Gospels so that often a choice has to be made as to which is the accurate rendering of the Greek. This means they could use their religious biases to have the Greek say what they wanted it to say and ignore the King James Greek by saying their manuscripts were better than the one used for the King James.

They treated The Bible as any other book and not as God's revelation.

Hort wrote:

*"For ourselves, we dare not introduce considerations which could not reasonably be applied to other ancient texts, supposing them to have documentary attestation of equal amount, variety and antiquity."*⁸⁸

The question arises: How can God use men who do not believe that His Book is any different than Shakespeare, Plato, or Dickens? Or who believed that it could be edited by men according to their view point of their beliefs?

It is a fundamental belief that the Bible is different from all other writings.

Why did not these two men believe so?

They have both become famous for being able to deny scriptural truth and still be upheld by fundamental Christianity as biblical authorities! Both Westcott and Hort failed to accept the basic Bible doctrines basic to the Christian faith. They wrote a Greek text that reinforced their views yet orthodox Christianity has accepted these heretical views and their Bible resulting from their heretical text.

They did not believe the Bible as shown by their beliefs.

Hort denies the reality of Eden:

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

He did not believe in many doctrines. Writing about another book and its authors Hort writes to Rev. Rowland Williams, October 21, 1858:

*"Further I agree with them [Authors of "Essays and Reviews"] in condemning many leading specific doctrines of the popular theology ... Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue. There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible."*⁹¹

Hort did not believe that the Bible was infallible:

"If you make a decided conviction of the absolute infallibility of the N.T. practically a sine qua non for co-operation, I fear I could not join you." He also stated:

And he further commented to a colleague:

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

Though unimpressed with the evangelicals of his day, Hort had great admiration for Charles Darwin! To his colleague, B.F. Westcott, he wrote excitedly:

"...Have you read Darwin? How I should like to talk with you about it! In spite of difficulties, I am inclined to think it unanswerable. In any case it is a treat to read such a book."

A belief in what Darwin wrote requires a disbelief in whom God is and a rejection of creation and that results from it. You basically have to reject Genesis Ch 1-11. In other words, you must believe that the Bible has myths so that it is all not accurate and has error in it as a result.

This means you cannot really trust any of The Bible as you do not know what else is in error so cannot justify your correcting the error as you do not know if it is wrong. So, you can only say what you think it says and if you do not believe basic doctrine your Bible text will contain heresy. This is why the new Greek is full of heresy because its originators did not believe basic bible doctrine and did not think the text they replaced was correct.

To John Ellerton he writes:

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

Dr. Hort was also an adherent to the teaching of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.

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

Hort was also a lover of Greek philosophy. In writing to Mr. A. MacMillian, he stated:

"You seem to make (Greek) philosophy worthless for those who have received the Christian revelation. To me, though in a hazy way, it seems full of precious truth of which I find nothing, and should be very much astonished and perplexed to find anything in revelation."

Hort did not believe in a personal devil he wrote:

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

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

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

"I think Maurice's letter to me sufficiently showed that we have no sure knowledge respecting the duration of future punishment, and that the word 'eternal' has a far higher meaning than the merely material one of

excessively long duration; extinction always grates against my mind as something impossible."

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

In other words He did not believe Jesus spoke the truth about these things. Hort only accepted from The Bible what met his theories on faith and ignored Jesus as being God because he ignored what Jesus said when it suited him. If you believe Jesus is God you do not do this.

Although the idea of a real devil and a hell was rejected by Hort's educated mind, he believed in the fictitious Roman Catholic doctrine of "purgatory." To Rev. John Ellerton he wrote in 1854:

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

Hort is an example of a reprobate mind that thinks truth is not true and what is not true, is true because they are so rejecting of God, they can no longer discern what is true and what is not (Rom 1:28).

Also, while advising a young student he wrote:

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

In other words after death there is still a chance to be purged of the defilement of sin and be saved. This contradicts The Bible completely and calls Jesus a liar.

So, we see that Dr. Hort's opinions were certainly not inhibited by orthodox Christian belief and it will be seen he also had other heretical Christian views.

He rejected the atoning death of Christ's for the sins of all mankind and considered the teachings of Christ's atonement as heresy!

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

Hort also believed Satan more worthy of accepting Christ's payment for sins than *God*.

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

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

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

He also said that:

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

In other words, Baptism confirms our salvation and not what The Bibles says about it.

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

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

It is interesting they removed Rom 8:37 as if to imply faith is not necessary to be a follower of Jesus so that anyone can say they believe in Jesus without the need to actually doing what He required of them.

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

"Westcott, Gorham, C.B., Scott, Benson, Bradshaw, Luard, etc., and I have started a society for the investigation of ghosts and all supernatural appearances and effects, being all disposed to believe that such things really exist, and ought to be discriminated from hoaxes and mere subjective delusions; we shall be happy to obtain any good accounts well authenticated with names. Westcott is drawing up a schedule of

questions. Cope calls us the 'Cock and Bull Club;' our own temporary name is the 'Ghostly Guild.' "

It is not an amazing thing that any one man could hold to so many unscriptural and ungodly beliefs. It is amazing that such a man could be exalted by Bible believing preachers and professors to a point of authority higher than the God of the King James Bible!

This they have done by accepting the New Geek and rejecting God's Textus Receptus as if to imply Westcott and Hort knew more about what God wanted to say than God did.

Dr Hort was a scholar, but scholarship alone does not qualify a person to edit a Bible especially when the scholar rejects the book they are to update to a more modern English and actually replace it with one of their own design that promotes their beliefs and not what the book they are supposed to update states as its beliefs.

This alone should stop people using this New Greek because you cannot trust a book edited by someone who hates it and questions what it says is the truth.

So it can be seen that Hort:

Did not believe in the infallibility of The Bible

Believed man was the judge of what God said because they knew what god wanted to actually say.

Believed it was not accurate and contained myths (Gen ch 1-11 amongst others) and followed evolution and not six-day creation

Did not believe in the atonement and redemption Jesus obtained for us (in other words he did not believe what Jesus said)

Believed Baptism has a part in Salvation and regeneration so that salvation was not by faith and a gift from God.

Believed The Bible was not different to any other old manuscript (in other words it was not written by God but by man so you could alter it as you desired)

Believed the Textus Receptus contained doctrinal error (according to his viewpoint of doctrine) which he could correct in his New Greek

Believed in new age things

Did believed in a fictitious Purgatory

Did not seek The Holy Spirit but sought spirits (demons) and formed a society to do this.

Hated the Greek behind the King James and was determined to replace it with his own version of Greek that stated his doctrinal beliefs (even though they were wrong)!

Westcott's viewpoint about the Bible and its contents

Dr. Westcott's viewpoints are even more anti-biblical than those of Dr Hort. Westcott did not believe that Genesis 1-3 should be taken literally. He also thought that "Moses" and "David" were poetic characters whom Jesus Christ referred to by name only because the common people accepted them as authentic (real historical people). Westcott states:

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

He also said that King David was not a real person but only a spiritual person.

Westcott was also a doubter of the biblical account of miracles:

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

In other words, he believed miracles do not happen and the Bible lied about them so it cannot be infallible.

Westcott believed that the second coming of Jesus Christ was not a physical coming but a spiritual coming:

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

Bishop Westcott, believed Heaven to be a state and not a literal, physical place. Note the following quotations from Bishop Westcott:

"No doubt the language of the Rubric is unguarded, but it saves us from the error of connecting the Presence of Christ's glorified humanity with place; 'heaven is a state and not a place.'"

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

In other words, they kept their Church of England 'hat' but followed Roman Catholics beliefs. To do this without being a hypocrite is not possible so Westcott was a hypocrite and God said Hypocrites will not come before Him. So who guided Westcott in the making of His New Greek? It could not have been God.

In writing to his future wife in 1852, Westcott wrote:

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

This was written after Newman had defected to Rome!

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

So Westcott, who followed Newman also believed The Bible was never meant to teach doctrine. In other words, **we should not look to the Bible for teachings on Doctrine or their statement.**

This means man has to determine what Doctrine is and teach it according to his understanding of it. It also means there is no definite basis for determining what doctrine is so that you can make it be what you want it to be. The doctrine will be determined by what the editor reasons it to be.

In other words, he promoted heresy he believed was the truth and expressed his heresies in the New Greek text.

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

May I inquire on all these topics with simple sincerity, seeking only the truth!"

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

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

How could he say The Bible was true but reject what it said about its own infallibility?

If He believed what it said was true how could he ignore Ps 12:5-6 and even try to change The Bible?

His leanings towards Catholic doctrine eventually led Westcott into allowing the practice of "prayers for the dead." In writing to a clergyman in August of 1900 concerning this Roman Catholic practice which had found its way into an Anglican church, he stated:

"I considered very carefully, in conference with some other bishops of large knowledge and experience, the attitude of our church with regard to prayers for the dead. We agreed unanimously that we are, as things are now, forbidden to pray for the dead apart from the whole church in our public services. No restriction is placed upon private devotions."

In other words, we are not supposed to do it but can do it privately if we do not get caught doing it.

So much for Westcott and Hort's respect for authority that they deliberately ignored it which is why Satan has to be behind their work and not God. Those who obey God respect authority and obey it if it does not contravene any law of God. But Westcott and Hort ignored the spiritual authority over their work to place their doctrinal bias and their erroneous beliefs in the Greek text they created!

To allow prayers for the dead would be useless if there were only a heaven and a hell. The "dead" in heaven would need no prayers, and the "dead" in hell would be beyond hope.

In other words, there had to be a belief in purgatory or these prayers for the dead would be a waste of time.

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

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

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

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

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

He doubted the miracles which Christ performed.

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

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

"A written narrative can convey no notion of the effect of such a recital. The eager energy of the father, the modest thankfulness of the daughter,

the quick glances of the spectators from one to the other, the calm satisfaction of the priest, the comments of look and nod, combined to form a scene which appeared hardly to belong to the nineteenth century. An age of faith was restored before our sight in its ancient guise. We talked about the cures to a young layman who had throughout showed us singular courtesy. When we remarked upon the peculiar circumstances by which they were attended, his own comment was: 'Sans croire, comment l'expliquer?' (translated: 'Without believing how can it be explained?') And in this lay the real significance and power of the place."

Westcott a man who believed:

The second coming of Christ was spiritual,

Heaven was a state of mind,

Prayers for the dead were permissible in private devotions

He believed in purgatory

And had an admiration for the Virgin Mary,

He thought the Bible was like any other book.

He neither believed in salvation by grace nor ever experienced it.

Both Drs. Westcott and Hort were hostile to the true Greek text of the King James Bible. It must also be pointed out that earlier Dr. Hort had been a student of Dr. Westcott's, as Arthur Westcott points out: "Another of Westcott's private pupils was F.J.A. Hort."¹⁷²

The common desire of these two Cambridge scholars was to eliminate the authority of the Universal Greek Text of the King James Bible. Scholars had long sought to do this, but were baffled by the obvious evidence testifying that the Universal Text was indeed the true text of the Bible, and in that, a preservation of the original autographs. These scholars, thought that their duty was to overthrow this pure, Protestant, Christ-honoring text and replace it with the Local Text of Alexandria, Egypt, but the overwhelming evidence was always weighted in God's favor. No one could find a way to explain why 99% of all extant MSS belonged to the Textus Receptus. "Textual criticism" was at a standstill until this roadblock could be circumvented.

This problem needed to be dealt with and the truth could not be used so they invented theories to bring the truth into uncertainty and replace it with their fiction.

Hort's Fiction

It was the genius of Fenton John Anthony Hort which brought the traditional text into disrepute. He used the same method to overthrow the authority of the Universal Text that Charles Darwin used to overthrow the fact of creation. He used a THEORY!

He did the same thing Darwin did who gave a theory that did away with God and suited many who did not believe in God or did not want to believe in a six-day creation.

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

There is no historical evidence to show this happened and the other problem he has is that church councils always used the Textus Receptus as their basis for doctrine and not the two manuscripts their new Greek was based on. In other words, church history showed the Textus Receptus was used as the basis for faith and not their two main manuscripts.

There is also the problem that creeds and statements of faith before the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were written were all based on the Textus Receptus. But like any good heretic these two men did not let facts get in the road of their fiction.

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

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

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

In otherwords people did not want to believe the Bible so gladly accepted unprovable theories that allowed them to reject The Bible and substitute their own theories in its text.

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

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

In spite of new evidence, historical facts, and God's continued blessing of the Authorized Version, Christian scholars still exalt the theory as though it were the truth.

So the basis for the New Greek translation is shown not to exist, so why are scholars still ignoring the Textus Receptus and using this new Greek text?

This is not done because they feel that Hort's theory will eventually lead them to the true Word of God. Any honest, "Christian" scholar today who upholds Hort's outmoded theory will be glad to tell you that there is no perfect translation of "the Bible" in English today. They will admonish each new translation as "a step in the right direction," but even the newest translation is not without errors.

This means we cannot really know what is correct in modern versions and what is wrong in them so they are uncertain guides to doctrine, depending on the whims and hates of the editors of them. It also means that The Holy Spirit cannot be guiding them as He leads us

into all truth and unity of translation and does not cause confusion, which the modern Bibles do because of the biases of their editors who go on what they believe their translation should say.

Another problem is that this new Greek was made in complete rebellion against the Spiritual authority that asked them to revise the King James to modernize the English in it and not to make a new translation. God does not work through rebellion but Satan does and it can be seen that this new Greek had to be the work of Satan and not God by the many alterations made that hide Satan and hell and which reduce Jesus to a mere man by removing references to His *divinity*.

The facts of their rebellion are as follows:

In 1870, the Convention of the Church of England commissioned a revision of the Authorized Version.

The Convocation had instructed the Revision Committee NOT to deal with the underlying Greek text of the Authorized Version. (which Westcott and Hort replaced with their own). They were instructed to do as follows:

- (1) to introduce **as few alterations** as possible into the English text of the King James Bible, and
- (2) **to limit** ... the expression of any alterations to the language of the Authorized Version.¹⁸³

Their new Greek was 20% different to that of the king James and watered down or removed doctrine from the Textus Receptus so they had completely ignored these two guidelines.

They completely rebelled against what they were told to do which God could not have honoured so their New Greek text could not have come from God.

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

In order to establish their own Greek text as authoritative, they first planned the strategy prior to the first meeting of the Committee. Their old friend Bishop Lightfoot was even there to help as Westcott notes in a letter to Hort dated May 1870,

"Your note came with one from Ellicott this morning ... Though I think the Convocation is not competent to initiate such a measure, yet I feel that as 'we three' are together it would be wrong not to 'make the best of it' as Lightfoot says ... There is some hope that alternative readings might find a place in the margin."

The next month he wrote to Lightfoot himself:

"Ought we not to have a conference before the first meeting for revision? There are many points on which it is important that we should be agreed."

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

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

This was completely different to the openness in which the Textus Receptus line of text was examined for the purposes of the King James Bible.

Although Westcott and Hort were men of scholarship, they were not men of integrity. In fact, with their rejection of The Bible as Godly and their rebellion against Authority it can be questioned whether they were even Christians.

Westcott and Hort were so successful at their secret task of subtly guiding the decision of the Revision Committee that many Committee members did not suspect that they had been used by the Cambridge duo to help destroy the authority of the Authorized Version and give the world a completely new Bible.

Philip Mauro (One of the greatest lawyers of the USA) records:

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

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

Conclusion

So you can that the two main editors of the modern Greek text did not believe in The King James Bible as being from God as it had in it according to them wrong doctrine.

When asked to update the King James English to a more modern text, Westcott and Hort who hated the King James and did not believe doctrines in it and had a perfect opportunity to rewrite the Greek to say what they believed the Bible should say.

Through this they imposed their erroneous doctrinal beliefs on all who would later read bible translations based on their "New" Greek text which is now the basis of nearly all Bible translations after 1881.

Their Bible was so bad that The Queen and parliament refused to give their assent to it and most Biblical scholars attacked its accuracy and in fact a revised, more toned-down version had to be almost immediately made before there was some semblance of its credibility and some acceptance of its translation.

Tell me now that God is behind the New Greek text and not Satan.

As you have seen the New Greek is based on a forged manuscript derived by two people who were not Christians and did not believe God was able to transmit the true text of The Bible so had to work out for themselves what it should say and were able to promote their heretical viewpoints in a New Greek test they manufactured because it does not follow one text accepted by all but two main texts they chose from to say what they wanted to say. They were aided by this as the two texts hardly ever agreed so they could make these say what they wanted it to say and so express their belief system.

Their text is based on a forgery so cannot even be considered for the purposes of translation.

So why do people still use this Greek as the basis for the translation of modern Bibles?

They are not listening to The Holy Spirit so do not realise the errors in what they are using to translate from.

They are deceived into believing the New Greek text is better than the Textus Receptus and has less errors.

They have the same attitudes to Jesus and The Bible as Westcott and Hort had and so perpetuate their erroneous beliefs using their heretical Greek text.

Publishers promote Bibles on this Greek text because it makes them money.

Do the research and you will see how heretical the Bibles based on the New Greek text are.

Westcott and Hort rejected the Divinity of Jesus (that He is God) and changed their text to reject all the following:

His work of redemption

His deity and preexistence

His Virgin Birth

He was the Son of God

His bodily Resurrection

His Bodily ascension

His Bodily return

This is shown by their own words in their writings some of which are shown above.

As it can be seen there is not much to recommend there two manuscripts if you believe in Christian Doctrine. But if you do not they are the best two to use for your heresies.

When arguing against the New Greek

It is no use arguing doctrine because they believe their Greek is sounder than the King James so that their doctrine is more accurate than that of the King James.

You need to show Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are forgeries so that their New Greek they based on these is based on forgeries so is of no use for anything biblical.

You destroy its foundation as that is the only way to show their Greek Text should not exist or be used as accurate for Bible Translation purposes.

(Note: the above is derived from various sources to which I am indebted to but unfortunately, as this was done years ago, I have lost the sources I used but one I do remember I believe was Wikipedia.)