

## **The Reason for the Heresy Behind Modern Bibles**

Neville Salvetti

[www.nevillesalvetti.com](http://www.nevillesalvetti.com)

### ***Preface***

In 1881 a new translation of the English Bible appeared. It should have not appeared as the editors of it had been told not to make a new translation but to update the language in the old one (The King James Version). The fact a new translation was done shows the editors were in complete rebellion against the Spiritual authority over them in this area. If they had provided a good translation the outcry would not have been as much but they provided a translation that ate away at the foundations of Christianity.

Rebellion is of Satan and this should have warned people about the source of this new translation and the Greek it was based on. The translation was so incorrect in so many places that the translation had to be seriously revised soon after it came out.

Queen Victoria refused to promote the translation as she considered it such a bad translation and many Biblical scholars warned of its doctrinal errors.

The second problem was that they had made a new Greek text as the basis of their translation based on less than 011% of the Greek codices available. They chose manuscripts to back up their doctrinal errors and heresy so that they ignored 99.9%<sup>^</sup> of accepted Greek manuscripts.

Unfortunately they chose two man codices: The Sinaiticus, which has now been proven to be a forgery, and the Vaticanus which according to their requirements should not have been used as a basis for Bible translation and which also was a forgery.

So the Greek text behind modern bibles was a translation based on two Greek texts that were ineligible to be used for translation purposes but which suited their heresies.

This book aims to show their heretical change to the traditional Greek text and that the editors of this new translation were heretics who used the occasion to promote their incorrect doctrine. You will see they did not believe in the Divinity of Christ, His Virgin birth and other important doctrines or matters.

### **Introduction**

How would Satan attack Christianity

For Centuries Satan hindered Christianity by hiding The Bible from the common people and leaving doctrine in the hand of scholars who promoted their viewpoints on it as well allowing the established church to proclaim doctrine according to what it needed to proclaim even though it might not have been Biblical or correct. Few non-clergy people knew the bible to be able to correct any errors and if they did the established church removed anyone daring to criticise its doctrinal errors or promote The Bible and the reading of it.

Then the printing press came along and The Bible was accessible to all. The church was no longer able to stop people reading it and the reformation occurred. Satan now was losing control of established religion.

Direct frontal attack did not work as it only strengthened the Christians so he needed to attack it from inside Christianity and not externally if he wanted to control the church and guide it again.

So he decided he would need to do the following:

To replace the correct Biblical text with his own version, changing doctrine from what was correct to what he wanted to promote as doctrine.

He needed to find codices he could use to replace the traditional text with and have them accepted by scholarship and denominations as being more accurate than the traditional text.

He needed to remove the concept of Biblical preservation and inerrancy so he could alter his text to suit his needs and remove the traditional text as being corrupted and not correctly preserved by God.

He needed people to write this new text and scholarship that would declare this new text was based on better codices than the traditional text and should be used in place of it. These scholars could not accept the traditional text or they would not teach this newer 'better' text.

He needed denominations to accept this new text and use it as their basis of doctrine and faith and to stop using the traditional text.

He then needed people to preach and teach it - preferably ministers and those authorised to teach doctrine in churches.

This he has succeeded in.

The Bible is the handbook of The Kingdom of God so Satan has used liberal theologians to attack it because The Bible tells us:

The type of faith required to enter The Kingdom

About Jesus, who He is and what He has done for us

How to obtain eternal life

What God requires of us as His Citizens

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.

### **The objectives of Satan**

From examining the approach of scholars and editors to modern bibles and seeing the alterations they have made the objectives of Satan appear to be as follows:

Make The Bible appear to be like any other holy book written by man so it can be altered without having to be worried about a God disapproving of the alterations.

Make out the Jesus was conceived normally and not miraculously so He is no different to the founder of any other religion.

Because they believe Jesus was not divine until after death He could not redeem us or save us, so it appears salvation requires us to do something and not just accept what Jesus is suppose to have done.

They believe that like Jesus, man can become divine through their personal effort just as Jesus became divine because of what He did and suffered.

Satan has to change the attitude people have toward demons and hell so that the conflict with God is hidden and he could represent these two things in a positive way or mythologise them so people would not believe

Satan then will have all religions on the same basis so that they can become one in worship as their basic beliefs are all the same.

This is why Jews, Muslims, and real Christians will be exterminated in the tribulation when Antichrist rules so that they will not be there to show the errors of the one world religions.

### **The attitudes of Modern Theologians**

Modern theology is a result of the rationalism of the 17th Century in which man reasoned things based on the experience of nature around them which is why evolution became so popular. God was secondary to science because The Bible seemed to be incorrect about some scientific things so that science overrode what The Bible stated about something.

The believed God was either impersonal or not all powerful which is why they said we cannot know what The Bible really said as God did not care enough or was not powerful enough to preserve the original text of it so that we would have it. This means we need to find out ourselves what God meant to say in His Bible and what it means must be deduced from the religions we know of that believe in a god or gods at the time of Jesus.

We need to look at the religions at the time of Jesus to really see what He did rather than what was said He did.

This is why Modern Bibles can change their texts as they obtain a 'better understanding' of what they believe The Bible should say and which is why it is no use debating them on doctrine as they believe their erroneous doctrine is correct so that no doctrine, according to them, is affected by their translation.

They go to the oldest complete manuscripts believing they are more accurate than earlier ones and use them as a starting point of translation.

Besides, they say that there is no guarantee that the early documents of the church have been correctly preserved so that they cannot be used to contradict their 'improved' Greek.

So they look at the beliefs in other religions around them as being what people have perceived as being what God requires of people (once again using historical experience rather than what The

Bible says) and make Christianity to be like them and because there are so many corrections in the two early documents they use they do not believe they are really as accurate as they could be. So using reason (based on their heretical beliefs) and the example of other religions they alter their bible to align it with what appears to be the orthodox practice of religions in the world who have texts that go back further than Christianity at times.

To do this they have too:

Make Jesus human, like the founder of other religions

Remove the authority of Christians over demons and sickness as other religions do not have this

Make Jesus an ascended master or similar or a holy one who is deified like many religions have done to other founders allowing them to have other humans become deified (Mary) or revered as superior to normal people (saints)

Remove the direct and personal interaction of God with people so you need to do things or work out what your god wants you to do making The Holy Spirit impersonal or a spiritual force, removing the personal role of guidance He has in The Bible.

Make it necessary to be saved through your personal efforts and not by faith so stopping the need to believe in a particular god for salvation also negating redemption and Jesus was considered not divine until after He had died so could not pay the price to redeem us.

Remove the hell of Christianity and replacing it with what world religions call hell, if they have a hell in their belief system. This is why Hell is missing from many modern bibles. If there is no punishment for evil then there is no evil angels to corrupt people to go there so Satan can be classified as good and have the same status of Jesus and even be the brother of Jesus, as some believe.

These alterations suit Satan as it allows him to make Christianity like any other religion so it can be united with them in a one world general religion that has the basic beliefs of all and which allows for some variance from the norm in their beliefs. This is why pagan events and beliefs are now rife throughout the Christian world.

Look at modern Bibles closely and all the six changes mentioned above will be found in them.

Note: If The Bible is not the final authority then any cult can be part of the one world church and use its own beliefs to judge what it does and does not need to be concerned about what Christianity says. It is because of The Bible we use classifies them as a cult we do not accept them and if The Bible is not the ultimate authority then what you believe correct, providing it fits in with what is generally acceptable as religion, can be part of your church or belief system.

People say the new bibles are Gnostic but they are not. They use a Gnostic text and build on it to make Christianity not Gnostic but new age so that all religions and new age beliefs can join as one. This is so Hinduism, Buddhism, Satanism, even witchcraft will be able to identify with the principles of this 'improved' Christian' belief system.

The Muslims, Jews and true Christians will not be a part of this new 'Christianity' which is why they are destroyed by the new religion and its government.

The Antichrist must be going to be revealed soon as the bible he needs is ready and ecumenicism and interfaith dialogue are become more open so that heads of the different religions even worship together which they could or would not have done under the faith requirements of the King James Bible.

### **Which God do modern theologians worship?**

God said He would preserve His word so we would know what He required of us.

Modern theologians say He has not done this.

So they have problems which are as follows:

They have a Textus Receptus text the basis of The King James they say is not correct and they have to correct to make it say what they believe God meant it to say but they have no original text to compare what they say it says so cannot know when they are correct in how they interpret it..

They have no Bible that is 100% accurate to compare what they come up with as a correct translation. So their 'bibles' may themselves be a wrong translation.

As they do not know what errors are in it they cannot really use any part of it.

This is why modern bibles change over time so that they will say different things at times because they keep changing them to what they believe it should be in light of new information or knowledge.

So any translation they make may have more errors than the King James and the Textus Receptus so you really cannot accept anything based on the Vaticanus or Sinaiticus which means all modern bibles should be rejected along with the King James.

So according to them we really do not have a Bible you can trust unless you consider what they believe is the correct translation of it.

To do this they have to reject 1800 years of Christian traditional doctrine which was given by Jesus to the early church. So according to them Jesus got it wrong also because what He taught, as found in the Textus Receptus was not right. Or if they say it was incorrectly passed down how do they know what is correctly reported of what Jesus said does not have error in.

So they need to find a God they can trust, a Bible they can use and saviour they can believe because they cannot use the Textus Receptus (King James) or trust God, its writer or traditional church doctrine as given to the church by Jesus.

### **So who is their God?**

It cannot be Jesus as He may be in error because we may not have what He actually said to know it was correct or may have been in error having given incorrect doctrine to the church.

It also cannot be the God that lied about preserving His Bible

### **Who is left?**

Only the other god, Satan.

### **Which God do they serve?**

If they love Jesus they serve Him, even if their understanding of whom He is, is not correct. God looks at the heart not the mind and if they love Jesus as Lord and wholeheartedly try to obey Him that is all He requires.

You are judged on what you do with what you know and not what others say you should do.

### **Do those following modern versions go to heaven?**

Do not judge their salvation. But it is possible to say that their lifestyle is such that it indicates they may not get to heaven and even then remember you may be in the same boat. So better usually not to say anything but to point them to what The Bibles says and to encourage them to follow the truths of The Bible.

### **Examples of the Changes made to the King James text**

As you look at the following changes ask yourself: “Why would God do that? Why would he demean Jesus and reduce him to being a normal person at birth and not God. Why would he attack the divinity of Jesus everywhere He could and why would He hide Satan, and hell and remove our authority over Satan so that that people did not believe in Satan and his kingdom of hell or fight him.

This would mean God was fighting Himself and a kingdom divided cannot stand. It is obvious God would not do these alterations to Jesus and if God did not do them then who did? It leaves only Satan. So it can be seen Satan is behind modern Bibles and used two heretics to make a translation that suited his plans perfectly.

### **Some verses altered in 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 doctrinally changing). The ‘critical test’ used for modern bibles is not a Greek text that is a correction of the received text used for traditional Bibles for 1800 years but a whole new Greek text designed to replace the received text for reasons unstated publicly by the editors of the RV. 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.*

The change they made to this text, saying the people and not the text was preserved, 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 then that Israel would be preserved. As we know Israel was restored a few times so this passages 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 over 95% of the time. The editors of the new Greeks elected 5 books that backed up their doctrine and used these to make the new Greek.. The translators and editors need to explain why they preferred these corrupted readings in these three main forged manuscripts and ignore the 5300+ others manuscripts which in the majority endorsed the content of the King James Version.

### **The two main texts used t oday**

I propose to comment more on the two Greek texts used as the basis for these Bible translations so the differences between them can be seen and so that people are encouraged to examine further the issues of possible corruption of The Bible 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 (selectively chosen texts), being based on a few handpicked manuscripts of which the main three are forgeries ignoring the remaining 5300 manuscripts that do not support their position of doctrine.

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 test is also called a Byzantine text as it is based on manuscripts from all over the Christian world and not from one small area of it 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 are called an Alexandrian Text because it is believed their origin is Egypt) although we know now the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are forgeries of the early 1800s).

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), or

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.

These two erroneous codices (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) disagree with each other in at least 3000 place 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 either or whatever of either codex 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.

It is to be noted that some Jehovah Witnesses prefer to use the NIV to their own heretical bible as it portrays their doctrine better in some areas.

### **Why is preservation and constancy of translation is 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.

It also means He is not powerful as He is not able to preserve His Word in which case he cannot be God and His Bible should not be followed as it claims He is God so is full of lies.

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 appears to have no previous texts to have been copied from.

If God had not preserved His principles and Words, no one for 1700 years would have known what it was until 'rediscovered' by modern theologians so these earlier people after the first few centuries would have had an incorrect 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 the textus receptus 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. There are more but I only quote a few worrying ones.

The Following verses from the King James Version are completely gone from the New International Version and other modern translations.

*Matthew 18:11- For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost. (KJV)*

Jesus knew His mission. All other religious founders did not have a mission. They lived a good life supposedly and their followers made them important and you find there is no mission statement like the above made by any other religious leaders. So this had to be removed.

*Mark 15:28 - And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors. (KJV)*

This is a prophecy about The Messiah who was God so had to be removed. After all, fulfilled prophecy is one of the major proofs of The Bible and modern versions alter prophecy in places so that this proof does not exist or is watered down.

*Act 8:37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*

This verse is a requirement for following Jesus which declares He is God's son and not the son of an earthly father. This had to be removed.

### **Mark 16:9-19**

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! The passage was in the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus but was removed before publication of the Greek text because they did not believe Jesus was divine before He ascended so could not give his delegation.

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 too do.

In the Gospels Jesus said we would do greater works than 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 original how can we believe anything they 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 as evidenced by historical and modern day evidence confirms this passage is being 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 or purposely left out.

### **The effects of Mark 16:9-21 not belonging to The Bible**

1. Removing this removes our authority over Satan and his works and implies all the miracles of healing and the casting out of demons could not be from Jesus as we do not have his delegated authority to do so. So it is either from our own authority (A lie) or from Satan (a bigger lie). Either way Satan is glorified or promoted in some way so the removal of this passage cannot be correct.
2. It stops you demonstrating The Kingdom of God and the authority it has over Satan so you have no real proof it exists except from the words of Jesus.
3. It makes evangelism just another set of words that compete with the words of other religions because there is no miraculous to make it stand out from them. It is the miraculous in evangelism that shows Christianity is special.
4. It removes the special relationship we have with God that shows we belong to His Kingdom.

It is obvious why Satan desired this passage to be removed from The Bible

### **The resurrection**

Passages have not been removed that showed Jesus rose from the dead. All religion founders died. Some died terrible deaths and others died naturally, so that the death of Jesus by Crucifixion was not unusual in regards to its terrible nature. However, the difference is that Jesus rose from the dead and no other religion founder has done this. So this needed to be hid but could not be because it was too well known and verified by historical evidence.

There are three passages that give an account of Jesus rising from the dead: Matt 28:6, Mark 16:9-21 and Luke 24:1--7. They leave two passages in because they cannot hide the fact but they remove Mark 16:9-21 because they do not believe He is Lord and God with authority over Satan and natural things so that you cannot cast out demons under His authority or heal the sick and raised the dead under His authority. The resurrection is in this passage and its removal is an accident and not the purpose for the removal of this passage which is the only passage that delegates to us the authority of Jesus.

Besides they do not tie the resurrection to Redemption so that reduces its value except to show Jesus was like other religious founders.

Without this passage Jesus is just another good man whom died and whom God raised from the dead.

The KJV does not have this error.

*I John 5:7 - For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. (KJV)*

If Jesus is part of the Trinity then He is God. This had to be removed.

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.

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 does not have this error.

Is 14:12

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 too 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), son 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 over 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

Implication is that He cannot be redeemer so that Calvary was a wasted effort by God and achieved nothing unless it was something Jesus needed to do for the purposes of His Salvation, implying Salvation is more than just by faith.

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 does 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 does 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 removes 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. It also means you cannot criticise other faiths that criticise these things because they do not believe in them.

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.

*Col 1:14 In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:*

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 leave this out as it underpins the purpose of Jesus dying. So why do the translators and editors of modern versions believe Calvary is not important?

The KJV does 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.

Finally compare the KJV to the NIV

*KJV 1 John 4:3, " And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist,"*

*NIV1 John 4:3, " but every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist,"*

Notice it does not declare Jesus has come in the flesh and by this shows it is not God's Bible.

Some words changed in the NIV

A blatant example of how modern theologians translate the Bible to meet their beliefs is in Is 7:14

*(KJV) Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.*

Some modern Bibles change ‘virgin’ to ‘young woman’ but correctly translate the word as ‘virgin’ in other places in their translation. This change removes a prophecy about Jesus and His Divinity by making Him the child of natural parents and not of God and His mother.

Modern theologians do not believe in the divinity of Jesus as will be shown more clearly in the next example. They also do not believe in prophecy which is one of the major proofs of The Bible.

In another example The KJV has:

*Dan 3:25 He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.*

Modern Bibles have:

*(ASV) He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the aspect of the fourth is like a son of the gods.*

Jesus has been reduced to just one of the children of gods which shows their use of Greek Mythology to translate their bible.

This is also why they change “Mary His mother and Joseph’ to ‘His father and mother’. The first phrase shows He was born of a virgin with God as His Father, while the second phrase He had a natural set of parents.

Note the words omitted which affect the Divinity of Christ and His anointing as The Messiah (The Christ) as well as other major doctrines and the hiding of Satan and hell.

| <b>Word</b>                    | <b>NIV</b>   |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Christ (Anointed one/Redeemer) | omitted 25 times   |
| Lord (God)                     | omitted 352 times  |
| Jesus                          | added 292 times (watered down the title that was originally there) |
| God (Redeemer)                 | omitted 468 times  |
| Godhead                        | omitted 3 times  |
| Lucifer                        | omitted 1 times  |
| devil(s)                       | omitted 80 times   |
| hell                           | omitted 40 times   |
| heaven                         | omitted 160 times  |

|                      |                  |
|----------------------|------------------|
| damned (able, ation) | omitted 15 times |
| blood                | omitted 41 times |
| salvation            | omitted 42 times |
| Word of God          | omitted 8 times  |
| Word of the Lord     | omitted 25 times |
| Lord Jesus Christ    | omitted 24 times |

The removal of the word 'Lord' removes the authority Jesus had. The removal of 'Christ' removes His anointing as The Messiah. One person even wrote a book asking what the NIV had against Jesus it had treated Him so badly.

See <https://www.nowtheendbegins.com/PDF/keith-piper-serious-omissions-in-the-niv.pdf> for a good review of the changes.

### **Why the Changes**

To have a one world religion in preparation for the coming of Antichrist Satan needs a one world bible all religions can associate with, or approve. One which shows Jesus is no different to the founders of other religions so that all can relate to Jesus because He is like the founder of their religion. This would allow Christians and other religions to worship together with little or no conflict between their beliefs. They may believe slightly different things but there would be little to cause division in these areas.

A Bible called "The King of Kings" Bible has in it a New Age Book, The old and New Testament (Jewish and Christian writings) and the Sutras of the Koran. All the Bibles of Major religions and new age writings are together in one Bible.

So how did the Bible become to be so corrupted so that any religion can use it or associate their leaders as being like Jesus?

Because people used reason instead of listening to The Holy Spirit and imposed their heresies on the bibles they edited.

### **Why is Jesus humanised in modern Bibles?**

Modern theologians use historical methods to Judge Jesus and so cannot really see anything historically that makes Him Divine and look to other religions to see what He should be like by looking at the religions of His time and arguing He should be like these. So modify The Bible to remove His divinity and all that would point to it so that He is like any other founder of a religion. To do this they rationalise about the proofs of His Divinity and prefer negative reasonings about it than positive ones built on faith.

They ignore the warning in 2 Cor 10:5 to take everything captive to Jesus and not assume, imagine or reason things out without reference to The Bible. This means anything supernatural done by

Jesus is not considered real or possible. This means they believe that miracles no longer occur which means one of the main proof of Jesus being Lord of all is not accepted as being a real event. When asked why these occur they cannot explain but reason there will be something found that will explain them as being not supernatural.

So they do the following to show He was human and not divine at birth:

Imply Jesus had a normal birth

Sinned

Cannot be redeemer

Was not resurrected in a way different to the resurrection of others supposedly resurrected.

They say we need to work at our salvation because the cross was ineffective for salvation. This was incorrect as the cross was about redemption as salvation has always been by faith. But they do not believe Jesus can redeem so replace redemption with salvation as the purpose of the Cross. They also believe salvation is not purely by faith so that we have to do 'works' to be saved.

They believe He was promoted by God (made divine) for His sacrifice and obedience like founders in other religions or Greek Mythology.

As a result this makes Christianity like any other religion so all religions can use the new modern bibles as Jesus is like the founder of any other religion and they can also fellowship together (which explains why ecumenicism is growing so we now have a one world bible for all religions that want to use part or whole of it - including the new age and Satanists) because they will find little in it to offend them. They just change the names of the Trinity in The Bible to match the names of their deities

### **How they do some of these things.**

They deny The Trinity because they do not believe Jesus is God so there cannot be a Trinity. They do this by removing 1 John 5:7 saying it was not in the early Bibles, but there is much evidence to show it was there and accepted by early Christians.

They remove Mark 16:9-21 and as a result remove a lot that makes Jesus Divine as well as our only way to proof The Kingdom of God has come in Jesus:

They remove the resurrection. They cannot historically prove it and as no other person has ever been resurrected the way Jesus was they assume Jesus could not have been.

They remove the authority delegated to us by Jesus over Satan and his works. No other religious founder has been able to cast out demons let alone authorise others to be able to do so and as they consider Jesus human He also could not do these things.

They remove the delegated authority to heal sickness which no other religious founder has or is able to give.

They remove the resurrection and the Ascension of Jesus as being special. No other religious founder has been ascended into heaven in the way Jesus was.

The fact He did miracles in His own ministry or raised the dead and removed demons is nothing special. After all Elijah and Elisha did those things.

They implied Jesus sinned in Matt 5:22 and John 7:8 so cannot be redeemer.

There are many verses dealing with these things and you will see this when you look at a modern bible that remove or modify them. You will usually find the margins saying what older versions have or do not have where the verses have been removed or adulterated.

They deny His virgin birth deliberately mistranslating 'virgin' as 'young woman' and declare Joseph and Mary are His parent and not God and Mary.

The modern New Testament is full of these changes made to the King James to remove the Divinity of Jesus or His work.

As you can see modern bibles are not based on faith but man's reasonings about it based on historical precedence and the assumptions of their theology.

God was never asked about the correct translation of His Bible and often a vote was taken by the members of the editorial board to see which was considered the best translation of a verse which unfortunately does not mean it is the correct translation of a verse.

Why do they need Jesus to be human? So He is no different to the founders of other religions and so they can all be combined in a one world religion regardless of what they consider to be their holy book. They do not realise Satan is using them to prepare this for his Antichrist so that they will soon be removed as the one world religion rulers and replaced by Satan.

The only way to show Jesus is superior is to show He and His Kingdom are real through casting out demons, healing the sick and raising the dead using the authority of His Name. But most churches do not do this believing it is not able to be done today or even applicable today.

Satan certainly has most churches and Christians really messed up and trained well.

This is why the three great revivals just before the tribulation occur to restore Jesus to how He should have been treated by showing He is superior to the founders of other religions by what is done in His delegated authority. This show He is God able to delegate these things and that He also cause them to happen which other religious founders cannot do and so show He is different to them and their god.

### **Who is the real God?**

Modern theology says that we do not have the original Greek writings of the Apostles so they have to work out what God is trying to say in His Bible. Their God was unable to maintain the accuracy of what He tried to teach us in The Scriptures. He was not in sufficient control of things to be able to do this or did not care whether or not we knew what He required from us. This god is not all powerful and not in complete control of things and does not guide man to interpret The Scriptures so they have to reason out what He said. This means they are as intelligent as God to be able to do this or their god does not know everything as man is able to tell Him what He was trying to say in The Scriptures.

This also implies something terrible. That for nearly 2000 years the Christian church has not had the true scriptures which they say are only coming to light now having been lost and now being rediscovered implying the God of Christians is a lesser God who cannot control things to preserve His Scriptures.

The problem modern theologians have is that they have no standard to compare their work to to see if it is correct. So, while they say they are working out what God was trying to say they cannot say they are correct because they have no standard to compare what they say to to show that it is correct. So you cannot trust any of the new modern versions as there really is no standard from God, according to them, to show they have correctly divined what God was trying to say. So in a sense they are back where they started not still not knowing what they believe God said is correct with the added disadvantage of being guided by what they have reasoned which may or may not be correct.

So they are either getting closer to what God said or further away by relying on possible inaccurate reasoning about what he said. Even if they are getting it correct you still cannot trust modern versions because you have nothing to compare them to to show they are actually correct in what they have determined The Bible says.

They have not got an accurate version or they would be using it and not need to work out what is correct.

The two main manuscripts they use are only a start because they have to work out from them what God said. In other words the two main manuscripts they have are not accurate or they would not need to work out what God was trying to say through them.

Their God is:

Not all knowing

Not all powerful

Not a God of Love or he would have tried harder to have them have a correct set of Scriptures

So He is a bit of an uncaring wimp or a loveless God or both and they have it wrong in their bibles when they say 'God is Love'.

The alternate viewpoint is that God preserve His Scriptures and it is in found in the Textus Receptus and similar manuscripts. The Textus Receptus has the advantage also of not needing to find out what God wanted to say to us as it goes back to the apostles so that we have an unbroken teaching from Jesus to the present day which is more than their two main texts have.

Unfortunately the two conflicting manuscripts that are the mainstay for modern theology and are a proven forgeries . In contrast to the god of the modern theologians, the God of the Textus Receptus is all powerful, all knowing and everywhere so He was able to protect His Scriptures to this day.

So the modern theologians have a wimp of a God, who cannot protect even what He wants to tell us and/or who is indifferent to us and lets man reason out what He said so without having us able to determine if it is accurate, so that you really cannot know if what is in modern bibles is what God said because it is only what man has reasoned is correct. So to trust these Bibles is to take your salvation in your hands because you cannot even trust what they said about it or redemption. After

all they have reasoned it is what God said and may not be what He said. There will be truth in their Bibles but also error and as they do not have a scripture that is correct to compare it too you cannot really trust any of it as being what God said but only what they believed their God said.

The writings of the Textus Receptus (the Greek of the King James Text) come from a direct line of the Apostles and have been preserved by God for nearly 1900 years so can be trusted. The God of The King James Version loves us enough to maintain His teachings for us to follow and has controlled their preservation so we have them today as they originally were.

Another interesting thing is that each of the modern bibles has to be different so they can be copyrighted. This means they cannot all say the same things. God is not the author of confusion and confusion results from the use of these different bibles in bible study as each states a verse in a slightly different way at times but this means it says a slightly different thing to what other Bibles say the verse means. God is not the author of confusion but Satan is and uses it for his purposes.

God always gives us His things freely at no cost and the King James is not copyrighted so is freely available to all and cannot be controlled like the copyrighted modern bibles can be. This alone shows that man is in control of modern bibles and not God and so they are not of Him or they would be free to all, except for printing and distribution costs where applicable.

The God of the modern Bible is a capitalist unlike the God of The King James who gives what He has freely to all. In fact 100,000 copies of the NIV on the way to Japan for the purposes of The Gospel were ordered destroyed because the royalties had not been received by the owner of the copyright who also has the copyright to the Satanic bible..

### **The Mind of God**

We cannot know the mind of God except as He reveals it to us and to say anything else is deception and assumptions that may or may not be correct.

This is really worrying with modern Bibles where the theologians say that God did not preserve His Bible and man has to figure out the gaps, ignoring the King James Version which claims to be preserved by God and on which all our Christian doctrine was based for 1800 years, and substituting their own words and ideas so that 20% of the King James Version is missing or altered this difference which the result of the reasonings of men and their perspective on Christianity, which is based on three codices which cannot and should not be used for Bible translation because they are forgeries.

How dare they say what God thinks and change The Bible according to their belief system they have superimposed on what they believe God is thinking when they 'translate'.

Either God told us all we needed to know in His Bible or He lied and man has to figure out what He meant to say. In other words a finite man is going to tell an infinite God what He wanted to say to us. (Just like in the Garden of Eden when Satan said to eve "*you will be like God knowing good and evil that is what is of God or of Satan*").

These Bible 'correctors' have assumed they understood the mind of God and wrote what they believed should be there which of course they can only assume and not really know and which of course was tainted by any errors of their doctrine.

If they had really believed what The Bible said they would not have made any changes as The Bible said God preserves His Word (Bible)

They have changed 20% of what was accepted previously in Bibles to follow their own reasonings which means the modern Bibles are 20% man's reasoning based on what they guessed was there because they cannot know the mind of God to say it is what He actually said there. No wonder Christianity has gone downhill since these modern versions were introduced.

In conclusion we are to work within what God has shown us to be there and assume nothing else as we cannot know the mind of God to say it is what He is thinking unless The Holy Spirit tells us it is what God is saying thus the importance of being guided by Him in all we do for God.

So how can modern Bible editors say they know what they have written is correct when:

They cannot know the mind of God

They cannot remove the bias of their doctrinal view from it

They cannot know whether the King James Version is wrong because they cannot know the mind of God to be able to say that.

This also applies to people who form doctrines that are not in The Bible or traditions that are not in The Bible.

### **Which God do you worship?**

One who demands money in the way of royalties before someone can sell his bibles?

Or,

A God, who is able to preserve His wisdom for us to know and who gives us freely all things we need for us to enjoy.

I know whom I would choose

### **The three main texts used**

Codex 2472

This was used to translate the Gospel of Mark in the 7th UBS Greek edition.

This has been proved to be a fake being based on a Greek text available only between 1857 and 1859 because a better Greek version replaced it in 1867 so it fell into disuse after this. It was based on an edition of the Vaticanus used by a Phillip Buttmann. No other Greek manuscript has the mistakes Buttmann made in his Greek text.

There is also the problem that some of the ink used in it was not available before 1740.

See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=39WV0AgeC8w&index=46&list=PLhmAbEGx-AnRnnY4pE6kwj1XYsqUeH0gY>

In other words the latest Greek text used to translate the Gospel of Mark is rubbish and fraudulent.

## **Codex Vaticanus**

This was supposed to be a Fourth century codex but the format it is in was not used until the fifth century between 440 and 464 AD. So it falls outside the period used to declare a document usable for Bible translation. So theoretically it should not be used for modern Bible translation but only as an aid.

As modern Bibles use this as one of the basis of translation then according to their method of choosing texts to translate they should not have used it so there is no guarantee that its text is the best available for Bible translation purposes.

Also it is a proven forgery as the Greek text uses Latin Vulgate names which only a Roman Catholic theologian would do.

## **Codex Sinaiticus.**

When a stock taker was made of the monastery this was found in it the early eighteenth century this codex did not exist. It miraculously appeared later without any history of where it has been until then.

It was found in a monastery that was run by the uncle of Simonides one of the most brilliant forgers of the 19th century who stated he did it. No one wanted to believe him and when the person who had seen him forge the Sinaiticus told Tischendorf of this, Tischendorf refused to believe him.

Simonides was such a good forger they had to ask him for a list of what he had forged.

So we have the forger and one who witnessed the forgery say it was a fake and no one wanted to believe them.

Later on another saw Tischendorf brushing its pages with a lemon supposedly to clean it but this was a method used to make manuscripts look older. This explains why all pages of the manuscript Tischendorf did not have are white and not brown.

They were going to test the Sinaiticus but after 2742 was shown to be a forgery because of the ink used in it they withdrew the offer to test the Sinaiticus. If they were certain it was real and not a forgery they would have tested it.

Unfortunately it is the one most trusted as the basis for modern bibles.

As it can be seen modern bibles are based on two forgeries and one unreliable manuscript and their changes cannot be trusted. Satan has succeeded in having his corrupted bible replace the true one and few realise this or why he did it.

## **Why the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus manuscripts were important**

Let us just imagine that you are a theologian who believes The Bible is not correct because it does not align with what science is finding out about the world, especially evolution, which had been around 100 years or more before Darwin wrote his book. You believe the Bible is corrupted because of this and has not been copied (transmitted) correctly.

You also believe, like others that Jesus was human and was made divine after death because this is how it appears to have been around the time of Jesus with other people and science says Jesus had to also be like these other people.

The church does not show there is a supernatural element to nature because of Cessationism so you become rational about things looking for natural explanations in all things.

As you are a scientist, history is very important so you look for historical Greek texts apparently much older than the ones used for the King James Bible and when two texts 1400 years old are discovered you embrace them because they appear to back up your criticism of The Bible's 'inaccuracies' and provide what appears to be a more accurate version of the Greek text..

You do not worry about doctrinal differences as you believe the doctrine in the King James is incorrect, being the result of later texts where errors were copied into it so that it does not accurately reflect doctrine according to you viewpoint.

So you promote the translation of this 'New, improved, earlier text' and ignore the arguments of those who follow the King James Bible.

Because you have other Greek texts apparently written earlier than the ones they had which you consider erroneous in some degree you also look at other religions to see what they were like when Christ was born as you assume what He did had to be like what they did.

Because you believe your two Greek texts are correct as far as you are concerned no doctrine is altered by them. If any are any differences to what Jesus did then you consider it is because of the erroneous texts used by the translators of the King James.

Because you do not believe in a supernatural events as none are evident in the church you remove as many of these as you can, such as creation, the flood, the fall, the virgin birth. So these errors' are removed from The Bible.

Because all world religions do not have God born as a man you reason Jesus must be a man so cannot be sinless. So he appears to sin in Matt 5:22 and John 7:8.

Because other founders of religions were deified you have no problem with Jesus being deified in heaven but not on earth.

You are not concerned about the miracles of Jesus or the gifts of The Spirit occurring today because of Cessationism in the churches. Besides they are not present in most religions

This means you do not need supernatural events to verify the Jesus you write about is the real one.

So you have a Jesus who was born a man, did good but was not perfect and died and became like an ascended master or god. But you consider He was not God before he died.

The Bible translations derived from the Greek you make out of these two codices reflects all of these suppositions and the churches that use them also accept them.

So the church becomes more like the pagan religions used to evaluate Christianity and it no longer demonstrates The King of God because it no longer demonstrates The Kingdom of God's authority over demons and nature.

This suits Satan who has to corrupt Christianity and its holy book so that Jesus is like the founder of other world religions and the supernatural is really not a part of their worship or lifestyle. This he has to do to prepare for Antichrist and so he can form the one world religion for Antichrist to be worshipped by.

Antichrist will be a normal man, like the founder of any other religion, and will be honoured like the founders of other religions are honoured. He will appear to be like Jesus but greater than Jesus because of the miracles he will perform.

Meanwhile the defenders of both Greek texts will fight to the death defending their text, believing the other side is deceived.

So a generation has grown up not knowing the doctrine of the King James Version and only know Bibles based on the New Greek. This means they will not see any doctrinal error in Bibles based on the New Greek and to them the King James will have the errors.

The stage is ready now for Antichrist to appear as he has a whole generation now trained in the bible he has created for the 'Christian' church to use and has moulded it to be like other religions so it can be easily assimilated with them in his one world church.

Part B of Satan's plan was the necessity to remove the ability of Christianity to do miracles and by this showing Jesus was no different to the founders of other religions. This is one reason they removed Mark 16:9-21 so that there was no delegation from Jesus to do miracles.

This they did about the time the 'Age of Enlightenment' occurred and used a reaction to the spiritual excesses of the Catholic Church to do this.

### **How do people alter The Bible?**

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

- Making a New Greek text that backs up their belief system

- Changing the meaning of the translation of words and phrases in this 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 of the Greek text they have replaced or which promotes their interpretation of their doctrine behind a verse

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

  - Give a rational explanation for a miracle that removes the supernatural element

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

  - Rationalising parts of the Bible to remove the need for faith (miracles are an example of this) as is the removal of the delegation to cast out demons.

  - 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 creates 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 or they would not have altered The Bible the way they do.

If you add to the Bible (like the Gap theory), Mythologise 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 a lot of prophecy, 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 (which is what religions do) and listening to your conscience to get to heaven.

### **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. Also the sexual revolution started with the birth of free sex and alternative lifestyles (which were necessary to justify the free sex and drugs that came onto the scene).

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.

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. It is a social club to many with mysterious rites like the Masons or Mormons have that the common people do not or cannot understand.

There is worldliness in the church as The Word is not affecting the people in the way it used too. 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 single 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 do 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 hid the test for an Antichrist.**

*1 Jn 4:3 And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world*

Any bible removing this verse 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 any 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.

### **Salvation in Modern Bibles**

All world religions have Gods that require appeasement for you to obtain their favour or the equivalent of salvation. This means that The Christian church, if it is to combine with worldly religions, must have salvation, based on a fickle God you must please through activity and not on a God who completed all that was necessary at Calvary and requires only faith in what He has done and obedience to His Will. This is apart from having a founder who was a man and became Godlike, like other worldly religions have as part of their beliefs.

The one world religion does not have one Bible for all of the faiths but has one belief set they all believe in which means they can use their bibles and not need another won which is why the KJV had to go so the bible could become more like the books of other religions,

As you read modern Bibles carefully examine the verses on Salvation to see if Jesus is the one you need to believe in or just declare He is Lord. The devils cannot believe in Him for salvation but they admit He is Lord. In this is the subtlety of the perversion of Salvation in Modern Bibles.

Today it seems you can admit Jesus is Lord without believing He is necessary for salvation.

From <http://www.simplebiblestudies.com/GAperverted.htm>

The Subject Of Faith Is Perverted: -- All too often you hear the expression, "But my faith is this -- ", and there follows a fanciful idea or opinion that is foreign to the Scriptures. Yet we are told, "*So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God*" (Rom. 10:17). If it is not in the Word of God, it is not scriptural faith. It is when each one formulates his "own faith" that the worth of the Bible is entirely discounted. Just recently one was declaring his belief in God, yet was strongly arguing, "God is dead." He began with scriptural faith, and then perverted it to his own selfish end, striving to make himself a god.

Modernists extol their faith, but at the very same time pervert it to suit their fancy. They claim to believe in Jesus Christ, but deny that He was the "only begotten Son of God" according to the record God gives us. Rather, they confess Him to be a great teacher and moral leader, but deny His deity. They reject the virgin birth, discount His miracles, scoff at His vicarious death for us, and ridicule the thought of a bodily resurrection. Yet they profess faith in Christ! It is a faith perverted to their own egotistical reasoning, with all saving power drained from the gospel they preach.

(The above quotes are from Dillard Thurman in Gospel Minutes, May 2, 1969, reprinted in Gospel Minutes, Vol. 57, No. 31, Aug. 1, 2008.)

If Jesus is not God but became one and was not divine at birth we really cannot ask Him for salvation and He cannot redeem us as He cannot be a perfect, complete eternal and universal offering for our punishment for our sins. This means we need to do something to obtain our salvation.

If He is just one of a number of people who are now ascended and have the same qualities like Jesus then you can also approach them for Salvation. An example is Mary of the Catholic Church who is described as a co-redeemer with Jesus and queen of heaven, which she could not have been if Jesus was divine and not just a man who became God-like.

This is why modern Bibles have been altered: to make Jesus Human and salvation and redemption a result of activity and not faith in the finished work of redemption, which they do not believe in.

As an example, Acts 8:37, The need to have faith in Jesus as saviour and Lord, is left out of Baptism so it is not identified with a correct attitude to Jesus but is just a religious act.

It is also why His Name is left out of passages like 1 Tim 3:16

### **Strategy for dealing with new bible versions**

People have not realised something very important when arguing with modern translators over the modern transnational errors.

Modern Bible editors believe their doctrine is correct, otherwise they would not have written it as such, and that in the King James is in error so as far as they are concerned no doctrine has been altered by the Modern Versions and in fact they would argue they are finding out more accurate details about them as they edit the text to 'improve it'.

While the King James people argue that modern versions have altered the true text the editors of modern versions argue that their text has been altered to make the Bible more correct.

It is a lose, lose situation as arguments are not from the same common basis so each argue from their side of the argument and not from a common ground so that things can be accurately compared.

Now I know why the first book I wrote on the subject God has me ask "Why would God make these changes?" Why would God demean Jesus?

Why in Daniel 3:25 would demons and their offspring be given credit for something He and Jesus did? The word 'gods' refers to demons so a son of a demon has been given credit for the rescue of Daniel from the lion's den.

In Isaiah 14:12 why is Jesus the one who fell from heaven for rebelling against God. (The titles of Jesus are used for this person and Lucifer, the real person spoken about is removed so that the devil is replaced by Jesus).

In Isaiah 7:14 why would they translate the Hebrew word incorrectly as 'young woman' when elsewhere they translate it as 'virgin' by this implying there was nothing special about the birth of Christ.

Why would they make Jesus out to be a liar in Jn 7:8 removing the perfection He had to be able to redeem us so that He was not able to meet the requirement of God for our sins.

There are many other examples but all imply the birth of Jesus was not special, He was not God but was made one, was not able to redeem us at Calvary and really was not divine and ruler and judge of all. In other words Jesus was inadequate for the task God was supposed to have sent to earth for and so man has to do something so that salvation is not purely by faith and is not a free gift of God.

It can be seen there are two different Bible: one that promotes Jesus and the other that demotes Jesus.

There will never be common ground between these two schools of translation so that to argue doctrine or Greek textual error will get you nowhere.

The only successful argument is to show that Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are forgeries and so ineligible for correct Bible Translation.

These are possible approaches that may have limited success:

1. Show the New Greek text was made in rebellion against the people in spiritual authority over the editors so could not come from God but from the devil so does not represent God's view point on things.
2. Show the New Greek is based on two forgeries and an ineligible document so it has no sound basis to be built on or translated from.
3. Ask why God would have made the changes in either direction to either demote Jesus in the New Greek or promote Jesus in the supposed editing of the original Greek of the Modern versions.
4. If He was God in control of all things why could He not preserve the original Greek text implying their God is not a real God as He has supposedly not done this, or conversely, He is an impersonal God not caring what happens to us so that The Bible lies about Him personally relating to each one of us.

These are the basis of the attacks I would use to argue against the modern Greek text which if you notice, do not argue doctrine. But the best one is to show they are forgeries as this removes their foundation and leaves them nothing to argue back.

Arguing doctrine will get you nowhere and has done little against the New Greek Scholars so it is obvious a new approach is needed.

### **Seven reasons for not using modern bibles**

1. The Greek text used for modern bible translation and the version first published from it were written in complete rebellion against the spiritual authority that commissioned them to revise the King James Version English. They were told not to make a new translation let alone make a New Greek text to use for translation purposes. Satan is the author of rebellion so you can see he is behind modern bibles and the Greek text they use.

God would not cause rebellion against His own Authority.

2. It was written by two men who hated the King James Bible and did not hesitate to make a New Greek text that promoted their heretical beliefs. In this they served Satan, the god behind modern bibles. Their text does not give Glory to God but actually removes it.

God would not allow His glory to be given to another which the modern bibles allow to happen

3. It uses three Greek texts. All are proven to be forgeries; Sinaiticus and 2472 (used for Mark) and Vaticanus. This means there is no foundation to these modern bibles as they use texts to translate from which are forgeries.

God would not allow this.

4. Modern bibles humanises Jesus and makes Him to be like any other founder of religions so that there is nothing in modern bibles these days that stops other religions from fellowshipping with Christians. Nowadays Muslims, Catholics, Liberal Christians and other faiths can happily worship together in one building and do so in various places.

God prohibits this type of fellowship.

5. They say their Greek is correct but then say there is no old manuscript to compare it with so in reality they cannot say it is correct but only assume it is correct. This problem does not happen with the King James Version..

God would not allow this uncertainty as He is a God of order.

6. They serve a god who cannot even communicate the truth to the editors of the modern Greek text and lovelessly leaves them to try and work out what we need to do to get to heaven. Because they humanise Jesus He cannot redeem us which mans Salvation now requires us to do something.

God would not remove His Grace if He is a God of Love so that their God cannot be Jesus but another loveless god, Satan. Besides He promises to lead us into all truth Jn 16:13 and not hide it from us if we need to know it.

7. Modern bibles are copyrighted which means they all have to be different or they could not be copyrighted. This result in them saying different things and leads to confusion at times as text say

different things to each other. This problem never arose for over 1700 years with the text used for the King James. God is not the author of confusion but Satan is.

God desires all to hear His Word and not to limit His Word because of copyright.

What kind of God do they have that cannot maintain order so that translations all say the same thing and agree on doctrine. The true God is able to maintain agreement in doctrine and text between all Bibles based on the traditional Geek text. So He cannot be behind modern bibles. This leaves only Satan.

God is not the order of confusion and would not promote it.

## **Conclusion**

In modern translations they use a text they say they cannot know is accurate as they believe they have nothing older than the Fourth century to compare it with (meaning their two forged Codices). This means they cannot really say what they translate is correct. There are older texts like the *Itala* and the *Syriac Peshita* but they make up a reason that cannot be proven by history as to why these are not good to use for translation purposes.

Modern Bibles remove the Divinity of Jesus which really removes the purpose of Christianity as it is based on a Divine Jesus and what He was able to do for us because of His being God.

So if you want an insecure faith use modern bibles. But if you want a secure faith then you need to use the King James Version which has none of the problems of modern bibles.

## **Closing comments**

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 Christian's Text for the one world religion and in the process of becoming this create a lukewarm faith and resulting lukewarm Church.

Without the expression of the authority of Jesus and the work of The Holy Spirit, Christianity is just the like the words of any other religion. There is no evidence the resurrection has occurred and that Jesus has the authority over nature and the spirit world that resulted from it. It might as well be the words of Jehovah's Witnesses, Unitarians or Mormons. In fact there are members of cults on editorial committees of Modern Bibles because they believe there is nothing to show the words of the Bible are different to the words of other holy books.

So how does the true Church show it represents Jesus?

It expresses the Authority of Jesus over nature and demons

It demonstrates effective spiritual warfare.

How does a person show The Holy Spirit was sent by Jesus and is at work in the world today?

They are guided by The Holy Spirit so knows how to serve Jesus effectively as well as when to speak to those The Spirit is convicting about the errors of modern theology.

They demonstrate the Gifts of The Holy Spirit in their life.

They demonstrate accurate prophecy, *Words of Knowledge* and *Words of Wisdom*

They demonstrate the fruit of The Holy Spirit in their life.

Unless the church does these things it will not effectively show modern Bibles are wrong through proving them wrong about what they have said about Jesus and The Holy Spirit. Arguments will only be words by two sides who are convinced they are correct and the other side is wrong.

Unfortunately, instead of learning about these things from Denominations that demonstrate them the established church prefers to criticise them to justify their own position and by this condemn many to a faith that is far less than what it should be, which is to be expected if reason and knowledge is more important than listening to The Holy Spirit and demonstrating The Kingdom of God to the world.

**Websites to obtain 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/>

There are many Good summaries and I mention two that I find good.

A very good summary of the changes in the NIV <https://www.nowtheendbegins.com/PDF/keith-piper-serious-omissions-in-the-niv.pdf>

Another good summary is at <https://www.ecclesia.org/truth/m-m.html>

## **Appendix A The Philosophical basis behind the New Greek text**

The heresy of Westcott and Hort

They are the editors of the Greek fabricated for the translation of modern bibles.

### **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). To doubt parts of the Bible as being accurate also questions the Holy Spirit's credibility.

It is a brave man who questions God and the credibility of The Holy Spirit.

You either accept The Bible as it is and what it says is there or has happened or you cannot accept any part of it and worship a God different to Jesus and must find a way of salvation elsewhere, as you cannot believe any part of The Bible as you do not know what parts are not correct.

The purpose of this appendix is to how the heretical beliefs of the two authors of the Greek behind modern Bibles as well as their hatred of the King James Version 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 using the Sinaiticus as a cover for their work.

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!

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

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 God, able to understand what God meant, which is highly improbable as a finite mind cannot understand the infinite.

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 considered not worth using and placed aside for over 800 years.

### **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 for over 800 years. 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 New Greek text based primarily on a manuscript from an area they thought came from Egypt which had been rejected by the rest of Christendom for over 1400 years because it had been written by people who did not believe in the divinity of Christ and also on another manuscript they thought was old but which has been proven to be a forgery.

These heretical manuscripts do not even agree among themselves. 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 text!

The two main manuscripts used by them, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus alone differ over 3000 times in the Gospels alone 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 The Bible 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."*

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. MacMillan, 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 shrank 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 who could hold to so many unscriptural and ungodly beliefs 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 suppose 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 just by faith and a gift from God.

Believed The Bible was no 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) he could correct in his New Greek

Believed in new age things

Did not believe in Satan or hell but 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.

In other words, he promoted heresy he believed it 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 12:576 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 suppose 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 I their erroneous beliefs.

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 otherwords, 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 neighbouring 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 some what 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."*

So it is seen that Westcott was 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."

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-honouring text and replace it with the Local Text of Alexandria, Egypt, but the overwhelming evidence was always weighted in God's favour. 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.

Of course they could not do this as these two manuscripts were forged after the early church councils had been held.

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. Like the lost scientists, they begrudgingly had to acknowledge that the evidence and facts of history were in favour 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 there 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 other words people did not want to believe the Bible 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 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 right 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 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 text of the King James Bible, and
- (2) to limit ... the expression of any alterations to the language of the Authorized Version.<sup>183</sup>

Their New Greek was 20% different to that of the king James and watered down or removed doctrine from the Textus Receptus.

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 was not 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 believe in it. 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.

So the two main editors, 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 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 manuscript derived by two people who were heretical 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 text 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.

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 fewer 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 these two manuscripts if you believe in Christian Doctrine. But if you do not they are the best two to use for your heresies.

## **Appendix B Why theologians are the way they are today**

In the Middle Ages The Bible ruled and science was subservient to what The Bible said about it. Science was not developed to the extent that its concepts were able to question what The Bible taught about the natural order of things.

Today science is king and The Bible is made to submit to it.

What caused this change in attitude?

The first was Cessationism in the church

The second was the change in attitudes towards what The Bible said because of the new discoveries of which science seemed to contradict The Bible resulting in this attitude towards it in the 'age of enlightenment' period.

The trials of Galileo in 1610 and 1633 were really about attitudes that would be a part of the age of enlightenment and not actually the theories involved in the trial. If the attitudes Galileo had towards the old theories had been accepted then there would have been no trial. The attitudes were behind the fact the new theories were expressed and the rejection of these theories' meant these attitudes were also rejected. So, in a sense, the age of the enlightenment's embryo was possible in the early 1600s and its full expression was later in the 18th Century.

It could be said that before the 'enlightenment' matured, science was aimed at expressing the Glories of God, revealing His Glory in the discoveries that were made, while the age of enlightenment was aimed at knowledge of things by man, giving man the glory for the discoveries made. The object of focus was turned from God to man and along with this faith in the things of God diminished amongst those who examined the things of science.

So we need to examine what Cessationism is and how it affected the church and then to examine the attitudes in the age of enlightenment that changed or modified the attitudes in the church to The Bible.

I will not present arguments for or against these two things as the purpose of this document is not to justify any stance but to just show the effects they had on faith in The Bible and acceptance of The Bible as fact by theologians.

### **Cessationism**

(From the Wiki article on Cessationism)

*In Christianity, Cessationism is the doctrine that spiritual gifts such as speaking in tongues, prophecy and healing ceased with the original twelve apostles. This is generally opposed to continuationism, which teaches that the Holy Spirit may at any time bestow the spiritual gifts on persons other than the original twelve apostles.*

*Cessationists teach that the primary purpose of gifts and miracles were to authenticate the Apostles' message as being of divine origin and, therefore, authoritative (Hebrews 2:3-4). However, since the completion of the canon, the Church can test the veracity (or lack thereof) of any message claiming to represent God, against his written revelation which having now been completed, rendering any supernatural sign as unnecessary (2 Peter 1:19; see also 2 Timothy 3:16-17).*

*Cessationists believe that, given that the authority of the early church has been established and the New Testament is complete, Christians do not require charismatic gifts to guide them. As a result, Cessationists believe that the spiritual gifts ceased to operate with the passing of the last of the twelve apostles and are no longer in effect today.*

This attitude does two things:

It makes Jesus a liar who said we would do greater things than Him, and

Removes the only proofs the church has of The Kingdom of God.

Cessationism has done much harm to the witness of the church and The Kingdom.

## **There are three types of Cessationists**

### **Full Cessationism**

These assert that no apostolic miracles are performed by God today. While some Cessationists allow for God's miraculous guidance. A true Cessationist contends that God's miraculous guidance is not through the operation of the Charismatic gifts.

#### Total Cessationists

The majority of Cessationists subscribe to the total cessation of spiritual gifts. This theory of Cessationists denies the possibility of a reemergence of the gifts on grounds of principle; that is, the denial is on a priori grounds: a strong Cessationist would deny the possibility of the existence or a reemergence of genuine God's prophets and healers in the post-Apostolic age, i.e. after the 1st century, no matter what – even if we met prophets or healers who prophesied/healed in the name of Jesus. This is supported using the principle of Sola Scriptura, insisting on three propositions

The completion of the canon of the Bible

The infallible and sufficient authority of the Bible

The perfection of the Scriptures to guide the Church

(In the 1600's these three points would have been accepted by all but now points 2 and 3 have been rejected by theologians resulting in the Hebrew and Greek texts used in modern translations.)

This attitude ignores the fact that gifts, miracles and prophecy still occur and is why the evangelical church condemns Charismatic and Pentecostal beliefs about these things.

### **Moderate Cessationists**

This view denies the current existence of manifestations of genuine charismatic gifts in the Church. However, moderate Cessationism allows for the possibility of a new charismatic period in the future, when God would powerfully guide His people. This openness to the possibility of a new charismatic period is motivated by premillennialist eschatological expectations, where it is assumed that Christ's Second Coming will occur before the establishment of Christ's millennial kingdom on Earth. Within this premillennialist conceptual framework, the Great Tribulation is seen as a future period immediately preceding Christ's Coming. This insists that the new charismatic period is possible only during the Great Tribulation, for otherwise the genuine gifts would be in operation

before the Tribulation, thus, charismatic gifts could not be rejected on grounds of principle. This is also compatible with all premillennialist positions (pre-trib, post-trib, mid-trib and pre-wrath).

### **Theoretical basis.**

Two types of Cessationism can be distinguished with regard to their theoretical bases:

Principled Cessationism: founded a priori, on grounds of principle

Empirical Cessationism: founded on a posteriori grounds, i.e. on experience or empiria.

Both strong and moderate versions of Cessationism are on principle because they appeal to the principle of sola scriptura or in Anglicanism and Methodism prima scriptura. Their denial of the possibility of gifts is on a priori grounds, on grounds of principle.

This is so even though there is no verse in The Bible that says any of these things have ceased.

Some Cessationists explanations about why gifts of the Holy Spirit ceased include:

Their original purpose has been fulfilled.

The testimony they were assigned to provide has been accomplished, that the Jewish church is now open to foreign nations.

The Holy Scriptures are now complete and wholly sufficient for all the needs of a Christian worker

They were neglected and faded from use.

They were withdrawn with the death of the apostles, in their distinct function as witnesses of new revelation.

They were taken away as a form of discipline from God on unbelief or disobedience.

They were misinterpretations or exaggeration and could instead be attributed to natural and psychological phenomena.

They were signs attesting to the truth and authority of the apostolic preaching of the gospel and are now preserved for the church in the New Testament witness.

The problems Cessationists have with these arguments are that gifts, exorcisms and healings continued from the time of the apostles through to the current day so they never really stopped and to say they have not is to question Charismatic and Pentecostal faiths and say they are of the devil or they would not work in these things.

### **Modern theologians are Cessationists.**

The problems Cessationism causes to the church.

Because the supernatural expression of the gifts, miracles and authority over Satan are the proof of Jesus resurrecting and the only expression of His Kingdom on earth then removing these things removes that which differentiates the Christian church from other religions making it no different to most of them. So when science comes along and needs proof of the supernatural the church has none. So science can proceed with its assumptions and theories even though they may remove

faith in things that people may have because the church cannot show that faith is real not having anything supernatural to show their faith is in a real God and not one just talked about.

For the liberal Christian church to be involved in the one world religion this attitude towards these things needs to be in force so that miracles, gifts and prophecy do not show it is different to other religions.

## **Age of Enlightenment**

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia

The Enlightenment was a philosophical movement which dominated the world of ideas in Europe in the 18th century. The Enlightenment included a range of ideas centered on reason as the primary source of authority and legitimacy, and came to advance ideals such as liberty, progress, tolerance, fraternity, constitutional government and ending the abuses of the church and state. The Enlightenment was marked by increasing empiricism, scientific rigor, and reductionism, along with increased questioning of religious orthodoxy.

It was man orientated toward what man could do and ignored God as it was centred on man and not God.

European politics, philosophy, science and communications were radically reoriented during the course of the "long 18th century" (1685-1815) as part of a movement referred to by its participants as the 'Age of Reason', or simply 'The Enlightenment'. Enlightenment thinkers in Britain, in France and throughout Europe questioned traditional authority and embraced the notion that humanity could be improved through rational change. The Enlightenment produced numerous books, essays, inventions, scientific discoveries, laws, wars and revolutions. The American and French Revolutions were directly inspired by Enlightenment ideals and respectively marked the peak of its influence and the beginning of its decline. The Enlightenment ultimately gave way to 19th-century Romanticism.

In his essay "What Is Enlightenment?" (1784), the German philosopher Immanuel Kant summed up the era's motto in the following terms: "*Dare to know! Have courage to use your own reason!*"

Locke argued that human nature was mutable and that knowledge was gained through accumulated experience rather than by accessing some sort of outside truth. Newton's calculus and optical theories provided the powerful Enlightenment metaphors for precisely measured change and illumination.

One historian's summary of Voltaire's "Philosophical Dictionary": "*a chaos of clear ideas.*"  
Foremost among these was the notion that everything in the universe could be rationally demystified and catalogued.

It was also a time of religious (and anti-religious) innovation, as Christians sought to reposition their faith along rational lines and deists and materialists argued that the universe seemed to determine its own course without God's intervention.

(My comment:) In the Middle ages God was behind everything so science had to obey The Bible. In the enlightenment, God was an impersonal player as there was no proof He existed because the supernatural was now absent from the established church because of Cessationism and so it became

a battle of words between the church and science. If Pentecostalism and Charismatic churches had been around things may have been different.)

The church had little or no evidence of a supernatural God while science had all the evidence it needed to prove it because all it theorised about, (at that stage), could be seen or proved by experiment. People embraced science and rejected Christian belief because it could not be proved and God did not appear to be real because He did not work through the church to prove His existence.

So a culture arose where it was allowable to doubt The Bible because what it said could not be proven at that time and not was backed up by science and archaeology and God did not appear to be real or relevant because He was not personally working miracles to prove who He was.

This attitude Satan used to his foulest advantage which has resulted in the modern day heretical bible and a church that is a wimp compared to what it could be spiritually.

## **Appendix C Not Believing in Genesis Ch 1 to 11**

Many Christians believe the stories in Genesis are a myth. They do not realise the consequences of this attitude. Once you realise what you are actually saying by this attitude you will be horrified.

If you do not believe in Genesis 3 (The Fall) then there is no need for Jesus and The New Testament.

This little document aims to show you what happens when you do not believe in any part of Genesis or other parts of The Bible.

### **Genesis Ch 1, 3 & 8 Creation, the Fall of Man and the Worldwide Flood**

These three events are a major test of your faith in God and who you believe He is

If you believe He is God you will believe in all these three things because you believe He is able to do these things

If you do not believe He is God then you will not believe in these things because you do not believe He is God and able to do these things

### **Six day Creation**

Do you believe God created everything in 6 days?

If Yes

You have the faith God requires to do His Will

You will not have the problems evolution causes people

You do not believe you are wiser than God to declare what He has or has not done (making you a god to be able to judge God) but will say what The Spirit shows you about God.

You do not need to correct The Bible to say what you believe it says because you will believe He is able to preserve it as He said He could.

You will not need to find alternative ways for things occurred which require more faith than believing these events happened

If No

You are accepting beliefs and theories that have not been scientifically proved but only assumed and are really only hypotheses as they have not been proven only assumed

You do not believe God could create everything in six days or you would accept a six day creation

You must find an alternative system for the formation of the universe and the earth

You must find an alternative to the God of The Bible and a holy book you can believe in

Evolution is the only alternative you can believe in for the formation of the earth and universe, which states

There was nothing before the universe and you would break all the laws of physics having energy being created out of nothing

God has no real part in the creation of all things we know exist

All is an accident

Life spontaneously came into existence from things that did not have life (you believe life was created from nothing rather than an all powerful God created it)

God's order and discipline is not in the universe or it would be firstly seen in creation

Chance is the guide in everything and there is no divine plan behind all that happens

God has no right to make plans for or to influence creation as He did not make it

We do not have to do with what God says to do with what He has given us

You can have no moral absolutes unless you can find a god who morals you can believe in

You can have no eternal purpose for life as God has no authority to give you one as He did not create you

You are your own god as you reject the God of The Bible and can do what you want as there is no God to judge you (so you believe)

Life after death may exist but God has no right to have a part in it as he did not create you so does not own you to be able to make plans for you or to control what happens to you

### **Do you modify Genesis to fit in with scientific beliefs?**

If yes

You do not believe God can create in six days so have the problems those above of those who answered 'No' above.

If No!

If you said 'No' because you believe in six day creation then you do not have the problems of those who do not believe in it.

If you said 'No' because you want to believe the Bible but want to accept what science says then you really do not believe God would create in six days or you would reject this way of these events happening and you would have many of the problems of those who do not believe in six day creation.

### **The Fall of Mankind into sin**

Do you believe there was a fall of mankind into sin?

If Yes

You believe Jesus is necessary to complete God's plan for you

You believe in Salvation and Redemption

You will obey God to preserve these

You will tell others of these things because they are good for other people and God's Love in you causes you to do this

If No

You cannot believe in Jesus and all He did for you as He is not necessary because there is no fall of man for Him to die and remove the effects, of which was His main purpose for coming to earth.

You will not love others as God does and will have a self-motivated expression of love. You may try to love as God Loves but you are really following a god that works within the limitations you have given him and because He is not the God of true Love you will not be able to express this in you to its fullest extent

You need to find a way of salvation you can believe in and you know is correct as you cannot trust anything The Bible says about it or anything else it states about anything to do with these things. You cannot pick and choose what parts of The Bible you want to believe in. It is all or none because once you start to pick and choose what you want to believe in you are no longer following the God who wrote it and have made your own bible

### **The worldwide deluge**

Do you think there was a Worldwide Noahic flood

If Yes

You will understand Geology correctly

You will know God's judgement and Grace to Noah and all who follow God

You will not fruitlessly need to search for explanation of things in geology regardless of how improbable they may seem or scientifically incorrect they are

If No

You will have to believe in evolution as an alternative to the flood to explain earth geology and formation

You will not understand geology correctly

You will always be looking for explanations to refute the things that show the worldwide flood occurred regardless of how improbable or impossible these explanations are

You cannot believe what The Bible says in Genesis about the flood so you cannot use The Bible as you believe it has error

Overall consequence of saying "Yes" to belief in the above three events

You believe the God of the Bible and all He said

You believe all The Bible says

You know what Salvation and Redemption is

You know how to live to obtain and preserve these

You will express God's Love and Control over all things

You will learn how to explain and defend these events against their critics

Overall consequence of saying "No!"

Jesus is irrelevant to you as all these point to Him in some way and He believed in creation

You Believe God lied in the first verse of The Bible and in subsequent chapters of Genesis so you cannot believe anything in The Bible as you do not know where else He lied. If you believe God did not lie but that the translation of these chapters is wrong you cannot believe anything else in it as they may have been wrongly translated.

You do not believe what Jesus did as He believed in all these events

You cannot be a follower of Jesus as you do not believe what He believed

You worship a different God to that of The Bible and Jesus and need a different holy book you can trust in place of The Bible

You cannot believe anything The Bible says or use it as you believe it has error in it so by using any of it you may be promoting error

You do not know what else in it is in error

You cannot accept what it says about salvation and redemption as it may be incorrect

You need to find a god you can believe in and trust

You need to find a 'Bible' you can believe in and trust

You have to create your own morality without any absolute being (a god) to compare your values with you can trust completely and believe in

You will have to promote evolution or modify the Bible creation in some way (which is the same as rejecting what it says) and will have to promote whatever you believe in and not what God says

You will have trouble relating to a God you reject in part or whole as salvation is a relationship and you will compromise your salvation and even lose it.

### **How God's Authority is affected by this rejection of any of these three events**

You believe God did not create everything

He does not own all things as He did not make them

His Will is not important as He has no right to enforce it on a creation He did not created

You can do anything with what you posses as He did not make it so you have the right to determine what to do with it

You do not believe He has moral authority over man as He did not create mankind

He has no right to punish anyone as He did not make them and cannot make moral laws for them because He is not their creator or maker

He has no right to judge anyone or anything in creation or to even interfere with it in any way as according to you He did not create these things so has no right of ownership or control over them

Jesus is not necessary as there was no sin against an infinite God needing infinite sacrifice to appease

God has no right to destroy the earth through a flood as sin was not against Him as He had not created us to have the right to make our moral laws

You do not believe God has any authority to formulate or evaluate morals

God cannot make you obey His laws unless He makes you His prisoner and forces His Will on you because He did not create you.

If He made you His prisoner He would not be god of Love

The Love of God and The Father are not relevant as we have not sinned against God to need them

If God shows us His love it is not because of Jesus as Jesus cannot redeem us because we have not sinned against God (there was no fall to do this and He has no right to judge us for our failings anyway as He did not create us)

You are in charge of your life and purposes unless you find another god to follow and even then you will be the one determining what you believe and how you want to obey this god.

## **Conclusion**

You cannot reject any part of The Bible in part or whole as it means you cannot trust any of it or The God who wrote it.

To do this you must believe the reasonings of men who do not believe God could create things in six days or that the other events happened.

The only person who promotes this belief system is Satan so that those believing these things have been deluded by Satan to believe these things as God would not persuade them to believe these things.

There are no fence sitters as there can be no grey area in belief for or against these things.

You will not seek the scientific truth to show the possibility that God created in six days or that the other events happened

To not believe in an infinite God, whose marks are all over creation, takes more faith to believe in men, who are finite and cannot prove what they believe is correct about creation and the deluge but only reason it from what they see and do not accept any other rational explanation because they do not really believe in God or they would accept all these events as being under the control of God.

To say Genesis Ch 1-3 are myths or allegory is to remove the need for Jesus and His coming as one of the major purposes for this coming to earth is for our redemption, which only is relevant if there was a fall! You also remove the need for a New Testament.

You cannot trust the prophets who were used to write The Bible

Another result of not believing in Genesis chapters 1 to 3 is that you cannot believe anything a prophet said in the Old Testament.

God said he spoke through the prophets so a prophet wrote Genesis.

If you are saying the Creation, The fall of mankind and the flood are not correctly told by Genesis, You are saying the prophet did not write what God said or that God did not speak through the prophet. This means you cannot really trust anything prophets said in the Old Testament. If one prophet got it wrong how do you know others did not get it wrong?

Everything that was prophesied about Jesus cannot be believed:

All the requirements of Him to be born as The Messiah

The work The Messiah would do

The death of The Messiah and what would accomplish

What the Messiah would usher in (the kingdom of God)

All the Messiah taught and did

What the prophets said cannot be trusted because you do not believe what a prophet wrote about in Genesis which means you cannot trust that other prophets have written.

It also means that God of the Bible lied according to you about His ability to have His Bible correctly written down and passed onto to future generations.

The Gifts and the Fivefold Ministries

People say the gifts of The Spirit no longer apply to Christians or that the roles of apostle and prophet no longer exist. Nowhere in The Bible has God told us these things have finished and no longer apply to Christians or are no longer to be used by Christians. Man cannot assume these no longer apply. So if you are not using the Gifts of The Spirit or believe the role of prophet or apostle no longer exists then you are adding to The Bible something that is not in it and calling God a liar.