

# Ephesians and the New Greek Text

## Preface

Paul wrote the book of Ephesians to show how superior Jesus was to Artemis, who was a major goddess of that period. Its principles can be also used to show how superior Jesus is to Satan, any man made gods and the founder of any religion or belief system, unless you use a bible translated from the modern Greek as you will see later on when I show how the modern Greek text alters Ephesians materially.

Satan knew Jesus was coming to earth so had organised a religion based on what Jesus would do so that people could see no reason for following Jesus.

Artemis was the equivalent of a female Jesus, having most of His attributes. The difference being Jesus could do what He was suppose to be able to do while Artemis could not. Also Jesus controlled the demons of Artemis and she could not control Christians.

While Paul wrote about the superiority of Jesus it was the miracles and healings He did in the Name of Jesus that showed Jesus was superior to Artemis and it is these the Christianity needs to do to show that Jesus is superior to the founders of other religions. Unfortunately it is not doing this which it is why it is in the mess it is in today.

## Foreword

This study of Ephesians looks at the book in a different way to the traditional approach to the study of Ephesians. It takes the approach that Ephesians was written to gentiles and not Jews. This is because I believe the book was written to show the superiority of Jesus over the goddess Artemis.

So it was written too:

Show the superiority of Jesus over Artemis

To encourage them to continue in the Christian faith

To teach them or remind them of certain things

To tell them of certain aspects of The Christian life they needed to know about

If it has been written to Jews, Paul would not have to have to has write to them about some of the practises He mentions in the book because their culture would not have allowed these.

## Two problems

There are two problems with the Greek translation of Ephesians by the New 'improved; Greek text used for modern versions.

Westcott and Hort, who made up the New Greek did not believe in the divinity of Jesus so altered all they could get away with to hide this. They stated it was based on the Sinaiticus but they altered its text to suit there heresies.

They hated the Authorised version because it showed up their wrong belief system so and devoted their whole energies to replace it with something they considered better which backed up their heresies which they did with their 'new improved Greek'.

As Ephesians was written on the premise that Jesus was divine and the arguments against Artemis were based on this, the removal of the divinity of Jesus tends to sink this line of arguing.

Artemis was a female version of Jesus and only the fact Jesus was divine and the son of God and she was not was the main argument against her.

Miracles and the casting out of her demons showed Jesus was superior to her.

The second problem is that they claim their translation is better than the King James because they have older Greek codices. But they still do not have the originals so cannot really say that what they translated as Ephesians is correct.

5400+ codices back up the King James Bible and only fragments and two books back up their translation. The two books they use are proven forgeries so their translating is based on forgeries with no proof that their 'new, improved Greek' is better than the King James version, which at least was the accepted translation throughout the Roman empire, unlike the Greek text used by Westcott and Hort which was basically only used in one city.

### **Modern Bibles - why they believe the Authorised is not a good translation**

Modern theologians believe in the copying of the Greek text over the last 1800 years errors have crept into it so that it no longer represents what God said and that they have to work out what God meant to say.

They choose what they believe are the oldest manuscripts we can rely on (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) which disagree with each other over 3000 times and expect to make order out of this confusion.

They remove or change 20% of the Authorised version (based on 5400+ documents) based on a handful of Greek texts of which only two (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) are relatively complete.

Because they believe they do not have the originals they cannot say that Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are the best manuscripts and the fact these manuscripts are in a minority and alter what the majority of texts say, without having a earlier codex to justify these changes that they can compare too to say that these changes are correct, If they had a correct text they would have used it so they cannot say that the texts they start off with are the best.

In other words, they are saying the Authorised version is incorrect in 20% of it but have no real text to show this statement is correct.

There is the Syriac Peshita that has an 1800 year unbroken tradition that backs up the Authorised version so to negate this codex they say the Peshita was altered in the 4th century but have nothing historical to back this statement up.

They seemed to have ignored the old Itala which was translated in 150 AD when the Peshita was translated.

So they alter 20% of the Authorised version to what they believe it should say without any Greek text they know is accurate to back up their alterations to the Authorised text.

### **In Summary**

They ignore the accepted Greek text used in over 5400 codices for two Greek texts backed up by a handful of texts used only one are of the Roman empire where a heretical church was located and that were ignored for 1400 years and suddenly discovered in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. They say they correct the Greek text to what God wants it to say but have no real Greek text they say is correct to back up these changes so can only assume their corrections are correct.

In other words the modern bibles are based on man's reasoned corrections and cannot be considered to be what God said but may have some of His truth in. This means they cannot be relied upon as you do not know what is of God and what is of the editor.

The Authorised can be trusted as its Greek agrees with the Syriac Peshita (circa 150 AD) and the old Itala (circa 150 AD).

It is hard to imagine in 250 Years (150 AD to 400 AD) 20% of the Greek texts were copied incorrectly which is what modern theologians say as justification for their 'better and more accurate' Greek text.

There is also another real problem they have in that Vaticanus and Sinaiticus have been proven to be forgeries so can not be relied on for anything to do with Bible Translation. This means the Greek of Westcott and Hort is based on forged codices and should not even be considered as a reliable text for translation purposes.

There is too much money involved and too much for theologians to lose to make this public so it has been hidden by modern bible publishing bodies and treated as incorrect and covered up or dismissed by them.

Do the research and you will see this is all true.

## **Examples of how they altered the text**

I will examine the Revised Version (RV), the Revised Version in an interlinear form with the Authorised Version (RVI) and the New Testament in English (WHNT) which Westcott and Hort published and which best showed their views on the translation of the New Greek.

I will also not examine where only the Greek case has been changed but the English does not materially change unless it makes a difference in some way to the sense of the passage.

### **Bibles examined**

Westcott Hort New Testament (WHNT)

Revised Version 1881 (RV)

Interlinear AV/RV (RV1)

There are slight differences amongst them at times

### **Ephesians Chapter I**

V1 The words 'at Ephesus' are bracketed in the WHNT and the margin of the RV states some early manuscripts do not have it implying it was not in the original so that the letter was not really sent to the Ephesus. This destroys the purpose of the letter as it was sent to the Ephesians to show Christ is the true God and Greater than any demon or idol!

Westcott and Hort did not believe Jesus was divine which is why they did this. This belief also caused them to emphasise the humanity of Christ and not His divinity by Changing 'Christ Jesus' to Jesus Christ'.

V4 WHNT and RV1 have 'blameless' and 'blame' instead of 'without blemish':

Without blemish means you have nothing that defiles you because you have been Redeemed by Jesus..  
With out blame shifts the emphasis from what Jesus has done to what you have done so that acceptance by God not because of what Jesus did but because of what you have done just like the followers of Artemis whose acceptance was by their activities for her.

It can be seen that Westcott and Hort did not believe in redemption. They did not believe Jesus was God so could not redeem us.

They believed we had to work at obtaining salvation so that it was not purely by faith. In reality we do not have to work obtain our salvation but work at the necessary obedience to maintain our salvation relationship.

V5 RV1 Changes 'foreordained' to 'predestined'.

If you foreordain something it needs to be done if you want the desired result and it is up to you what you do with it. If it is predestined then it will occur regardless of what you do.

The RV changes 'children' to 'sons'. We are all children of the Father by adoption. The Father only had one natural born son, Jesus. Westcott and Hort did not believe in the Divinity of Jesus and considered His conception was of a man and woman, like every one else's birth.

V7 They could not remove redemption so changed 'the riches' from masculine gender to feminine gender so that it does not refer to Jesus but to The Father. WHNT does not mention Jesus and implies it is all the work of The Father.

V10 WHNT Replaces Christ with Messiah without saying who the Messiah was. It obvious they did not believe Jesus was The messiah sent by God!

RV, RV1 and WHNT changed "in the earth" to 'upon the earth'!

Hell is though to be in the earth and Wescott and Hort did not believe in hell so removed reference to it.

V12 WHNT Because they did not believe Jesus was God they changed 'Christ' to the impersonal Messiah, which could have been anyone and changed 'Glory' which only belongs to God to 'honour' which any man can have.

V13 WHNT RV RV1 leave out the word 'trusted' written in italics put in by the AV editors to enhance the sense of the verse and which means it is not in the Greek. Without it you just have to believe and not necessarily trust like demons, who believe in Christ but did not follow Him.+

VI4 'until' is changed 'unto'. "Until" means something is maintained until and event happens' 'Unto' means something is going to happen and keep being made to occur until an event is reached.

'Redemption' is removed in WHWT and it states that we will be redeemed not because of Jesus but because The Holy Spirit has marked as belonging to The Father

The Holy Spirit is called an 'it' (WHNT) so not a person

The 'purchased possession' is replaced by 'God's own possessions'. The 'purchased possessions' are the redeemed. God owns every thing so everything is already 'God's own possessions'

The AV say we are redeemed. The RV and RVI says we are working towards an event when we will be redeemed because we have the Holy Spirit marking us as belonging to God..

V15 The word 'love' is left out of all three Texts so it appears faithfulness only is required in the Christian life.

V17 All three translations change 'the Spirit' to 'a Spirit' In other words, 'The Holy Spirit, is replaced by 'a spirit' which could be a demon.. Thus shows their dabbling in the occult where they sought to communicate with spirits and not Jesus or the Holy spirit for their guidance.

V 18 All three versions changed 'eyes of understanding' to 'eyes of your heart'. Understanding something is different to having a belief in your heart about it. It is almost as if they did not believe you could have any understanding of what God has done in the next few verses but had to blindly believe in it.

Some other verses

2:1 WHNT left out 'hath the quickened' removing the fact that the effects of sin were no longer on us as we were redeemed. Westcott and Hort did not believe in redemption so had to remove it.

The word 'through' was changed to 'in'. The power of God's Grace flowed through Christ Jesus. They said it was found in Jesus so that it did not flow through Jesus but was part of his nature. They believed Jesus was human not divine so limit God's Grace by this.

2:8 WHNT has 'a faith'. In other words, any type of faith.

2:9 All three change 'boast' to 'Glory'. 'Glory' belongs to God so no man can claim it. But they allow pride (boasting) because people can say I have achieved it. They believed salvation was by faith and works.

2:10 "'Foreordained" has been changed to 'prepared'. We are commanded to do what God has prepared for us to do and not just acknowledge they have been prepared for us and not necessarily have to do them.

2.20 The cornerstone / foundation is changed from 'Jesus Christ to 'Christ Jesus' from the 'human' Jesus being emphasised to the 'anointed, divine, Messiah' being emphasised.'

3:6 RV RV1 'Should be' was changed to 'are'. 'Should be' is what should happen (future) 'are' is what is happening now. So according to RV&RV1 the gentiles are now fellow heirs of the promise given to Christians. Note that 'Jesus' is removed so only 'The Christ', who ever that is, is the one we are heirs of.

3.9 'fellowship' has been changed to 'dispensation' From a relationship with God to the way God deals with His creation. To emphasise this they leave out 'Christ Jesus'.

There are many more examples of how The heresies of Westcott and Hort permeate their Greek but the above should be sufficient show how bad a Greek it is, especially since it has no textual foundation for even existing.

## **Introduction**

### **The Letter to the Ephesians – a background**

The Missionary journeys of Paul took between three to four years. The fact he spent so long at Ephesus (2-3 years) in the third missionary journey indicates he had problems there which I believe were to do with the similarity of the claims between the followers of Jesus and the followers of Artemis.

Ephesus was a city full of witchcraft and magic, as well as all the ritual attendant on a great pagan goddess's temple. The goddess was Artemis and we need to examine the claims her followers made for her to understand why Paul wrote what he did in the letter to the Ephesians.

To succeed in this Paul has to show Jesus was superior to a Artemis in every way.

An example.

Jesus has always been God. Artemis was born and had not been God from the beginning of everything.

The main proof was that Jesus had authority over Artemis and her demons which is also the only proof we have Jesus is superior to Satanism and The New Age.

## **Artemis**

Artemis was the principle deity of Ephesus and the surrounding regions. Ephesus was where her worship was strongest. There was a magnificent temple erected there to honour her and a large trade was centred on supplying the need of her worship. There was also a strong 'missionary' movement amongst her followers so that there were many adherents to her cult. Worship of Artemis formed a part of their daily life, either by seeing it or participating it.

This was what Paul faced when he moved to Ephesus. This move to Ephesus was a strategic move as it was a important centre of worship and trade and any Christians in that city could influence a larger area than just Ephesus. Christianity would also remove the influence of Artemis.

Words would not persuade the followers of Artemis to leave her because her attributes were very similar to that of Jesus. Paul had to show Jesus was superior to Artemis by demonstrating Jesus and The Kingdom of God was superior to that which Artemis could do.

This was done through a natural expression of his ministry - signs and wonders. This was demonstrated by the casting out of the demons behind Artemis and her worship as well as healing people in a way Artemis could not do. This Ministry was not mentioned in Ephesians as it was so natural to his lifestyle and ministry that Paul did not have to tell them about it or how to do it

His first problem was to show how superior Jesus was to a people whose goddess has similar attributes to Jesus (See Acts 19). Because of the similarities, enough Christians wavered between the two (Artemis and Jesus) to make it necessary for Paul to write to them and explain how superior Jesus was over Artemis as well as what lifestyle was expected from a follower of Jesus.

Thus we have the Epistle to the Ephesians - a book illustrating the superiority of Jesus over the devil and his representative (Artemis), Illustrating what Jesus did for us as well as how Christians should live and fight Satan. It is a book of spiritual things that have their effect in the natural and should really be read as such.

I am going to list things about Artemis, which Paul had to deal with in his letter to Ephesus. He did not deal with all of them but with some of them. As you read Ephesians look for how he answered the claims of the followers of Artemis. Some of these claims are still around today and the lessons of Ephesians, in regards to the cult of Artemis, are still valid today because the demons behind Artemis are still active in New Age teaching and Satanism.

## **Beginnings (according to Mythology)**

Born out of an adulterous relationship between Zeus and Leto (two Olympian gods) and had a brother named Apollo who was god of the sun.

## **Position**

Goddess of the moon and the hunt.

Goddess of childbirth and virginity.

Part of an unholy trinity:Selene	Moon goddess
Artemis	On earth
Hecate	In the lower world

Supposed Power (enacted by the demons behind Artemis)

Control over life and death - able to bring new life into the world or to take it away.

Worshipped at Ephesus as supreme in divine power and position, governing all things.

Able to resurrect people from the dead.

Goddess of the underworld, controlling demons there and in nature as well as the dead in the underworld.

Able to help people with magic spells and invoked by magicians to do so.

Able to deliver people from any peril involving evil spirits. (who would want to be delivered from good spirits!)

Goddess of 'nourishing' power - able to empower people (symbolized by her many breasts).

Immortal goddess - the demon behind her still is around to promote her style of life.

Able to heal you if you got her favour.

She was the great 'mother goddess' - the mother of all life

Protector of the young (human and animals), maidenhood and pregnancy.

### **Attributed to her**

Chaste, virgin goddess, some of whose followers also followed chastity, some even castrating themselves. Her followers practiced ritual prostitution and human sacrifice. (If you killed a pregnant deer - an animal associated with her - you had to sacrifice one of your own children, although this sacrificing rarely appeared to occur.

### **Known as:**

The goddess of the night

The goddess of fruitfulness

The huntress

The lady of the beasts

The woodland goddess

The bull goddess

The personification of the moon

The eternal virgin

Protector of all who give life

Goddess of hunting and childbirth

She did not rise from the dead as Jesus did neither was she morally pure as He was. Her character was changed over the centuries from an angry vengeful goddess to one that was chaste and pure and protected women so that she was like Jesus when He was born. Just as Jesus was pure and chaste and had a special spot in his heart for women because of the way many of them were treated.

To worship her required sacrifice and ritual and to get to their version of heaven required meeting her requirements (as told by her priests). We are told in Ephesians that faith and obedience are necessary and we do not have to work to get salvation as it is a free gift of God.

The armour of a Christian was to fight Artemis and all like her. Paul tells us in Ch 6:1-12 that we are not fighting Artemis but the demons behind her who controlled the temple of Artemis and the priests that served in it. These demons are still around today and need to be fought the same way the demons behind Artemis were fought.

### **Character**

About Artemis it could be said 'the woman, she is fickle.'

Archetype of femininity and feminism - men have no part in her life.

Known for her anger, revenge and unforgiveness

Killed or threatened all who threatened her.

Vengeful on those that affronted her.

Killed all her followers who broke their vow of chastity - even if raped.

Was involved in lesbian relationships.

Dressed immorally later in her evolution as a goddess - wore hunting dress and not the long flowing tunics of women.

Enjoyed leading the dances of her associates (nymphs, muses and charities).

Legalist - supposedly sent a wild boar to ravage a kingdom where the king forgot to offer a sacrifice to her but remembered all the other gods.

Today, we have the same demons Paul had to face in Ephesus. Unless our lives show Christianity's power and teaching as better than that which the world around us offers, the people in the world will not be interested in what we are trying to communicate with (our life and empowerment), let alone our message.

This is where the powerless, current church system fails, which does not demonstrate the Authority of The Kingdom of God over demons and the natural world, fails and so the church with its language and terms (which normally are not understood by the world and) is irrelevant to people outside of it..

Unless the church catches the power and teachings of Ephesians, it will not succeed in the Great Commission

As a side note it is to be remembered that Diana and Artemis were the same goddess so to fully look at this contrast one should also look at the epistles to the Corinthians where the people who formerly worshipped Diana carried into the church there some of their practices.

### **Things found in Ephesians.**

The trinity is found in Ephesians as each person of the Godhead is addressed individually in respect of what they have done for us in Jesus. And as the work of each is mentioned it is by implication contrasted with what the religion of Artemis promoted. All the way through Paul shows how superior the things of God are compared to those of Artemis.

She was a favourite goddess of the rural populace and was worshipped in different places through out the Roman empire and in different ways according to the local populace's understanding of whom she was. So Paul calls for unity in The Spirit to show Jesus is the same everywhere as He was divinely revealed to all wherever they were and was not just in the imagination of people.

Her domain was earth and its animals so Jesus is shown as being ruler of heaven where the 'god's, including Artemis, would supposedly have resided.

She was a goddess to be feared and appeased if you wanted to have a good afterlife and this appeasement was done through sacrifice and ritual. God is showing providing us with salvation through faith and obedience out of His Love for us.

She was a protector of women. Paul shows God protects all and does not favour women over men. He addresses men and women equally in his letter and not just women or men.

### **The question is begged "What is the Wisdom of God? How superior is God's Wisdom to that of Artemis?"**

Firstly, it is spiritual Wisdom and not earthly (worldly) wisdom (1 Cor. 1:20,21).

Secondly, it is the knowledge of Jesus and what The Father has done through Him (1 Cor. 1:24, 30).

Thirdly, it can only be revealed by the Holy Spirit, thus the need to be Spirit filled and led by the Holy Spirit! (Eph. 3:3-5).

Fourthly, It is knowledge of things of the true God revealed to us by Jesus and not according to what the priests of Artemis thought it should be.

Ephesians is about the superiority of Jesus and It details: what The Father has done through Jesus, what the Spirit is doing now, as well as what is expected from those indwelt by the Holy Spirit, who have reaped the benefits of what The Father has done through Jesus!

## **Gods Love and its Expression in Ephesians**

Subject: God's Love, how superior it is to what (Artemis) Satan offers and how it is to be worked out in relationships.

Purpose: To show God's Loves is superior to what Artemis offered her followers and that Jesus is superior to Artemis because of what He did as a result of this love.

Premise: God Loves us and desires a relationship with us to express His love toward us, doing so in His Mercy and Grace, freeing us from fear. Artemis (really the demons behind this figurehead) cannot express love as demons only know how to fear, and thus relate to her followers in fear and legalism.

Comment on this premise: God Loves us and helps us when we do not deserve it, in His Love Mercy and Grace freeing us from fear. Demons (Artemis) use people for their purposes and control them through fear, keeping them in bondage.

Conclusion: We are at war with the demons behind Artemis as we have left their area of control and now must battle demons to stay free. It is how we express God's Love as directed by the Holy Ghost that will determine how we succeed in the battle. It is a result of faith in Jesus and nothing we have done .

Comment: It is a book that showing the superiority of Christ over Artemis but it shows it through God's Love expressed towards us as attributes of each, such as divinity, raising the dead, healing, childbirth etc cannot be used as these abilities were ascribed to both Jesus and Artemis.

This is why relationships are dealt with in chapters 5 and 6.

Ephesians illustrates how to approach people in the new age, detailing God's Love and Grace and not the theology as the gods of the new age have basically all the attributes of Jesus but they do not have His love and freedom and that is alone is what sets Jesus apart from them.

You cannot use the moral laws of Christianity as these people follow the laws of their god and you cannot use theology as they have their own. All you can show is God's superiority over Artemis and that He loves them and desires a relationship of Love with them and that Jesus can set them free if they follow Him (which is where deliverance and inner healing and the other demonstrations of The Kingdom of God come into play).

Eph 1:3-14 What God's Love has done for us

Eph 1:15-23 Paul prays they may see and understand God's Love for them

Eph 2:1-7 God's Love removed us from the kingdom of Satan and the control of demons to the protection and blessings of His Kingdom.

Eph 2:8-10 A result of Faith in Jesus and His finished work and not anything we can do except believe in Jesus and what He has done.

Eph 2:11-22 The expression of God's Love to us was done through Jesus and His death on the cross.

Eph 4:1-6:10 How this Love is to be expressed in relationships.

Eph 6:10-19 Love for God will cause us to prepare for war and fight His enemy.

Ephesians was written to remind the converts there of how superior Christ is to Artemis and that the real enemy were the Demons behind her. They were also reminded of the new lifestyle based on the expression of the quality of God's Love and not on the fear of the wrath of Artemis. John 3:16 has no comparison in the theology of Artemis.

**So the object of Ephesians was threefold:**

Show the superiority of Christ over Artemis .

Warn them of falling back into the ways of worshipping Artemis .

Remind them of the battle being with demons and not the people the demons are using

**In Conclusion**

Study this book well and you will understand how to fight the New Age because you will be able to show how superior Jesus is to the 'god's of the New Age.

Artemis this is just an old version of the New Age so in Ephesians Paul is also telling you about the battle we have with the New Age. The principles we learn in Ephesians and how to fight Artemis are the principles we will need to use to defeat the new age.

It is noted that signs and wonders, the expression of The Kingdom of God, drew people to Jesus and not just words. So the church needs to demonstrate the authority of The Kingdom over that of Satan if they are to reach people who are in the New Age.

Question: If Artemis is the goddess Paul is showing Jesus is greater than, then why is she not mentioned in the book?

Answer: Artemis was a greatly admired goddess and people came from all over the middle east to visit her temple. They came because of what she was supposedly able to do so that Paul did not need to show these things in his letter to Ephesus. Everyone would know what he was showing in what areas Jesus was greater than Artemis.

**Were Westcott and Hort able to make a New Geek Text?**

Before examining their changers to Ephesians and the e effects on its purposes we need to examine:

**The guidelines for the revision of The Authorised Version**

Did the editors of t hie New Greek have the authority to make a New Greek text and an English translation from it?

Were the tests they derived to justify their approach valid?

Was their attitude to the doctrine of the King James valid so that the doctrinal changes they made were correct?

Were they authorised to make these doctrinal changes?

### **Did they have authority to write the New Greek?**

Authority to revise The Bible can only come from God and be under His guidance and direction.

So what Authority were they given to revise The King James Bible? And if they exceeded this authority was it with the permission of God and under His guidance and direction?

Were the people who authorised this new translation authorised by God to do it?

It appears it was from reason that it was done and not God's instructions so that at the outset it was going to be flawed.

The fundamental Resolutions adopted by the Convocation of Canterbury on the third and fifth days of May were as follows:

1. That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.
2. That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorised Version.
3. That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where in the judgement of the most competent scholars such change is necessary.
4. That in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing Version be closely followed.
5. That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.'

The Principles and Rules agreed to by the Committee of Convocation on the twenty-fifth day of May 1870 were as follows:-

1. To Introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorised Version consistently with faithfulness.
2. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorised and earlier English Versions.
3. Each Company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided. (So much for the guidance of The Holy Spirit).
4. That the Text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating: and that when the Text so adopted differed from that from which the Authorised Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin.

5. To make or retain no change in the Text on the second final revision by each Company, except two thirds of those present approve of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.
6. In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereupon till the next Meeting, whensoever the same shall be required by one third of those present at the Meeting, such intended vote to be announced in the notice for the next Meeting.
7. To revise the headings of chapters and pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuation.
8. To refer, on the part of each Company, when considered desirable, to Divines, Scholars, and Literary Men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions.'

As it can be seen no new Greek or translation was authorised. So they were not authorised to make a new Greek text or a translation made from this text.

They did not believe God had protected His Bible Greek because of the mess it was supposedly in and they did not believe The Holy Spirit spoke to people and guided them in things.

So where did they get the Authority to make the New Greek? It was not from God. They must have assumed it themselves for their own purposes which is why they chose the Sinaiticus as it allows them to remove the Greek of the King James that they hated and replace it with a Greek more amenable to their doctrine.

Did they have authority to change doctrine?

If they did not have the authority to make a new Greek text then there was not authority to change doctrine because that would have meant making a New Greek text in places or removing text already there and also they were not authorised to make any changes to doctrine by the spiritual authority giving them the work of updating the text.

Conclusion about authority

It can be seen that they were not authorised to make a new Greek and a translation from that New Greek so that they had no authority to make the changes they did to the Greek of the King James and to ignore 1800 years of doctrine tradition.

Satan finally was able to destroy the foundation of Christianity (The Bible) and when the New International Version came out in (it was so bad that some Jehovah's Witnesses preferred it to their bible for witnessing) the western church went into decline and the Gospel was no longer a priority or an imperative.

Can anything good come out of outright rebellion against authority?

**The three main texts used**

**Codex 2472**

This was used to translate the Gospel of Mark in the 7th UBS Greek edition but was not used in the Revised Version as it was not known at the time of the making of the Greek for the Revised Version.

This has been proved to be a fake being based on an edition of the Vaticanus. It has Mark 16:9-21 in it which shows the Vaticanus in 1846 has this in it but it was removed before the Vaticanus was published.

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.

It also has so many corrections that it is impossible to determine which correction is the correct one to use for Bible Translation purposes.

Another problem is that, although it was supposedly written by a Greek it uses Latin Vulgate names which does not make sense. It could only have been written by a Catholic scholar as no other religion would have used the Latin Vulgate names.

Modern Bibles use this as one of the basis of translation but according to their method of choosing texts to translate they should not have used it. There is no guarantee that its text is the best available for Bible translation purposes especially since it appears to have been a forgery.

### **Codex Sinaiticus**

The Sinaiticus came into existence as follows:

Simonides was the greatest forger of documents the 1800's had. He was so good they had to ask him for a list of documents he forged. He claimed he forged the Sinaiticus. How could he say that?

His uncle was the Abbott of a monastery Simonides was staying at. His uncle wanted to send a gift to the Czar of Russia so the Czar might give them a printing press to preserve all the documents in the monastery.

So he had Simonides do a New Testament for him to give to the Czar. There was one problem. His uncle did not like the King James and the Greek it was based on so had Simonides write a Greek that was different to the one used for the King James Version.

So Simonides made a Greek text (The Sinaiticus) which was different to the King James Greek. He was seen doing this by others at the monastery so there were witnesses to Simonides doing this Greek text.

Because it was on new vellum the pages were white which caused a problem when trying to say the Sinaiticus was Fourth century.

The white pages were seen by the Lewis sisters, a Bohemian theologian. The pages sent to King Frederick were white as were the pages in Russia and discovered in the 1990's in the monastery it was originally found in. But Tischendorf's pages are brown.

When the person who had seen Simonides forge the Sinaiticus told Tischendorf of this, Tischendorf refused to believe him.

Tischendorf was a liar who lied to his own wife and family and lied about how he got the manuscript.

It was not, as he said, found in a pile of documents waiting to be burnt because you do not burn vellum because it stinks so much if you do. He did not get given it but borrowed it and never returned it (in other words he stole it).

When Westcott and Hort saw the Sinaiticus and how it was against the King James they embraced it and used its reading whenever it and the Vaticanus differed.

It allowed them to write their heresy into the New Greek they had made for the purposes of making a new translation..

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

So we have the forger and a person who witnessed the forgery say it was a fake and no one wanted to believe them and no record of it anywhere before it was 'discovered'.

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 2472 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.

It also had Mark 16:9-21 but this was rewritten out.

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

Can you trust a manuscript that removes the delegated authority Jesus gave us over Satan and so removes from the Christian church the one main weapon we have against Satan?

God would not remove it but Satan would.

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.

### **Conclusions re texts**

It can be seen that the texts they used were ineligible for use as a basis to make a New Greek from let alone a translation of this New Greek so that the changes they made to the Greek were not valid which means all modern translations of the Bible are invalid as they are based on erroneous texts and a text that is not eligible to be used under their guidelines.

### **Modern Bibles**

Modern theologians believe in the copying of the Greek text over the last 1800 years errors have crept into it so that it no longer represents what God said and that they have to work out what God meant to say. However they really mean the errors crept in between 70 and 400 AD just before Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were supposedly written.

It is hard to imagine in that short period over 20% of The Bible was corrupted which is what is implied by their adjustments and alterations to The Bible total.

They choose what they believe are the oldest manuscripts we can rely on (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) which disagree with each other over 3000 times and expect to make order out of this confusion.

They remove or change 20% of the Authored version (backed up by 5400+ documents) based on a handful of Greek texts of which only two (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) are relatively complete.

Because they believe they do not have the originals they cannot say that Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are the best manuscripts and the fact is that these manuscripts are in a minority and alter what the majority of texts say, without having a earlier codex to justify these changes that they can compare too for them to say that these changes are correct, If they had a correct text they would have used it so they cannot say that the texts they start off with are the best.

In other words, they are saying the Authorised version is incorrect in 20% of it but have no real text to show this statement is correct.

They also have no correct text to compare with which would make their Greek text redundant anyway.

There is the Syriac Peshita that has an 1800 year unbroken tradition that backs up the Authorised version so to negate this codex they say the Peshita was altered in the 4th century but have nothing historical to back this statement up.

So they alter 20% of the Authorised version to what they believe it should say without any Greek text they know is accurate to back up their alterations to the Authorised text.

### **In Summary**

They ignore the accepted Greek text used in over 5400 codices for two Greek texts backed up by a handful of texts that were ignored for 1400 years and suddenly discovered in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. They say they correct the Greek text to what God wants it to say but have no real Greek text they say is correct to back up these changes so can only assume their corrections are correct.

In other words the modern bibles are based on man's reasoned corrections and cannot be considered to be what God said but may have some of His truth in. This means they cannot be relied upon as you do not know what is of God and what is of the editor.

The Authorised can be trusted as its Greek agrees with the Syriac Peshita (circa 150 AD) and the old Itala (circa 150 AD).

There is also another real problem they have in that Vaticanus and Sinaiticus have been proven to be forgeries so can not be relied on for anything to do with Bible Translation. There is too much money involved and too much for theologians to lose to make this public so it has been hidden by modern bible publishing bodies and treated as incorrect and covered up or dismissed by them.

Do the research and you will see this is all true.

### **Assumptions Westcott and Hort made that cannot be proved correct**

There is no way to prove what they assumed was correct so that is no basis really for the attitude they took when making their new Greek text.

### **So what assumptions did they make?**

The first assumption was to assume their assumptions were correct then wrote reasons (not all valid) for justifying them.

They assumed errors had crept in to the copying of the texts over the centuries which needed to be corrected

They assumed they had more accurate text than those used for the King James then picked texts that backed up their doctrinal errors and changed it to match their belief system altering Christian doctrine.

They assumed their belief system was more important than that held by the Christian church for an unbroken period of over 1800 years.

They assumed they knew what God originally wanted to say in His Bible so were able to correct it.

They assumed they had the authority to do these things

We need to examine these six assumptions to see how valid they were.

The first assumption was to assume their assumptions were correct then wrote reasons (not all valid) for justifying them.

As they relied on no external person or body to verify or contradict these assumptions were correct they believed they were. So we need to look from an external perspective as to whether or not they were correct.

Assumptions are never a basis for final positions as they are used to test positions to reach a conclusion. So these assumptions should not have been used without retesting to see if they were true by others and not just themselves. This alone would indicate their assumptions were incorrect as they did not reveal them to the world until after their New Greek had been published.

They assumed errors had crept in to the copying of the texts over the centuries which needed to be corrected

How do they know errors crept in when by their own omission they do not have any original documents to compare original to the Greek of the New Testament. One would think that the 99% of texts that agree, which they ignored, would indicate consistency of copying. So why did they pick less than 1% of codices to be used for their new Greek. Perhaps it was because they suited their heretical doctrines.

They assumed they had more accurate text than those used for the King James then picked texts that backed up their doctrinal errors and changed it to match their belief system altering church doctrine.

How could they know the texts they chose were more accurate when they did not have the originals to compare them too? Especially since the texts they chose were ignored by orthodox Christianity for nearly 1400 years.

They assumed their belief system was more important than that held by the Christian church for an unbroken period of over 1800 years.

To change established doctrine they must have believed their doctrinal viewpoint was more important than established doctrine. So who confirmed their doctrinal view points were correct?

It was not those asking them to make the revision of The King James.

It was no one apart from themselves as no one else knew of the New Greek text they had made until after the Revised Version Bible, based on this New Greek Text, had been published.

So there was no confirmation that their doctrinal viewpoint was correct which is why they kept it secret until it was made public so that no one could show the errors in it.

They assumed they knew what God originally wanted to say in His Bible so were able to correct it.

Their God did not communicate with copyists so why would He tell them why would he communicate with them to tell them what to correct? We are also told by God that we cannot understand His mind so for them to think they could is ridiculous.

They assumed they had the authority to do these things

It was not given to them by man and it certainly did not come from God given the alterations they made to The Bible so that to be self assumed which means no one else was able to examine their claim.

In Conclusion

It be seen that no one was there to examine their assumptions and that had no authority from God to make a New Greek. It is interesting that they worked on in secret for years so no one would know what they were doing.

These things can only mean Satan was behind it as God does not do things of such importance in secret but openly because there is nothing to hide from orthodoxy. The fact they hid what they were doing from the Christian church for many years shows that what they were doing was not acceptable as being correct for the purpose of doctrine and Bible translation.

### **Alterations Made**

The following is from the Wikipedia

[https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revised\\_Version](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revised_Version)

*“The New Testament revision company was commissioned in 1870 by the convocation of Canterbury. Their stated aim was "to adapt King James' version to the present state of the English language without changing the idiom and vocabulary," and "to adapt it to the present standard of Biblical scholarship." To those ends, the Greek text that was used to translate the New Testament was believed by most to be of higher reliability than the Textus Receptus. The readings used were compiled from a different text of the Greek Testament by Edwin Palmer.*

*The revisers were charged with introducing alterations only if they were deemed necessary to be more accurate and faithful to the Original Greek and Hebrew texts. In the New Testament alone more than 30,000 changes were made, over 5,000 on the basis of what were considered better Greek manuscripts.”*

The question arises as why 25000 changes were made if it was not because of a better text as the reading would not change if the text did not change. It could only be because of doctrinal belief that they had held differently from that of the text.

An example is Is 7:14 where the word ”virgin” is translated as “young woman” removing an important prophecy about the divinity of Christ.

Westcott and Hort did not believe in the divinity of Christ so this was removed along with 1 John 5:7.

There are numerous other example where changes wee made because of their doctrinal beliefs being different to the orthodoxy expressed in the King James text.

### **Guided by Satan?**

The work they did was in complete rebellion against the Spiritual authority over them. God does not cause this rebellion but Satan does. They also did it in complete secrecy so that no one could see what they were doing and show the error of their text. God does not do things in secret but openly for people to be able to examine and find any errors in the text. So it must be concluded that behind this travesty of a Bible was Satan.

### **Six 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 disliked 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) and This means there is no foundation to these modern bibles as they use texts to translate from which are forgeries or their criteria say are ineligible to be used for translation purposes.

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 Jesus promises to lead us into all truth Jn16:13.

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 Greek used for bibles up too and including 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 cannot know is accurate as they have nothing older than the Fourth century to compare it with. They have a text based on three proven forgeries so they really have no basis for a translation as they do not have a text that fulfils their requirements to be able to be used for translation.

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.

### **How the adjustments were justified**

The following are comments on the

“COMPANION

TO THE REVISED VERSION

OF THE ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT

BY

ALEX. ROBERTS, D.D.,

NEW TESTAMENT COMPANY. (Of the Revised Version New Testament Committee)

Cassell, Fetter, Galpin & Co.:

LONDON, PARIS, NEW YORK “

(Which was released before the Revised Version English translation of the New Testament was released)

*Preface*

*The object of this little work is to explain to the English reader the general grounds of those many departures from the Authorised Version which he will find in the Revised translation. Not one of these alterations has been made without what appeared to a majority of the Revisers an adequate reason.*

The editors voted on the adjustment and did not ask The Holy Spirit what to do.

*They are all to be traced to one or other of two causes either to a change of the Greek text which it was found necessary to adopt, or to a change of translation which stricter fidelity to the original seemed to require.*

(According to their heretical doctrinal view point s).

*Under these two heads, all necessary explanations (so far as space permitted), will be found in the following pages.*

*For the sake of those who are acquainted with the original, the Greek words referred to have been some times given at the bottom of the page, but the text will be perfectly intelligible without these to the English reader.*

*It is scarcely needful to add that for what is here written the author alone is responsible.*

*Alex Roberts*

Two reasons are given for the alterations to the English text made by the Revised Version:

*A change of the Greek text which it was found necessary to adopt,*

*A change of translation which stricter fidelity to the original seemed to require*

As these are the only two reasons given for the change they will need to be examined for their being necessary.

In Wikipedia we are told:

*The revisers were charged with introducing alterations only if they were deemed necessary to be more accurate and faithful to the Original Greek and Hebrew texts. In the New Testament alone more than 30,000 changes were made, over 5,000 on the basis of what were considered better Greek manuscripts.”*

So it is obvious that 25000 changes were made to the English text without any changes to the Greek because they thought the King James translated the Greek incorrectly.

Firstly: no one had pointed out these errors before the Revised Version committee found them so it is strange they ‘all of a sudden’ found 25000 errors in translation.

Secondly: some of the greatest Greek speaking theologians translated the King James Version and the Revised Version Committee implied these people did into know how to translate Greek correctly. This is a ridiculous assumption.

The only conclusion is that the changes were made to back up their beliefs and support their erroneous doctrines.

They did not believe in the divine preservation of the Bible so had to change Ps12:5-7 so that Israel was preserved and not the Bible which is rubbish as Israel as a nation was not preserved. This belief also allowed them to change what they wanted to so that their doctrine was promoted by the text.

Their comment on the Bible's preservation is on page 4 and reads as follows:

*How different does the case stand in regard to the New Testament! No miracle has been wrought to preserve its text as it came from the pens of the inspired writers. That would have been a thing altogether out of harmony with God's method of governing the world. The manuscripts containing a record of the divine will have been left, like others, to suffer from those causes of error which will presently be mentioned. But a gracious providence has, nevertheless, been exerted in connection with the text of the New Testament. It has been so ordered that vastly more copies of the sacred volume have come down to us in manuscript than of any other ancient writing. We learn from the best authorities on the subject that no fewer than 1,760 manuscripts of the New Testament, in whole or in parts, are known to scholars in our day, "The most important of these will be afterwards described. But it is enough at present imply to note the existence of such a wealth of material, in order to feel how abundant is the means with which it has pleased God to furnish us for ascertaining, through careful examination and comparison, the true text of the New Testament.*

So there are errors because of copyists but we have so many manuscripts that we can work out what was meant to be said. The problem is that most back the Greek of the King James Version so were ignored.

This shows their belief that they know the mind of God to be able to say what He desired to be said without asking The holy Spirit about what to correct and how to correct it which is why a vote was taken on corrections instead of asking God what to do.

The texts used for translation purposes

*Thus, then, stood the text of the Greek New Testament when the revisers of the Bishops' Bible set themselves to form from it our present Authorised English Version. Not one of the four most ancient manuscripts was then known to be in existence. Even Codex D, which was known, had scarcely any weight assigned to it, and the whole Greek text had been based upon a very few modern manuscripts.*

*(Vaticanus was known to the King James editors but was rejected as too heretical and not a good text to use).*

*The ancient versions had not been examined. No careful investigation had been made into the testimony to the primitive text borne by the Fathers. Textual criticism was still in its infancy, the materials for it had not been gathered, the principles of the science had not been studied, and the labours of Mill, Bentley, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and other great scholars, to secure the purity of the text of the New Testament, were as yet unheard of, and only to be put forth in the course of many future generations.*

*In these circumstances can it be wondered at that vast multitudes of changes will be found in the Revised English Version, owing to an amended text? The wonder really is that they are so few, or, at least, that they are, in general, of such small importance. When we trace, as has been briefly done, the parentage of our English Bible, and when we see on what a slender basis of authority it rests, when we confront with this the enormous wealth of materials for settling the true Greek text which we possess at the present day, and the amount of labour which has been expended in applying them, we might well fear that the alterations requiring to be made in the Bible with which we have all our days been familiar should be of the most revolutionary character.*

(They used less than 1% of available Greek texts choosing ones that satisfied their doctrinal requirements).

*But, blessed be God, such is not the case. No doctrine of the faith is in the slightest degree affected.*

(According to their concept of what was doctrine).

*False supports of important doctrines may be removed, and true defences of them may be supplied, but that is all. The Bible remains, for all practical purposes, totally unaffected. That is one grand result of the labours of the New Testament Revision Company, for which all English Christians have good reason to be thankful. They now know the utmost that Biblical science demands.*

*No suspicion need in future haunt them that the Scriptural truths which they love are insecure. These have been proved to rest on an immovable foundation, and they will endure as long as the Divine Word that reveals them, "which liveth and abideth for ever;" But more than this, every loyal Christian heart should surely rejoice to have access, in as pure a form as possible, to the message sent us by our Father in heaven. That is the great positive work which has been aimed at by the New Testament Company, and the fulfilment of which is presented in the Revised Version. English readers of the Scriptures have now the opportunity of making themselves acquainted with the New Testament in a form more nearly representing the primitive text than they ever had before.*

*(which is hard to imagine as no one knows what the original text looks like to be able to say it closely resembles it).*

*Most of the changes made hardly affect the sense, but many even of these alterations are highly interesting. Some few others are of great importance, and will naturally attract more attention from readers of the Revised Version. To these two classes of changes which have been required by an amendment of the text we shall advert at some length in the two following chapters.*

From their comments above at the end of the third chapter after discussing the texts they used and those used for the King James Version it can be seen they did not think much of the Greek behind the King James and pointed out as many problems as they could with them.

Their comments that no doctrine has been changed is because they placed their doctrinal views in the Greek Text they used provided by Westcott and Hort and ignored the doctrine of the King James believing it to be incorrect as it was supposedly based on inferior manuscripts.

There is so much presumption and assumptions behind their changes that at times is more like a work of fiction.

In chapter 4 they deal with examples of minor changes caused by a change of text. In other words the Greek text does not change but they have changed the English translation of it. They try and justify all the changes they mention:

*They say that "In the majority of cases, however, the changes caused by a change of text, will, on consideration, commend themselves as improvements. They will be found to impart greater clearness, terseness, or force, to the Version. Thus, there is a vividness at Mark i. 27, "And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying. What is this? a new teaching! with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him," which does not belong to the Authorised Version. Thus, again, it will be felt to be with the remarkable variation which occurs at 2 Cor. i. 20, where we read in the Revised Version, "For how many soever be the promises of God, in him is the yea: wherefore also through him is the Amen, unto the glory of God through us."\* As has been well observed, the "yea" here "denotes the fulfilment of the promise on the part of God, and 'Amen' the recognition and thanksgiving on the part of the Church, a distinction which is obliterated by the received reading."\* So, at i John v. 13, it is an obvious gain to get rid of the clumsy and almost absurd repetition which occurs in the Authorised Version, and to read simply, "These*

*things have I written unto you, that ye may know ye have eternal life, unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God." But whether the true readings be deemed improvements or not, they should always be welcomed simply on the ground of their genuineness. To find out what is true is the supreme object of Biblical science ; and while, no doubt, there \* Lightfoot, On a fresh revision of the New Testament, p. 52. may often seem an artificial attractiveness about what is erroneous, there should always be felt a sovereign majesty in truth. With these remarks, let us look at some of the minor changes which have been made in the Revised Version owing to a change of text. I shall first take a few from each of the Gospels, and then some from the other books of the New Testament."*

They give examples and ignore the fact of the effect on other parts of The Bible.

*St. Matthews' Gospel. At chap. v. 22, the Revised Version omits the words " without a cause. ^ The evidence from manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, is here not quite conclusive, but the internal evidence is clear. It is obvious that a strong temptation presented itself to transcribers to insert the words, in order to soften the apparent harshness of the precept, whereas, had they existed in the primitive text, it is scarcely possible to account for their having been dropped. There is little, if any, doubt, therefore, that they ought to disappear.*

Their comments ignore two things:

Jesus was angry and to remove 'without cause turns Him into a sinner who cannot redeem us.,

God is a judge and does not lessen His sentence because we think it is too hard.

Another example given is:

*St. Luke Gospel, At chap. xvi. 9 we find the interesting change of " it " for " ye," and read in the Revised Version^ \*' Make to yourselves friends out of the mammon of unrighteousness, that, when it shall fail, they (the friends whom you have thus made) may receive you into the eternal tabernacles."*

*Luk 16:9 And I say to you, Make friends for yourselves through the wealth of this life, so that when it comes to an end, you may be taken into the eternal resting-places.*

The RV has "mammon of unrighteousness" which implies wealth is wrong., The KJV has "wealth of this life" which is neutral because money is only evil if evilly used and can be beneficial to others if used properly.

*The Acts of the Apostles, At chap. xv. 23 we find an interesting example of the alteration which may take place in the meaning from a very slight change in the text. The words " and the " are simply omitted, and we then read, "The apostles and the elder brethren," instead of "The apostles, and the elders, and the brethren."*

Note that the RV leaves out normal members of the congregation and mentions only those who lead the people like Nicolaitans lead the people.

*"and it is supported by A, C, D, k^ the most important versions, and many of the Fathers. At chap. vii. 6 a reading was introduced by Beza into his third edition, which was a mere conjecture of his own, and is supported by not a single manuscript or version*

This shows their bias to the versions they want to use as they ignore all the texts used for the King James and choose only the ones they want to. They will also point out that the Sinaiticus is the preferred reading over all the others including the Greek texts used for the King James Version. They ignored 99% of the Greek texts and focused on two main ones (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus as and a few incomplete Greek texts.

In 1 Cor 11:24 they omit that Christ was broken on the cross as if the cup cause Him no suffering. Why remove Calvary? They did not believe in redemption so the sacrifice of Jesus at Calvary for our redemption had to be removed.

There are other changes that change the English sense without the Greek having changed and you wonder why they did this. Instead of making the King James clearer they changed the meaning of the text for which no real basis seemed to be for their doing do.

This applies to many other changes they made.

Chapter 5 deals with changes in the English caused by Greek textual differences.

They select five texts they say are the best and ignore the ones used for the King James translation. They use one rejected by the King James translators (Vaticanus) because they reckoned it was useless for Bible translation work because it has so many corrections and still had error in it..

So the people behind the Greek for the RV used 5 manuscripts mainly, ignoring the over 1800 that backed up the King James Version. This alone shows they had a hidden agenda and were promoting their own ideals and not those of orthodox Christianity or they would not have altered the King James Version's doctrine.

Of these five manuscripts they mainly used two: Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

Vaticanus and Sinaiticus differ in over 3000 places in the Gospels so you wonder how they can make a uniform text from them. Not only that, but Vaticanus was corrected at least 8 times by different people then cast aside for 1400 years as being worthless. So you wonder how they could work out what God originally wanted to say in His Bible.

Sinaiticus was used as the main correcting text and there is one big problem with it. The finder of it, Tischendorf, was told by the forger and a witness to its forgery that Sinaiticus was a forgery but Tischendorf ignored them because of the fame and notoriety it bought him. He was also seen darkening the pages with lemons to make it look more ancient. So the main text they used was a forgery and the other text was considered useless for Bible Translation purposes. This is why I will not bother examining changes in the Greek as there is no basis for the New Greek being taken seriously as a basis for Bible translation.

All modern Bibles are based on a fake Greek text, that has no basis for its existence and the whole of modern Bible theology is based on a fraud

### **The Attitudes of Westcott and Hort**

In 1862 Westcott published a book titled "A General View of the History of the English Bible. It is a scholarly work examining the external influences on the English Bible as well as variances between them., From this he must have assumed that they were copied incorrectly because there was so much difference between the various Bibles and source material.

He did not belittle the editors of the Authorised Version and said the following about them;

*"they were competent to deal independently with questions of Hebrew and Greek scholarship Like the earlier translators suffered most from the corrupt form in which the Greek text of the New Testament was presented to them. But as a whole their work was done carefully and honesty."*

So he respected their scholarship but concluded their Greek texts were faulty. It is obvious he did not believe God was able to preserve His Scriptures. One can see why Westcott sought what he considered to be better Greek texts.

He also observed:

*“They did not in every case carry out the principles by which they were generally directed”*

Perhaps this is why he felt he could ignore the guidelines he had been given as the editors of the Authorised text also appeared to have done this.

Note that when the Authorised text is described as ‘vile’ by Westcott and Hort, it is in an old sense of being useless and corrupt not of being evil. You can understand they thought this after looking at the English Bibles and the number of variations in them.

So when he formed a New Greek text, he modified to promote his doctrine which he considered more correct than that of the Authorised Version. Unfortunately his doctrine was heretical in ways.

What follows is a summary of an excellent document on the subject found at

Source: <http://www.nivexposed.faithweb.com/custom3.html>

Which I can recommend if you desire more information on the subject.

### **In regard to Hort**

He did not believe in the God of The Bible that had said that He preserved His Bible so that no errors crept into it when it was transmitted down the ages. This is why the Westcott and Hort theory states that the Bible is to be treated as you would treat any other book.

He did not believe the text used for the Authorised Version was correct. Westcott and Hort believed the Greek text which underlies the AV was perverse and corrupt. Hort called the Textus Receptus vile and villainous (Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, Vol., p.211).

### **The Scriptures:**

He rejected the infallibility of the Scriptures and thought their faith was a compromise. He did not hold a high opinion of the inspiration of The Bible and its Authority.

### **The Deity of Christ:**

He did not believe Jesus was God but only pointing people to God

### **Salvation:**

He did not believe in redemption or Salvation purely through faith.

### **Hell:**

He did not believe that hell was a place of punishment but a place where departed spirits went and progressed to higher states.

### **Creation:**

He disbelieved the first three chapters of Genesis and followed evolutionary thought.

### **Romanism:**

He worshipped Mary and believed in the Catholic Sacraments.

### **Doctrines**

He did not believe in many of the traditional doctrines held by The Church.

### **Hort's Atonement**

He rejected the Atonement of Jesus which meant He did not accept Jesus redeemed us.

Westcott held similar views which is why they were able to work on the New Greek together.

As it can be seen they thought they needed to find the correct Greek text and translate it. They did not believe the doctrine of the King James was correct as it was based on corrupted texts. So they wrote what they considered was a new Greek Text with correct (theirs) doctrine in it.

The following book details in more detail some of the points raised above and shows how truly heretical Westcott and Hort were.

[Gipp's Understandable History of the Bible](#)

©1987 by Samuel C. Gipp.

### **Conclusion**

/If you desire to know what God said you cannot use a modern Bible as they are based on forgeries and a Greek text edited by men who did not believe Jesus was divine.

You need to go to the Syriac Peshita or The Authorised Version as these are what was originally written in spite of what modern theologians say.