

The Oldest and Best Manuscripts

By Cecil J. Carter

825 18th Ave, Prince George, BC, Canada, V2L 3Z7

maranath@mag-net.com

<http://www.maranath.ca//OLDBEST.HTM>

WARNING

This paper was not intended for use as a reference book. The *Chapter Headings were not in the original essay*. They have been added to make finding things easier. **THIS ESSAY WAS WRITTEN TO BE READ STRAIGHT THROUGH.** The order was slightly modified in order to organize into chapter headings. **HOWEVER, NO MATERIAL WAS ALTERED**

Chapter Headings

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. THREE WITNESSES AGAINST THE “OLDEST AND BEST”
 - 1. Herman Hoskier
 - 2. John William Burgon
 - 3. Prebendary H. Scrivener
 - 4. Various Board Members
- III. SINAITICUS
 - 1. Antiquity
 - 2. Penmanship
 - 3. Correctors
 - 4. Readings Examined
- IV. FIVE FAMOUS UNCIALS
- V. VATICANUS
 - Omissions**
 - 1. Genesis
 - 2. Psalms
 - 3. The Lord’s Prayer
 - 4. 1 Timothy
 - 5. 2 Timothy
 - 6. Titus
 - 7. Hebrews
- VI. TO HEAL THE BROKEN HEARTED
- VII. HORT
- VIII. ROME
 - 1. Infiltration
 - 2. The Firstborn
 - 3. By Himself
 - 4. Catholic Error
- IX. 1 TIMOTHY 3:16
- X. CONCLUSION

“For in Him,(Jesus Christ) dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily”. Colossians 2:9

“...and this is life eternal, that they may know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom though hast sent”. John 17:3

I. INTRODUCTION

The vast worldwide new Bible version movement depends mainly for its credibility upon the character and integrity of two ancient Greek manuscripts; namely:

(a) **VATICANUS** - or “B” as it is often designated.

(b) **SINAITICUS** - or “Aleph” (א)

Great and prestigious claims have been made by scholars for the antiquity, purity, neutrality, and authority of these two manuscripts; presently advertised as “*THE OLDEST AND BEST*”.

MY PURPOSE

To conduct an inquiry regarding the validity of those claims; and to present convincing evidence that the multitude of new Bible versions are based upon Greek manuscripts that are so depraved, mutilated, and corrupted, that the truth of God has been changed into a lie.

IN OTHER WORDS

The greatest and most successful attack of the devil, against the church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the 20th century is the flood of corrupted versions now sweeping millions of professing Christians into confusion, apostasy, and into the world church of antichrist.

Since the time of Drs. Westcott and Hort, who headed the attack on the English Authorized Version of 1611; the vast majority of scholars have, apparently without any valid reason, accepted the false claims of superiority made on behalf of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

TESTIMONY OF THE MAJORITY REJECTED.

A very high percentage of the changes of the text in modern versions are based almost solely on the witness of these two documents in spite of a vast array of evidence of manuscripts, ancient versions, and church fathers to the contrary.

On occasions more numerous than the scholars know themselves, the change has been made upon the authority of only one of these documents, while the other clearly opposed the change.

Continuously the scholars exalt these and a few other ancient documents, over the Received Text, (Textus Receptus), which underlies the magnificent Authorized, (KJV), Bible of 1611. They do not well.

THIS INQUIRY IS FAR OVERDUE!

Millions of precious souls have been deluded into the fatal step of basing their hope of salvation upon the testimony of Bible versions that skillfully downplay the “Deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ”.

WESTCOTT AND HORT

Skillfully and deceptively these men have woven an aura of antiquity and majesty about these two witnesses that have so blinded the minds of scholars that they reject the testimony of approximately 90-95% of all Greek manuscripts when they oppose their testimony. On thousands of occasions they brand each other as liars. At this point, at least, we can accept their testimony against each other.

II. THREE WITNESSES AGAINST THE “OLDEST AND BEST”

OUR FIRST WITNESS AGAINST THE “OLDEST AND BEST MANUSCRIPTS”

Herman Hoskier

“Codex B and its Allies”, chiefly Sinaiticus, lists 3036 references where Vaticanus and Sinaiticus contradict each other in the four Gospels. These are very real differences, not a matter of punctuation or differences in spelling. In every case one or the other must be in error; and in a multitude of situations both of them err.

At least 7,000 contradictions

Another has estimated there must be at least 7,000 times in the New Testament where each accuses the other of being untrue.

The differences in the four Gospels alone amount to 3,036; as follows:

Matthew	656+
Mark	567+
Luke	791+
John	1022+
<u>Total</u>	<u>3036+</u>

Codex B and its Allies P.1 Vol. 2

“It is high time that the bubble of Codex B should be pricked”. H. Hoskier “Codex B and its Allies” P.1 Vol. 1 Preface.

Hoskier, a distinguished scholar, in a magnificent rebuttal of the outrageous claims made in favour of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, has published over 900 pages of scholarly refutation; and exposure of the erroneous claims of the scholars who have believed, without verification, that these were the “oldest and best”.

“I present therefore an indictment against the manuscript B (Vaticanus) and against Westcott and Hort, subdivided into hundreds of separate counts.

I do not believe that the jurymen who will ultimately render a verdict have ever had the matter presented to them formally, legally, and in proper detail”. H. Hoskier Codex B. Vol. 1 P.1 Preface

In his remarkable analysis Hoskier directs our attention to the fact that scribes of “Vaticanus and Sinaiticus” had obviously taken many liberties with their texts. His comment on Hort’s outlandish claim that,

“Vaticanus is a neutral text”, is Neutral text indeed, neutral rubbish.

The Bible speaks the final word.

The Word of God disqualifies and rejects witnesses that disagree with each other.

“And the chief priests and all the council sought for witness against Jesus to put him to death: and found none. For many bare false witness against him, but their witness agreed not together. And there arose certain, and bare false witness against him, saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands. But neither so did their witness agree together”. Mark 14:55 -59

Obviously these witnesses differing so radically with each other must be rejected and counted as either mistaken or malicious.

NOTE - Even the Lord’s murderers would not, yea, could not accept divergent accounts as valid witnesses. Nor should modern scholars mutilate the Holy Bible on the basis of Greek Texts that owe their origin to the faulty, wavering, uncertain, contradictory evidence of the two, “Oldest and Best” manuscripts.

Yet that is precisely what so very many have done.

In the 20th century they have been presented with the “mummified” remains of manuscripts rejected by the church as unacceptable, hundreds of years ago. Every Christian that trusts a new version which is based on Westcott and Hort’s Greek text, or Nestle’s, or the eclectic text of the United Bible Societies, is accepting without challenging the versions, the testimony of false witnesses. i.e. those that are Biblically disqualified

THE TRAGEDY

Furthermore the Bible believer is constantly subjected to alterations, errors, and deletions, leaning in the direction of Roman Catholic errors. Many Protestant churches have come into bondage to Rome, by virtue of receiving and believing versions based upon the debased Codex B and it's Allies.

OUR SECOND WITNESS AGAINST THE "OLDEST AND BEST" MANUSCRIPTS

John William Burgon -

He was an illustrious scholar and a great authority on the ancient manuscripts, a steadfast defender of the infallibility of the Scriptures. In 1860, while Chaplain to an English congregation in Rome, he personally inspected Codex B (Vaticanus).

In 1862 he inspected the manuscripts in St. Catherine's Monastery; where Tischendorf had "found" Sinaiticus. Concerning the manuscripts, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, Burgon said;

"I am utterly disinclined to believe", continues Dean Burgon, "so grossly improbable does it seem - that at the end of 1800 years 995 copies out of every thousand, suppose, will prove untrustworthy; and that the one, two, three, four or five which remain, whose contents were till yesterday as good as unknown, will be found to have retained the secret of what the Holy Spirit originally inspired".

"I am utterly unable to believe, in short, that God's promise has so entirely failed, that at the end of 1800 years, much of the text of the Gospel had in point of fact to be picked by a German critic out of a wastepaper basket in the convent of St. Catherine; and that the entire text has to be remodeled after the pattern set by a couple of copies which had remained in neglect during fifteen centuries, and had probably owed their survival to that neglect; whilst hundreds of others had been thumbed to pieces, and had bequeathed their witness to copies made from them..".

Concerning B and ALEPH his remarks are as follows.

"As for the origin of these two curiosities, it can perforce only be divined from their contents. **That they exhibit fabricated texts is demonstrable.** No amount of honest copying - persevered in for any number of centuries - could by possibility have resulted in two such documents. Separated from one another in actual date by 50, perhaps by 100 years, they must needs have branched off from a common corrupt ancestor, and straightway become exposed to fresh depraving influences".

Rev. Revised P. 318

"If they had been good manuscripts, they would have been read to pieces long ago. We suspect that these two manuscripts are indebted for their preservation, solely to their ascertained evil character; which has occasioned that the one eventually found its way, four centuries ago, to a forgotten shelf in the Vatican Library; while the other, after exercising the ingenuity of several generations of critical Correctors, eventually (viz. in A.D. 1844) got deposited in the wastepaper basket of the Convent at the foot of Mount Sinai. Had B and ALEPH been copies of average purity, they must long since have shared the inevitable fate of books which are freely used and highly prized; namely, they would have fallen into decadence and disappeared from sight, but in the meantime, behold their very antiquity has come to be reckoned to their advantage; and (strange to relate) is even considered to constitute a sufficient reason why they should enjoy not merely extra-ordinary consideration, but the actual surrender of the critical judgment". (Revision Revised P.319)

Burgon continues;

"What we are just now insisting upon is only the depraved text of codices A, B, C, D, -- especially of B, D, and Aleph. And because this is a matter which lies at root of the whole controversy, and because we cannot afford that there shall exist in our reader's mind the slightest doubt on this part of the subject, we shall be constrained once and again to trouble him with detailed specimens of the contents of B, & C., in proof of the justice of what we have been alleging. We venture to assure him, without a particle of hesitation, that B, D, and Aleph (Sinaiticus), are three of the most scandalously corrupt copies extant: -- exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anywhere to be met with: -- have become, by whatever process (for their history is wholly unknown), the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and intentional perversions of Truth, -- which are discoverable in any known copies of the Word of GOD".

(Revision Revised p.15, 16)

“With regret we record our conviction that these accomplished scholars, (Westcott and Hort) have succeeded in producing a text vastly more remote from the inspired autographs of the Evangelists than any which has appeared since the invention of printing”.

(Dean Burgon. Revision Revised p. 25-26)

With regard to Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

“We are able to show -- that the readings they jointly embody afford the strongest presumption that the Mss. which contain them are nothing else but specimens of those ‘corrected’, i.e. corrupted copies, which are known to have abounded in the earliest ages of the church”. (Dean Burgon)

“Nay, who will venture to deny that those codices are indebted for their preservation solely to the circumstance, that they were long since recognized as the depositaries of Readings which rendered them utterly untrustworthy”.

(Burgon Revision Revised p. 30)

“The impurity of the Texts exhibited by Codices B and Aleph, (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) is not a matter of opinion, but a matter of fact”.

“These are two of the least trustworthy documents in existence. So far from allowing Dr. Hort’s position that--’A text formed’ by ‘taking Codex B as the sole authority’, ‘would be incomparably nearer the Truth than a Text similarly taken from any other Greek or other single document’ (p.251), -- we venture to assert that it would be, on the contrary, by far the foulest Text that had ever seen the light: worse, that is to say, even than the Text of Drs. Westcott and Hort. And that is saying a great deal”.

(Revision Revised p. 316)

This illustrious scholar so greatly feared by Westcott and Hort, that after a few feeble rebuttals, they tended to ignore the battering ram criticisms of their attack on the Word of God; now calls for testimony from one of the Westcott and Hort demolition team of “revisers” of the pure English Bible.

OUR THIRD WITNESS AGAINST THE “OLDEST AND BEST” MANUSCRIPTS

Prebendary H. Scrivener M.A.

This gifted scholar now approaches the very manuscripts used by Westcott and Hort as the foundation of their Greek text, on which so many new Bible versions rely for their authority. With sledge hammer might he delivers terrible blows at the corrupt manuscripts that underlie all versions, which are based on the Greek texts, of Westcott and Hort, Nestle’s, or the eclectic texts of the United Bible Societies.

WHO is this man that arises from the ranks of Westcott and Hort team to destroy the authority of the debased and corrupted manuscripts used by his colleagues to finally deceive millions of professing Christians and bring them into the great and final apostasy? John William Burgon, an outstanding authority on Biblical manuscripts, describes Scrivener as “**THE MOST LEARNED OF THE REVISIONIST BODY**”. That is the Westcott and Hort team of “revisers”.

(Revision Revised p. 30)

Prebendary H. Scrivener M.A.

He was the only really competent textual critic of the entire revising body that worked on the team of Westcott and Hort.

It is well known that he found himself perpetually outvoted by two thirds of those present. Dr. Scrivener pleaded in vain for the general view we have ourselves advocated in this and the preceding articles. (Dean Burgon Revision Revised p. 231)

Burgon recognizes Scrivener as the leader of a few intelligent faithful scholars who were strongly opposed to the vicious attack on the Authorized (K.J.V.) Version, by Drs. Westcott and Hort and their hand picked majority. He was obviously, powerfully opposed to many of the outrageous warring of Holy Scripture that the committee voted to be the Word of God -- by a show of hands.

Scrivener remained on the committee to the finish of the English Revised Version of 1881.

How his soul must have writhed within him as he found his scholarly propositions to be constantly voted down by persons, who being themselves unqualified to judge the issues, blindly followed the powerful lead of Drs. Westcott and Hort.

Comment of Scripture!

“Let them alone”. i.e. Have nothing to do with them.

“They be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall into the ditch”.

Matthew 15:14

The present chaotic condition of the Churches is traceable to the fact that millions of professing Christians have been deceived into the tragic error of abandoning the Word of God, the sword of the Spirit, for corrupted modern Bible versions, which depend for their authority on the so called “Oldest and Best Manuscripts”.

We shall, as the Lord enables, return to Dr. Scrivener shortly.

An ominous warning that still goes unheeded.

Briefly let us look at the behaviour of other members of the scholars whose conscience’s troubled them, as the terrible objectives of Westcott and Hort became apparent.

Samuel Wilberforce

“A godly bishop of enormous influence.

The first chairman of the committee of the revisers.

His acceptance of a position on the board, greatly helped to allay the fears of many, and to secure needful backing for the project. After attending only one meeting of the committee, he withdrew, greatly saddened by that which he had discovered to be the intent of the guiding scholars”.

(Dean Burgon Revision Revised p.230)

Dean Merivale

“Another learned and accomplished Dean, (Dr. Merivale) after attending 19 meetings of the Revising body, withdrew in disgust from them entirely”.

(Dean Burgon Revision Revised p. 230)

Dr. Lee - Archdeacon of Dublin

“It is no secret that Dr. Lee - the learned Archdeacon of Dublin (one of the few really competent members of the Revising Body,) found himself perpetually in the minority”.

(Revision Revised p. 230)

A Solemn Protest

“By the way - What about a certain solemn protest, by means of which the minority had resolved ‘liberare animos suas’ concerning open disregard shown by the majority for the conditions under which they had been entrusted with the work of Revision, but which was withheld at the last moment?”

(Revision Revised p. 230)

A MUCH MORE SOLEMN PROTEST

Revelation 22:18 -19 *“For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:*

And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book”.

The Westcott Hort Greek Text: - exalting Vaticanus and Sinaiticus omitted many complete verses of Scripture from the New Testament. Mutilated almost 200 verses by excising an important portion. Placed over two dozen verses in double brackets, indicating doubt.

Dr. Scrivener

He published “A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text of the New Testament”, in 1863.

In so doing, Dr. Scrivener bequeathed to the defenders of the Textus Receptus and our beloved Authorized (K.J.V.) Bible, a mighty weapon against its adversaries.

This learned scholar in his introduction to the collation of Sinaiticus with the Received Text, levels mighty blows at this strange manuscript.

III. SINAITICUS

THE ANTIQUITY OF SINAITICUS

Scrivener repeatedly claims “High Antiquity” for Sinaiticus.

“The independent value of Codex Sinaiticus **as a critical record**, and the extreme antiquity of the readings it preserves, even when we may not on the whole be inclined to adopt them as the genuine words of the inspired penman”.

(Introduction p.40)

Here we find that this great scholar has none of the “superstitious Reverence” that Westcott and Hort, arbitrarily assigned to it.

Constantine Tischendorf, in 1844, “discovered”(?) a portion of this manuscript in a waste paper basket in St. Catherine’s Monastery on the slopes of Mount Sinai.

His published reports concerning this “find” included “A commentary on the text.....describing the **15,000** changes made by contemporary or later hands”. (Scrivener’s Introduction p.11)

Scrivener continues -

“It is no slight proof of the early date of Codex Sinaiticus, that it is covered with such alterations, brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of them systematically spread over every page, others occasional or limited to separate portions of the manuscript, many of them being contemporaneous with this first writer, far the greater part belonging to the sixth or seventh century, a few being as recent as the twelfth”. (Introduction p.19)

CONSIDER - Sinaiticus is disqualified.

Why do the scholars and translators of new Bible versions not inform us that this “Oldest and Best” manuscript which presumes to correct our English Bible, has literally thousands of changes in it which completely disqualify its claim to be one of the oldest and best?

Think carefully at this point.

Many thousands of Sinaiticus corrected readings are of the 6th and 7th centuries, a few of the twelfth.

Why were you not told this?

Do our modern Bible translators not know this?

Or do they not want you to know it?

Is this withholding of vital information ignorance or deceit on the part of the scholars? One or the other it must be.

A Manuscript with 15,000 alterations!

Another has reasoned along these lines.

If Sinaiticus, when first written, was an accurate copy of the Word of God; 15,000 alterations later it is so remote from accuracy as to completely bar it from the claim to be one of the best.

On the other hand, if the original Sinaiticus was not an accurate copy of the Word of God; and it's owners obviously felt it required improvement, to the extent of 15,000 alterations it has positively no claim to be one of "The Best". Rather it should be classified among the worst.

Would my reader dare to trust the salvation of your soul to the authority of such a mutilated, patched up document?

If you are trusting any one of the modern versions, apart from a few futile efforts to "improve" the Authorized version (K.J.V.); you are almost certainly being influenced by this strange specimen of manuscript depravity.

Antiquity

What value is there in the claim for antiquity for such manuscripts as Vaticanus and Sinaiticus?

Burgon introduces Scrivener to us as follows.

"In the brave and faithful words of Prebendary Scrivener (Introduction p. 453), words which deserve to become famous, --

'It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subject, originated within a hundred years after it was composed: that Irenaeus (A.D. 150), and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephens thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Textus Receptus.'

And Codices B and Aleph are, demonstrably, nothing else but specimens of the depraved class thus characterized".

(Revision Revised p.317)

Thus Dr. Scrivener nullifies the value of the claim of antiquity for these two principal supports for the new version movement.

NOR BY LETTER AS FROM US

The Scriptures reveal that satanically depraved manuscripts, claiming the Apostle Paul's name were being circulated, even before the New Testament was completed. These were definitely heretical.

"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand".

2Thessalonians 2:1-2

Many which corrupt, (adulterate) the Word of God

Paul the Apostle reveals the fact that satan had many persons engaged in corrupting the Word of God.

2Corinthians 2: 15 - 17 "For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish: To the one we are the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things? For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in sight of God speak we in Christ".

My readers will note the connection between, "**them that perish**" in verse 15, and "**corrupting the word of God**" in verse 17.

All sides agree with Prebendary Scrivener's claim that "the worst deprivations of the New Testament texts took place within a very few years of the time of the original writings".

The Bible informs us that the deprivations commenced before Paul wrote 2Thess. or 2Corinthians. Is it then to be marveled at, that two or more of those corrupted manuscripts, whose ancestry cannot be traced beyond the fourth century, have come forth like ghosts from the grave to breathe their foul breath of error into the minds of modern scholars to successfully lead millions of professing Christians into apostasy?

THE SLOVENLY PENMANSHIP OF SINAITICUS

“The scribe is never careful to end a word at the close of a line, since even, (two or three letter words) are habitually found divided”.

Imagine, if you will, a little word like ‘on’, or ‘to’ coming toward the end of a line. The scribe habitually would write the first letter ‘o’, then with plenty of space left would write the ‘n’ on the line below!!

“The continuity of the text is much broken by a line being left incomplete (sometimes it will contain only two or three letters.)”

This manuscript (Sinaiticus), must have been derived from one more ancient, in which the lines were similarly divided, since the writer occasionally omits just the number of letters which would suffice to fill a line, and that to the utter ruin of the sense; as if his eye had heedlessly wandered to the line immediately below.

Instances of this want of care will be found Luke 21:8; 22:25; perhaps John 4:45; 12:25, where complete lines were omitted; John 19:26; Hebrew 13:18 (partly corrected); Apoc. 18:16 19:12; 22:2, where the copyist passed in the middle of a line to the corresponding portion of the line below.

SINAITICUS ABOUNDS IN ERRORS.

“It must be confessed, indeed, that the Codex Sinaiticus abounds with similar errors of the eye and pen, to an extent not unparalleled, but happily rather unusual in documents of first rate importance....”.

“Letters and words, even whole sentences, are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately canceled: while that gross blunder technically known as Homoeoteleuton, whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the N.T., though the defect is often supplied by a more recent hand”.

(Scrivener’s Introduction p. 15)

Who would trust his life and the life of his wife and children, to a very old car that had 15,000 repair jobs done on it; and that by persons who knew little or nothing of what they were doing; whose work was slovenly and betrayed complete incompetence to do the repairs?

Scrivener Comments.

After his devastating exposure of the grotesque appearance of Sinaiticus, Prebendary Scrivener appears to give slight credence to the manuscript. Why he does so I cannot tell, nor does he give us any reason for the following tribute. One cannot help but wonder if this scholar may have been “tongue in cheek”, when he wrote concerning those many thousands of deformities in Sinaiticus.

“...but while they must be admitted to deform the face of this exquisite relique of the primitive ages of our faith, they need not be held to detract materially from its intrinsic value, much less ought they to militate against our conviction of its very high antiquity”.

(Scrivener “Introduction” p.16)

How a scholar could see “intrinsic value” in a document that screams of error, ignorance, and carelessness, on virtually every page is indeed a mystery. Scrivener now continues his battering ram exposure of Sinaiticus.

The Original Scribe of Sinaiticus Correcting Some of His Own Errors

“The penman, proceeding with his monotonous task rapidly and perhaps a little heedlessly, falls into some clerical error; which he immediately discovers and proceeds to set right;....as in Sinaiticus, by points or some such marks over the letters or words he wishes to revoke. To give one instance out of thousands. In Acts 4:3 ...”. (Scrivener “Introduction” p.20)

“Far the greater part of the changes throughout the whole manuscript belong to C, (stands for the third corrector of Sinaiticus) of about the seventh century.... The frequent repetition of the note (C. cum Steph) in the ensuing collation will prove that one object of this corrector was to assimilate the Codex (Sinaiticus) to manuscripts more in vogue in his time, and approaching far nearer to our Textus Receptus”. (Introduction p.23)

SINAITICUS CORRECTORS CORRECT EACH OTHER

Corrector Cb

“He often recalls a reading of the original scribe, which Ca had banished, so that he had before him a text somewhat different from Ca’s, to which he corrected the manuscript”. (Introduction p.24)

This endless correcting of this manuscripts brings to mind a scripture which seems to fit the case.

Mark 5:25-26 *“And a certain woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years, And had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse”.*

Corrector D.

“Whose style bespeaks the 8th or 9th century”.

The Last Corrector E

Appears but three times in the New Testament, and seems fully as late as the twelfth century. Corrector E places the word “God” in the great text of 1 Timothy 3:16. “God was manifest in the flesh”.

So at the last Sinaiticus is compelled to witness that in this point of great controversy, the Textus Receptus, and K.J.V. reading is the true one.

Scrivener’s Comment

“It will readily be imagined how vastly the labour and anxiety of a critical editor must be enhanced by so extensive a mass of alterations, many of them being corrections of corrections, in such different hands and spread over the course of many centuries”. (Introduction p.25)

The comment of Scripture.

2Peter 1:21 *“For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost”.*

Can any rational sound mind believe that the mixed up manuscript with 15,000 slovenly applied corrections; and corrections that correct corrections, be that which God’s Holy Spirit inspired originally, by holy men of God?

The correction of scripture - **“For God is not the author of confusion”. 1 Cor. 14:33a**

READINGS EXAMINED

Queer Readings in Sinaiticus.

Luke 24:13 *“And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs”.*

Very properly, the finest Bible the world has ever seen, or ever will see reads, that the walk from Jerusalem to Emmaus was “about threescore furlongs”. That is approximately 8 miles.

In verse 33 we learn that the disciples, having seen the Lord Jesus, and been taught by Him, “rose up the same hour and returned to Jerusalem”. This would make their round trip a walk of roughly sixteen miles. Considerable energy would be required for this effort but it was perfectly possible.

Sinaiticus reads: “160 stadia”, which is approximately 21 miles from Jerusalem to Emmaus, and of course a 42 mile return trip. Obviously someone has erred.

The most highly advertised and widely accepted new Bible versions which specialize in giving useless information in their margins, as long as the (mis-) information tends to exalt their effort to supercede the pure and precious Authorized (K.J.V.) Bible; fall silent at this point.

A thunderous silence greets the ear of the Bible school student, and he may never learn the fact that this famous manuscript is at times so ridiculous, that even its most ardent admirers, with crimson faces, we trust, reject it on numerous occasions.

To give all of the Sinaitic readings in any new version would completely discredit the translators and their work. For any Bible teacher to be aware of the foregoing unveiling of the evil content in Sinaiticus, and reject the Authorized (K.J.V.) Bible, claiming its basic text, (Textus Receptus), to be inferior to those of Westcott and Hort, Nestle's, and United Bible Societies; leaves that man open to the judgment of God, as the Lord Himself declared to the religious leaders of Israel.

Matthew 23:24- *“Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel”*.

Sinaiticus Blunders Again

Matthew 13:35 - *“That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world”*.

Sinaiticus attributes the prophecy to Isaiah, (Esaias). Obviously the quotation before us is from Psalm 78:2. At this point, the New American Standard Version and the New International Version scholars forsake the reading of their idol, and escape this tragic error. In each case a tiny footnote reads, “Psalm 78:2”; but the scholars fail to inform us that one of the two “Oldest and Best” manuscripts errs terribly at this point.

This information would be of great interest to the student who is considering the value of the various Greek texts and the versions which are based upon them.

However, it might dissipate the delusion in the student's mind concerning the extravagant claims of accuracy and purity, claimed for Sinaiticus by Westcott and Hort, and the multitudes who follow them in their manifold errors. Tischendorf and Hort stated this was the correct reading. A well taught Sunday School child would know that the reading is not, “correct”, but rather “corrupt”. In their wisdom the translators have decided that their readers ought not to know of this error. It just might affect their adoration of the twin sister idols of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; and even affect the sale of their new versions.

FAR REACHING RESULT OF ERRORS

In the third century, the heathen critic, Porphyry, a formidable antagonist of Christianity, found fault with Matthew for having written, “Esaias” here. i.e. Matthew 13:35.

Obviously, Porphyry the enemy of Christ and His people, had access to a corrupt ancestor of Sinaiticus.

Such blatant errors place weapons in the hands of the enemies of the Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The only version known to this writer that dared to follow Sinaiticus in this error is the pathetic New English Bible.

The Errors Seem Endless

John 13:10 - *“Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all”*.

Of all Greek manuscripts, in Burgon's time, only Sinaiticus omits the words, “save to wash his feet”, thus destroying the great lesson of the text.

The New English Bible obligingly follows its blind guide, Sinaiticus, into the ditch; but fails to warn its readers. Even the New World Translation rejects Sinaiticus at this point. Most of the scholars responsible for the flood of new version of the Bible flee in all directions from their rebellious idol. They know that their idol has feet of clay, yet seldom warn their readers to beware of its corruptions.

Sinaiticus then is like unto an old man who all his lifetime has suffered from every disease known to man, one who has been treated in vain with 15,000 prescriptions and surgeries, and is now upheld by unholy hands, himself unable to breathe, walk, or speak, is declared to be the world's oldest and best example of virile, healthy living. Like a ventriloquist's dummy it is made to say anything its manipulators wish it to say; but there is no life in it, nor in the equally depraved Vaticanus, as we shall see.

My evidence for this claim is the fact that the very small minority of ancient manuscripts which form the basis for all of the more recent Greek texts, differ so greatly among themselves that scholars have no difficulty in producing scores of widely different versions from them.

Dr. Scrivener presents the facts in a scholarly fashion.

“So far as this investigation goes Cod B (Vaticanus) is not much upheld by Cod Aleph (Sinaiticus) in its peculiar and characteristic readings, while the mutual divergencies of the very oldest authorities become more visible and perplexing than ever”. (Introduction p.42 b.o.p. and 53 t.o.p.)

The Word of God strips these two ancient manuscripts of their totally unwarranted authority, with a simple declaration that witnesses that habitually contradict one another, invalidate their united testimony on any subject. (See Mark 14:55-59)

In this case their so called corrections of the Textus Receptus are Biblically rejected and the twin pillars of the new version movement fall flat on their faces before the majesty and power of their opponent.

An interesting parallel might be drawn from the Old Testament.

1 Samuel 5:2-4 - *“When the Philistines took the ark of God, they brought it into the house of Dagon, and set it by Dagon. And when they of Ashdod arose early on the morrow, behold, Dagon was fallen upon his face to the earth before the ark of the LORD. And they took Dagon, and set him in his place again. And when they arose early on the morrow morning, behold, Dagon was fallen upon his face to the ground before the ark of the LORD; and the head of Dagon and both the palms of his hands were cut off upon the threshold; only the stump of Dagon was left to him”.*

The Rise and Fall of the Vaticanus - Sinaiticus Based Versions.

Looking back over many years of beholding the rise and fall of the new Bible versions can be a comforting experience. As one new version after another has arisen to challenge the supremacy of the Authorized (K.J.V) Bible, each with its claim to have corrected or improved the K.J.V., we see wave after wave of new versions each of which seeks to displace its predecessors.

More recently the New International Version with its “eclectic” text arrives on the scene.

“With exceedingly beautiful format, including very readable type set on fine quality paper, with wide margins and flowery introductory remarks, together with the thunderous applause of professional evaluators of new versions, its little halo just shining, the NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION of the Bible made its debut in 1973, insofar as the New Testament was concerned”.

(The New International Version by Cecil J. Carter p.1)

This version immediately consigns all other modern English versions to the waste paper basket. One is reminded that this is precisely where Tischendorf “found” a goodly portion of Sinaiticus. It is reported that the monks of St. Catherine’s monastery were using it to light the fire. There it gave the truest light it ever did!

The N.I.V. Questions and Answers Booklet

“One of the basic reasons (that the Bible is not being read and understood by any significant number of people) is believed to be THE LACK OF A FAITHFUL TRANSLATION IN MODERN ENGLISH. (Capitals mine) N.I.V. is designed to fill that need”. (About the Bible p.1)

To the first statement many thousands of God’s children will say a hearty AMEN.

As for the second; that remains to be seen.

Interestingly, this sweeping denunciation of all previous modern translations, as “lacking faithfulness”, is slightly modified as follows.

“Today we have many modern translations to help us understand God’s Word”. (About the Bible p.6)

There appears to be a startling contradiction between these two statements. If any concerned readers will write to the publishers, they may be able to sort out the problem.

BACK TO THE MANUSCRIPTS

We call Prebendary Scrivener to the witness stand.

“The two chief places, out of many that might be cited wherein the united testimony of Cod Aleph (Sinaiticus) and B is supported by the weighty authority of contemporary writers, are Mark xvi. 9-16 and Ephes. i. 1. For the omission of the whole paragraph containing the last twelve verses of the second Gospel we have indeed no other direct manuscript evidence than theirs, and even the scribe of Cod. B betrays a certain consciousness of an omission by leaving blank the column immediately following the end of St. Mark, this being the only perfectly vacant column throughout the whole volume. Cod. Aleph (Sinaiticus) presents no such peculiarity”.
(Introduction p.44)

Here our worthy and honorable scholar makes two errors, with reference to the fact that Sinaiticus and Vaticanus alone omit the last twelve verses of Mark’s Gospel.

(a) Scrivener confesses that there is no other direct manuscript evidence for the omission; but claims the weighty authority of contemporary writers supports the omission.

Undoubtedly there were some.

(b) After properly reporting that the scribe of Codex B (Vaticanus) leaves the next column blank, indicating that he was consciously omitting these verses; Scrivener says; Codex Aleph (Sinaiticus) presents no such peculiarity;- Prebendary Scrivener published his excellent, “collation of Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text of the New Testament” in 1864.

We will not fault our famous scholar for giving both manuscripts undeserved credit; nor for his error in stating that “Codex Aleph presents no such peculiarity”.

Scrivener could not know that in 1871 the redoubtable John Burgon would publish his devastating exposure of the false claims that had been made in favour of the omission of the last twelve verses of Mark’s Gospel, by the two culprit manuscripts. Although the Westcott-Hort team of destructive scholars found very little manuscript authority for the omission, apart from their two main manuscripts, they did not dare to omit the twelve verses. A blank space separates mark 16:8 from the remaining verses, while a marginal note sounds forth the funeral dirge, sung over the burial places of the many hundreds of precious words, phrases and in some cases, whole verses that are excised from Holy Scripture -- **“Not found in the oldest and best manuscripts”**. In the R.V. the marginal note reads in part, “The two oldest Greek manuscripts and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end”.

Burgon’s exhaustive treatment of the subject leaves no doubt of the fact that the omission was and is a serious error. “The alleged hostile witness of certain of the early ‘Fathers’ proved to be an imagination of the critics”.

VATICANUS EXAMINED

It is now time to place Codex B. Vaticanus on the witness stand.

For many years a certain class of scholars have bowed themselves down before the authority of manuscript or Codex Vaticanus with a servility that brings to mind the forced worship that King Nebuchadnezzar demanded of his subjects, who, when they heard the sound of “*all kinds of music*” were commanded to;

“Fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the King hath set up; And whoso falleth not down and worshippeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace”

We all know the sequel concerning the three Hebrews who refused to fall down and worship the golden image. One speaker capsulated the story as follows.

(a) They would not **BOW**, given one last opportunity --

(b) They would not **BUDGE**.

(c) Thrown into the burning fiery furnace --

They would not **BURN**.

For many years, it has been the practice of certain scholars to bow before the presumed authority of these two “Oldest and Best Manuscripts”.

Those who refused have often been cast into the midst of burning fiery criticisms! Even today there are those who can see through the false claims made on behalf of these Codices, but remain silent, and stifle their conscience, for fear of the ultimate fire of the furnace; namely being branded as “un-scholarly”, by those who have abandoned their God given critical faculty and have fallen prostrate before these two “golden idols” that Drs. Westcott and Hort have set up.

We shall now hear from one who refused to BOW! BUDGE! or BURN!

Dean John Burgon.

Who personally examined Vaticanus, while serving as a Chaplain in Rome. “It is undeniable, in the meantime, that for the last quarter of a century, it has become the fashion to demand for the readings of Codex B something very like absolute deference. The grounds for this superstitious sentiment, (for really I can describe it in no apter way,) I profess myself unable to discover. Codex B comes to us without a history: without recommendation of any kind, except that of its antiquity. It bears traces of careless transcription in every page.

The mistakes which the original transcriber made are of perpetual recurrence. ‘They are chiefly omissions, of one, two, or three words; but sometimes of half a verse, a whole verse, or even of several verses...I hesitate not to assert that it would be easier to find a folio containing three or four such omissions than to light on one which should be without any.’ In the Gospels alone, Codex B leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 1,491 times: of which by far the largest proportion is found in St. Mark’s Gospel”.

(The Last 12 Verses of Mark p.151)

“But then it is undeniable that some of the omissions in Cod. B are not to be so explained. On the other hand, I can testify to the fact that the codex is disfigured throughout with repetitions. The original scribe is often found to have not only written the same words twice over, but to have failed whenever he did so to take any notice with his pen of what he had done.

What then, (I must again inquire,) are the grounds for the superstitious reverence which is entertained in certain quarters for the readings of Codex B? If it be a secret known to the recent Editors of the New Testament, they have certainly contrived to keep it wondrous close”.

(The Last 12 Verses of Mark p.153)

IV. FIVE FAMOUS UNCIALS

Burgon and the famous “Five Famous Uncials”

The principal ancient witnesses against the Received Text are known as A; B(Vaticanus); C; D; and Aleph (Sinaiticus).

The framers of the Greek texts which underlie the modern versions of the scripture lean very heavily upon the discordant witness of these “Famous Five” Uncials. After careful investigation of these strange manuscripts, Burgon reports.

“My only object in them all was to prove that Codices A, B (Vaticanus); Aleph (Sinaiticus), C; and D; yield divergent testimony; and therefore, so habitually contradict one another, as effectually to invalidate their own evidence throughout.

“My only object in them all was to prove that Codices A, B (Vaticanus); Aleph (Sinaiticus), C; and D; yield divergent testimony; and therefore, so habitually contradict one another, as effectually to invalidate their own evidence throughout. THIS HAS NEVER BEEN PROVED BEFORE. (capitals mine) It can only be proved, in fact, by one who has laboriously collated the codices in question, and submitted to the drudgery of exactly tabulating the result”

(Revision Revised Preface p.18)

The results of Burgon's investigation of the character of the main witness against the authority of the true Word of God.

"The result of the experiment already referred to...has been, to demonstrate that the five manuscripts in question stand apart from one another in the following proportions:- 842(1); 1798(C); 2370 B (Vaticanus); 3392 Aleph (Sinaiticus); 4697 D.

But would not the same result have been obtained if the 'five old uncials' had been referred to any other common standard which can be named? In the meantime, what else is the inevitable inference from this phenomenon but that four out of the five must be--while all the five may be--outrageously depraved documents? Instead of being fit to be made our exclusive guides to the Truth of Scripture, -- as Critics of the school of Tischendorf and Tregelles would have us believe that they are?"
(Preface of Revision Revised p.19)

The Mystery is Solved!

How is it that we are flooded with scores of versions of the Bible, each claiming the authority of the oldest and best manuscripts while offering so many different readings?

The answer is that with so many conflicting voices in the five oldest and best manuscripts, the scholars are able to make any version read exactly what they want.

"Singular to relate, the first, second, fourth, and fifth of these codices (B Aleph C D), but especially B and Aleph (Sinaiticus), have within the last twenty years established a tyrannical ascendancy over the imagination of the Critics, which can only be fitly spoken of as a blind superstition. It matters nothing that all four are discovered on careful scrutiny to differ essentially, not only from ninety-nine out of a hundred of the whole body of extant MSS, besides, but even from one another. This last circumstance, obviously fatal to their corporate pretensions, is unaccountably overlooked. And yet it admits of only one satisfactory explanation: viz. that in different degrees they all five exhibit a fabricated text".

(The Revision Revised p.11-12)

Burgon asks

"If the underlying Greek Text be mistaken, what else but incorrect must the English translation be?"
(The Revision Revised Preface p.12)

A KNOCKOUT BLOW TO CODEX D.

Burgon teams up with Scrivener to clear the ring of one witness which has been classed with the "Five Famous Uncials".

"But by far the most depraved text is that exhibited by codex D. 'No known manuscript contains so many bold and extensive interpolations. Its variations from the sacred Text are beyond all other example.' This, however, is not the result of its being the most recent of the five, but (singular to relate) is due to quite an opposite cause. It is thought (not without reason) to exhibit a 11nd-century text. 'When we turn to the Acts of the Apostles,' "(says the learned editor of the codex in question, Dr. Scrivener,)--

'We find ourselves confronted with a text, the like to which we have no experience of elsewhere. It is hardly an exaggeration to assert that codex D reproduces the Textus Receptus much in the same way that one of the best Chaldee Targums does the Hebrew of the Old Testament: So wide are the variations in the diction, so constant and inveterate the practice of expounding the narrative by means of interpolations which seldom recommend themselves as genuine by even a semblance of internal probability".

(The Revision Revised p.12-13)

Burgon administers, "Le coup de grace"

"Though a large portion of the Gospels is missing, in what remains (tested by the same standard) we find 3704 words omitted: no less that 2213 added, and 2121 substituted. The words transposed amount to 3471: and 1772 have been modified: the deflections from the Received Text thus amounting in all to 13,281.--Next to D, the most untrustworthy codex is Aleph (Sinaiticus), which bears

on its front a memorable note of the evil repute under which it has always laboured: viz. it is found that at least ten revisers between the IVth and the XIIth centuries busied themselves with the task of correcting its many and extraordinary perversion of the truth of Scripture.--Next in impurity comes B:” (The Revision Revised p.13-14)

V. VATICANUS

EXAMINATION OF THE CHIEF PILLAR OF THE NEW VERSION MOVEMENT

B. or Vaticanus - continued.

Some of its many omissions.

(a) All of Genesis from Genesis 1:1 to 46:28

Gone from this mutilated corpse is:

- The creation of the universe by the Word of God Gen. 1:31
- The creation of man in the image of God. Gen. 1:26-28; 2:7-25
- The fall of man accomplished by the world’s first revision of the Word of God. Gen. 3:1-24
- The judgment of God on a world of violence and immorality by means of the flood of Noah’s day. Gen. 6:1-7:24
- Institution of capital punishment Gen. 9:6
- The judgment of God on man’s first effort to have peace and safety by his own efforts:--”The Tower of Babel”. Gen. 11:1-9
- The seed plot of the Bible. Chapters 1 to 11 of Genesis-- known as the seed plot of the Bible. So many New Testament doctrines have their roots in these first eleven chapters.
- The “Indefeasible Certificate of Title”, of the land of Israel given to Abraham and his seed through Isaac, forever. Genesis 13:14-18; Genesis 15:18-21
- God’s blessing on the estate of Holy matrimony. Genesis 1:28
- God’s fiery judgment on sex perversion. Genesis 13:13; 19:1-6; and vs. 28.
- The beautiful record of Joseph as a type of Christ. Genesis 37:1FF
- And very much more is missing.

The careful reader will have observed the fact that God’s answers to many of the problems that trouble humanity are found in the missing portion.

(b) The Missing Psalms.

- Psalms 106-138 are not found in the “Oldest and Best?” manuscript. Interestingly, many of the missing Psalms glorify the eternal nature of God’s greatness and mercy.
- Psalms 106:1 -- *His mercy endureth forever.* cf. Ps. 107:1
- Psalms 110 -- *His priesthood endureth for ever*
- Psalms 111:3 -- *His righteousness endureth for ever.*
- Psalms 111:8 -- *His commandments endure for ever.*
- Psalms 111:9 -- *His covenant endureth for ever.*
- Psalms 111:10 -- *His praise endureth for ever.*
- Psalms 117:2 -- *His truth endureth for ever.*
- Psalms 118:1 -- *His mercy endureth for ever.* cf. also vs. 2, 3, 4, 29
- Psalms 119:89 -- *His Word endureth for ever.*

- Psalms 125:1 -- *His Mount Zion abideth for ever.* cf. Ps. 132:14
- Psalms 135:13 -- *His Name endureth for ever.*
- Psalms 136:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26. *His mercy endureth for ever.*
- Psalms 138:13 -- *His mercy endureth for ever*
- Psalms 119:1-176 -- The great and glorious exaltation of the Word of God, over all the wisdom and tradition of men, has no place in the Vatican manuscript.
- Psalms 119 -- from beginning to end sets the Word of God before us in all its glorious, power, beauty, and authority over all creation.
- Small wonder Psalms 138 which informs us of how highly God honours His Word is not found in Vaticanus.

“Thou hast magnified Thy Word above all Thy Name” Ps. 138:6b

Since soul saving, *“faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God”*, Romans 10:17, let us therefore reject all those versions that spring out of the polluted manuscripts of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

We are commanded to, *“receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls”*. James 1:21b. **Who then would dare** to trust the salvation of the soul to Bible versions, that have their roots in corruption?

(c) Vaticanus robs the treasury of God’s Word of its jewels

Missing from its mutilated text is --

- The record of our Lord being strengthened by an angel from heaven, as He knows the LORD is about to lay on Him the iniquity of us all. Luke 22:43
- As He takes His place as *“the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world”*; He knows that shortly the dread experience of 2Corinthians 5:21 will be on Him. *For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him”*.

Soon our holy, harmless, undefiled Lord and Saviour, will become our Redeemer, and the glorious message will ring out triumphantly.

“Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree”. Gal 3:13

Soon the world will hear the great and glorious soul saving, heart thrilling news.

Jesus Christ -- *“Who His ownself bare our sins in His own body on the tree”*. I Peter 2:24

- Apostles and saints will see the captives of the devil set free, their chains of sin snapped by the mighty power of the *“glorious gospel of Christ”*, as they proclaim with joy;

“But God commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us”. Romans 5:8

Surely the Lord of Glory, the Prince of life, (Acts 3:15), the *“Prince of Peace”* (Isaiah 9:6), *“sweat as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground”* (Luke 22:43-44). The Vatican document gives us no hint of this heart touching scene of our Lord’s agony of soul. These two glorious verses have been omitted. In their Greek Text, Drs. Westcott and Hort place these precious words in double brackets, signifying that *“it is morally certain that verses 43 and 44 of Luke 22 are of spurious origin”*.

In spite of a multitude of witnesses, many of the writers recognizing these verses wrote long years before the time of Vaticanus; and the witness of the whole body of manuscripts, uncial, as well as cursives, and by every ancient version; the Greek Texts of Westcott and Hort, Nestle’s, and the Bible Societies insist on shutting up that most precious records in *“Double Brackets”*.

The New Versions -- reject all their authority

The Westcott Hort demolition team leave these verses in the English Revised Version of 1881, with deceptive marginal note, “many ancient authorities omit ver. 43, 44”. They fail to give even one ancient authority to back their fanciful claim.

The fascinating fact remains that virtually all the leading new versions reject all of the above named Greek texts at this point. They dare not do otherwise. The American Standard Version, the New American Standard, the Revised Standard Version, the exceedingly corrupt New English Bible, and the New International Version all include the wondrous story that the framers of the Greek texts have tried to suppress, or at least to cast doubt on it.

Edgar Goodspeed, in his New Testament, American Translation omits the sacred record. The numbering of the verses at this point leaps from 42 to 45, without a word of acknowledging that he has excised two verses from the sacred record.

Williams in his “New Testament”, omits verses 43-44 without a word of explanation, thus joining Goodspeed and others in danger of bringing the judgment of Revelation of 22:18 upon themselves.

The Berkeley Version and Amplified Bible include the verses without question.

The Revised Standard Version, The New English Bible, and the New International Version as previously recorded include the disputed texts. These three, while rejecting their Greek Texts, can not resist that “some ancient authorities omit”; R.S.V. and N.E.B. and N.I.V. all conspire to indicate some doubt as to its authenticity. **Not one** mentions the paucity of authority for the omission.

Not one records the overwhelming authority for the inclusion. **Not one** dares to enlighten its readers that the other manuscript, twin sister to Vaticanus, even Sinaiticus brands Vaticanus as faulty here, and on 6,999 other occasions. Yes! Sinaiticus includes the wondrous story. The “New World Translation” of the people who claim falsely to be “Jehovah’s Witnesses”, includes this gracious record, without any question of any sort in their 1961 edition, thus shaming the R.S.V., the N.A.S.V., and the N.I.V.

The Ferrar Group of ancient manuscripts

The four Codexes, of this group insert the record of our Lord’s agony and blood-like sweat in Matthew’s Gospel between Matthew 26:39 and verse 40; thus creating a complete absurdity.

Another jewel is stolen from the Scriptures by Vaticanus.

Vaticanus omits our Lord’s prayer on the cross. “*Father forgive them, they know not what they do*”. Luke 23:34

THE EVIDENCE FOR OUR LORD’S PRAYER

- (a) Every known Uncial.
- (b) Every known Cursive -- except four or five.
- (c) Every ancient Version.
- (d) Over forty of the ancient Fathers.

THE EVIDENCE AGAINST INCLUSION

- (a) Codex B. Vaticanus, the Manuscript now under investigation.
- (b) Codex D. The most corrupt of the “Five Ancient Uncials”.
- (c) Cursives. Four or five, opposing many hundreds of cursives.
- (d) One Egyptian Version.
(Revision Revised p.83)

Acting upon this pitiful handful of highly suspicious documents, and flying in the face of the massive mountain of favourable evidence, Westcott and Hort shut up this precious prayer of our Lord and Saviour in double brackets in their Greek Text: thus indicating their “moral certainty” that the words are spurious. **Who would trust such scholarship?**

Every person who trusts the new versions based on their text!

Here is where ignorance is not bliss: it is fatal.

Once again the heretical New World Version accepts the prayer without question, again shaming the New American Standard and the New International Version, which quite unable to conceal their venom, or else ignorance, lash out with their usual funeral dirge, “some manuscripts omit”, - N.A.S.V. 1971 edition; and the N.I.V. “Some early MSS omit verse 34a”. Without a word of apology the N.A.S.V. 1972 Edition, removes the offending footnote.

Not surprisingly the New American Roman Catholic Bible, encloses this portion in single brackets. In this manner the marginal notes, so often useless, become positively harmful as they sow the seeds of doubt in the minds of those not fully acquainted with manuscript evidence. The result in the minds of millions of professing Christians is a very hazy concept of what really is the Word of God. This is without question the work of our great but defeated adversary, the devil.

(E) Vaticanus omits all of First Timothy - WHY?

Why would a document so highly prized by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy omit **all** of first Timothy?

A prayerful reading of this book may give us some clues.

(a) 1 Timothy 2:5 reads: -

“ For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus”.

This truth is hidden from millions of religious persons.

(b) 1 Timothy 3:2 reads: -

“A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach”.

This shatters the teaching that claims celibacy for the clergy.

verse 3:

- not given to wine
- not greedy of filthy lucre
- but patient, not a brawler
- not covetous.

verse 4: - One that ruleth well his own house, **having his children in subjection with all gravity.**

verse 5: - *For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?*

1 Timothy 4:1-4 - ***“Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils:***

Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron;

Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.

For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving:”

Interestingly, in 1 Corinthians 9:5-6 Paul the Apostle declares that Peter was a married man. **“Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?”** Cephas is Peter, see John 1:42.

Mark 1:30 tells us that *“Simon’s wife’s mother lay sick of a fever”*. It is generally agreed that a man who has a mother in law, usually has, or has had a wife.

Vaticanus omits all of 2Timothy! But WHY?

(a) The call of Paul the Apostle destroys the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. In Galatians 1:1, he plainly declares: ***“Paul an Apostle, (not of men, neither by man), but by Jesus Christ, and God the***

Father, who raised Him from the dead...”. Paul leaves on record the fact that no man had anything to do with his call to be an Apostle.

Galatians 1:14-17 - *“And profited in the Jews’ religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.*

But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother’s womb, and called me by his grace, To reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood:

Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus”.

In 1Timothy 1:1 and in 2Timothy 1:1 Paul reiterates the truth that his call to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ, was from God alone.

(b) 2Timothy 3:15-17 teaches that the Scriptures alone, are all sufficient to make us “*wise unto salvation*”. They also perfect our faith, and teach us to give our lives to serve the Lord in “*all good works*”.

Vaticanus omits all of Titus! WHY?

Titus contains instructions for the ordination of elders or bishops. *“If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly”. “A bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God, not soon angry...not given to wine...not given to filthy lucre..”.*

Titus 3:4-7 declares that our salvation does not come to us “*by works of righteousness that we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost..., that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life*”.

VATICANUS OMITTS THE LAST FOUR AND A HALF CHAPTERS OF HEBREWS.

Why would the Vatican highly prize a manuscript with such a deficiency? Significantly Vaticanus contains nothing after chapter 9:13. The omitted or excised portion!

Vs 14. Abolishes the Romish doctrine of penance. It exalts cleansing from sin by the “*Blood of Christ*” for the purging of the conscience, at the same time scorning the thought of “*dead works*” in their effort to quiet the conscience.

Vs 15. Abolishes the Romish teaching that makes each priest behave as if he were a mediator between God and man.

“For there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus;..”. 1 Timothy 2:5

Vs 22. States “*Without shedding of blood is no remission*”. An unbloody sacrifice can not cleanse the stain of a single sin.

Vs 25. Teaches Christ is not often offered for sins.

Vs 26. “*but now once in the end of the age, hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*”.

Vs 27. Slaughters the idea of purgatory, revealing it to be a figment of imagination without a shred of scriptural foundation for the teaching. “*As it is appointed unto man once to die, but after this the judgment*”.

10:11-12 & 14. Another glorious attestation to the all sufficiency of the once for all sacrifice of our Lord. “*And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*”.

10:38. Re-iterates the great text of the Reformation that Luther preached so effectively that millions have ceased their vain efforts to be justified by works. “***THE JUST SHALL LIVE BY FAITH***”.

11:32-40 “Shades of an ancient inquisition!” This is an awesome record of “man’s inhumanity to man”, so terrible that only the devil himself could have inspired such cruelty. The record is deleted from the Vatican manuscript, but not from the all seeing eyes of the righteous “*Judge of all the earth*”.

Vaticanus continues to rob the scripture of its jewels.

Luke 4:4 - “*And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God*”.

Among many new versions the highly rated New American Standard Version, and the New International Version, mutilate this scripture as follows;

“And Jesus answered him, It is written, Man ‘SHALL NOT LIVE ON BREAD ALONE’”.

The omission of the words, “*but by every Word of God*”, **completely destroys** the glorious truth that is taught in Matthew 4:4, and Deuteronomy 8:3.

Doubtless there are many hundreds of thousands of people living depraved lives who would be in complete agreement with the statement as it appears in the N.A.S.V., N.I.V., R.S.V., N.E.B., and a host of lesser “lights”.

Listen if you will to men who are slaves to every sort of evil, as they say, “The N.I.V. is right, we do not want to live on bread alone, we want wine, women and song:, and so it goes on ad nauseam.

The question that baffles some of the scholars is not, did the Lord quote the full quotation as in Matthew 4:4? This is admitted by all. The vexatious question is, did Luke quote it in full in his Gospel?

The learned men in their cumulative wisdom have decided that Luke did not complete the quotation. Upon what authority was this decision made?

You have already guessed the answer.

The main culprits are the depraved Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Beside these someone has delved deeply into the debris of old manuscripts, and has come up triumphantly clutching one more that omits the proper ending. They crown their efforts with two Egyptian Versions, guilty of the same crime. (Coy - Inside Story p.174)

Evidence for the inclusion of the K.J.V. ending.

“Mss. A. B. (corrected), E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, W, X, Delta, Lamba, Pl. All of the cursives, (possibly hundreds that contain Luke 4) the old Latin Vulgate, Peshito, Philoxenian Syriac, Wilkin’s Memphitic, the Gothic, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Arabic Versions”.

(Coy - Inside Story p.174)

Against this vast array of witnesses of integrity, the revisers have the two corpses of Vatican and Sinaiticus exhumed from their sleep of death and darkness, principally by the efforts of Westcott and Hort. Now these two feeble witnesses unable to stand alone are supported by equally feeble testimony. The whisper of their feeble voices, raised against the vast majority of manuscripts has been harkened to by so many revisers, while the thunderous Niagara of voices proclaiming the truth is ignored. This is the calamity of the new version movement. The result is a devastating falling away from the truth which is necessary before the world can be presented with “*the man of sin*”.

2 Thessalonians 2:1-4 “*Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God*”.

Our “Jewel Thieves: lay wicked hands on Luke 4:18.

Luke 4:18 “*The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised*”.

Who has sensed the hiss of “that old serpent”:, in reading this glorious scripture, when one is suddenly aware that another precious jewel has been silently Stolen from the Crown Jewels of Scripture?

Gone from our Lord’s declaration of His mission for which He left the glory that He had with the Father, before the world was, and the adoration of the myriad’s of holy angels, is the second great blessing for believing humanity.

VI. HE HATH SENT ME... “TO HEAL THE BROKEN HEARTED”

How many millions of broken hearted men, women, and children have discovered the wounds of life’s greatest tragedies have been perfectly healed, by the Blessed One Who offers Himself as the perfect sacrifice for our sins, and the One Who alone can speak such words of comfort that hearts that have been shattered, with all hope lost, will vibrate once more with love and hope and joy? Multitudes of once almost fatally wounded persons who have suffered injustice, betrayal, malicious slander, robbery and violence, can now testify joyously to the fact that when the Lord Jesus speaks peace to the broken hearted, not even scar tissue remains. All glory to His blessed Name!

The thief apparently leaves no fingerprints.

This robber of the Scriptures has done his work well. The “Old Serpent” has done all in his power to cover the tracks of his dupe, knowingly or ignorantly the mass of new versions co-operate in a futile attempt to hide the fact that the readers of the new versions have been robbed of one of the great assurances of Holy Scriptures. This is a masterpiece of satanic strategy.

Many who may feel the weight of their guilt on account of sin, are drawn to Christ, when they learn;

(a) *That he bore our sins in his own body on the tree.* 1 Peter 2:24

(b) *“Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows”.* Isa. 53:4

What more can a troubled soul require?

Our sins and our sorrows, all cared for by our Lord. True it verily is, that sorrows can and do assail the hearts of Christians: trials and tribulations,- even martyrdom-, has been the experience of those whose sins have been forgiven by our God, Who alone has power to forgive sins.

1John 1:9 *“If we confess ours, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness”.*

The apostle Paul records the marvelous effect of the “healing of the broken heart”.

“As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing” **2Corinthians 6:10a**

This is a marvelous revelation of the fact that the heart of redeemed humanity is capable of entertaining two apparently diametrically opposed emotions, at the same moment of time. Blessed are they that have experienced this comfort.

The author of this essay testifies.

By nature we would not desire to experience heartbreak and sorrow; but I would far rather experience the glorious healing of a shattered heart; than to go through life, protected from every possible heart wrenching experience.

Philippians 4:6-7 *“Be careful for nothing; but in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanks-giving let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus”.*

A remarkable cover up

Very often, I may say far too often, when a new version is found to omit, or excise portions of the sacred scriptures, we find the “scholarly (?) comment..

“Not found in the oldest and best manuscripts”.

“Some ancient manuscripts omit”.

“Most ancient manuscripts omit”.

“Some ancient manuscripts insert”.

“Some manuscripts add”.

Millions of professing Christians have blindly succumbed to these deadly sleeping pills and allowed the precious truths of the Word of the Lord to be excised forever from the hearts of themselves and their children.

Without a whimper they have abandoned the one true English Bible, for versions that have readings, skillfully fabricated by the prince of the powers of the air, and inserted into the minds of men who pride themselves on their wisdom.

The contemplation of these often dishonest, misleading marginal notes brings to mind lines from Tennyson’s great poem, “Death of the Duke of Wellington”. This famous poem reaches its climax with the description of the actual burial of this great man. With the substitution of only one word, to adapt the lines to my theme, I quote: “Hush, the Dead March wails in the people’s ears:.. the dark earth yawns”. The ‘Scripture’ disappears. “Mortal” There you have it. By waving their magical wand of misleading, unproved, unscholarly, deceitful, marginal notes the apostates have invaded and destroyed a very high percentage of the fruits of the Protestant Reformation.

One has well said, “the church has been revised back into the dark ages”.

The new versions of the Bible are indeed corrupt beyond adequate description. Well spake Dean John Burgon.

“Shame,---yes, shame on the learning which comes abroad only to perplex the weak, and to unsettle the doubting, and to mislead the blind! Shame,---yes, shame on that two-thirds majority of well-intentioned but most incompetent men, who,---finding themselves (in an evil hour) appointed to correct “plain and clear errors” in the English ‘Authorized Version,’ --- occupied themselves instead with falsifying the inspired Greek Text in countless places, and branding with suspicion some of the most precious utterances of the SPIRIT! Shame,---yes, shame upon them!”
(the Revision Revised p.134-135)

The cover up of the thieves of the rich treasure, stolen from Luke 4:18 continues. Few of the many versions that omit our gem: “*TO HEAL THE BROKEN HEARTED*”, give any notice that this treasure is missing from their version. In a multitude of robberies of other portions, one of the reasons mentioned in our funeral dirge is given in the margin.

It is not so with this treasure.

Without any warning reference, or footnote or excuse it is omitted by;

The New World Translation - 1961

The Berkeley Version - 1962

The Revised Standard Version - 1952

The New English Bible - 1970

The New Translation - JN Darby - of 1950

The New American Standard Version - 1971

The New International Version - 1974

and many others.

This glorious scripture disappears from before the longing trusting eyes of the youth and children of our day. If the adversary has his way they will never know the truths that have been stolen from them by the “Jewel Thieves” of Holy Scripture.

CAN WE TRACE THE CULPRITS?

Apparently there are few fingerprints for identification. However, there are some occupations which lend a definite odour to the workmen, to such an extent that it is not necessary, for them to inform you that they work in a glue factory, or a whaling station. The fact is obvious.

So in this case there is a certain odour, that assails our nostrils, as we research our question.

The missing jewel is found in;

Luther’s Greek New Testament - 1552

William Tyndale’s New Testament 1526

Luther’s German Bible 1532

Douay-Rheims New Testament 1582

Authorized, King James Version 1611

Our Jewel disappears completely from the Revised Version of Westcott and Hort in 1881.

More recent versions seem to be almost unanimous in their ejection of this scripture. Almost always there is no indication of the deletion. Modern Bible translators have followed their blind guides into the ditch of scholarly criticism, and the awesome condemnation of Revelation 22:19.

VII. HORT

Hort’s Method

In order to be able to exalt the depraved Vaticanus he must first endeavor to dethrone the marvelous Text Receptus, or Received Text, from its throne of supremacy.

Hort first, while collaborating with Westcott in secretly preparing their faulty Greek Text, intended to supplant the Received Text; launched his attack on the Textus Receptus by branding it, “that vile Textus Receptus”

Hort’s horrible hatred a result of heresy.

To begin with Hort was an apostate.

Apostasy is a snare of the devil.

Hort Jr. continues his revelation concerning his father. “A word is perhaps necessary to explain his religious development at this period. So far, as has been shown, HE HAD BEEN BROUGHT UP IN THE DOCTRINE OF THE EVANGELICAL SCHOOL... the effects of this training were doubtless modified in the atmosphere of Rugby...AT A NOT MUCH LATER PERIOD, HOWEVER, HE OUTGREW THE EVANGELICAL TEACHING, WHICH HE CAME TO REGARD AS SECTARIAN..”. Vol. 1 Page 41 Life & Letters

“HENCE HE WAS LED TO SEEK FIRMER FOUNDATIONS THAN HE COULD FIND IN THE EVANGELICAL POSITION...HE COULD NOT DISCOVER THE RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY WHICH HE DESIDERATED”. Vol. 1 Page 61 Hort Life & Letters

HORT’S HORRIBLE HERESIES

Hort No Longer Able to Distinguish Truth

“I am very far from pretending to understand completely the ever renewed vitality of Mariolatry. But is it not much accounted for, on the evil side, by the natural reversion of the religious instinct to idolatry and creature worship and aversion to the Most High; and, ON THE GOOD SIDE, **by a right reaction from the inhuman and semidiabolical character with which God is invested in all modern orthodoxies-Zeus and Prometheus over again?**”

IN PROTESTANT COUNTRIES THE FEARFUL NOTION, “Christ the believer’s God” is the result. In Romish countries the Virgin is a nearer and more attractive object, not rejected by the dominant creed; and the Divine Son retires into a distant cloud world with the Father....Another idea has lately occurred to me; is not Mariolatry displacing much worship of scattered saints, and so becoming a tendency towards unity of worship?...I HAVE BEEN PERSUADED FOR MANY YEARS THAT MARY - WORSHIP and “JESUS” - WORSHIP HAVE VERY MUCH IN COMMON IN THEIR CAUSES AND THEIR RESULTS”. Life & Letters Vol. 2; page 49,50,51

HORT - THE OCCULT AND THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS

Hort greatly influenced by the occult!

“TWO OTHER SOCIETIES of widely different aims were started in the same year, IN BOTH OF WHICH HORT SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN THE MOVING SPIRIT: one a small club formed for the practice of choral music, the other called by its members, THE GHOSTLY GUILD, the object of which was to classify authenticated instances of what are now called ‘psychical phenomena’,...”. Vol. 1 page 172

Hort - The Occult - And The Textus Receptus

In **1 Timothy 4:1**, Paul speaks of seducing spirits and doctrines of demons. “*Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith (this is precisely what Hort did) giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of demons*”.

It is only a short step from abandoning evangelical doctrines fundamental to the faith, to that of “giving heed” to seducing spirits, and “doctrines of devils”.

Any teaching which contradicts the clear teaching of the Holy Spirit, comes from an unholy spirit, i.e. a demon. Dr. Hort’s letters seem to literally abound in contradictions of Scripture; and as we have already seen he glories in his rejection of evangelical doctrines. This is the work of Satan in the souls of men.

SCHOLARS HAIL HORT AS “THE MAN WHO SLEW THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS”.

Let Dr. Hort speak for himself on this matter.

HORT TO JOHN ELLERTON

December 20, 1851

“I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of texts, having read so little Greek Testament, AND DRAGGED ON WITH THE VILLIANOUS TEXTUS RECEPTUS...THINK OF THAT VILE TEXTUS RECEPTUS LEANING ENTIRELY ON LATE MANUSCRIPTS: IT IS A BLESSING THERE ARE SUCH EARLY ONES..”.

Vol. 1 p. 211 Life and Letters.

Hort Jr., his father’s biographer, unconsciously reveals beyond a shadow of doubt that his father’s rejection of the Received Text was conceived directly through the agency of the world of the occult.

From where did Hort get this great antipathy to the Textus Receptus so early in his career? How did he conceive his ingenious theories to minimize the fact that the Textus Receptus, (the Greek text underlying the King James Version of the Bible), is without doubt representative of a very high percentage of all Greek manuscripts? Let the careful student of the case, remember that Hort was never able to produce a vestige of historical evidence for his carefully spun out theories. It just does not exist.

HORT AND THE OCCULT!

To this writer the statement which immediately follows Hort’s describing the sacred text as “Vile” is most revealing.

“Westcott, Gorham, C.B. Scott, Bensen 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”. (Vol. 1 p.211)

“Our own temporary name is the Ghostly Guild”. The connection of this statement with his declamation against the Textus Receptus is of great significance.

THE SECRET IS OUT!

Here we have the hidden background for the modern spreading rejection of the King James Version. The followers of Westcott and Hort are following the lead of men who at the instigation of seducing spirits, have departed from the faith. In some cases this departure is openly manifested by a strictly forbidden prying into the occult. These having received from the world of spirits a hatred for the true Word of God, are swiftly and surely leading multitudes into the same Satanic pitfall.

Witness the strange behaviour of multitudes who having abandoned the King James Version of the scriptures, react in various ways.

- (a) Many refuse to discuss the reason for receiving a modern version.
- (b) Many more have an angry reaction when questioned.
- (c) Many in high positions give evasive answers.
- (d) Many say the most ridiculous things, without proof of any kind.
- (e) Many deride the Textus Receptus. Derision is the last resort of a mind that is bankrupt of sensible arguments; when used apart from logic.
- (f) Almost all avoid an open public debate on this vital subject.

Any and all of the above reactions are those of men and women who have been misled in the greatest matter in this life. That is, where is the pure Word of God?

Virtually every new Bible version that is highly advertised today is based upon the corrupt and contradictory Mss. Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Protest as they may, the translators labour under the heavy shackles of the erroneous thinking of Westcott and Hort.

The writer is deeply convinced of the great danger to the individual who trusts a new Bible Version. It is my conviction that, **THE GREATEST ATTACK OF THE DEVIL ON THE CHURCH IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY IS THE NEW BIBLE VERSION MOVEMENT.**

It was Westcott and Hort who figured greatly in the elevating of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus to the unwarranted place of authority that these manuscripts hold in the minds of modern translators.

Why do so many new version fans respond with anger to inquiry as to why they have abandoned the Authorized K.J. Bible?

It is apparent that the Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts are antagonistic to the Received Text.

Marvelously, mysteriously, the antagonism of the corrupted manuscripts to the true, is imparted to the minds of many of those that have been led into the same apostasy. The most kindly, well meaning, enlightened efforts to help friends are often met by stern unwarranted rebukes.

It is also to be noted that a person may reject as many of the new versions as he wishes; yet he is still highly accepted as long as he receives almost any one of them.

When a Christian rejects all of the corrupted versions, he is immediately subjected, by many, to character assassination.

VIII. ROME

Infiltration

The Revised Version of Westcott and Hort 1881.

Since the Douay-Rheims, Roman Catholic Version dares to excise hundreds of words, in commencing its attack on the holy scriptures; it may come as a great surprise to find the “Protestant” versions, greatly exceeding the “Romanist”, in mutilating the sacred writings.

The Mystery is Unveiled

Why do nominal Protestants take liberties with the text that no Romanist scholar would dare to desecrate?

The Soul Destroying Secret

Westcott and Hort under strong delusion to believe a lie, exalted the mutilated Roman Catholic owned "Vaticanus", and the 15,000 times doctored, "Sinaiticus", to a place of supreme authority over all the other manuscripts. The tragic results are manifest in a flood of new versions of the Bible, with greatly increased mutilation of the scriptures; along with many mischievous, misleading marginal notes.

For millions of professing Christians the proper Biblical barrier between the doctrines of the Roman Catholic religion and those of the Protestant Reformation have been skillfully removed.

HOW WAS THIS AMAZING CHANGE ACCOMPLISHED?

How is it that many are now saying; The Scriptures are now revised back into the dark ages?

Why do so many of the alterations in the modern versions change true Biblical doctrines in favour of Rome?

Why this strange reversal of Protestant separation from Rome; and the abandoning of truth in order to embrace error? THE ROMAN CATHOLIC MUTILATED MANUSCRIPT WITH ITS MULTIPLIED ERRORS, ALONG WITH THE GHASTLY SINAITICUS WITH ITS 15,000 clumsily performed alterations have become the principal manuscripts underlying those falsely termed, Protestant versions.

The Protestant scholars are deceived!

The errors of Rome have been cleverly introduced into the new versions of the Bible.

In this manner the new versions by a masterpiece of duplicity, worthy of the "*old serpent, the devil*" have become not only anti Protestant, but pro Roman Catholic.

Rome rejoices over the Revised Version of 1881.

Cardinal Wiseman

"When we consider the scorn cast by the Reformers upon the Vulgate, and their recurrence, in consequence, to the Greek, as the only accurate standard, we cannot but rejoice at the silent triumph which truth has at length gained over clamorous error. For, in fact, the principal writers who have avenged the Vulgate, and obtained for it its critical preeminence, are Protestants". (Wiseman, Essays vol. 1, p 104)

Tobias Mullen,

Catholic Bishop of Erie, Pa., says: "It will be perceived here, that the variations between the Catholic Version and the Revision are immaterial, indeed no more than what might be found between any two versions of different but substantially identical copies of the same document". (Mullen Canon, p333. Quoted by Wilkinson, O.A.B. Vindicated, p 204)

Dubin Review

(Roman Catholic) July 1881 "One thing at least is certain, the Catholic Church will gain by the new Revision, both directly and indirectly".

A Catholic priest rejoices.

The Very Rev.?? Thomas S. Preston, of St. Ann's R.C. church of New York. "It is to us a gratification to find that in very many instances they have adopted the readings of the Catholic Version, and have thus by their scholarship confirmed the correctness of our Bible". (Inside Story of A.A. Rev N.T. p 229)

Well we might ask the question; how is it possible for the deluded Protestant scholars to take a corrupted Roman Catholic Manuscript and do anything else but bring forth corrupted readings?

Well spake the ancient Patriarch.

“Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one”. Having considered only some of the manifold corruptions of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, it is the duty of every upright soul to declare all the versions based upon them to be that which they certainly are -- unclean.

Our Lord Jesus declares the issue.

Matthew 7:17-19 *“Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire”.*

It is utterly impossible for these evil books, declared to be “tools of the devil” by Evangelist, C.O. Bowen, Hero of the Athenia; to bring forth anything but evil fruit.

To witness the truth of this, consider the multitudes, professedly converted under ministry from these versions, rushing madly toward union with Rome, which in turn is gathering all religions into one vast monstrosity, whose destruction is clearly foretold in the Book of Revelation. This is just one of many entire books missing from Vaticanus by the original scribe.

Oldest and Best! Indeed not!

Let us not marvel at the news that a demon deluded “channeller” has received messages from the Spirit world, to “rewrite” the book of Revelation. This is the book that plainly reveals the doom of the beast and the false prophet, the devil; and the total destruction of the New Age Armies at the command of our glorious Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Revelation 19:19-21; 20:10.

The Revised Standard Version New Testament (Catholic Edition)

Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, writing a glowing testimonial for this work expresses “great joy” in approving it, and knowing full well that the Reviser’s text leans heavily on Vaticanus for its strange readings, writes as follows;

“The very fact that we have adopted their text is a high tribute to Protestant scholarship; their willing consent is a tribute to their Christian concern. THE ADOPTION OF THIS TEXT IS ALSO A SIGN OF THE ADVANCE OF BIBLICAL SCIENCE AND OF IMPROVED RELATIONS OF CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT SCHOLARS”.

Actually this is not compromise by the R.S.V. scholars. It is absolute capitulation to the claims of Rome for supremacy of their scriptures and compete betrayal of the historic Protestant cause.

To put the matter plainly.

Nominally Protestants scholars, their eyes blinded to the duplicity of the movement to glorify the Romanist manuscripts have accepted them as valid, and now to the delirious delight of Rome are responsible for the giving to the world, millions of depraved bibles, which in turn are shutting up the truth of God, so that multitudes perish as a result of trusting awesome corruption of the text.

How one priest views the stolen jewels of scripture.

We have dealt with only a very small portion of the precious portions of scripture deleted from our Authorized K.J. Bible.

The Very Rev.? James A. Corcoran, D.D. - Re: the revised version of 1881

“One of the great benefits conferred (sic.) by the Revision of the English Protestant world, though, very few or none seem to realize it, is that all the wicked translations whether by falsification of meaning, or by interpolations, or by foisting of glosses into the text, have been ruthlessly swept away by the besom of Revisers., And why? Solely on the grounds that they were corruptions... and every honest man, every friend of religious truth must be thankful that they have with unsparing hand driven these unholy abominations out of the book of God’s revelation.

This proves that their honesty was wholesome, not partial or interested”.

(Dr. Warfields’s Collection of Opinions and Reviews Vol. 2, p.82 Quoted “Coy-Inside Story” p.222)

On what authority were these “unholy abominations” driven out of the book of God’s revelation?

Undoubtedly their principal authorities were the two manuscripts Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, which have been demonstrated to be themselves, “unholy abominations”. Each guilty of giving the lie to the other, as we have seen already over 3,000 times in the Gospels, and 7,000 times in the New Testament.

On numerous occasions the framers of modern Greek texts reject both of their idols as untrue, and flee to their junkpile of old manuscripts to find another reading, not quite so obviously ridiculous as the “oldest and best”, Vaticanus, mutilated beyond adequate description, and Sinaiticus with its 15,000 corrections, receive the slavish homage of many modern scholars.

Their faltering speech, supported by manuscripts of equally suspicious character have touched the faint hearts of those who, fearing the term, “unscholarly” outrage their own intellects and bowing to their presumed authority, destroy faith in the Word of God.

An examination of a few more “unholy abominations”.

Firstborn Son

Matthew 1:25 “*And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS*”.

As long as “her firstborn”: remains in the Bible, the world has a conclusive teaching which devastates the Roman Catholic doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary, the mother of Jesus.

Tyndale in his 1526 A.D. New Testament, translates:

“She brought forth her first son; and called His Name Jesus”

The Douay-Rheims Roman Catholic New Testament A.D. 1582 translates:

“She brought forth her firstborn son; and called his name JESUS”.

The scholars promptly bend all of their ingenuity in order to explain why their Bible does not mean what it says; namely, “her firstborn son”.

The Revised Version of 1881 - of Westcott and Hort, is very obliging, as always, to Rome. Without note or comment the word “firstborn” is excised from the text, so that the new reading is: “...she had brought forth a son; and he called his name Jesus”.

Now the door is open for Protestants to receive the error of Rome.

Obediently,

The Revised Standard Version,

The New American Standard Version,

The New English Bible,

The New International Version,

and many others fall in line and omit “firstborn”. Some of my readers may recall memories of the early three ring circus, in which one of the acts was performed by a number of elephants, each one held in his trunk the tail of the one ahead of him. In this manner they all stolidly followed the leader as he led them around in a circle. Thus they got nowhere; while the crowd yelled and cheered at this marvelous sight.

Let us keep this act in mind as we see “all the scholars” agreeing on a reading that is obviously an error.

Nevertheless, Westcott and Hort’s theories says so, and they must follow, or be called unscholarly.

On what manuscript authority is “firstborn” omitted?

“These words, Her firstborn son, are quoted by Tatian (A.D. 172) and twelve of the Fathers before the fourth century. That is the presumed date of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. They are contained in nearly all Manuscripts, except the Vatican and Sinaitic (cent 4).

All the texts omit “her firstborn” on this weak and suspicious evidence. But there is no question about it in Luke 2:7”. (The Companion Bible p.1309)

Utterly unable to find a few scraps of manuscript evidence to the contrary we find the versions are compelled to translate “her firstborn”. So we find it reluctantly included in Luke 2:7.

The Revised Version of 1881

The Revised Standard Version

The Berkeley Version

The New International Version

The New World Translation

And others.

The Question

With all the incontrovertible evidence for “her firstborn” in Luke 2:7, why did so many versions omit the words in Matthew 1:25? Was this prejudice?

The Roman theologians labour industriously, and I fear deceitfully, to convince us that Mary, the mother of Jesus did not have any children by natural generation.

Matthew 13:55-56 *“Is not this the carpenter’s son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this man all these things?”*

The foregoing clearly refers to Joseph as “the carpenter”. Our Lord Jesus as the carpenter’s son (so they thought). His brethren, four in number, are named, and reference is made to His sisters.

The Douay-Rheims Bible contains these verses, which obviously negate the Roman doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary.

A frantic footnote screams helplessly at us.

“Ver. 55 His brethren. These were the children of Mary the wife of Cleophas, sister to our Blessed Lady...and therefore, according to the usual style of the Scripture, they were called brethren, that is near relations to our Saviour”.

Once again the R.C. Bible is made to teach in the footnote that which it does not teach in the text. As always the scripture comes to its own rescue.

Psalm 69:8-9 *“I am become a stranger unto my brethren, and an alien unto my mother’s children. For the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me”.*

John 2:17 *“And his disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up”.*

John 2:17 clearly reveals that Psalm 69:9 is a Messianic prophecy; that is a prophecy which refers to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Verse 8 explodes the Roman Catholic theologians erroneous teaching. It recognizes that our Lord found His Blessed Self to be a stranger unto His brethren, (near relatives in the footnote);

“And an alien unto my mother’s children”

Brethren may refer to near relatives occasionally; but my mother’s children, settles the controversy for ever. Mary did have other children, and the Jesuit’s effort to explain away the truth is exposed as error.

Nevertheless Westcott and Hort admit “firstborn” in Matthew 1:25; but they dare not in Like 2:7. In so doing they have done their best to remove from the Protestant Bibles, that which was described as an “unholy abomination”, by the Roman priest.

Another “unholy abomination” is removed

OR

Is it a most precious jewel?

By Himself

Hebrews 1:3 *“Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;”*

“**By Himself**” is omitted.

This priceless jewel is stolen quietly away. It has disappeared without note or comment from many of the new versions. Obviously it was never intended that readers of the new versions would know that it ever existed.

Leading the way in the march of the noble army of Protestant Bible mutilators, the Revised Version of 1881 under Westcott and Hort, follow the lead of the R.C. Douay Rheims Bible and eject these two precious jewels.

Obediently,

The Revised Standard Version

The New English Bible

The New American Standard Bible

The New International Version

And many others, join the parade and circle around the arena, amidst the thunderous applause of the aforementioned Bible evaluators. Not one of these give the faintest clue to the fact that the two words have been stolen away. Gone is the scholarly hocus pocus; “Not found in the Oldest and Best Manuscripts”. Absent is the misleading, “some Mss. omit”, or the equally deceitful, “Some ancient Mss. add”. Obviously this “jewel theft” is of supreme importance. Not only must the jewel disappear, but there must no evidence be left that would indicate that it had ever existed.

The importance of the jewel - “BY HIMSELF”.

As long as these words remain in Hebrews 1:3, the Protestant world will know that the teaching to the effect that Mary, the mother of Jesus, is co-redemptress of the world is blasphemous and of course completely untrue.

Remove those jewels and the door is left open for Bible believers to believe the lie and a great obstacle to Mary worship is removed.

Upon what manuscript authority is the jewel stolen?

Most scholars refuse to give any information in their margins. A diligent search is necessary.

The mystery is solved and the culprits identified by Dean Henry Alford, in his New Testament for English Readers.

A marginal note informs us;

“By himself” and “our” are not found in our most ancient Mss”.

The question arises,

Why would Westcott and Hort remove those vital words that effectually keep the true Christian from worshipping Mary?

We shall let the record speak for itself.

Westcott writes to his fiancée;

“After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill...Fortunately we found the door open. It is very small, with one kneeling-place; and behind a screen was a ‘Pieta’ the size of life (i.e. a Virgin and dead

Christ)...Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours”.
(Westcott, Life of Westcott, Vol.,I p.81)

No one can worship Mary without detracting greatly from the glories of God, and our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

HORT NO LONGER ABLE TO DISTINGUISH TRUTH

“I am very far from pretending to understand completely the ever renewed vitality of Mariolatry. But is it not much accounted for, on the evil side, by the natural reversion of the religious instinct to idolatry and creature worship and aversion to the Most High; and, ON THE GOOD SIDE, **by a right reaction from the inhuman and semi-diabolical character with which God is invested in all modern orthodoxies-Zeus and Prometheus over again?** IN PROTESTANT COUNTRIES THE FEARFUL NOTION, “Christ the believer’s God” is the result. In Romish countries the Virgin is a nearer and more attractive object, not rejected by the dominant creed; and the Divine Son retires into a distant cloud world with the Father...Another idea has lately occurred to me; is not Mariolatry displacing much worship of scattered saints, and so becoming a tendency towards unity of worship? **...I HAVE BEEN PERSUADED FOR MANY YEARS THAT MARY - WORSHIP AND “JESUS” - WORSHIP HAVE VERY MUCH IN COMMON IN THEIR CAUSES AND THEIR RESULTS**”. (Life and Letters Vol. 2 p.49-51)

Catholic Error

ST. FRANCIS MARIA DE LIGUORI, BLASPHEMES GOD

“We can go ever further, according to St. Ambrose, and say that, having deigned to make Mary His Mother, Jesus Christ obligated Himself to obey her, since He was her Son. For this reason, says Richard of St. Lawrence, while we may say of the other saints that they are “with God”, of Mary alone can it be said that since she was not only favored to be subject to the will of God, but that God Himself was subject to her will, the Lord could well be said to be “with Mary”: The Lord is with thee (Lk. 1:28). And whereas it can be said of all other virgins, the same author remarks, that they follow the Lamb wherever he goes (Apoc. 14:4), of the Blessed Virgin alone can it be said that the Lamb followed her, having become subject to her.....**At the command of Mary, everybody obeys, even God**”.

(The Glories of Mary, Liguori p.111-112)

“With excellent reason the, O sweetest Queen, St. John Damascene calls you the “hope of the despairing”. And with equal right, St. Lawrence Giustiniani calls you the “hope of evil-doers”, and St. Augustine the “hope of evil-doers”, and St. Augustine the “only hope of sinners”. St. Ephrem likes to call you the “safe port of the shipwrecked”. He even goes so far as to call you the “protectress of the damned”. Finally, St. Bernard is right when he tells even the despairing not to despair: “Let him who is without hope hope in you”.

Obviously the thinking of Roman Catholic and Protestant needs the corrective of Holy Scriptures as found in the one and only true Bible, the Authorized Version of 1611.

RADICAL HERESIES OF THE SEMINARIES

The new Bible versions have bought the radical, often blasphemous heresies taught for many years almost exclusively in the seminaries, into the pews and pulpits of the nations.

This is a short lived victory for the powers of darkness.

Without Vaticanus and Sinaiticus it is doubtful that this world of evil could have been inflicted on the Churches.

HORT’S DUPLICITY - A SELF REVELATION

Hort to Roland Williams Oct. 21st, 1858

“The errors and prejudices, which we agree in wishing to remove, can surely be more wholesomely and also more effectually reached by individual efforts of an indirect kind than by combined open assault. At present very many orthodox but rational men are being unawares acted on by influences which will assuredly bear good fruit in due time, if the process is allowed to go on quietly; but I

cannot help fearing that a premature crisis would frighten back many into the merest traditionalism". (Life and Letters - Hort Vol. 1 p.400)

Here we have a plain statement to the effect that Hort, was deliberately leading orthodox believers, by a system of brain washing into the same diabolical trap wherein he and Westcott had fallen.

IX. Is there not yet another missing jewel?

1 Timothy 3:16

Timothy 3:16 *"And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory".*

This time the stolen jewel is a diamond.

The thief has replaced it with "paste" jewelry; namely a cubic zirconia. Gone is the glorious truth; **"God** was manifest in the flesh". Lying limply in its place we gaze in unbelievable amazement at the imitation jewel.

Tyndale's New Testament of 1526, very properly reads: "God was showed in the flesh"

The Douay - Reims R.C. Bible gobbles up the jewel "God", and comes up with "Which was manifested in the flesh".

The King James Authorized Bible restores the stolen jewel reading - "God was manifest in the flesh".

The restoration gives us again that which disappeared in the Jesuit Bible; namely a clear Biblical attestation of the Deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The Revised Version of 1881 - of Westcott and Hort notoriety, removes the word "God" from its glorious position in the English Bible. This action after not less than 355 years of glorious occupation.

A marginal note reads, "The word 'God', in place of 'He who', rests on no sufficient evidence".

So the Revised Version of 1881, reads rather uncomfortably; "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifested in the flesh,..".

Comment:

The above reading is not acceptable! No man was ever manifest except in the flesh. The breathtaking truth taught here is that our Lord Jesus Christ, is "God manifest in the flesh". This marvelous testimony to the Deity of our Lord must be removed if the devil is to forge a one world religion, to which all must bow or die.

The New English Bible reads: "He who was manifested in the body".

There is no footnote of any kind to indicate that an important change has been introduced into the text. Nor is there a note to indicate the "cubic zirconia", left in exchange for the genuine in the N.E.B. Greek text edited by professor Tasker, is an unholy substitute for "God".

Obligingly:

The New American Standard Bible reads: "He who"

But Henry Alford says "Who"; (thus, and not 'which', nor He who). It would appear that the contestants are in danger of knocking each other out of the ring.

The New International Version, not to be out done in contest of corrupting the text and stealing jewels, reads, "He appeared in a body".

When scholars list Vaticanus as omitting "God", from the text they are sorely tempted **not** to mention, that Hort's oldest and best Vaticanus, omits ALL of the first and send Timothy, Titus, and Revelation.

Thus a note, “not found in Vaticanus”, is a meaningless, mischievous, misleading, and monstrous fabrication, designed to deceive and destroy. That is unless the scholar is ignorant of these things.

The N.I.V. footnote reads, “Some MSS. read God”. This is a masterpiece of understatement.

We shall now examine the claim of the Revised Version of 1881.

The marginal note -

The word ‘God’ in place of “He Who”, rests on no sufficient evidence”.

The question is of supreme importance, so it is vital that we be certain of the facts.

The Evidence for reading “God was manifest in the flesh”.

All the Uncial copies, (in Burgon’s day) except two.

The 15,000 times repaired Sinaiticus.

And the most depraved of all Mss.-D.

All of the cursives except one.

And Vaticanus which omits all of 1st and 2nd Timothy, and consequently has nothing to say in this great controversy.

The universal consent of all the Lectionaries, proves that the word, “God”, has been read in all the assemblies of the faithful from the 4th or 5th century of our era.

We inquire next for the testimony of the Fathers; and we discover that a goodly number wrote using “God” in their articles.

Gregory of Nyassa uses “God” twenty-two times. Chrysostom, Dionysius, Diodorus of Tarsus, and many others quote 1 Timothy 3:16 in conformity with the Textus Receptus.

Against this vast array of more than sufficient evidence for our K.J.V. Bible we have a pitiful handful of testimony against it.

1. The exploded Latin fable that Macedonius (A.D. 506) invented the reading.
2. Epiphanius substitutes.
3. A statement by an unknown scholiast that Cyril also substituted.
4. A Latin epistle of Eutherius.
5. A casual reference possible by Bishop Pearson.
6. Theodorus Mopsuest (quoted at the Council of Constantinople. A.D. 553) who in one place substituted and in another balanced this writing, by refusing the substitute. This negates witness #6 as it appears that the writer was neither one side nor the other.

“And this closes the evidence”, so says Dean John Burgon, Revision Revised page 101-103.

Burgon examines the evidence for “Who” in 1 Timothy 3:16.

- (a) It is not found in more than two copies.
- (b) It is not certainly supported by a single Version.
- (c) Nor is it clearly advocated by a single Father.

Burgon states, with the foregoing (lack of) evidence in view; “For ourselves, we venture to deem it incredible that a reading...(as above) can be genuine”.

“It does not at all events admit of question, that until far stronger evidence can be produced in its favour, ‘who’ may on no account be permitted to usurp the place of the commonly received ‘GOD’ of 1 Tim. iii.16. But the present exhibits in a striking and instructive way all the characteristic tokens of a depravation of the text. (1st) At an exceedingly early period it resulted in another deflection. (2nd) It is without the note of Continuity; having died out of the Church’s memory well-nigh 1400 years ago. (3rd) It is deficient in Universality; having been all along denied the Church’s cor-

porate sanction. As a necessary consequence, (4th) It rests at this day on wholly insufficient Evidence: Manuscripts, Versions, Fathers being all against it. (5th) It carries on its front its own refutation". (6th) Lastly, it is condemned by internal considerations. 'Who' is in truth so grossly improbable - rather, so impossible - a reading, that under any circumstances we must have anxiously enquired whether no escape from it was discoverable....should we not have felt that it required an overwhelming consensus of authorities in favour of 'Who' to render such an alternative deserving of serious attention? It is a mere abuse of Bengel's famous axiom to recall it on occasions like the present. We shall be landed in a bathos indeed if we allow gross improbability to become a constraining motive with us in revising the sacred Texts".

(The Revision Revised p.104 and 105)

Burton Continues -

"The traditional reading of the place ought to have been let alone. May we be permitted to say without offense that, in our humble judgment, if the Church of England, at the Revisers' bidding, were to adopt this and thousands of other deprivations of the sacred page, ---with which the Church Universal was once well acquainted, but which in her corporate character she had long since unconditionally condemned and abandoned, -- she would deserve to be pointed at with scorn by the rest of Christendom? Yes, and to have that openly said of her which S. Peter openly said of the false teachers of his day who fell back into the very errors which they had already abjured. The place will be found in 2 S. Peter ii.22".

(The Revision Revised p.105-106)

In Burton's day, exactly 300 Codices witnessed to the fact that the true reading of 1 Timothy 3:16, is "God was manifest in the flesh". (Revision Revised p.528)

The Mystery of godliness, Who!! ---a wretched substitution. "Mystery", being a neuter noun, cannot be followed by the masculine pronoun "who".

Such an expression is abhorrent alike to grammar and to logic, - is intolerable, in Greek as in English. By consequence (who) is found to have been early exchanged for (which). From a copy so depraved, the Latin Version was executed in the second century. Greek authorities for this reading, (who) are few enough. (John Burton Revision Revised p. 438).

Burton's eight page discussion on 1 Timothy 3:16 received a twelve page, rebuttal from Bishop Ellicott. Burton's reply extended to seventy-six pages of overwhelming evidence for the K.J.V. Authorized Bible reading. "Every other known copy of St. Paul's Epistles, (written in the cursive character) I have ascertained (by laborious correspondence with the chiefs of foreign libraries) concurs in exhibiting, 'God was manifest in the flesh'.

Very properly, this champion of "God was manifest in the flesh" declares to his opponent, the hostile evidence collapses therefore". (Revision Revised p.438)

X. CONCLUSION

NOTE TO MY READERS

If you are trusting a new version of the Bible, please consider the monumental evidence to the fact that the whole result of a translation based upon the Oldest and Best Manuscripts, is deceit and departure from the faith "as it was once delivered to the saints". The inevitable result is apostasy.

If at this moment you have feelings of anger and resentment; this indicates that the spirit of error is at work. Horts ghastly prophecy is being fulfilled. The power and influence of the occult is at work, seeking to destroy your faith.

Someone cries, "the new versions are easier to understand!" I agree that this is so; but an honest appraisal of the evidence shows indisputably that **you are understanding error** of the most deadly nature.

In order that the devil may have a one world religion, the doctrine of the Deity of Christ must be destroyed. Having pictured the Lord of Glory, the Prince of Peace, the Creator of the Universe, the

Only Begotten Son of God the Father, as being simply one of a number of religious leaders, the stage is set for the destruction of the soul, and the soon to be destroyed Church of the antichrist to be set up.

Question - do YOU want to be part of that which is on its way to perdition?

“Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other Name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved”. Acts 4:12

THAT NAME IS JESUS!

Copyrighted May 1989

All capitals within the quotations have been provided for emphasis by C.J.C. .