

In defense of a Bible

Not all Bibles are created equally.

Bible version differences do matter, and do affect “major doctrines.”

This is not an exhaustive list of all the discrepancies one can find among the various Bible versions, but a fair attempt at bringing to light some of the issues which arise when one compares them with the Authorized Version.

All passages used as the standard are cited from the authorized version of the English Bible, commonly referred to as the “King James.”

Deity of Christ

Isaiah 48:12 states,

Hearken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called; I am he; I am the first, I also am the last.

This is Jehovah of the Old Testament. We See Jesus Christ make the same claim in Revelation 1:11:

...Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last...

This is the One who is like unto the Son of man (Rev. 1:13), and He that liveth, and was dead, and behold, is alive forevermore (v. 18).

Question: when did God die? *How* can God die? He could only possibly experience death if He took on the form of a man.

Jehovah says in Zechariah 12:10,

And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall

mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn.

Jehovah prophesied that He would be *pierced*, and that the house of David and inhabitants of Jerusalem would *look upon Him*. How could they look upon the invisible God, whom no man hath seen at any time (John 1:18)? They could only look upon Him if Jesus is Jehovah, the fullness of the Godhead bodily. Note also the switch in personal pronouns in the verse above: they shall look upon *me*... and they shall mourn for *him*. Here we see distinction between the Father and the Son, and yet both are One. Both are Jehovah.

Muslims' claim that Jesus never said He was God, or that the Bible doesn't teach that He is God, only exposes their ignorance of what's contained therein.

Jesus states in John 8:58,

Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.

In Exodus 3:14 it is written,

And God said unto Moses, I Am That I Am: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I Am hath sent me unto you.

Jesus is the *I AM*.

In Isaiah 45:23, Jehovah says,

I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.

This is, by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, applied to Christ Himself in Philippians 2:10-11,

That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;
And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Jesus Christ is unmistakably God.

The cross reference between Isaiah 48 and Revelation 1 positively identifies Jesus Christ as the LORD God Almighty of the Old Testament. Cross references are often the mechanism by which the Bible interprets itself, and so it is not a minor thing if a cross reference is removed or changed.

The first part of Revelation 1:11 is not found in most modern Bibles. It is not found in the NIV, the ESV, the NLT, the NASB, the CSB, the ASV, the CEV, the ISV, or the Good News Translation, as well as others.

Granted, Revelation 1:8, even in modern Bibles, contains the words of Christ, "I am the Alpha and the Omega," and thus one can still know that Jesus is God, but the clear cross reference to Jesus as God in Isaiah 48 is removed entirely. In Isaiah 48, Jehovah doesn't say *I am the alpha and the omega*, but He says, *I am the first, I also am the last*. The authorized version of the Bible leaves no ambiguity or room for doubt as to Jesus Christ's claim.

Come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I: and now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me. Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go.
(Isaiah 48:16-17)

This passage identifies the Redeemer also as the Creator.

Consider Ephesians 3, verse 9:

...And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ...

Modern Bible translations do not include the last phrase, "by Jesus Christ."

...and to make plain to everyone the administration of this mystery, which for ages past was kept hidden in God, who created all things.
(New International Version)

I was chosen to explain to everyone this mysterious plan that God, the Creator of all things, had kept secret from the beginning.
(New Living Translation)

...and to bring to light for everyone what is the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God, who created all things...
(English Standard Version)

...and to enlighten all people as to what the plan of the mystery is which for ages has been hidden in God, who created all things...
(NASB)

1 Timothy 3:16 reads as follows in the KJV:

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.

Notice that it says *God* was manifest in the flesh. Consider how modern translations render the verse:

Beyond all question, the mystery from which true godliness springs is great: He appeared in the flesh...
(NIV)

Without question, this is the great mystery of our faith: Christ was revealed in a human body...
(NLT)

Great indeed, we confess, is the mystery of godliness: He was manifested in the flesh...
(ESV)

By common confession, the mystery of godliness is great: He appeared in the flesh...
(BSB)

And confessedly, great is the mystery of godliness: Who was revealed in the flesh...
(BLB)

Beyond question, great is the mystery of godliness: He who was revealed in the flesh...
(NASB)

But the reading of the Authorized Version makes it clear exactly *who* was manifest in the flesh—and that would be *God Himself*—and that He did not simply *appear* in the flesh, or was *revealed* in the flesh, as these other *Gnostic* translations suggest, but that He, *God*, was *manifest* in the flesh.

From a traditional standpoint, this would mean God took on flesh from conception, being born of a woman. From a more accurate standpoint, this is referring to the life of Christ (God) being made manifest in our mortal flesh (Rom. 8:11, alluded to in 2 Cor. 4:11)—this *is* the mystery of Godliness which Paul speaks of in 1 Timothy 3:16, which is the same “great mystery” which Paul speaks of concerning Christ and His church (Eph. 5:30-32), that we are members of His body. Thus, what God the Father did with His Son Jesus, in that He learned obedience through suffering (Heb. 5:8), He is performing in us spiritually today through the ministry. Jesus Christ was not preached unto the gentiles before being received up into glory. This *is* speaking of Christ, but it’s Christ in us, *His Body*, the church. You wouldn’t get that however in the modern versions, because they use the pronoun *he* instead of God.

The authorized Bible leaves no room for doubt as to *who* Jesus Christ is. He is God manifest in the flesh—the Creator, the Redeemer, and the Judge—He is the *fullness of the Godhead bodily*, states Colossians 2:9:

For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

And while modern translations do assert Christ's deity in Colossians 2:9, they use phrases such as *fullness of the Deity* (NIV), *all the fullness of God* (NLT), *the whole fullness of deity* (ESV), and *fullness of God's nature* (CSB).

This isn't problematic unless you realize that the word "trinity" isn't the biblical phrase in English for the divine nature of God, but that the word *Godhead* is, and that it is used exactly three times in the scriptures of the authorized version.

The words translated as *Godhead*, *theiotēs* (θειότης; Rom. 1:20), *theotetos* (θεόπητος; Col. 2:9), and *theion* (θειον; Acts 17:29), can be translated as *divine*, which is what modern translations often choose to render them, but the word *divinity* is insufficient to communicate the nature of said divinity. The phrase *Godhead* implies One Absolute Authority, whereas divinity alone doesn't.

The historic renderings of Hippolytus' and Irenaeus' usages of these Greek words are also *Godhead* (Hippolytus Refutation of All Heresies Book 10, chapter 6; Irenaeus Against Heresies Book 1).

Wycliffe's translation (1395), Tyndale's (1525), Coverdale's (1535), the Great Bible (1540), the Matthew's (1549), the Bishops Bible (1568), the Geneva (1599), the Beza New Testament (1599), and more, have all rendered these three Greek words *theiotes*, *theotetos*, and *theion* as *Godhead*.

Merriam Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary 1967, defines Godhead as following:

" the nature of God ESPECIALLY AS EXISTING IN THREE PERSONS -- used with the".

In the above passage of Isaiah 48 we see the *economic Godhead* described, when The LORD, that is, Jehovah, who is the first and the last (Is. 48:12), states that He laid the foundation of the earth (v. 13), that the LORD has loved Him (vs 14, *past tense*), that the LORD has called Him and will make His way prosperous (vs 15), and that the Lord GOD and His Spirit *hath sent Him* (v. 16); He then says *He is the Redeemer*, and the Holy One of Israel, and that He is the LORD God who teaches Israel to profit (v. 17).

We see here clearly the trinitarian nature of the Godhead, Jehovah making a distinction between Himself, God (that is, the Father), and His Spirit, and yet their personal pronouns (His,

Him, Me, I) are all used interchangeably in this passage as being God. This shows the distinct triune nature of the One True and Holy God.

Jesus Christ is, in fact, *God the Son*; He Himself being God, who laid the foundation of the earth, and yet sent by the Father and the Spirit for the work of redemption.

For,

*Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me,
I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart.*
(Psalm 40:7-8)

Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God.
(Hebrews 10:7)

The triune nature of God is again testified to in 1 John 5, and yet again we see omissions in the text of modern versions.

7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.
(1 John 5:7-8)

The NIV omits the integral part of verse 7:

7 For there are three that testify:
8 the spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement.

As does the ESV:

7 For there are three that testify:
8 the Spirit and the water and the blood; and these three agree.

So too with the NLT:

7 So we have these three witnesses—
8 the Spirit, the water, and the blood—and all three agree.

And also the NASB:

7 For there are three that testify:
8 the Spirit and the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement.

Is it any wonder that entire denominations have now rejected the truth of the trinitarian nature of God, such as “oneness Pentecostalism?”

There is a supposed “controversy” that exists over the passage of 1 John 5:7, that it was a later addition to the scriptures and not a genuine part of scripture at all.

Bruce Metzger, Kurt Aland and other textual critics outright reject(ed) this reading, and spent much time refuting its authenticity. What they fail to take into account, leaning solely on the late date of the manuscripts which *do* contain the verse, is the standard practice of the Catholic Church to persecute any outliers who would depart from the Catholic infrastructure and/or attempt to copy the scriptures for themselves. In so doing, they would often burn any copies of the scriptures these alleged “heretics” possessed. The late dating is to be expected from a historical perspective, for as time marches onward, less likely are the older copies to survive. The reason Sinaiticus survived was because it was forgotten in a monastery, in a trash bin essentially, which should indicate just how highly it had been esteemed by its previous stewards. Note the obvious sarcasm.

James White, Mark Ward and the like, have one fundamental problem—they don’t believe in *any* Bible. Sure, they believe *in* the Bible, and as an academic matter they believe that it is in fact scripture from God and authoritative, but they don’t believe it possible for a Bible to exist in modern times without error. Thus they don’t have any ultimate standard of authority. They are free from the restrictions of any one text, free from the confines of set doctrine, are free to wallow in Greek tenses and the multitudinous nuances that can be interpolated from them *ad infinitum*—an endless black hole of interpretations and man’s devising. They get to take part in the transformation of a “living text,” ever evolving, while they themselves are ever learning, and yet never able to come to the knowledge of the truth (2 Tim. 3:7), let alone stand as the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. 3:15), as the church is upmeant to be. They remain ignorant of the fellowship of the mystery (Eph. 3:9) committed to the apostle of the gentiles (Rom. 11:13), and unable to make known unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God (Eph. 3:10). They cannot discern God’s will for man in the present age. They minister questions rather than Godly edifying which is in FAITH (1 Tim. 1:4). Note that Godly edifying *relies on faith*, and the principle object of our faith is THE WORD. And really this is a matter of faith, because, in the case of textual critics, their faith is in original autographs that they have never seen, and in the text-critical work of men alone. That is what they stand on. Whereas I myself place my faith, not in originals only, and in man and his textual abilities only, but in God and His Word also and ultimately. Textual criticism is necessary—but to place our faith solely in men and approach the Bible as if it were any other book denies what the Bible says about itself, that it is in fact supernatural, inspired by God, and to be preserved through a multiplicity of copies throughout the ages—the best safeguard against corruption or forgery there could be.

I say all that as an aside, but that truly is the heart of this entire matter. Do you have a Bible you can trust and believe, or don’t you? They did not and do not and will not. They’re too busy trying to reconstruct something “better.”

Erasmus, who translated several editions of the Greek *Textus Receptus*, did not include the passage of 1 John 5:7, often referred to as the *Johannine Comma*, in the first edition of his text, but did include it in the second edition. Speculation abounds as to why he did or didn't include it, but to get bogged down on Erasmus is unnecessary. The tradition of this verse extends much farther back than Erasmus.

[The following information is sourced from AV1611.com, who in turn cites Dr. Thomas Holland's book *Crowned With Glory: The Bible from Ancient Text to Authorized Version*]

1 John 5:7 is found in a notable body of evidence. First, it is found in Greek manuscripts 629 (14th century), 61 (16th century), 918 (16th century), 2473 (17th century), and 2318 (18th century); it's also found in the margins of 221, 635, 88, 429, and 636. And though these constitute the minority reading of the Greek manuscripts, the reading is also found in the older Latin manuscripts.

Jerome (347-419/420 AD) says of 1 John 5:7 in his prologue to the canonical epistles:

Just as these (the "general" epistles) are properly understood and so translated faithfully by interpreters into Latin without leaving ambiguity for the readers nor [allowing] the variety of genres to conflict, especially in that text where we read the unity of the trinity is placed in the first letter of John, where much error has occurred at the hands of unfaithful translators contrary to the truth of faith, who have kept just the three words water, blood and spirit in this edition omitting mention of Father, Word and Spirit in which especially the catholic faith is strengthened and the unity of substance of Father, Son and Holy Spirit is attested.

Cyprian (210-258 AD) writes:

The Lord warns, saying, "He who is not with me is against me, and he who gathereth not with me scattereth." He who breaks the peace and the concord of Christ, does so in opposition to Christ; he who gathereth elsewhere than in the Church, scatters the Church of Christ. The Lord says, "I and the Father are one;" and again it is written of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, "And these three are one.

Wycliffe's Bible, which was published in full in 1382, contains 1 John 5:7, because the Latin Vulgate contained 1 John 5:7, and Jerome included this verse because there was ample evidence in the *Vetus Latina* to include it.

In Psalm 132:11, the NIV, NLT, ESV, NKJV, Berean Standard, and the 2020 version of the NASB make the recipient of David's throne simply one of his descendants, rather than God Himself. Interestingly, the NASB 1977 and 1995 editions get this right but the 2020 edition places the

pronoun one in the verse in italics, meaning, that pronoun isn't even found in their base Greek text.

KJB

The LORD hath sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it; Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne.

NIV

The LORD swore an oath to David, a sure oath he will not revoke: "One of your own descendants I will place on your throne."

NLT

The LORD swore an oath to David with a promise he will never take back: "I will place one of your descendants on your throne."

ESV

The LORD swore to David a sure oath from which he will not turn back: "One of the sons of your body I will set on your throne."

BSB

The LORD swore an oath to David, a promise He will not revoke: "One of your descendants I will place on your throne."

NKJV

The LORD has sworn in truth to David; He will not turn from it: "I will set upon your throne the fruit of your body."

NASB

The LORD has sworn to David A truth from which He will not turn back: "I will set upon your throne one from the fruit of your body."

In Genesis 22:8, only the AV reads in such a way as to imply that God will offer Himself a sacrifice:

KJB

And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering: so they went both of them together.

NIV

Abraham answered, "God himself will provide the lamb for the burnt offering, my son." And the two of them went on together.

NLT

“God will provide a sheep for the burnt offering, my son,” Abraham answered. And they both walked on together.

ESV

Abraham said, “God will provide for himself the lamb for a burnt offering, my son.” So they went both of them together.

NASB

Abraham said, “God will provide for Himself the lamb for the burnt offering, my son.” So the two of them walked on together.

Not only are there affirmations of Jesus’ deity effected in new translations, but there are corruptions that effect His attributes as deity.

Luke 2:22 says *Their* purification (NLT, ESV, BLB, NASB), but the KJB says *her* purification. Leviticus 12:6 says specifically that the “purification” is for the woman, and the offerings that are subsequently required at the temple include not only a burnt offering but a *sin* offering. So, did *Jesus* need a *sin* offering?

In Luke 2:33, should it read Joseph and his mother (KJB) or his father and his mother (NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, LSB, BLB, BSB)?
Wasn’t God Jesus’ Father?

In Matthew 1:25, the phrase *firstborn* in reference to Jesus is removed. Exodus 13:2 says all the firstborn are sanctified unto the Lord; Ex. 34:19 all that open the matrix are the Lord’s.

In Matthew 5:22, when Jesus says Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment, but in new versions the phrase *Without a cause* is omitted, and in Mark 3:5 Jesus is angered. Is He then in danger of judgment?

In John 7:8, Jesus says, I go not up yet to this feast, and in verse 10, it says, *But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.* Here we see how the word *yet* could change the reader's entire perception of Jesus. New versions do not include the word *yet*.

The phenomena of alterations and omissions are found in nearly every major “translation” of the Bible since the “Revised Version,” (New Testament published in 1881, Old and New Testament in 1885) which is based on the critical Westcott and Hort Greek text (1881) and the critical Tregelles text (1857). These critical Greek texts used as their primary source manuscripts which are fewer in number, with a higher level of disagreement amongst themselves and with the majority of extant texts, as well as the historical witness of the scriptures as quoted in the works of the ante nicene “fathers,” such as John Chrysostom, as well as early church lectionaries, *and yet* this minority of manuscripts is thought to be “more accurate” because they are placed at an earlier date of origin.

Older does not necessarily mean *better*, however.

For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God...
(2 Corinth. 2:17)

Even in Paul’s day, there were already attempts to subvert the truth of the scriptures. And why wouldn’t there be? Paul himself attests to the fact that the revelation given to him by Christ was the capstone of revelation—that he would be used instrumentally in the completion of the canon of scripture:

Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God....
(Colossians 1:25)

Paul also addresses the issue of forgeries in his name:

That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us...
(2 Thess. 2:2)

He thus affirms the authenticity of the letter at the end:

The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write.
(2 Thess. 3:17)

The corruption of God’s word was already underway in the time of the apostle Paul, for, *the mystery of iniquity*, he writes, *doth already work* (2 Thess. 2:7), a reference no doubt to the religious system which will one day culminate with humanities worship of the Beast (i.e. Satan), and which began with the turning away from the truth of God’s inspired Word unto fables and vain jangling (1 Tim. 1:4,6), unto Jewish fables and the commandments of men (Titus 1:14). Sadly, the general apostasy of believers from the truth was also already underway in Paul’s lifetime, as he writes,

This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me; of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.
(2 Timothy 1:15)

Apostasy from truth and the corruption of scripture was already taking place in the first century.

[As an aside, consider what the “New King James” Version says in 2 Corinthians 2:17:

For we are not, as so many, peddling the word of God...

There is quite a difference between *corrupting* and *peddling*. Ironical in that it changes *corruption* into the very thing they’re aiming to do: *peddle* the Word of God; and they justify this by of course appealing to Greek nuances that the translators of the authorized version obviously rejected.]

And so it is of no real consequence whether a manuscript be older in date or not, when that manuscript by its very nature is one of corruption. The oldest manuscripts are still some 3 centuries removed from the time of the apostle Paul in any case.

Dean Burgon, who himself collated and examined codices Alexandrinus (A), Vaticanus (B), Bezae (D), and Sinaiticus (κ)—the oldest extant manuscripts of the New Testament—makes the following statements in his late nineteenth century work *The Revision Revised*:

I. And, first of all, the reader has need to be apprised (with reference to the first-named class of evidence) that most of our extant COPIES of the N. T. Scriptures are comparatively of recent date, ranging from the Xth to the XIVth century of our era. That these are in every instance copies of yet older manuscripts, is self-evident; and that in the main they represent faithfully the sacred autographs themselves, no reasonable person doubts. Still, it is undeniable that they are thus separated by about a thousand years from their inspired archetypes. Readers are reminded, in passing, that the little handful of copies on which we rely for the texts of Herodotus and Thucydides, of Æschylus and Sophocles, are removed from their originals by full 500 years more: and that, instead of a thousand, or half a thousand copies, we are dependent for the text of certain of these authors on as many copies as may be counted on the fingers of one hand. In truth, the security which the Text of the New Testament enjoys is altogether unique and extraordinary. To specify one single consideration, which has never yet attracted nearly the amount of attention it deserves—‘Lectionaries abound,

which establish the Text which has been publicly read in the churches of the East, from at least A.D. 400 until the time of the invention of printing.

But here an important consideration claims special attention. We allude to the result of increased acquaintance with certain of the oldest extant codices of the N.T. Two of these,—viz. a copy in the Vatican technically indicated by the letter B, and the recently-discovered Sinaitic codex, styled after the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet (Aleph) are thought to belong to the IVth century. Two are assigned to the Vth, viz. the Alexandrian (A) in the British Museum, and the rescript codex preserved at Paris, designated c.

One is probably of the VIth, viz. the codex Bezae (D) preserved at Cambridge. Singular to relate, the first, second, fourth, and fifth of these codices (B Aleph C D), but especially B and (Aleph), 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.

Between the first two (B and Aleph) there subsists an amount of sinister resemblance, which proves that they must have been derived at no very remote period from the same corrupt

original. Tischendorf insists that they were partly written by the same scribe.

Yet do they stand asunder in every page; as well as differ widely from the commonly received Text, with which they have been carefully collated. On being referred to this standard, in the Gospels alone, B is found to omit at least 2877 words : to add, 536 : to substitute, 935: to transpose, 2098 : to modify, 1132 (in all 7578):

—the corresponding figures for Aleph being severally 3455, 839, 1114, 2299, 1265 (in all 8972).

And be it remembered that the omissions, additions, substitutions, transpositions, and modifications, are by no means the same in both. It is in fact easier to find two consecutive verses in which these two MSS. differ the one from the other, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree.

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.'¹ 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 2nd-century text. 'When we turn to the Acts of the Apostles,' (says the learned editor of the codex in question, Dr. Scrivener, 1)—

'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.'

Vix dici potest' (says Mill) 'quam supra omnem modum licenter se gesserit, ac plane lasciverit Interpolator.'

Though a large portion of the Gospels is missing, in what remains (tested by the same standard) we find 3704 words omitted: no less than 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, which bears on its front a memorable note of the evil reputé 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 perversions of the truth of Scripture.2—Next in impurity comes B:—then, the fragmentary codex C: our own A being, beyond all doubt, disfigured by the fewest blemishes of any.

What precedes admits to some extent of further numerical illustration. It is discovered that in 111 (out of 320) pages of an ordinary copy of the Greek Testament, in which alone these five manuscripts are collectively available for comparison in the Gospels,—the serious deflections of A from the Textus receptus amount in all to only 842: whereas in C they amount to 1798: in B, to 2370: in Aleph, to 3392: in D, to 4697. The readings peculiar to A within the same limits are 133: those peculiar to C are 170. But those of B amount to 197: while Aleph exhibits 443: and the readings peculiar to D (within the same limits), are no fewer than 1829. . . . We submit that these facts—which result from merely referring five manuscripts to one and the same common standard—are by no means calculated to inspire confidence in codices B Aleph C D:—codices, be it remembered, which come to us without a character, without a history, in fact without antecedents of any kind.

But let the learned chairman of the New Testament company of Revisionists (Bp. Ellicott) be heard on this subject. He is characterizing the same 'old uncials,' which it is just now the fashion—or rather, the craze—to hold up as oracular, and to which his lordship is as devotedly and blindly attached as any of his neighbours:—

(Article 1, pg. 10-14)

These numbers reflect the sterling reputation of the “*oldest and best*” manuscripts praised by modern scholarship and held as the standard to which all bibles should now be held.

Nowhere does the Bible itself set a pattern for believers to go digging for the oldest, but assumes that the scriptures are present and available.

Consider 2 Timothy 3:15-17:

...And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

Notice that the purpose of Scripture—that the man of God be perfect and furnished unto all good works—can only be fulfilled if it is preserved and available.

These good works of 2 Timothy 3 are not arbitrary, but correspond to God's will for this dispensation. When one begins altering or "correcting" the words of the Bible, what invariably happens is the clear distinctions in the Bible become obscured, and God's will becomes a mix of the various instructions He gives throughout the ages, and in an attempt to resolve the confusion Christianity throws up its hands and gives in to cliches like "just follow Jesus," rather than a specific set of instructions, with a specific base of knowledge at its foundation. Of course we should follow Jesus. But *how* we follow Jesus matters, and this is the crux of the issue, that Jesus' dispensation and set of instructions changed from Acts 8 to the conversion of the apostle Paul.

It can be biblically demonstrated that the preservation of God's word through history has always been accomplished through copies. The two tables of stone which Moses made, having broken the originals, were later put into the Ark of the covenant, which no one ever opened again and lived to tell about (1 Sam. 6:19).

And yet no one doubts the veracity of the Ten Commandments as we know them today; they were to be written on the Israelites door posts, bound to their hands and placed between their eyes. It is not a debated issue at all, that from the time the tables of stone were put into the Ark the sole transmission of these commandments were written copies.

Neither is language a barrier to the transmission and preservation of God's word; if the "scholars" were at all consistent in their reasoning, passages such as Acts 22 in the Greek manuscripts, where Paul gives his testimony before the Jews in Jerusalem in the Hebrew tongue, would not be considered authoritative even in the original Greek autographs, since the original language in which it was spoken would have been Hebrew, and the Greek but a translation.

The accounts in the gospels too, no doubt, were not spoken in Koine Greek, but we're most likely spoken in Aramaic and at times Hebrew. And so if, for instance, the gospel of Luke was originally inspired in Greek, it was a text that was inspired as a translation from the original spoken language. This would mean that the language into which it was translated was perfectly sufficient to accurately and authoritatively convey every word, meaning any idea that God wanted to convey. And if Greek was sufficient for this, then that means a translation into another language is not at all a barrier to preserving the text.

[If copies cannot be authoritative, then how can we know that what we have in our English Bible is accurate? According to modern scholars, we can't. We can only have textual confidence, but not certainty. This leaves more than a little wiggle room in the rendering of words and phrases, opening the door for men to do what is right in their own eyes, trusting their own consciences rather than the infallible words of an eternal God, who's Words are forever settled in heaven (Psalm 119:89).

Keep in mind, no original texts exist; we simply don't have them. And without the standard of the "inspired originals," how can we know that what we have is accurate or not? The answer comes by allowing the Bible to be its own proof: through cross references it interprets itself, and through a cross examination of scripture with the scriptures (comparing spiritual things with spiritual as Paul states in 1 Corinthians 2:13), we see that it is consistent and without error.

The same can't be said with modern Bible versions.

To the carnal man, finding some obscure text in the ground after thousands of years is considered to be some "holy grail," holding precious secrets long since forgotten, some hidden truth. Never mind that they refuse to understand the Bible right in front of them... But perhaps they were forgotten in the dirt because real Christians knew they weren't authentic in the first place, especially as the Body of Christ was first being formed, during the time of Israel's diminishing (Rom. 11:12), when they were endued with spiritual giftings prior to the completion of the scriptures, as a mechanism by which they could know truth from falsehood and preach and know that truth by the Spirit prior to the letter. This is perhaps why there were fewer copies made of these more obscure texts, and why the ones that *were* made were forgotten, buried in the ground, as opposed to the proliferation of copies extending into the later eras of human history, such as the Byzantine tradition of manuscripts, many of which are dated to the Middle Ages.

When thinking about these things, I'm always reminded of Isaiah 45:19, which says,

I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth: I said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain: I the LORD speak righteousness, I declare things that are right.

The Lord did not speak in secret, in some dark place of the earth, as if in utterance from the mouth of some remote cave...from the stone and the dirt. He associates such with *vanity*. He speaks *righteousness*, He declares.

******What good would God's word be if it was not made known? How then could His word judge men at the last day?

John 12:48 - *He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.*

Certainly *God Himself* could judge sinners regardless of His Word being made known and published abroad; but for *His Word* to judge men at the last day requires that it be available for men to believe and obey, or not—that it be preserved.

[Even the judgment of the Body of Christ in the heavens, at the Day of Christ, is based upon knowledge of mystery revealed to Paul, and the pattern thereby set forth, and requires our building upon the foundation that he laid, that is, fidelity to the doctrine revealed to Paul by Christ, both in faith and practice. Without the preservation of the scriptures, many already as yet obscure passages are even further obscured, leaving most unaware altogether of the distinct nature of Paul's apostleship as opposed to the twelve. This is something we will touch on later however.]

*******Modern versions, though still containing aspects of truth, actually do affect "major doctrines." For instance, references to *Jesus as God* are changed or omitted:

In Acts 8:37, the Ethiopian eunuch confesses that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, before Philip allows him to be baptized in water:

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

This verse is entirely omitted from the NLT, the ESV, the NIV, the BSB, and some editions of the NASB. It's bracketed in the Amplified Bible with a footnote stating that early manuscripts do not contain this verse, casting doubt in the mind of the believer as to whether it's genuine at all. One doesn't need to subscribe to conspiracy in order to understand the reason behind any mistakes or omissions in the Bible.

Around the middle of the second century, the Catechetical School of Alexandria was established, led by men such as Clement, Origen, and Pantaenus—men more aptly described as philosophers, in some cases with ideas more resembling gnosticism, who popularized the allegorical interpretation of scripture, and who often tried to harmonize Greek culture, ideas, and

philosophy with Christianity, though they are largely regarded as orthodox by the Catholic infrastructure and their “protestant” following.

Later, Augustine of Hippo (354-430 AD) would also carry the torch of allegorical interpretation, and continue to sow the seeds of doctrine that would eventually become cemented as “official church” (Roman Catholic) doctrine through his writings. Augustine was a disciple of Manichaeism for nine years before he became a “Christian,” which was a sect who followed the teachings of Mani (AD 216-277), a Persian who claimed he was the Paraclete who would reestablish the teachings of Christ in their pure form, who was eventually crucified for his teachings. Mani’s beliefs and teachings however were a far cry from being biblically sound, and imitated the dualism of Gnosticism, believing that Christ had no literal physical body but was spiritual, and did not actually die on the cross. Augustine eventually left Manichaeism yet retained some of its ideals and those ideals continued to shape his theology.

Some century and a half prior to Augustine, Adamantius Origen of Alexandria was engaged in the work of Bible translation, producing *the Hexapla*, a series of six critical translations of the Old Testament published in side by side columns, in Hebrew and in Greek. It is from this work that in 382 AD Jerome began to create the Latin vulgate at the command of Pope Damasus. What other translational efforts were taking place in Alexandria around that time we can’t be certain, though codex Vaticanus, one of the premier manuscripts of modern day textual critics, is commonly dated to the fourth century AD, and is thought to possibly originate in Alexandria (though other locales such as Caesarea and Italy have also been proposed).

Pantaenus, the first known president of the catechetical school of Alexandria, is recorded by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History (book 5, chapter 10) as having been trained in stoic philosophy.

***The following is an excerpt from Will Kinney’s website, *Another King James Bible Believer*.

The evidence in favor of including this verse (Acts 8:37) is quite massive. It is found in the Greek texts of Erasmus, Stephanus 1550, Beza 1598, Elzevir 1633 and Scrivener 1894. It is in manuscripts E, 4, 36, 88, 97, 103, 104, 242, 257, 307, 322, 323, 385, 429, 453, 464, 467, 629, 630, 913, 945, 1522, 1739, 1765, 1877, 1891, and others.

Why would omissions be made in the first place if one were making copies of the scriptures? It is possible that men who had been corrupted by philosophy and Gnosticism were not comfortable with the idea that Jesus was in fact Jehovah of the Old Testament—that He is in fact God; that God exists in three persons as *One*, or that Christ Himself preexisted His incarnation.

In Gnostic theology, the God of the Old Testament was considered a vengeful demiurge, a lesser god who was the offspring of the true God (who exists apart from material creation) and “Sophia,” that is, Wisdom. This lesser god is said to be an imperfect offspring responsible for the creation of the material world and all of its flaws. Thus they believed the physical world to be

evil, and the spiritual good. They believed that Jesus was the son of the true god, not the lesser demiurge, and that He came to bring knowledge (gnosis) to humanity, that we might attain deliverance from the evil, physical world in which we live. They categorically denied the bodily resurrection of Christ, since the flesh was considered evil; some even denied that He was in fact the incarnation of God Himself in the flesh, though not all.

And so, if Jesus is the God of the Old Testament, their system of theology falls apart.

In 1945, in Nag Hammadi, a town in eastern Egypt along the Nile, thirteen papyri were found which date back to around 350 AD. The manuscripts include pseudepigraphical works such as the gospel of Thomas and the gospel of Phillip. These writings are unequivocally Gnostic in content and help us to see the prevalence of this belief system in the North African continent at that time.

Is it any wonder with Gnosticism so widespread that copies of the scriptures would eventually be adulterated?

Another change in these manuscripts that has carried over into modern Bibles is found in Daniel 3:25.

The authorized version reads as follows:

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

Certainly Nebuchadnezzar at this juncture in life had no faith or fidelity to Daniel's God, nor would he have knowledge of God's Son. It is possible Daniel himself had little or no knowledge of God's Son either, for that matter, except perhaps through what the scriptures revealed. What Nebuchadnezzar was inspired to speak was not for himself alone but for the witness of Scripture, for a witness of God the Son preexisting His incarnation, since He is Jehovah, the Lord God Almighty. God has often used the unbelievers or the unfaithful to express truths in the scriptures, such as Balaam who prophesied blessing over Israel in spite of his own motives to curse Israel for gain; or Caiaphas the high priest who didn't even believe that Jesus was the Christ, who prophesied that it was better for one man to die for the nation of Israel than that the whole nation should perish

New versions render Daniel 3:25 as follows:

He said, "Look! I see four men walking around in the fire, unbound and unharmed, and the fourth looks like a son of the gods."
(NIV)

"Look!" Nebuchadnezzar shouted. "I see four men, unbound, walking around in the fire unharmed! And the fourth looks like a god!"

(NLT)

He answered and said, "But I see four men unbound, walking in the midst of the fire, and they are not hurt; and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods."

(ESV)

He said, "Look! I see four men loosed and walking about in the midst of the fire without harm, and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods!"

(NASB 1995 edition)

He responded, "Look! I see four men untied and walking about in the middle of the fire [r]unharmd, and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods!"

(NASB 2020 edition)

The content of this verse is entirely changed in meaning. The fourth man was either the Son of God, or like a son of the gods, or like a god. All cannot be true, if God's Word is true and to be believed.

Omissions

Luke 11:2-4 - And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.

The NIV, the NASB, the ESV, and the NLT all omit key parts of the above prayer; namely, they omit the phrase, *which art in heaven*; they omit *thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth*; and they omit *but deliver us from evil*.

This prayer does not acknowledge their father as being in heaven, it does not request the Father in heaven's will to be done on the earth, and does not request to be delivered from evil. Rather, it simply asks for forgiveness and daily food. But the disciples were taught in Matthew 6:33,

...seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

They were to seek His will *first*. This was not *the Lord's prayer*—the Lord never prayed this prayer once, because He never needed forgiveness of sins. This was Christ teaching the remnant of Israel what to pray as they went into the prophesied time of tribulation, before their kingdom promises were realized—a time when, in order to buy or sell, one would have to take the mark of the beast, or else face starvation, persecution, homelessness, etc.

But, if they sought first God's kingdom and righteousness, and kept the commandments and faith of Christ, God would and will provide for them daily bread just as He did in the wilderness after they were delivered from Egypt

Matthew 17:21 - *Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.*

This verse is entirely omitted from the ESV, the NIV, the NLT, the BSB, from the 2020 edition of the NASB, and is bracketed in the 1977 edition of the NASB.

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

This verse is entirely omitted from the ESV, the NIV, the “new” New American Standard Bible, bracketed in the 1977 edition, bracketed in the Legacy Standard Bible, bracketed in the Amplified Bible, omitted from the ASV, omitted from the ERV, and bracketed in the LSV.

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

This verse is omitted from the ESV, the NASB, the NIV, the NLT, the BSB, the ASV, the ERV, bracketed in the LSV, LSB, the Amplified Bible, and the NASB 1977 edition. This verse is actually present in the NASB 1995 edition—which tells us clearly that these “translators,” *publishers* really *at best*, have no clue what they're doing. One edition affirms, *yes this verse is part of the eternal and perfect Word of God*, the next edition of the same Bible removes it entirely.

Sorry, we were wrong. Maybe we'll change our minds again though in ten years.

Mark 16, verses 9-20, along with John 20:21-23, Matthew 28:16-20, and Luke 24:46-49, are all accounts of Jesus' commission to the twelve apostles of Israel for the kingdom of God on the earth, and explain several aspects of their mission eschatologically, namely, that they would have to go through the time of prophesied tribulation where special signs would follow them (Mark 16), that they would be preserved through it, that they would have to first begin preaching in Jerusalem (Luke 24:47), to the leaders of Israel, that is, those who sit in Moses' seat (Matt. 23:2), and then to the nations, teaching the scattered remnant of Israel to observe the Law of Moses and all things that Christ commanded, and baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost (Matt. 28:19-20), and then acting as priests, that is, mediators, between God and humanity in their Kingdom (John 20:23).

The signs given in Mark 16 are specially tailored to the unique situation the remnant of Israel will be in during the tribulation. And yet Mark chapter 16, verses 9 through 20 are thought to not belong in scripture at all because two of the oldest manuscripts do not contain the passage.

It is bracketed in the ESV with a footnote casting doubt, stating:

[Some of the earliest manuscripts do not include 16:9–20.]

The NLT offers a hard break after verse 8 with the following:

[The most ancient manuscripts of Mark conclude with verse 16:8. Later manuscripts add one or both of the following endings.]

The NLT then proceeds to first offer verse 20 in conclusion, then verses 9 through 20 as an alternative conclusion.

The NIV handles the passage in similar form, including a comment in brackets and the rest of the chapter in italics; the NASB brackets verses 9 through 20 and adds a footnote.

All cast doubt as to the authenticity of the passage. Sure, they include it in brackets, but they make sure to tell you that it doesn't belong so as to cause doubt. And so the question must be asked to those who use and promote those versions: do you have a perfect Bible? Do you have God's eternal, infallible word or not? If the Bible's full of passages that supposedly don't belong, how can we trust ANYTHING in it? The special revelation the Bible contains *cannot* be discerned naturally—it had to be revealed by God in a way that could communicate those truths *specifically*, such as through language. Pictures could not communicate many of the truths recorded therein; but in man's abuse and obscuring of the verbally inspired Word of God, they've reduced many of those truths to vague characatures. The idea has always been, by man's philosophy, let's make the Bible "easier to understand," let's change the words. But with the increase and promotion of new Bible translations into "simpler" forms of speech, Bible literacy has actually declined substantially.

John 7:53 through John 8:11, the account of the woman caught in adultery, is dealt with much as Mark 16, being italicized or bracketed in modern versions with a footnote stating that early manuscripts do not contain these verses.

John 7 ends with,

And every man went unto his own house.

This occurred after the Pharisees and Chief priests sought to have officers take hold of Jesus, that He might be brought to them.

John 8 begins with,

Jesus went unto the mount of Olives.

Undoubtedly this is a continuation of the thought in 7:53, that every man went unto his own house, and yet Jesus went to the Mount of Olives.

He then goes to the temple early in the morning, and all the people came to Him, and He sat down and taught them (vs 2).

It is then that the scribes and Pharisees bring to Him the woman who was caught in adultery. This entire account is doubted by modern scholarship at large.

Immediately after Jesus says to the woman, *go and sin no more*, the very next verse states,

Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life. (vs 12)

Remember, He was in the temple teaching as verse 2 states, and the scribes and Pharisees brought to Him the woman (vs 3), thus, Jesus is still with the people in the temple. And so verse 12 makes sense if Jesus was in the temple teaching, for Him to speak unto them *again*. You cannot speak again unless you spoke once before.

And yet modern versions jump from chapter 7 verse 52, where the Pharisees are speaking with Nicodemus, to chapter 8 verse 12, when,

...Then spake Jesus again unto them...

This makes no sense contextually if Jesus was not speaking in the temple to begin with, which is what the footnotes all imply.

Modern versions also obscure the substitutionary atonement of Christ and His blood, both in prophecy and epistle:

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

...in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.
(NIV)

...who purchased our freedom and forgave our sins.
(NLT)

...in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.

(ESV)

...in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.

(NASB)

An almost identical reading is found in Ephesians 1:7; new versions include the blood in this passage, but do not include it in Colossians. It is clear however from other passages that forgiveness requires atonement, and atonement requires blood, since life is in the blood:

For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul. (Leviticus 17:11)

The substitutionary atonement is obscured in important prophecies regarding Messiah's death:

Daniel 9:26A - And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself...

After the sixty-two 'sevens,' the Anointed One will be put to death and will have nothing.
(NIV)

After this period of sixty-two sets of seven, the Anointed One will be killed, appearing to have accomplished nothing...
(NLT)

And after the sixty-two weeks, an anointed one shall be cut off and shall have nothing.
(ESV)

Then after the sixty-two weeks, the Messiah will be cut off and have nothing...
(NASB)

The phrase *cut off* is used elsewhere in prophecy to describe Christ's death as an offering for the sins of His people:

Isaiah 53:8-10

He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken.

And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.

Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand

Messiah being cut off, *but not for Himself*, that is, for the sins of His people, is explained in this passage of Isaiah for us, and yet modern bibles render Daniel 9:26 as *and he shall have nothing*, or, *appearing to have accomplished nothing*, which entirely changes the meaning of the passage, diminishing its importance and destroying the cross reference to Isaiah 53.

Errors

Mark 1:1-3

The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God;

As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

We see here the author citing *the prophets*, and proceeding to quote two different passages:

Malachi 3:1(a) - *Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me...*

Isaiah 40:3 - *The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.*

Thus it is fitting that Mark chapter 1, verse 2, specifically states *As it is written in the prophets*, as it is not simply from one prophet in particular but two.

Many new Bible “versions” cite Isaiah alone, and fail to clarify that there are in fact two separate prophets being quoted here:

This is the Good News about Jesus the Messiah, the Son of God. It began just as the prophet Isaiah had written:

Look, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, and he will prepare your way.

He is a voice shouting in the wilderness,

‘Prepare the way for the LORD’s coming!

Clear the road for him!’

(NLT)

The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. As it is written in Isaiah the prophet.

*“Behold, I send my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way,
the voice of one crying in the wilderness:*

*'Prepare the way of the Lord,
make his paths straight,'"*
(ESV)

The beginning of the good news about Jesus the Messiah, a the Son of God, as it is written in Isaiah the prophet:

*"I will send my messenger ahead of you,
who will prepare your way" —
"a voice of one calling in the wilderness,
'Prepare the way for the Lord,
make straight paths for him.' "*
(NIV)

The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, just as it is written in Isaiah the prophet:

*"BEHOLD, I AM SENDING MY MESSENGER BEFORE YOU,
WHO WILL PREPARE YOUR WAY;
THE VOICE OF ONE CALLING OUT IN THE WILDERNESS,
'PREPARE THE WAY OF THE LORD,
MAKE HIS PATHS STRAIGHT!'"*
(NASB)

This is not an exhaustive list but I've chosen the four main Bible translations in use at present to show that all four inaccurately attribute two separate passages from two separate prophets to Isaiah alone.

In Matthew 17, when Jesus' disciples ask Him why they were unable to cast out a devil, Jesus replies in verse 20 with,

...Because of your unbelief: for verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you.

And yet, modern versions, again taking their cue from the critical texts of Nestle and Aland and Westcott and Hort, read as follows:

He replied, "Because you have so little faith. Truly I tell you, if you have faith as small as a mustard seed, you can say to this mountain, 'Move from here to there,' and it will move. Nothing will be impossible for you." (NIV)

"You don't have enough faith," Jesus told them. "I tell you the truth, if you had faith even as small as a mustard seed, you could say to this mountain, 'Move from here to there,' and it would move. Nothing would be impossible." (NLT)

He said to them, “Because of your little faith. For truly, I say to you, if you have faith like a grain of mustard seed, you will say to this mountain, ‘Move from here to there,’ and it will move, and nothing will be impossible for you.” (ESV)

And He said to them, “Because of your meager faith; for truly I say to you, if you have faith the size of a mustard seed, you will say to this mountain, ‘Move from here to there,’ and it will move; and nothing will be impossible for you.” (NASB)

The issue wasn’t their “little faith,” because even faith the size of a mustard seed would have sufficed; the issue was their *unbelief*.

Another error found in some modern versions is they make Paul out to be the worst sinner of all time, rather than the chief—tha

Another error can be found in Luke 2:33, which states,

And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

Some modern versions depart from the narrative of Jesus’ miraculous birth by stating that Joseph was Jesus’ father:

The child’s father and mother marveled at what was said about him.
(NIV)

And his father and his mother marveled at what was said about him.
(ESV)

And His father and mother were amazed at the things which were being said about Him.
(NASB)

The Amplified Bible at least puts the word *legal* in brackets before *father* to stay in keeping with the truth of Mary’s conception by the Holy Ghost; the NLT simply uses the words *Jesus’ parents*, avoiding the issue altogether.

Another mistake can be found at the very outset of the Bible. Genesis 1 states that in the beginning, God created *the heaven* (singular) and the earth.

There was only one heaven in the beginning. The *heavens*, plural, only came into existence on the second day, after God separated the waters which were above from the waters which were below, creating the firmament between the highest heaven where God’s throne is and the heaven which encompasses the earth, that is, the sky. Thus there are three heavens; this is attested to by the pen of the apostle Paul by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost in 2 Corinthians 12:2:

I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven.

In the beginning, however, there was only *the heaven*, singular, and the earth, and no firmament existed.

Yet modern versions contradict themselves in this:

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.
(NIV)

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.
(NLT)

In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.
(ESV)

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.
(NKJV)

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.
(NASB)

Perhaps some would say that this is splitting hairs, and unimportant. Jesus says after all that in the beginning God created them male and female, and this was on the sixth day. But the context of Genesis 1:1 demands that this interpretation be incorrect:

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.
(vs 1)

And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.
(vs 2)

Verse 2 is connected to verse 1, and so defines “the beginning” not simply as the the week of creation, which can also be defined as the beginning, but as *the beginning of the beginning*, when the earth was without form and void, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters, prior to their separation and the creation of the firmament.

Thus at the outset, from the very first line of the very first passage, modern Bible translations get it wrong.

Modern versions also make Jesus subject to judgment, that is, they make Jesus out to be a sinner. Consider Matthew 5:22 in the KJV:

But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.

Jesus here is giving an addendum to the Law of Moses, as He is the Law-Giver Himself, and is explaining the economy of how to enter the Messianic Kingdom on the earth, and the standards of judgment that will be executed there. In verse 22 He explains that to be angry with your brother *without a cause* is worthy of judgment; to call a man worthless (*raca*) also is one thing, and worthy of being brought before the court, but to say *thou fool* is to say that their brother, who is a part of Israel and a child of Jehovah, is the same as a Godless heathen, for, *the fool hath said in his heart, there is no God* (Psalm 14:1).

(Interesting to note is that only those of Israel who believe in and obey God in the personhood of Christ are considered brothers and enter the kingdom, and in that kingdom they will know Christ personally as King and High priest, and will serve under Him as a nation of priests; and so to call a brother a fool would be a lie, for they will all know and believe in God and in Christ as the image of the invisible God. Thus, to call one a fool would be slander. Contrast this with Paul, who in 1 Corinthians 15:36 calls those who doubt the resurrection fools, as we currently live in an age where men indeed *do* doubt and disbelieve God, and by virtue of which are indeed fools. Even God Himself, in Luke 12:20, calls the man who laid up treasures on earth to the neglect of God's will a fool. Such a man is indeed a fool.)

According to the Law (which Jesus here in Matthew 5 is not abrogating but in fact clarifying), *thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart: thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him* (Lev. 19:17). According to the Law, the sin was not the rebuke itself, but the posture of the heart. It was a righteous thing to air your grievances with your brother, rather than to secretly harbor hatred in your heart because of them; thus *the cause* of those feelings was considered legitimate.

And so we see the reading of Matthew 5:22 in the KJV is consistent with the Law of Moses. To be angry for a cause was not considered sinful. We see this testified to also by Paul in Ephesians 4:6:

Be ye angry, and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath...

And yet modern versions do not include the phrase *without a cause* in Matthew 5:22:

But I tell you that anyone who is angry with a brother or sister will be subject to judgment. (NIV)

But I say, if you are even angry with someone, you are subject to judgment!
(NLT)

But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment...

(ESV)

But I tell you that anyone who is angry with his brother will be subject to judgment.

(BSB)

But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother shall be answerable to the court...

(NASB)

But I tell you, everyone who is angry with his brother or sister will be subject to judgment. (CSB)

And so when Jesus gets angry in Mark 3 verse 5, Jesus convicts Himself as a transgressor according to His own words:

And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other.

(KJV)

He looked around at them in anger and, deeply distressed at their stubborn hearts, said to the man, "Stretch out your hand." He stretched it out, and his hand was completely restored.

(NIV)

He looked around at them angrily and was deeply saddened by their hard hearts. Then he said to the man, "Hold out your hand." So the man held out his hand, and it was restored!

(NLT)

And he looked around at them with anger, grieved at their hardness of heart, and said to the man, "Stretch out your hand." He stretched it out, and his hand was restored.

(ESV)

Jesus looked around at them with anger and sorrow at their hardness of heart. Then He said to the man, "Stretch out your hand." So he stretched it out, and it was restored.

(BSB)

After looking around at them with anger, grieved at their hardness of heart, He said to the man, "Stretch out your hand." And he stretched it out, and his hand was restored.

(NASB)

Preservation

One doctrine that is almost universally overlooked or denied is the doctrine of the preservation of God's Word.

Matthew 24:35 states,

Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

For,

The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.
(Isaiah 40:8)

In Matthew 5:18, Christ appeals not only to the meaning and essence of the law, but to the *written form* of the Law itself:

For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

As far as I know, the above verses are universally accepted by modern scholars as "authentic Bible," and are included in modern versions, along with many other passages that teach the preservation of God's Word. The issue isn't that the doctrine of preservation is entirely removed from modern versions.... The issue is that there are *irreconcilable differences in meaning* with respect to some passages, and thus, one of necessity must be wrong. Not all versions can be the inerrant, inspired, and preserved Word of God if they contain contradictory readings.

Colossians 2:18 is an example of this. The KJV reads as follows:

Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind...

This passage specifically states that those in question attempt to intrude into those things which they have *not* seen. And yet some versions say the opposite:

Do not let anyone who delights in false humility and the worship of angels disqualify you. Such a person also goes into great detail about what they have seen; they are puffed up with idle notions by their unspiritual mind.

(NIV)

Do not let anyone who delights in false humility and the worship of angels disqualify you with speculation about what he has seen. Such a person is puffed up without basis by his unspiritual mind.

(BSB)

Let no one disqualify you, delighting in humility and the worship of the angels, detailing what he has seen, being puffed up vainly by his mind of the flesh...

(BLB)

Take care that no one keeps defrauding you of your prize by delighting in humility and the worship of the angels, taking his stand on visions he has seen, inflated without cause by his fleshly mind...

(NASB)

If God's Word is to be preserved, it stands to reason that the meaning of the passage must be preserved. If two different "versions" make two opposing statements, one of them must be incorrect.

Psalms 12:6-7 says,

The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

The way in which these verses are rendered in modern versions makes God's preservation apply to His people, even though the context is unmistakably the spoken words of man in contrast with that of God:

They speak vanity... with flattering lips... they do speak (vs. 2)

The Lord shall cut off all flattering lips, and the tongue that speaketh proud things (vs 3)

...With our tongue will we prevail; our lips are our own: who is lord over us? (vs 4)

Consider the way in which verse 7 is rendered in alternate texts:

You, LORD, will keep the needy safe and will protect us forever from the wicked...

(NIV)

Therefore, LORD, we know you will protect the oppressed, preserving them forever from this lying generation...

(NLT)

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

(ESV)

You, LORD, will keep them; You will protect him from this generation forever.

(NASB)

Nevermind that the very preceding verse in all of these versions continue the theme of the spoken word, and which builds to contrast man's words, corrupted with lying and flattery, with God's words which are pure:

And the words of the LORD are flawless, like silver purified in a crucible, like gold refined seven times.

(NIV)

The LORD's promises are pure, like silver refined in a furnace, purified seven times over.

(NLT)

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

(ESV)

The words of the LORD are pure words; Like silver refined in a furnace on the ground, filtered seven times.

(NASB)

And yet Psalm 12:7 departs from the subject of His Word and changes the preservation of His Word which is true and perfect, not corrupted with lies and flattery, to the preservation of God's people.

Verse 5 does state that God will defend the poor and needy, but this is in the context of His faithfulness to His word. Even the preservation of God's people Israel is dependent upon His faithfulness to His promises, to His Word. The theme of the psalm itself is a contrast between man's corruption of speech and God's purity and faithfulness in speech. This of course implies that God has indeed spoken, and if He has spoken, and He is perfect in truth and righteousness, His words also must be right and true.

Jeremiah 8:8 is used, especially by Muslims, to prove that the modern Bible has been universally altered and corrupted. The text of the authorized version reads as follows:

How do ye say, We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us? Lo, certainly in vain made he it; the pen of the scribes is in vain.

(vs 8)

The wise men are ashamed, they are dismayed and taken: lo, they have rejected the word of the Lord; and what wisdom is in them?

(vs 9)

This passage is clearly about the vanity of God's law to Israel's scribes because they have rejected His word. Though they no doubt wrote it and preserved it by occupation, as the stewards of the oracles of God, they regarded it with low esteem. They rejected His word (vs 9).

Modern translations read as follows:

How can you say, "We are wise, for we have the law of the LORD," when actually the lying pen of the scribes has handled it falsely?

(NIV)

How can you say, "We are wise because we have the word of the LORD," when your teachers have twisted it by writing lies?

(NLT)

How can you say, 'We are wise, and the law of the LORD is with us'? But behold, the lying pen of the scribes has made it into a lie.

(ESV)

How can you say, 'We are wise, And the Law of the LORD is with us'? But behold, the lying pen of the scribes Has made it into a lie.

(NASB)

Modern versions change the meaning of the verse to indicate that the text of the scribes themselves—the Law (i.e. the Word of God)—had been corrupted. This is the antithesis of the preservation of God's Word. Certainly, if modern versions are correct in their rendering of Jeremiah 8:8, then the Bible itself may very well have been corrupted early on, in which case, who knows if we have the Word of God as it was originally written. Luckily, the text of the scriptures never indicate such a thing, except in the perverted modern Bible versions being promoted in modern Christian culture.

The Name of God

In preface to this section, I would like to address one issue. As Paul states in Acts 17 verse 22, *I perceive that in all things ye (men) are too superstitious.*

There is a rapidly growing train of thought in modern *cult*-ure that the Name of God is some magic word and that if it isn't pronounced *just* so then God will refuse to hear your prayer. This is absolute nonsense and ironic in that proponents of this cult-like ideology most often gravitate towards names such as *Yahweh*, which can be traced back to paganism, and which are promoted by atheist "scholars" who don't even believe the Bible to start with.

God's Name is not a magic incantation or spell to manipulate Him or earn His favor. The issue with which this section is concerned is the body of evidence surrounding the usage of the Name Jehovah as the correct and preserved Name of God in the English Bible, as the proper transliteration of the Name *Yehovah* in Hebrew, and how Bibles are increasingly departing from this pronunciation or omitting it altogether.

Rudolf Kittel (1853-1929), German Bible scholar, antisemitic, and translator of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* from the Ben Asher Codex of Leningrad (which contains unreliable and inconsistent vowel pointing in the Hebrew in regards to the Tetragrammaton), which forms the basis of the modern bible's Old Testament, is quoted by Gail Riplinger in her book *In Awe Of Thy Word*:

"The origins of Yahweh worship...it appears that this cult was established before Deborah... Thus Yahweh appears as an old deity of Sinai, revered in untold antiquity as a weather-god..." (The New Schaff, Vol. XII, p. 472)."

Kittel does not necessarily agree with this assertion, a view called *the Kenite hypothesis*, but is recounting the view held by Tiele, Stade, and Budde. The Kenite hypothesis is essentially the idea that the Hebrews' worship of "Yahweh" originated from the Kenites whom Moses had interaction with through the Midianites. Immediately we should see the problem with this hypothesis—that it outright denies the historical account recorded in God's Word. Kittel himself even says as much on the same pages, not far from where Riplinger leaves off in her quote:

"Of a change in the conception of God from a mere weather-god to an ethical being the narrative says nothing; there is not a word which corresponds to the hypothesis of a derivation of their deity by Israel from the Kenites."

This is one problem I have with Gail Riplinger and other "KJV defenders," is that they pull statements out of context to fit their own means. This is not real scholarship and it is dishonest. I am not a perfect man, but I have done my best to ensure that I accurately represent the statements of others, the ideas expressed in their writings, and the facts of history according to the sources available.

The idea of *Yahweh* as a weather god may stem from a faulty etymological connection, namely the root *hovah*, which means *disaster* or *calamity*. However, there is no etymological connection between *hovah* and *hayah*, the Hebrew root form which means "to be." This will be discussed later.

One scenario as to the origin of *Yahweh* derives surprisingly from Ancient Greek mythology.

The son of Noah, Japheth, *Yepheth* in Hebrew (יָפֶֿתֿ), after the flood, was eventually "immortalized" in ancient mythology as *Iapetus*, the Titan, son of Ouranos (heaven) and Gaia (earth). As the father of the Japhetic peoples, the Greeks likely included, he would eventually be considered a god, and would even be confused with the Creator Himself.

(Perhaps Japheth's prolonged lifespan after the flood, in an age where men—his own offspring—were living shorter lifespans, contributed to their superstition and reverence of him as a titan, but this is speculation on my part.)

The Greeks called Japheth *Iapetus* (Yapetos); to the Roman's he became known as *Iu Pater* (Yu Pater), which means *father Jove*, and which is transliterated in modern English as Jupiter.

The etymological connection between *Japheth* and *Iapetus* is implied by Matthew Poole in his Commentary on the Holy Bible:

Japheth's portion was at first Asia the Less, and afterwards by degrees all Europe, and the northern parts of Asia. This is he so much celebrated among the Greeks by the name of Iapetus. (Gen. 10:2)

Flavius Josephus in *Antiquities of the Jews* (Section 1.122-1.124) states matter of factly that the Greeks indeed owed their lineage to Japheth, the son of Noah.

Robert Graves and John Pairman Brown have also supported this idea.

Bill Cooper in his book *After the Flood: The Early Post-flood History of Europe*, espouses the connection between Japheth, Iapetus, and the Roman Jupiter.

This is one line of reasoning and not entirely without merit; at the very least it is historically probable that the Greek did indeed have a lineage descending back to Japheth. There is no true etymology linking the Hebrew Japheth to Iapetus that we can definitively prove, as even their meanings are different. *Iapetus* carries the idea of *piercing*, while *Japheth* in Hebrew carries with it the idea of *enlargement* or *expansion*. True enough, words and names can take on new connotations when adopted by new languages and cultures. Nevertheless, nothing more than homophonics can be truly said to connect the two.

A more likely scenario comes from

The Dio- of Diotrephes derives from Dyeus which is the sky-god of daylight in proto-Indo-European mythology. Forms of his name and worship can be found in the Vedic Indo-Aryans, Latins, Greeks, Phrygians, Messapians, Thracians, Illyrians, Albanians, and Hittites (The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World, by Mallory, James P.; Adams, Douglas Q).

Dyeus became widely known as Father, thus the idea of "Father Sky." Father in Greek is translated as Pater, and the bright daytime sky as djou, thus Father Sky is known as Jupiter. You may even note the phonetic resemblance between Zeus and Dyeus—Zeus, who is synonymous with Jupiter in the Roman pantheon.

Jove comes from Ιαβε in Greek, as the *J* becomes an *I*, the *ia* in turn makes the “ya” sound, and the βε becomes the “weh” sound.

Thus we have the name Yahweh.

Gilbert Genebrard in the 16th century transliterated Ιαβε into *Yahweh*, and attributed it to the Tetragrammaton. His precedent for translating the Tetragrammaton into Ιαβε was Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus (c. AD 450), and who, according to Al Garza in his work titled *The Hebrew New Testament*, was not familiar with the Hebrew language, and often relied on Syriac in his translational work. It is likely also that Theodoret got the pronunciation Ιαβε from Epiphanius’ work *Against Heresies* (AD 390). And so we have here a connection between the name *Yahweh* and the apostate infrastructure known as the Roman Catholic Church, as both Genebrard and Theodoret were both Roman Catholic. We will discuss in a later section the further ties the Roman Catholic Church has to modern Bible versions as well.

Heinrich Gesenius, the 19th century lexicographer, theologian, and Hebraist, also makes the following statement in his *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*:

To give my own opinion, I suppose this word (IABE) to be one of the most remote antiquity, perhaps of the same origin as Jovis, Jupiter, and transferred from the Egyptians to the Hebrews...

- Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon To The Old Testament Scriptures, page CCCXXXVII

Ιαβε is found prior to Epiphanius in the form of Ιαβεζεβουθ, meaning, Ιαβε of hosts, or, Jupiter of hosts, on a curse tablet found in Cumae, Italy, dating back to 250 AD. This tablet is basically a request, through magical incantation, for the supernatural vengeance against a wayward wife and the ability of the writer to forget about her. Is it more probable, then, that a superstitious Roman involved in magical incantation would be calling upon the Hebrew God of the Bible or the false god of the Romans? Wilhelm Henzen, who transcribed the tablet, and presented this transcription in 1846, assumed this form to be the Hebrew Divine Name for reasons which I don’t fully understand. But it is very possible that Henzen was only following the scholarship of the day, which took its cue from those such as Gilbert Genebrard.

Josephus records in his *Antiquities of the Jews*, book 12, section 257, that the Samaritans chose to make peace with Antiochus Epiphanes by making the temple on mount Gerizim a temple of Jupiter. This same temple they said was erected in the past “without a name.”

Theodoret is quoted as saying that “the Samaritans call it Yahveh, while the Jews call it Aya,” (*Questions on Exodus* ch. 7).

And so Theodoret, in about 500 AD, is appealing to the Samaritans for support of the name *Yahweh*, but we have seen that the Samaritans first erected a temple without a name at all, and

that they subsequently dedicated that temple to Jupiter. And so why would the Samaritans call the name of God Yahveh? Perhaps it's because they adopted the name of the false god Jupiter.

In Exodus 3, verses 14, God says to Moses His Name is *I Am That I AM*, and to tell the children of Israel that "I Am hath sent me unto you."

In the next verse, God says to Moses,

Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, the LORD God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.

The phrase here, *LORD God of your fathers*, is *Jehovah the God of your fathers* in the Hebrew text. The King James translators chose to reserve the articulation of the formal Name of God only to certain contexts, namely when the Tetragrammaton is used as His personal Name, when His Name is repeated as "Jah Jehovah," or when His name is used in the name of a location, such as Jehovah-Jireh (Gen. 22:14).

When considering the King James Bibles substitution of the personal Name of God, Jehovah, with either LORD or GOD, consider that God Himself by inspiration has already done the exact same thing in the Hebrew and Greek texts. In Matthew 4:4, Jesus quotes Deuteronomy 8:3, which uses Jehovah; and yet in the Greek texts in which Jesus is recorded as quoting Deuteronomy 8:3—the Greek texts of which scholars claim are alone authoritative—Jesus uses the word *God* in place of Jehovah. Whether Jesus truly substituted *the Name* with *God* or the gospel writers made the substitution is a moot point because even the "educated scholars" believe (most of them) that the originals were inspired. And so the Holy Spirit Himself made the substitution, not man. This is not the only example of such a substitution in the original languages either, but occurs elsewhere such as 2 Samuel 5:19 and 1 Chronicles 14:10, where in the first *David enquired of the LORD*, and in the second otherwise identical account, *David enquired of God*. Again, there are numerous other examples of this.

And so in Exodus 3, "His Name forever" in verse 15, is in the English text understood as what is contained in verse 14, *I Am That I Am*, or *ehyeh asher ehyeh* in Hebrew. And indeed the Name iterated in verse 15 in the Hebrew text is thus explained in verse 14.

This is because the Name *Jehovah (Yehovah)*, is a combination of the Hebrew verbs *hayah*, *hoveh*, and *yihyeh*. *Hayah* means "He who was," *hoveh* means "He is," and *yihyeh* means "He will be." This is the meaning of the Name *Yehovah*, and is the basis of the triadic declaration as found in Revelation 16:5.

The root *ehyeh*, which means *I am*.

Hayah, hoveh, and yihyeh, Combination on 3 forms of "to be"

I am that I am is the explanation of the name Yehovah (exodus 3 and 6)
He who was and is and is to be

*The name Yahweh has no evidence in usage by the Jews historically,
It has no connection with the verb “to be”
And grammatically cannot be the pronunciation in the verb *to be*.

“Race”

Modern Bible versions also sometimes use the word *race* in place of *kinsmen*, *seed*, *peoples*, *nations*, et cetera.

The NIV implies that there are *different races* of people:

Romans 9:3 - *For I could wish that I myself were cursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my people, those of my own race...*

There are not multiple “races” of people on the earth; this is an idea that has permeated culture through the philosophy of Darwinian evolution—an idea which has led to great tragedy in human history, such as slavery and the holocaust.

Acts 17:26 says,

And (God) hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation...

A point to consider is that when God separated the people at the Tower of Babel, all men were one people, and they weren’t divided according to their appearance, but according to *language*. From language man gets *understanding*, and lack of understanding is what ultimately divides humanity. God did not divide “races,” He divided language, and from the various languages flowed the different cultures and people groups which became the nations.

In Ezra 9:2, the word *seed* is replaced in modern versions by the word *race*.

They have taken some of their daughters as wives for themselves and their sons, and have mingled the holy race with the peoples around them. And the leaders and officials have led the way in this unfaithfulness.

(NIV)

For the men of Israel have married women from these people and have taken them as wives for their sons. So the holy race has become polluted by these mixed marriages. Worse yet, the leaders and officials have led the way in this outrage.

(NLT)

For they have taken some of their daughters to be wives for themselves and for their sons, so that the holy race has mixed itself with the peoples of the lands. And in this faithlessness the hand of the officials and chief men has been foremost.

(ESV)

For they have taken some of their daughters as wives for themselves and for their sons, so that the holy race has intermingled with the peoples of the lands; indeed, the hands of the officials and the leaders have taken the lead in this unfaithfulness.

(NASB)

The Authorized Version reads as follows:

For they have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of those lands: yea, the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass.

“Seed” is simply a way of saying *offspring*, and implies a bloodline. The Holy offspring would literally produce the Messiah, and thus it was quite literally *the Holy Seed* in that sense. They were also Holy because God had separated them unto His purpose, giving them covenants by which they could be blessed and the world could in turn be blessed through them.

In Mark 7:26, the word *nation* is replaced by *race* in the following:

Now the woman was Gentile, Syrophenician by race, and kept asking Him that He should cast forth the demon out of her daughter.

(BLB)

Now the woman was a Gentile, of the Syrophenician race. And she kept asking Him to cast the demon out of her daughter.

(NASB 1995)

In Acts 7:19, the word *kindred* is replaced by *race* in the following:

He dealt shrewdly with our race and forced our fathers to expose their infants, so that they would not be kept alive.

(ESV)

Having dealt treacherously with our race, he mistreated our fathers, making them abandon their infants so that they would not live.

(BLB)

It was he who took shrewd advantage of our race and mistreated our fathers so that they would expose their infants and they would not survive.

(NASB 1995)

Kindred simply relates to familial bonds, by blood or marriage. Humanity simply consists of different families of peoples.

“Race” is also used in this verse in the Amplified Bible, the Christian Standard Bible, the Holman Christian Standard Bible, the NASB 1977, and American Standard Version.

In 1 Peter 2:9, *chosen generation* is changed into a *chosen race* in the NASB 1995 and 1977, the BLB, the ESV, the Amplified Bible, the CSB, the HCSB, the LSV, and others.

Race is a word used in the Bible only in the context of endurance, as in *running a race*. It occurs four times in the King James Bible, and each time this is the context in which it is used.

Paul's Apostleship

Modern translations also obscure Paul's unique apostleship and gospel:

Galatians 2:7 - But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter...

(KJV)

The language of the authorized version is clear and agrees with the Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew's, and Geneva Bibles, as well as the Bishops Bible and the Great Bible. The verse states that “the gospel,” the *euaggelion* (εὐαγγέλιον), of the uncircumcision was committed unto Paul, just as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter. The adverb in Galatians 2:7, “as,” is defined as meaning *to the same degree or amount*, thus Paul is making a claim of authority. Just as authority had been given to Peter to preach the gospel of the circumcision, the same authority from Christ had been given to Paul to preach the gospel of the uncircumcision (which includes gentiles *and* unbelieving Israel), and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery (Eph. 3:9).

The context demands that these be two separate “gospels.” Verse 2 says,

And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.

The point of Paul going to Jerusalem to meet with the other apostles and with “those of reputation” was to communicate to them that which he was preaching, which was Christ without the law, without Israel’s covenants, and without the circumcision. This was news to the circumcision. As Paul says in verse 6 and the beginning of verse 7,

*But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man’s person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me:
But contrariwise...*

These men of reputation, whoever they were, whether the 11 apostles (for James had been put to death) or James the Lord’s brother, in conference added no new information to Paul, *but contrary*, Paul had additional information for them. Paul was the last to see the Lord, and to receive any revelation from the Lord post-ascension.

Consider Galatians 2:7 in modern Bible versions:

On the contrary, they recognized that I had been entrusted with the task of preaching the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter had been to the circumcised.
(NIV)

Instead, they saw that God had given me the responsibility of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles, just as he had given Peter the responsibility of preaching to the Jews.
(NLT)

On the contrary, when they saw that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter had been entrusted with the gospel to the circumcised...
(ESV)

But on the contrary, seeing that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter had been to the circumcised...
(NASB)

New versions turn the gospel of the circumcision and of the uncircumcision into the same gospel, just to a different audience. It would seem that all new Bible translation efforts began with the premise that the word *gospel* is always a reference to the same thing, when in fact the word *gospel* is a general, non specific word simply meaning “good news.” There are various types of *good news* in the Bible. What that does not mean is that there are different ways to be saved in the Bible. Salvation always remains the same, through the blood of Christ, and His death; the terms however by

which one gains access to that salvation are not always the same. The word *gospel* then is applied to the various messages preached at various times during God's plan of redemption, relating to a specific content of faith and practice.

The gospel of God for instance is the preaching that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of David, declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead (Rom. 1).

The gospel of the kingdom relates to the good news of Israel's kingdom on the earth, which is connected to the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David. This was preached in the gospels prior to the disciples understanding or faith in the gospel of God.

The gospel of the circumcision relates to the good news that through the circumcised people, that is, the remnant of Israel, the entire world will receive blessing by virtue of their covenants (Rom. 11:12).

The gospel of the uncircumcision is the good news that even through *Israel's fall*, and them being considered no different than the uncircumcision, salvation and blessing is going to the entire world without distinction—something the prophets never spoke about. This means that salvation is going to the uncircumcision without the covenants of promise or the Law, and thus without Israel.

The gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth (Rom. 1:16); it is the mystery of the mechanics of salvation, revealed to the apostle Paul—how a sinner can be justified before an infinitely Holy God, and how before Him none is righteous.

This is closely related to the gospel of the uncircumcision, in that, before God, all are sinners and there is no difference, whether Jew or gentile (Rom. 3:22-23). This is why Paul states that God shall judge the secrets of men by *his gospel* (Rom. 2:16), because there is no distinction, whether Jew or gentile.

This is “the gospel” that is almost universally meant when one speaks about “the gospel,” because this gospel, this good news, actually reveals the nature of eternal salvation for everyone across time, whether Jew or Greek, under the law or without the law (Rom. 2:11-12), that no one at any time has ever merited salvation except for Christ who was Himself God in the form of a man.

The gospel of Christ, being the power of God unto salvation, is faith alone in Christ's work of death, burial, and resurrection:

For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;

And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures... (1 Corinth. 15:3-4)

But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.

(Rom. 4:5)

We can see then how modern versions obscure these different messages in the Bible, and so obscure Paul's unique gospel which is what is to be preached today. The gospel is the fundamental issue in Christianity, and modern versions obscure the purity and simplicity of it by making all gospels in the Bible indistinguishable. God wills that all men be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. 2:4)—this cannot happen without the preaching and understanding of the gospel.

In 1 Timothy 1:16, modern Bible versions obscure the fact that Paul's conversion was the first of its kind and a pattern for the Body of Christ, and make him out to be the worst of sinners.

The KJV reads:

Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting.

Consider the modern renderings:

But for that very reason I was shown mercy so that in me, the worst of sinners, Christ Jesus might display his immense patience as an example for those who would believe in him and receive eternal life.

(NIV)

Israel and the Body of Christ

The NIV makes the Body of Christ a part of Israel and their covenants:

Ephesians 3:6 - That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel... (KJV)

This mystery is that through the gospel the Gentiles are heirs together with Israel, members together of one body, and sharers together in the promise in Christ Jesus.

(NIV)

Gentiles are not *heirs together with Israel* in this age, but *from twain God made one new man* (Eph. 2:15), a *new creature*, where neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails anything (Gal. 6:15). If we were heirs together *with Israel*, we would be made subject to the Abrahamic covenant, and be required to bless Israel in order to be blessed, and we would then also be heirs of the promise to the land and kingdom of Israel on the earth forever. And yet we have a heavenly hope, promise, and calling, not an earthly.

Romans 14:10 in new versions changes the judgment seat of Christ into the judgment seat of God, obscuring the specificity of the phrase as it is in reference to the body of Christs judgment in the heavens, as opposed to the several other judgments which will occur, namely, of Israel, the nations, and the unsaved of all time.

The Day of Christ is turned into the Day of the Lord:

In 2 Thessalonians 2, we have a passage that has been the source of much contention and confusion.

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, shewing himself that he is God.

The Day of Christ will not come, until the falling away happens first and the man of sin is revealed, who exalts himself as god in the temple of God. The man of sin exalts himself as God in the middle of the week of the restored Old covenant system, in the middle of the prophesied seventieth week.

There are two errors in the thinking of Christianity which lead to erroneous conclusions: one, that the Day of the Lord is the tribulation period; and two, that the Day of Christ is the same as the Day of the Lord.

Modern versions turn the Day of Christ into the Day of the Lord.

Whereas saints are naturally predisposed to view this passage from the vantage point of the earth, that's not what Paul is doing in writing it, because the content of his revelation concerns, not the restoration of the earth, but the heavens.

The *Day of Christ* is a reference to the day that we will stand before Christ in judgment, where we will either receive reward or loss, and receive the fullness of our adoption of sons status as we each receive our inheritance. It is not a reference to the catching up of the saints, neither is it properly a reference to the Day of Lord, though the Day of Christ and the Day of the Lord are part and parcel of the same overall purpose, and occur within the same period of time.

Paul references this often, calling it *the day* (Rom. 13:12, 1 Cor. 3:13), *that day* (2 Tim. 1:12, 2 Tim. 4:8), *the day of Jesus Christ* (Phil. 1:6), *the day of the Lord Jesus* (1 Cor. 5:5, 2 Cor. 1:14), or *the day of our Lord Jesus Christ* (1 Cor. 1:8).

He specifically calls it *the day of Christ* also in Philippians 1:10 and 2:16.