The Textus Receptus is the text that has been used for 2,000 years by Christians. This is also the text that agrees with **more than 95%** of the Bible Manuscripts in Koine (common) Greek. It is known by other names, such as the Traditional Text, Majority Text, Byzantine Text, or Syrian Text.

In his essay *Textual Criticism*, Dr. Thomas Cassidy writes: "The Traditional text of the New Testament has existed from the time of Christ right down to the present. It has had many different names down through the years, such as Byzantine Text, Eastern Text, Received Text, Textus Receptus, Majority Text, and others. Although no complete Bible manuscripts have survived which would allow us to date the Traditional text to the first century, there is a strong witness to the early existence and use of the Traditional text by the early church in its lectionaries."

A few facts showing the respected historical position of the Textus Receptus are in order. Its prominence and respect did not **begin** in 1611 with the KJV translators. They merely recognized (as others before them had), that the **Textus Receptus was God's preserved**
Consider the following:

- Prior to the 20th century, all English Bibles since Tyndale's first New Testament (1526) were based on the Textus Receptus. This includes: Miles Coverdale's Bible (1535), Matthew's Bible (1500-1555), The Great Bible (1539), The Geneva Version (1560), The Bishops' Bible (1568), and the King James Version (1611). [STORY OF OUR ENGLISH BIBLE, by W. Scott]

- Ancient Versions followed the reading of the Textus Receptus. These versions include: The Peshitta Version (AD 150), The Italic Bible (AD 157), The Waldensian (AD 120 & onwards), The Gallic Bible (Southern France) (AD177), The Gothic Bible (AD 330-350), The Old Syriac Bible (AD 400), The Armenian Bible (AD 400 There are 1244 copies of this version still in existence.), The Palestinian Syriac (AD 450), The French Bible of Olivetion (AD 1535), The Czech Bible (AD 1602), The Italian Bible of Diodati (AD 1606), The Greek Orthodox Bible (Used from Apostolic times to the present day by the Greek Orthodox Church). [Bible Versions, D.B. Loughran]

In his excellent book, Truth Triumphant: The Church in the Wilderness, Benjamin Wilkinson writes, "The Protestant denominations are built upon that manuscript of the Greek New Testament sometimes called Textus Receptus, or the Received Text. It is that Greek New Testament from which the writings of the apostles in Greek have been translated into English, German, Dutch and other languages. During the dark ages the Received Text was practically unknown outside the Greek Church. It was restored to Christendom by the labours of that great scholar Erasmus. It is altogether too little known that the real editor of the Received Text was Lucian. None of Lucian’s enemies fails to credit him with this work. Neither Lucian nor Erasmus, but rather the apostles, wrote the Greek New Testament. However, Lucian’s day was an age of apostasy when a flood of depravations was systematically attempting to devastate both the Bible manuscripts and Bible theology. Origen, of the Alexandrian college, made his editions and commentaries of the Bible a secure retreat for all errors, and deformed them with philosophical
speculations introducing casuistry and lying. Lucian’s unrivalled success in verifying, safeguarding, and transmitting those divine writings left a heritage for which all generations should be thankful.”

Why did the early churches of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries and all the Protestant Reformers of the 15\textsuperscript{th}, 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries choose Textus Receptus in preference to the Minority Texts?

The answer is because of the following:

- **Textus Receptus** is based on the vast majority (over 95%) of the 5,300+ Greek manuscripts in existence. That is why it is also called the Majority Text.
- **Textus Receptus** is not mutilated with deletions, additions and amendments, as is the Minority Text.
- **Textus Receptus** agrees with the earliest versions of the Bible: Peshitta (AD150) Old Latin Vulgate (AD157), the Italic Bible (AD157) etc. These Bibles were produced some 200 years before the Minority Texts (like Vatican and Sinai) favored by the Roman Catholic Church.
- **Textus Receptus** agrees with the vast majority of the 86,000+ citations from scripture by the early church fathers.
- **Textus Receptus** is untainted with Egyptian philosophy and unbelief.
- **Textus Receptus** strongly upholds the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith: the creation account in Genesis, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the virgin birth, the Saviour’s miracles, his bodily resurrection, his literal return and the cleansing power of his blood!
- **Textus Receptus** was (and still is) the enemy of the Roman Catholic Church. This is an important fact to bear in mind.
With apologies to Judges 9:25, it seems today that "every man does that which is right in his own eyes," as far as selecting a Bible is concerned. But how can you decide which, if any, best preserved the inspired, authoritative Word of God? After all, God did say that His Word had been "for ever settled in heaven" (Psalm 119:89) and had given sober warning to any who would presume to supplement, delete, or distort any of the words of Scripture (Revelation 22:18,19; II Peter 3:16).

So, allow me to ask a simple question: Does it REALLY matter which Bible you use? For probably 20 years, I have been using the NASB or the NIV. My wife got saved while reading the Good News Bible. There are literally HUNDREDS of different Bible translations to choose from. Most people (including myself and my wife until recently) don't really have a clue as to which translations are based on accurate source documents (i.e. manuscripts).

I was shocked to recently learn that the NIV removes, alters and completely changes the meanings of more than 64,000 words and verses in the Bible. However, it is done so subtly that very few ever realize it. Whole verses and sentences are completely deleted! Important words like "Lord", "Jesus", "Christ", "blood", "repent", and "hell" are omitted many times! Laurence M. Vance has written a book called Double Jeopardy, in which he documents word for word the changes made in the 1995 NASB as compared to the previous 1977 NASB. The 1995 NASB has almost 7,000 fewer words in it than did the previous 1977 edition!!

When we take a close look at the changes that are made in the new versions, vital doctrinal truths about the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, salvation, the resurrection, the second coming of Christ, heaven and hell and others have been omitted or changed in many places. It would almost seem that these important truths were taken out to deliberately weaken certain doctrines. Imagine completely removing most of Paul's teachings, all of Peter's, Jude's, James' and John's including Revelation. Does that bother you? It should. Do you think that it matters just who handles the Word of God? Does it really matter to you whether the book you base your eternity on is corrupted or not?

Suppose you had a pastor who was also an adulterer, a liar, a thief, and a sorcerer. Would THAT matter to you? Suppose that same
pastor did not believe in any miracles or healings, that he supported occultism, communication with the dead (necromancy), and evolution. What if he rejected the doctrine of the resurrection? What if he also despised the doctrine of the atonement and denied that it was through the shed blood of Jesus Christ that forgiveness was given? Would you still trust that man to lead you to heaven, to teach you and to explain to you the Word of God? What if the pope or the Jesuits translated a bible for you? Would you trust it? Suppose Satan himself translated a bible for you. Would you trust him? Suppose one of his fallen angels had a hand in the work, would it matter then?

My wife loves raspberry tea. But not just any brand of raspberry tea...she must have Bigelow’s! I’ve tried to persuade her to settle for one of the other brands. I have asked her, "What difference does it make? They’re all raspberry tea." She would reply in a matter of fact manner, "They’re just not as good as Bigelow’s." You see, my wife is not indifferent about the "contents" in the package of tea. **Which is exactly my point.** We shouldn’t be indifferent about the contents of our Bible!

**And let me reiterate this very important point:** the debate is **NOT** whether the King James Bible is better than the other versions. The debate is whether the TEXTUS RECEPTUS is more reliable than the Minority Texts, such as Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus.

We can only stay strong in our Christian walk with the true Word of God. How could a warrior fight against an enemy with a dull sword? How can we fight the good fight if we don't have the true Word of God? As you read through the material on this website, please ask yourself: **Does it REALLY matter?**

**Why is this important?** It is simple: if two books say different things, or if two books say inherently contradictory things, they cannot both be God’s Word. This is simple, basic logic. To say otherwise is to accuse the Holy Spirit of doublespeak.

And please remember....You do **NOT** have to be a Greek scholar to understand this issue. You just have to be a **truth seeker**.
A manuscript is a hand-copied document. This was the method used for writing and duplicating existing literature prior to the invention of printing. There are over 5,300 (5,309 to be exact) existing manuscripts of the Scriptures. Some of these manuscripts contain a large portion of scripture, while other are fragments.

Let us first consider certain Greek texts from which all New Testament translations are derived:

1. the **Majority Texts** (*Textus Receptus*), and
2. the **Minority Texts** (primarily the *Westcott and Hort* Greek Text, based primarily on the *Codex Sinaiticus* and the *Codex Vaticanus*).

For obvious reasons, the *Textus Receptus* is also referred to as the "Majority Text" since the **majority** (95% or more) of existing manuscripts support this reading. These extant manuscripts were brought together by various editors such as Lucian (AD 250-312), Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevir brothers. The most notable editor of all was Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) one of the greatest scholars the world has ever known. When the early Protestant Reformers of the 16th and 17th centuries decided to translate the scriptures directly from Greek into the languages of Europe, they selected *Textus Receptus* as their foundation Greek document.
The NASB, the NIV, the Jehovah’s Witness bible (“New World Translation”), and most modern translations and paraphrases use the Westcott and Hort Greek Text, which is supported by only a small portion (5% or less) of existing manuscripts, including Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Alexandrian Codex, Parisian Codex, and Codex Bezae.

For obvious reasons, this text is referred to as the “Minority Texts.” Westcott and Hort relied heavily on the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus for their Greek Text, which is particularly odd, considering the fact that these two codices contradict each other over 3,000 times in the gospels alone.

As stated above, there are more than 5,300 manuscripts in existence. These manuscripts are divided into several different formats:

1. *Papyrus fragments* -- papyrus was relatively inexpensive compared to vellum (animal skins), and therefore was widely used. However, it was not very durable and copies would wear out rather rapidly through usage. The size of these papyrus fragments range from a few verses to large portions of an entire book.
2. *Unical* -- these are copies that were written in capital letters.
3. *Cursive* -- those written in small hand.

Of these 5,300+ existing manuscripts, over 95% are in agreement with, and form the basis for the Textus Receptus, which is the text which the King James translators used. Strange as it may seem, Westcott and Hort threw out the preponderance of manuscript evidence and opted rather to go with the Minority Texts! Hence we have inherited an ongoing struggle among New Testament critics, accompanied by havoc and confusion in churches caused by the introduction of these conflicting New Testament Greek texts. Since 1881, most subsequent versions have followed the Minority Texts.
Study the information in the following table. Although this data was compiled in 1967, recent archeological discoveries will not significantly affect the results. This data illustrates why the Textus Receptus is referred to as the "Majority Text."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Manuscript</th>
<th>Total # of this type manuscript</th>
<th>Number that support WH*</th>
<th>Number that support TR**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papyrus</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13 (15%)</td>
<td>75 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unical</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>9 (3%)</td>
<td>258 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursive</td>
<td>2764</td>
<td>23 (1%)</td>
<td>2741 (99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectionary***</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2143 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* WH indicates Westcott-Hort Greek Text (Minority Text)
** TR indicates Textus Receptus (Majority Text)
*** A lectionary is a book that contains a collection of scripture readings

The table gives the approximate number and percent of each type of Greek manuscript that supports the Westcott and Hort Greek Text, as well as the number and percent of each class that supports the Textus Receptus Greek text. These approximations are taken from the careful research of Dr. Jack Moorman in his book Forever Settled. [From: THE FOUR-FOLD SUPERIORITY OF THE KING JAMES VERSION By Dr. D.A. Waite]

There are a few other old manuscripts, even including fragmentary Greek papyri, whose textual character seems to conform more to the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus than to the Textus Receptus. However, these all have been traced (by liberal and conservative scholars alike) to a probable source in Alexandria, Egypt, in the 2nd or 3rd century. The most influential man among the "intellectual" community of Alexandria was the learned Origen, and it is believed by many that he was largely instrumental in developing the so-called "Alexandrian" text of the New Testament (of which the Vatican and Sinai manuscripts are representative),
in contrast to the "Byzantine" text, from which the *Textus Receptus* has largely come.

With all his immense learning and zeal, however, Origen was a heretic. Like modern theistic evolutionists, he felt constrained to harmonize Christianity with pagan philosophy, especially that of Plato and the Stoics. This led him into excessive allegorization of Scripture, especially Genesis, and into denigrating the actual historical records of the Bible, even that of the bodily resurrection of Christ, as well as the literal creation of the world.

Whether or not Origen and his associates were first responsible for the differences in the Alexandrian text from the Byzantine, the fact remains that significant differences do exist, and that practically all modern English translations have been heavily influenced (via Westcott and Hort, etc.) in favor of the former, whereas the King James translation has its basis primarily in the latter.

The only place where these error laden, unreliable manuscripts excel is in the quality of the materials used on them. They have good bindings and fine animal skin pages. Their physical appearance, contrary to their worthless texts, are really rather attractive. But then we have all heard the saying, "You can’t judge a book by its cover." The covers are beautiful but their texts are reprehensible.

And yet in spite of these well-known corruptions, they are the basis for many new versions such as the NIV and the NASB, rendering these versions critically flawed and unreliable. I will give many, many examples of these errors and omissions when I deal with the altered verses. Many of the differences between the manuscripts involve significant watering down of even such basic doctrines as Biblical inerrancy and the perfect divine/human nature of Christ.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** Please remember that, while the modern versions of the Bible do water down the truth and are not the BEST translations, they certainly do not completely eliminate these key doctrines, so it is still possible to discern these doctrines and to find the true gospel and way of salvation in many of the new texts or translations. My wife, for instance, was saved while reading the Good News Bible, which is a paraphrase based on the Minority Texts, which were corrupted. So you see, God uses even the flawed translations to accomplish His purposes and decrees.

Think about it . . . can you really imagine the Lord of Lords, the Holy One of Israel hiding *Codex Vaticanus* away for over 1,000 years in the Vatican Library till 1481? Or better yet, can you imagine Him prompting the monks of St Catherine's
Monastery to dump **Codex Sinaiticus** into a waste basket?

Remember, the early Christians **REJECTED** these manuscripts. So, they went into secret libraries...and there they lay...until they were later dug up as "ancient manuscripts."

**So here's what likely happened:** the corrupt Alexandrian text (also called the "Egyptian" or "Hesychian" type text) found it's way into Constantine's bible (via Origen and Eusebius), one of which was the Vatican manuscript and another of which was the Sinai manuscript, but they were rejected and "thrown in the closet" by Christians of that day. However, after hundreds of years, they eventually were revived via the Westcott and Hort Greek Text, and finally crept into the new "Bible" versions in your local "Christian" bookstore.

**The Devil is sneaky, isn't he??**

Therefore, when you hear or read of someone "correcting" the King James Bible with "older" or "more authoritative" manuscripts, you are simply hearing someone trying to use a corrupted, pagan, gnostic, ecumenical, Roman Catholic text to overthrow the God-honored text of the Protestant Reformation and the great revivals.
Brooke Foss Westcott (an Anglican bishop and professor at Cambridge University) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (also an ordained priest and professor at Cambridge) produced a Greek New Testament in 1881 based on the findings of Tischendorf. This Greek New Testament was the basis for the Revised Version of that same year. They also developed a theory of textual criticism which underlay their Greek New Testament and several other Greek New Testaments since (including the Nestle-Aland text).

Greek New Testaments such as these produced most of the modern English translations of the Bible we have today.

On one side, their supporters have heralded them as great men of God, having greatly advanced the search for the original Greek text. On the other side, their opponents have leveled charges of heresy, infidelity, apostasy, and many others, claiming that they are guilty of wreaking great damage on the true text of Scripture.

I have no desire to sling mud nor a desire to hide facts. I just want to share the truth about these men. So, put on your seatbelt, and
get ready for a quick ride through the beliefs of Westcott and Hort.

In order to give you an idea of what they really believed and what their real intentions were when creating their Greek New Testament, I will let the men speak for themselves. I will tell you nothing. I will merely let these two men speak for themselves. The rest of this page will be only quotations. If this makes you angry, don't be angry with me...I'm just giving you the words of Westcott and Hort...

TELLING QUOTATIONS FROM WESTCOTT AND HORT

Concerning the Deity of Christ:

"He never speaks of Himself directly as God, but the aim of His revelation was to lead men to see God in Him." (Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 297).

"(John) does not expressly affirm the identification of the Word with Jesus Christ." (Westcott, Ibid., p. 16).

Concerning the Scriptures:


"Our Bible as well as our Faith is a mere compromise." (Westcott, On the Canon of the New Testament, p. vii).

"Evangelicals seem to me perverted. . .There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, especially the authority of the Bible." (Hort, The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, Vol. I, p.400)

Concerning Hell:

"(Hell is) not the place of punishment of the guilty, (it is) the common abode of departed spirits. (Westcott, Historic Faith, pp.77-78).
"We have no sure knowledge of future punishment, and the word eternal has a far higher meaning." (Hort, Life and Letters, Vol. I, p.149).

Concerning Creation:

"No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history. I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did." (Westcott, cited from Which Bible?, p. 191).

"But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with..... My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable." (Hort, cited from Which Bible?, p. 189)

Concerning the Atonement:

"I think I mentioned to you before Campbell's book on the Atonement, which is invaluable as far as it goes; but unluckily he knows nothing except Protestant theology." (Hort, Life and Letters, Vol. I, p. 322)

"The popular doctrine of substitution is an immoral and material counterfeit...nothing can be more unscriptural than the limiting of Christ's bearing our sins and sufferings to His death; but indeed that is only one aspect of an almost universal heresy." (Hort to Westcott, Life and Letters, Vol. I, p. 430)

"I confess I have no repugnance to the primitive doctrine of a ransom paid to Satan. I can see no other possible form in which the doctrine of a ransom is at all tenable; anything is better than the doctrine of a ransom to the father." (Hort, The First Epistle of St. Peter 1:1-2:17, p. 77).

Concerning Man:

"It is of course true that we can only know God through human forms, but then I think the whole Bible echoes the language of Genesis 1:27 and so assures us that human forms are divine forms." (Hort to Westcott, August 14, 1860)

"Protestants (must) unlearn the crazy horror of the idea of Priesthood." (Hort, Life and Letters, Volume II, pp. 49-51)
Concerning Roman Catholicism:

"I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry (the worship of the Virgin Mary) bears witness." (Westcott, Ibid.)

"I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-Worship and Jesus-Worship have very much in common." (Hort, Life and Letters, Volume II, pp. 49-51)

"The pure Romanish view seems to be nearer, and more likely to lead to the truth than the Evangelical." (Hort, Life and Letters, Vol. I, p. 77)

"I agree with you in thinking it a pity that Maurice verbally repudiates purgatory . . . the idea of purgation, cleansing by fire, seems to me inseparable from what the Bible teaches us of the Divine chastisements." (Hort, Life and Letters, Vol. II, pp. 336,337)

Concerning the Cumulative Effect of Multiple Changes to the Manuscripts:

"It is quite impossible to judge the value of what appear to be trifling alterations merely by reading them one after another. Taken together, they have often important bearings which few would think of at first. . . The difference between a picture, say of Raffaelle, and a feeble copy of it is made up of a number of trivial differences. . . We have successfully resisted being warned off dangerous ground, where the needs of revision required that it should not be shirked. . . It is, one can hardly doubt, the beginning of a new period in Church history. So far the angry objectors have reason for their astonishment." (Hort, Life and Letters, Vol.I, pp. 138,139)

It is one thing to have doctrinal differences on baby-sprinkling and perhaps a few other interpretations. It is quite another to be a Darwinian theologian who rejects the authority of scriptures, Biblical salvation, the reality of hell, substitutionary atonement, makes Christ a created being to be worshipped with Mary his mother, and to openly admit that your "trifling alterations" with the Greek Text have begun a "new period in Church history"!! Yet, these were the views of both Westcott and Hort!! This is UNBELIEVABLE!! No less significant is the fact that both men were involved with the occult and were members of spiritist
Bible students are often told that the Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus are better (i.e. more accurate) than other manuscripts because they are older. So, let's examine if OLDER necessarily equates with BETTER, shall we?

The whole subject of New Testament criticism is too complex to discuss here (or for me to try to discuss anywhere!), but it is significant that almost all of the new versions of the New Testament are based on what is known as the Westcott and Hort Greek Text, or some modification thereof (such as the Nestle-Aland text), whereas the King James Bible is based largely on what is known as the Textus Receptus (aka the Received Text or the Byzantine Greek Text).

Of significance is the fact that Westcott and Hort were involved in the occult and spiritism and they both hated ("reviled" in their own words) the Textus Receptus. So, what did they do? They basically "invented" their own Greek text, which was based primarily on two very corrupt 4th century Catholic manuscripts: Codex Vaticanus (discovered in the Pope's library in 1481) and Codex Sinaiticus (discovered in 1844 in a trash can at St. Catherine's monastery near Mount Sinai).

Since the late 1800's, their Greek New Testament text has largely replaced the traditional Textus Receptus in modern seminaries, especially as revised and updated by two Germans, Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland. All of these men were evolutionists. Furthermore, Westcott and Hort, although they were Anglican officials, they were "closet" Roman Catholics, denied the inerrancy of Scripture, hated the Biblical teaching of substitutionary atonement, believed that all men were gods, and were involved in spiritism and the occult.

The evidence shows that both codices (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) are corrupt beyond measure. To be honest, they are "better" in
appearance, but certainly not in their content. Remember they are written on expensive vellum; so they ought to be in good shape. Yes, these two codices are older than other Greek manuscripts, but for anyone to suggest that they are more accurate is absurd. It is like someone saying "You will find the greatest TRUTH being preached in the oldest and most beautiful cathedrals of the world," or, "the most beautiful women have the best characters."

It is interesting to note that these two manuscripts are NOT older than the earliest versions of the Bible (the Peshitta, Italic, and Waldensian), all versions which agree with the Textus Receptus, the underlying text of the King James Bible. These ancient versions are some 200 years older than Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; so the "older is better" argument should not be used.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

COLONEL SANDERS - The Kentucky Fried Chicken Analogy

Let me attempt to illustrate the "older is better" fallacy by means of a story.

I love Kentucky Fried Chicken. Don't you? I mean who doesn't love a hot, juicy piece of the Colonel's original recipe? Now, let's suppose that when Colonel Sanders was 17 years old, he developed his original recipe and he wrote it down on an old piece of paper. He always kept this paper in his pocket, and whenever someone wanted to fry chicken, he would pull it out and give them the recipe. However, there were 2 boys (Dick and Harry) that really despised him. His white clothes, white hat, and white beard (well, maybe not at age 17 :-) really irritated them. So, these 2 boys copied his original recipe and they changed it... not a lot...just a little... They added a few ingredients and subtracted a few ingredients, and they copied it on pretty letterhead. They tried to sell the recipe, but no one liked it. Their chicken tasted terrible, and the people were already used to the excellent taste of the Colonel's original recipe. So, they put the recipe in an old shoe box and forgot about it.

About 20 years later, Colonel Sanders began to make millions of dollars franchising his restaurant, and his original recipe became the favorite chicken of millions of Americans. He had so many franchisees, and had pulled the paper out of his pocket and copied the original recipe so many times that the paper literally fell apart. Eventually, he had 2,000 franchisees and millions of satisfied
customers. Unfortunately, Colonel Sanders eventually died, but his chicken lived on. Now, when Colonel Sanders died, Dick and Harry (both very old men) remembered the old recipe in the shoe box. They climbed into Harry’s attic, pulled out the recipe and began to take out newspaper ads that they had "discovered" their recipe for fried chicken. They sent copies of their supposedly "original" recipe (written on the pretty letterhead) to all 2,000 franchisees, and they demanded that they change their recipe and also pay Harry and Dick a royalty for using the "older" and "better" original recipe, which had mysteriously been lost for decades but now was discovered in an old shoe box.

After trying the new "original" recipe, the franchisees had a dilemma. The recipe which Harry and Dick had "discovered" was definitely OLDER than their recipe (since the Colonel's original recipe had long since disappeared), but the chicken just didn’t taste right. Which recipe was the REAL ORIGINAL RECIPE? Well, they solved the problem rather quickly. On one hand, there were 2,000 franchisees, all using the same recipe, all with millions of satisfied customers. On the other hand, there was one recipe, which was definitely older, however, there were no satisfied customers, and no franchisees were using that recipe.

So, what do you think they decided? With such a great "cloud of witnesses" supporting the Colonel's original recipe, the franchisees unanimously concluded that, while Harry and Dick's recipe was definitely OLDER than any of their recipes, it definitely was not better, and it definitely was not the original recipe, since all 2,000 franchisees were using the SAME RECIPE. Thus, they had the TRUE original recipe.

In this analogy, OLDER definitely did NOT mean better.

What about the NASB, NIV, and Other Translations?

Source

English Revised Version (1885)
American Standard Version (1901)
The first full-scale frontal attack on the Word of God came with the publication of the ERV in 1885, and its counterpart, the ASV in 1901. Only a few voices of protest were raised. Most staunch defenders of the faith of that day were apparently unaware that the ASV differed from the KJV in over 36,000 places or that the Greek text underlying the translation of the ASV (the Westcott-Hort Text) differed from the Textus Receptus (underlying the KJV) in over 5,700 instances. Possibly it was because the Fundamentalists then were too busy combating the modernists’ infiltration of seminaries and churches; or, perhaps it was due to the fact that the ASV never really found great acceptance publicly. It was not until the publication of the Revised Standard Version in 1946 and 1952 that many Fundamentalists became aware of how effectively a new Bible version or translation could be used to pervert the truth.

**Revised Standard Version (1946, 1952)**

Some of God’s people woke up with a start when the Revised Standard Version was published in 1952. This version, supposedly a revision of the ASV of 1901, eliminated the word **virgin** in the prophecy of Christ’s birth in Isaiah 7:14. It was also copyrighted by the apostate National Council of Churches. Protests were heard far and wide! Sadly, many failed to recognize that some of the same changes they found so objectionable in the RSV were also true of the ASV. The furor over the RSV gradually died down. But this was the version which paved the way for future perversions of the Scriptures. It had conditioned people to accept changes in the Bible—changes dictated by modern scholarship. At least the RSV left the word virgin in the New Testament references to the birth of Christ. It remained for the Good News Bible to remove it in both the Old and New Testaments.

**Good News For Modern Man (1966)**

When the first edition of Good News For Modern Man (The New Testament in Today’s English) was published in 1966, the word **virgin** appeared in all the texts in Matthew and Luke referring to the birth of Christ. But, when the 2nd and 3rd editions were published and then the entire Good News Bible was published in 1976, the word **virgin** had mysteriously disappeared from Luke 1:27 while remaining in Luke 1:34 and Matthew 1:23. Of course, the latter two verses have no meaning at all if the word **virgin** is removed or replaced. Also, the **blood** of Christ, a most important and precious word and theme, was lacking in many key New Testament references. It was replaced by “**death**” or “**costly sacrifice,**” both good words in their own place but not what the Holy Spirit gave in the original text. The heretical views of the main translator, Dr. Robert Bratcher, help to explain the many places in which the Deity of Christ is played down or omitted. The Good News Bible is one of the worst versions, yet it has been distributed by the
millions, largely due to endorsements by Billy Graham, Bill Bright and other evangelical leaders.

The Living Bible (1967, 1971)

This is neither a translation nor a version - it is a **paraphrase**. The Living Bible, praised by Billy Graham and other New Evangelical leaders, has reached a publication figure of 37 million copies and has made its author, Ken Taylor, a wealthy man. It is very readable, but at the expense of truth in so many places. Taylor admits that the principle he worked from was not a "word-for-word" translation but rather a "thought-for-thought" paraphrase which he called, "dynamic equivalence." Taylor said he worked for the most part from the ASV of 1901, a corrupt translation to begin with. The Living Bible decimates the Scriptures, almost completely eliminating important and precious words and truths as grace (see John 1:17; Acts 4:33, 15:11, 20:24; Romans 3:24; 2 Corinthians 9:8; Ephesians 2:8-9; Jude 4) and repentance (see Matthew 9:13 and Acts 17:30). "Honor" is substituted for "begotten" in Acts 13:33, Hebrews 1:5 and 5:5. Significant changes are made regarding such matters as creation in Genesis 1:1-2 and a prophecy of Christ in Zechariah 13:6. The meaning of Romans 8:28 is changed completely. Vulgar language is used in John 9:34, 11:39 and 2 Kings 18:27. The language of 1 Samuel 20:30 in early editions of TLB shocked many but it has now been softened. The author has left the door open for further suggestions, corrections and clarifications. Who knows what future editions may contain?

New American Standard Version (1960, 1971)

The NASV was to be the Bible for conservatives, Evangelicals and Fundamentalists. The foreword states that the NASV "has been produced with the conviction that the words of Scripture as originally penned in the Hebrew and Greek were inspired of God." The basic problem with this translation, however, is revealed in this statement: "This translation follows the principles used in the American Standard Version 1901 known as the Rock of Biblical Honesty." Who gave the ASV such a title? In the Principles of Revision, it is stated: "In revising the ASV consideration was given to the latest available manuscripts with a view to determining the best Greek text. In most instances the 23rd edition of the Nestle Greek New Testament was followed." This gets right to the heart of the major problem with the modern Bible versions - most are patterned after the corrupted Westcott-Hort Greek Text rather than the Textus Receptus. The word **virgin** does appear in Isaiah 7:14, but a footnote says, "or, young woman"- no doubt a sop to the liberals. Verses like Matthew 18:11 and Matthew 23:14 appear in brackets with a footnote saying, "most ancient manuscripts omit this verse" or, "this verse is not found in earliest manuscripts." A **corrupted Greek text** thus becomes the basis for raising questions about the entire verse. In other instances as in Luke 24:40, the number of the verse appears followed by "see marginal note" which explains that "some ancient Mss. add verse 40."
One wonders if the NASV translators were determined to list everything anyone ever added or left out of a manuscript until one discovers that some parts of verses are left out with no explanation whatsoever as in Colossians 1:14 and 1 Timothy 6:5. It is sad to see so many conservatives pushing this version and criticizing the KJV.


Like the NASV, the NIV was produced by those who are said to "hold a high view of Scripture." Sponsored by the New York Bible Society, they admitted the NIV translators represent a "broad spectrum in evangelical Christianity" and the list of names confirms the broadness of the spectrum. Instead of being a revision of a previous version, the preface says, "It is a completely new translation made by many scholars working directly from the Greek." The Greek text used is an "eclectic one" that is, the translators mixed different texts supposedly in "accord with sound principles of textual criticism." However, they did not state what those principles were and much of the previous undermining of the Scripture has been done on the supposed basis of "sound principles of textual criticism." Examining the text, you find that the NIV leaves out many of the same verses and portions that the ASV and the NASV also omit. An added problem, however, stems from the fact that where an entire verse is omitted, even the verse number is missing and only a small letter refers to a footnote of explanation. A careful study of this version confirms what one Christian leader said several years ago, "For every verse or word clarified in these new translations, two new problems are created." We agree with his statement. In a critique of the New International Version, one Fundamentalist scholar correctly objected that "words were dropped out; words were added; and key words were sometimes changed." Yet, the same objection must also be raised concerning the New American Standard Version which this same Fundamentalist scholar defends and recommends. This objection - the deletion or addition of words - also applies to all the other modern versions. We still insist on using and recommending only the Authorized Version.

**New King James Version (1979,1982)**

The NKJV translators claim to have "preserved the authority and accuracy" and "improved the purity and beauty" of the original KJV. We disagree that the "purity and beauty" have been improved. Although the NKJV uses the underlying Textus Receptus Greek text, the translators repeatedly use marginal notations to reference the Modern Critical Text upon which all of the modern versions are based. The NKJV advocate opens a door that lends credibility to a perverted underlying text used by all the other versions. Furthermore, changes in the text are made which simply are not warranted. The NKJV primarily uses the 1967/1977 Stuttgart edition of Biblia Hebraica and draws from sources which result in a Hebrew text that is different from the Jacob ben
Chayyim text underlying the KJV Old Testament. As a result the NKJV preface rightly stated, "significant variations are recorded in footnotes." We believe the potential for most textual problems and variants between the KJV and NKJV will be found in the Old Testament.

**New Revised Standard Version (1990)**

The NRSV is the latest product of ecumenical scholarship and will soon replace the RSV, thus helping to fill the financial coffers of the apostate National Council of Churches which holds the copyrights on both the RSV and NRSV. Translated by liberal Protestant, Catholic and Jewish scholars, and eliminating so-called sexist language, the NRSV with the Apocrypha, has already received the Imprimatur of the Roman Catholic Church and may well become the ecumenical Bible of the future.

**Other Recent Versions**

In recent years, the proliferation of modern Bible versions has increased tremendously. New versions that are based primarily upon the United Bible Societies' 4th revised edition *Greek New Testament* and the Nestle-Aland 27th edition *Novum Testamentum Graece* include the New Living Translation (NLT), the New Century Version (NCV), the Contemporary English Version (CEV) and Eugene H. Peterson's *The Message*. Most of these versions and translations are not only based on an inferior Greek text, but are also thought-for-thought translations (which allow for greater interpretive freedom of the text by the translators) rather than literal, word-for-word translations.

The more we have studied and researched this question of Bible versions, the more convinced we are that many of our dear brethren in the ministry and many Fundamentalist leaders have not taken time to look at the abundant evidence now available that clearly demonstrates the inaccuracies, inconsistencies and confusion that results from new translations. It is clear that many scholars who consider themselves to be evangelical have been influenced by the apostate scholarship of the past and present. We recognize the difference between "higher criticism" (which would be rejected by most Fundamentalists) and "textual criticism" or "lower criticism" (which is accepted by most Fundamentalists). But many do not see how the whole field of textual criticism has been shaped and molded by the false premises and conclusions of "higher criticism." The central issue revolves around the acceptance of the Westcott-Hort text rather than the *Textus Receptus* as the basis for Bible translations, versions and revisions.
While recognizing the extreme difficulties involved in translations of any kind and especially of a book as important as the Bible, we are convinced that the King James Bible has been blessed by God for hundreds of years and should be used by believers today. It will be far better for us to expand our vocabulary in order to understand its terminology than to continually rewrite the Bible to suit those who will not be able to understand it anyway apart from the New Birth or to suit those Christians who are too lazy to study. It is true that the meanings of some English words have changed and others are no longer commonly used. Yet such words are comparatively few and can easily be comprehended with the use of a good dictionary; but if the word is missing altogether, what then?

The promotion and use of so many different Bible versions has resulted in great confusion among God's people. Why don't more pastors and Christian leaders see this? Congregational reading is becoming virtually impossible. Bible memorization is most difficult. Men and women lose confidence in the validity of God's Word when some verses are included, some are bracketed, and some are missing completely.

For all of these reasons and many more, we conclude that modern Bible versions are dangerous and that God's people should beware of them. We close with a plea to all who love the Lord and His Word—look into this important question quickly and carefully. Then join us in seeking to alert and warn others concerning these subtle and devastating attacks being made upon God's Holy Word.

Our Final Authority

The written Word of God is our final authority in all matters of which It speaks, for It is God's final revelation to man. The Bible is God's trustworthy, authoritative Book, and no more is to be added thereto. The Holy Spirit supernaturally inspired the writers of the 39 books of the Old Testament to record the very words God desired His people to possess (2 Pet. 1: 2 1). Likewise, the prophetic promise Jesus Christ made to His disciples (soon to be the apostles and writers of the 27 books of the New Testament) restated the same divine operation of inspiration, for the Holy Spirit later also guided these men "into all truth" (Jn. 16:12-15). "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3:16, 17), and that inspired Scripture encompasses nothing more, nor anything less, than the 66 books of the Bible, the completed canon of Scripture. 2 Peter 3:2 tells us that if we want to know God's Word, then we are to look nowhere other than to the "words which were spoken before by the holy prophets [O. T. Scripture], and of the commandments of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour [N.T. Scripture]." God's Word provides us with all we need to be built up
in the faith and to do God’s will and work - God gave no additional revelation once the Bible was completed. The inspired writings of the apostles, circulated among the churches and later canonized, were perfect and complete (Lk. 1: 1-4; 1 Cor. 14:37; Eph. 3:1-7; 1 Thess. 2:13; Rev. 22:18, 19). The internal evidence of the Word of God states without equivocation that believers today have a final authority - God’s Written Word.

Since the completion of the canon of Scripture, no additional divine revelation has come through any "latter day prophets," charismatic dreamers, cult authorities or the tradition/Magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church, as Pope John Paul II has reinforced in a recent encyclical. With the passing of the original disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ (the apostles who penned the 27 books of the New Testament), the partial revelation ceased and "that which is perfect"-the Written Word of the Living God-was come. "That which is in part" was done away (1 Cor. 13:8-12). With the passing of the apostles and the subsequent completion of the canon, no more revelation came from God. It is essential, therefore, that we earnestly contend for the faith "once delivered" (past tense) and against any attempt to claim an authority for faith and practice other than God's Word, the 66 books of the Bible. Remember, Timothy’s household did not have the "original autographs," but the copies they had were designated by God as "the holy scriptures" (2 Tim. 3:14, 15). Likewise, Paul commended the Ephesian elders to the "word of his grace, which is able to build you up..." (Acts 20:27, 32). We can have confidence today that we have a Bible that is the holy Word of God in the Authorized (King James) Version.

A problem developed, however, with the 20th century's proliferation of new Bible versions. It became necessary to study the history of the English Bible and the Greek text which had been used down through the centuries and compare that text with the claims of the "higher critics" who championed the minority text upon which the new versions are based. After careful study of the subject, the FEA concluded that the Textus Receptus, the underlying text upon which the Authorized King James Version is based, is the providentially preserved Greek text. The Textus Receptus was derived from the majority family of manuscripts used in the Greek-speaking church down through the centuries. This text was the divinely preserved text - an accurate rendition of the very originals (miraculously inspired by the Holy Spirit) written by the apostles, and, in the Hebrew tongue, by the Old Testament prophets. The Masoretic text of the Old Testament and the Textus Receptus of the New Testament are, in reality, the divinely preserved texts of the divinely inspired original writings.

**But now, another problem has arisen within the last few decades.** An element of those who were strong defenders of the inerrancy and veracity of the Authorized Version, used and blessed by God in the English-speaking world for well over 300 years,
began to advance the idea that the KJV English translation is superior to the Greek and Hebrew texts and that the King James translators were themselves inspired by the Holy Spirit in producing their translation. As a result of this proposal, they claim that the English King James translation has been miraculously inspired just as the original autographs themselves were inspired. This false teaching even assumed the newly ascribed authority to correct the underlying Greek and Hebrew text from which it was translated. What we have by this proposed phenomenon is what is often known as "double inspiration" - the original writings of the prophets and the apostles consist of the first "inspiration," and the second work of "inspiration" occurred when the King James translators produced the English Authorized Version in 1611. Certainly the King James translators were the best scholars ever assembled to produce a translation that we can hold up today as our authoritative, trustworthy translation; but were those esteemed translators "inspired" in the biblical sense? Absolutely not!

We cannot accept this conjecture, for the concept of a superior English text or of "double inspiration" completely denies What the Bible Itself teaches about Its own initial inspiration by the miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit and Its promised preservation through each successive generation. No, the English-speaking world is not the sole proprietor of the Word of God. Other nations and languages can also boast an accurate, trustworthy translation of the Word of God from the Greek Textus Receptus and the Hebrew Masoretic text.

It is the conviction of the FEA that the Authorized Version should be the standard and final authority for the English speaking world for two reasons: First, because it is based on the Masoretic Text and the Textus Receptus, and second, because it is an accurate, literal (formal, word-for-word) translation of the aforementioned Greek and Hebrew texts (that is, the translation of the text is literal, as much as is possible of any translation from one language to another). We must reject the teaching of those who claim the KJV is full of errors, yet we must also reject the teaching of those "KJV-only" proponents who claim that the KJV is in itself inspired and superior to the underlying Hebrew and Greek texts. Notice the following timely words by Pastor M. H. Reynolds, Jr., which accurately sum up the Biblical position regarding inspiration and preservation:

We are sometimes accused of believing in "double inspiration" or "continuing revelation," i.e., that the King James translators were divinely inspired in the same way as were the original human writers of the books of the Bible. Not so! The use of these terms amounts to a dishonest misrepresentation of what we believe. The miracle of inspiration applies only to the initial giving of the Word of God to the writers of the autographs (all of which are no longer in existence). But we also believe that the Bible Itself teaches and the history of manuscript evidence supports the contention that the miracle of initial inspiration extends to the divinely
superintended preservation of a pure text to this day. We have, therefore, an inspired Bible today in the sense that it is the accurate translation of the text once and finally inspired by God and recorded in the "original autographs," the majority text used down through the centuries in the Greek church. Be wary of any opponent of the KJV who contrives impressive sounding buzz words to misrepresent what the defenders of the Authorized Version actually believe.

From the FEA publication *Modern Bibles-the Dark Secret* by Pastor Moorman, wonderfully used of God to defend the Authorized Version and to debunk the credibility of the other versions, the concluding paragraph reads:

It is not impossible that in the providence of God another universally accepted standard translation could be produced. However, given the lateness of the hour, the lack of spiritual scholarship, and the fact that our language no longer has the depth and vitality it once had, this seems most unlikely. All indications point to the KJV as the Bible God would have His people use in these last days before the Second Coming of Christ.

The Old Testament Scriptures were to accomplish one central purpose-to glorify the Lord Jesus Christ (Luke 24:25-27). The same is true of the New Testament as well (John 16:14). Those who undermine the authority and accuracy of the Authorized Version only cause God's people to lack a confidence in His Message and the impeccability of Christ and His finished Work. This certainly does not advance the purpose of God-to glorify His dear Son and to cause His children to have absolute confidence in His final and complete Revelation. Praise God, He has given to us His Word, and we have before us in the English language the Authorized King James Bible, a literal, accurate translation of the very words God breathed in His Revelation to man.

One of the fundamental deceptions being promoted by modern Bible publishers is that the new Bibles are merely "updated styles of writing," or that they are simply "easier to read" than the KJV, and that nothing has been removed or changed in God's word. I fell prey to this deception for over a decade of my Christian life!!

You've heard the old saying, "the proof is in the pudding." Well, in this situation, the proof is in the changes. Take a look at just a
few of the changes between the Textus Receptus translation (KJV) and the translations (NIV, NASB) based upon codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. It will astonish you. It literally sickened me!!

Do these verse charts in some way prove that the KJV is perfect? Of course not, and they are not meant to. The KJV does have errors, some of which are corrected in modern versions such as the NIV (e.g. Acts 12:4, where the KJV erroneously has "Easter," while the NIV and modern versions, and the Textus Receptus, have "Passover"). What these charts will do is stir you to study. When you see glaring differences between Bible versions that create shrouds of doubt surrounding the veracity of "sola scriptura," you should want to know why these differences exist.

Personally, I do believe that the very nature of the differences can convince someone that the modern Bibles are based on corrupt manuscripts, as they make Christ less than equal with God (and even talk about Joseph being his "father"), they lessen the atonement, and they remove the need for repentance and walking in the Spirit. But that is not the primary goal here. The goal is to prove to you that all Bibles do not say the same thing.

Why is this important? It is simple: if two books say different things, or if two books say inherently contradictory things, or if of two books one says more than the other, they cannot both be God’s Word.

<p>| Mt 5:44 | Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you. | Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. | love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. |
| Mt 9:13 | for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. | For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners. | For I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners. |
| Mt 18:11 | For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost. | OMITTED | footnote casts doubt |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt 19:17</th>
<th><strong>Why callest thou me good?</strong></th>
<th>Why do you ask me about <strong>what is good</strong>?</th>
<th>Why are you asking me about <strong>what is good</strong>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt 24:36</td>
<td>But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.</td>
<td>No one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, <strong>nor the Son</strong>, but only the Father.</td>
<td>But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, <strong>nor the Son</strong>, but the Father alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 25:13</td>
<td>Ye know neither the day nor the hour <strong>wherein the Son of man cometh</strong>.</td>
<td>You do not know the day or the hour.</td>
<td>You do not know the day nor the hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 27:35</td>
<td>And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: <strong>that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, “They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.”</strong></td>
<td>When they had crucified him, they divided up his clothes by casting lots</td>
<td>And when they had crucified Him, they divided up His garments among themselves by casting lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 7:19</td>
<td>Because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats?</td>
<td>For it doesn't go into his heart but into his stomach, and then out of his body. <strong>(In saying this, Jesus declared all foods “clean.”)</strong></td>
<td>because it does not go into his heart, but into his stomach, and is eliminated? <strong>(Thus He declared all foods clean.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 10:24</td>
<td>how hard it is <strong>for them that trust in riches</strong> to enter into the kingdom of God!</td>
<td>how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!</td>
<td>how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 2:33</td>
<td>And <strong>Joseph</strong> and his mother...</td>
<td>The <strong>child's father</strong> and mother...</td>
<td><strong>His father</strong> and mother....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 4:4</td>
<td>Man shall not live by bread alone, <strong>but by every word of God</strong>.</td>
<td>Man does not live on bread alone.</td>
<td>Man shall not live on bread alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 4:8</td>
<td><strong>Get thee behind me, Satan.</strong></td>
<td>OMITTED</td>
<td>OMITTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 11:2</td>
<td>And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father <strong>which art in heaven</strong>, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth.</td>
<td>He said to them, When you pray, say: “Father, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come...</td>
<td>And He said to them, When you pray, say: Father, hallowed be Your name. Your kingdom come...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 1:18</td>
<td>No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.</td>
<td>No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only, who is at the Father's side, has made him known.</td>
<td>No one has seen God at any time; the only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Original Text</td>
<td>Naturalized Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 3:13</td>
<td>And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.</td>
<td>No one has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven—the Son of Man.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 6:47</td>
<td>He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.</td>
<td>He who believes has everlasting life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 8:9</td>
<td>And when they heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out.</td>
<td>those who heard began to go away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 9:4</td>
<td>I must work the works of him that sent me.</td>
<td>We must do the work of him who sent me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 10:30</td>
<td>I and my Father are one</td>
<td>I and the Father are one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 16:16</td>
<td>A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.</td>
<td>In a little while you will see me no more, and then after a little while you will see me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac 2:30</td>
<td>that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;</td>
<td>he would place one of his descendants on his throne. to seat one of his descendants upon his throne.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac 8:37</td>
<td>If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.</td>
<td>OMITTED footnote casts doubt (some editions just omit it)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac 23:9</td>
<td>Let us not fight against God.</td>
<td>OMITTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 8:1</td>
<td>There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.</td>
<td>Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 13:9</td>
<td>Thou shalt not bear false witness.</td>
<td>OMITTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Cor 15:47</td>
<td>The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.</td>
<td>The first man was of the dust of the earth, the second man from heaven.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co 1:14</td>
<td>In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.</td>
<td>In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Ti 3:16</td>
<td><strong>God</strong> was manifest in the flesh.</td>
<td>He appeared in a body.</td>
<td>He who was revealed in the flesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Pe 1:22</td>
<td>Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth <strong>through the Spirit</strong>.</td>
<td>you have purified yourselves by obeying the truth.</td>
<td>Since you have in obedience to the truth purified your souls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Jo 4:3</td>
<td>And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus <strong>Christ is come in the flesh</strong> is not of God.</td>
<td>But every spirit that does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God.</td>
<td>And every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jo 5:7</td>
<td>For there are three <strong>that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost:</strong> and these three are one.</td>
<td>For there are three that testify:</td>
<td>For there are three that testify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re 1:11</td>
<td>I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book...</td>
<td>which said: &quot;Write on a scroll...&quot;</td>
<td>saying, &quot;Write in a book...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re 5:14</td>
<td>Four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped <strong>him that liveth for ever and ever</strong>.</td>
<td>the elders fell down and worshipped.</td>
<td>the elders fell down and worshipped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re 20:9</td>
<td>Fire came down <strong>from God</strong> out of heaven.</td>
<td>Fire came down from heaven.</td>
<td>Fire came down from heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re 21:24</td>
<td>And the nations <strong>of them which are saved</strong> shall walk in the light of it.</td>
<td>The nations will walk by its light.</td>
<td>And the nations shall walk by its light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re 22:14</td>
<td>Blessed are they that <strong>do his commandments,</strong> that they may have right to the tree of life ...</td>
<td>Blessed are those who <strong>wash their robes,</strong> that they may have the right to the tree of life ...</td>
<td>Blessed are those who <strong>wash their robes,</strong> so that they may have the right to the tree of life ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you really want to watch something educational, take a few hours and watch these videos by Dr. Walter Veith. You'll be glad you did!!

**Total Onslaught - 213B - Battle of the Bibles**
1 hr 31 min

Our battle is not against flesh and blood. Spiritual forces would wish to rob man of the only source of inspiration outlining the road to salvation. In the Battle of the Bibles hard evidence is provided for how the enemy has worked behind the scenes to create the stage for the final attack on the Word of God itself. The history and affiliations of those who have dared to reshape God's Word to suit there occult philosophy is clearly exposed.

**Total Onslaught - 214B - Changing the Word part 1 and 2**
1 hr 37 min

In this video a hands on approach of the Bible is followed, exposing the blatant changes that have been made in modern translations to rob Christ of His pre eminence. See for yourselves and prove whether these things are so.

**Total Onslaught - 214B - Changing the Word part 3**
42 min
Much has been written on secret societies and there are numerous speculations as to which powers control them. The nature of secrecy is such that the real power behind the power should remain exactly that—Secret. In this lecture, clear evidence is provided to show who really stands behind the throne of Earthly power.

Here is a [LINK](#) to over 40 of Dr. Veith’s lectures. FASCIN