

## **The character of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus texts**

Most of the over 5000 New Testament differences between the King James Bible and modern Bible versions like the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV, NET, Living Bible, and others, are the result of two manuscripts which allegedly date to around 350 AD called Sinaiticus (Aleph) and Vaticanus (B).

Dean John William Burgon, personally collated the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus manuscripts. In his book, "The Revision Revised", which he wrote in 1881, he gives his opinion and lists undeniable facts about what these two manuscripts say.

Mr. Burgon states on page 11; "Singular to relate Vaticanus and Aleph have within the last 20 years established a tyrannical ascendance over the imagination of the Critics, which can only be fitly spoken of as a blind superstition. It matters nothing that they 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. In the gospels alone B (Vaticanus) 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 3455 omitted, 839 added, 1114 substituted, 2299 transposed, 1265 modified (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.**"

On page 319 of he remarks, "In the Gospels alone Vaticanus has 589 readings quite peculiar to itself, affecting 858 words while Aleph has 1460 such readings, affecting 2640 words."

In his book, Revision Revised, Dean Burgon wrote over a hundred years ago, concerning the ages of Codices Vatican (B) and Sinai (Aleph): Quote: "Lastly, - We suspect that these two Manuscripts are indebted for their preservation, solely to their ascertained evil character, which has occasioned that the one eventually found its way, four centuries ago, to a forgotten shelf in the Vatican library; while the other, after exercising the ingenuity of several generations of critical Correctors, eventually (viz. in A.D. 1844) got deposited in the waste-paper basket of the Convent at the foot of mount Sinai. Had B and Aleph been copies of average purity, they must long since have shared the inevitable fate of books which are freely used and highly prized; namely, they would have fallen into decadence and disappeared from sight." (Ref: P1)

In short these two codices are old simply because, first, they were written on extremely expensive and durable antelope skins, and secondly, they were so full of errors, alterations, additions and deletions, that they were never used by true believers and seldom even by their own custodians. Thus they had little chance of wearing away.

Herman Hoskier also has written a 2 Volume set called: Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment. - Hoskier, Herman Charles (1864-1938) This thorough and scholarly work can now be seen online here: In it he documents many of the 4000 or more differences that exist just

between these two "oldest and best" manuscripts.

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/hoskier/codexb1.html>

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/hoskier/codexb2.html>

The purpose of this article is to give you just a few of the many examples of just how contradictory and confusing these two "oldest and best" manuscripts really are when contrasted with the Traditional Greek Text that underlies the King James Bible of 1611. Literally thousands of words have been omitted from the KJB text primarily on the basis of Aleph or B, yet the modern versions follow no discernible or logical pattern as to when they decide to include or exclude readings from one or the other

SINAITICUS (Aleph) completely omits the following verses while they are found in Vaticanus. Matthew 24:35 - "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away"; Luke 10:32 - "And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side."; 17:35 - "Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left."; John 9:38 - "And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him."(omitted in Sinaiticus original and P75, but found in Vaticanus and P66); 16:15 - "All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you."; 21:25 - "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen."; and I Corinthians 2:15- "But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man." and 13:1b -2 - "I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not - (charity, I am nothing)."

(As a side note, there are many sections and even whole books missing from the Old Testament. Aleph -"Sinaiticus: written more than 200 years after the completion of the New Testament. It omits Genesis 23:19-24:46, Numbers 5:27-7:20, 1 Chronicles 9:27-19:17, all of Exodus, Joshua, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Ezekiel, Daniel and Judges. It contains New Testament Apocrypha.)

VATICANUS (B) omits Matthew 12:47 - "Then one said unto him, Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee." and Luke 23:17 while Sinaiticus retains them. Luke 23:17, "For of necessity he must release one onto them at the feast", is omitted in B, the NASB, and NIV, yet it is in Sinaiticus and the majority of all Greek texts. Yet B omits Luke 23:34, "Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do", while it is retained in Sinaiticus and this time kept in the NASB and NIV. Go figure. Vaticanus also omits the entire verse of 1 Peter 5:3 but it is found in Sinaiticus and the Majority of all manuscripts and Bible translations - "Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock."

Luke 23:17 "FOR OF NECESSITY HE MUST RELEASE ONE UNTO THEM AT THE FEAST."

This entire verse is found in the Majority of all texts as well as Sinaiticus. However Vaticanus omits the whole verse and so do the NIV, RSV, ESV, RV and ASV. The NASB pulls its usual trick, and from 1963 to 1972 the NASB omitted the verse, but then in 1977 and again in 1995 the NASB scholars decided to put the verse back in the text. The brand new ISV of 2004 and the Holman Christian Standard of 2003 also retain the verse and place it in their modern versions, but The Message and the NET version continue to omit it. Aren't you glad we have the latest sure findings of modern scholarship to help us find out what God REALLY said?

Matthew 12:47 reads: "Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee." This verse is found in the Majority of all texts, in Sinaiticus correction, C and D. However Vaticanus omits it.

The RV and ASV included the verse. Then the Revised Standard Version of 1952 omitted it, but the NRSV of 1989 put it back in again. But wait. Now the 2001 ESV again omits it! However the NASB, NIV, ISV and Holman all keep it in their texts. Some "science" huh?

In the gospels alone, both SINAITICUS and VATICANUS omit the following verses. Matthew 17:21, 18:11, 23:14; Mark 7:16, 9:44, 9:46, 11:26, 15:28; Luke 9:55-56, 17:36, 23:17, and John 5:4. They are all found in the majority of the remaining Greek texts we have today. The NASB of 1972 omitted these verses, but in 1977 put them back [in brackets]. The NIV continues to omit these verses entirely.

Matthew 6:13

What is commonly referred to as the Lord's Prayer ends with these words: "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen." Out of about 1000 remaining manuscripts these words are found in all but 10, or a ratio of 100 to 1. They are included in the Didache 150 AD, and the Diatessaron 170 AD (200 years before Sinaiticus and Vaticanus). They are also found in the following ancient Bible versions: The Old Latin 200 AD, the Syriac Peshitta 250 AD, Harclean, Curetonian, Palestinian, Coptic, Gothic, Armenian, and Ethiopic.

These inspired words of our Lord Jesus Christ are also found in Tyndale, Coverdale, Great Bible, Matthew's Bible, the Bishops' Bible, the Geneva Bible, NKJV, Lamsa's 1936 translation of the Syriac, the Italian Diodati, Spanish Reina Valera, German Luther, and the new Complete Jewish Bible.

However both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus omit all these words and the NIV, RSV, ESV omit them while the NASB, and Holman Standard put them in brackets.

Matthew 16:2-3 Both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus completely omit most of 2 and all of verse 3. "When it is evening, ye say, It will be fair weather: for the sky is red. And in the morning, It will be foul weather today: for the sky is red and lowring. O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky: but can ye not discern the signs of the times?". Here the NASB includes the words with no notes while the NIV footnotes that these words "are not found in some early manuscripts".

Matthew 17:20 An error still retained in the NASB, ESV and NIV is the result of following Aleph and B. When the disciples could not cast out a devil they ask Jesus why. The Lord tells

them, "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." In this instance they had no faith at all and Jesus tells them that if they had just a little bit of faith they could remove mountains.

However both Aleph and B read "little faith" instead of "unbelief", and so the NASB, ESV and NIV read, "Because you have SO LITTLE FAITH. I tell you the truth, if you have faith as small as a mustard seed. . .". If they had a little bit of faith to begin with, it doesn't make sense to tell them they only need a mustard seed of faith to accomplish great things. But if they had no faith, then Jesus's words make sense.

**NASB Confusion - The two sons and the Father's vineyard - Matthew 21:28-31**

Matthew 21:28-31 - "A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to day in MY vineyard. He answered and said, I will NOT: BUT AFTERWARD HE REPENTED, AND WENT. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I GO, sir.; and HE WENT NOT. Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The FIRST."

This is the reading of the King James Bible 1611, Wycliffe 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, the Revised Version of 1881, the American Standard Version of 1901, the RSV 1952, NRSV 1989, ESV of 2001, the NKJV 1982, Holman Standard 2003, the ISV 2010, the Catholic Douay 1950 and Jerusalem bibles 1969, 1985, the NIV of 1984 and even the NET version. These readings are found in the majority of all manuscripts and in the Sinaiticus copy, one of the so called oldest and best. However Vaticanus or B, reverses the order of the two sons. Even the Catholic bibles rejected the Vaticanus reading, and they have it in the Vatican library as one of their treasured possessions. Yet they chose to follow the reading that matches that found in the King James Bible.

When the Father came to the first son and told him to go work in his vineyard, instead of saying "I will NOT:BUT AFTERWARD HE REPENTED, AND WENT." the NASBs from 1962, 63, 68, 71, 72, 75 and 1977 say "I WILL, AND HE DID NOT GO." And when he comes to the second son, in the NASBs from 1962 to 1977, instead of him saying "I GO SIR, AND HE WENT NOT" the NASBs have "I WILL NOT, YET AFTERWARD HE REGRETTED IT AND WENT." Then, when Jesus asks which of them did the father's will, instead of "the FIRST", the NASBs (1963 to 1977) say "the LATTER"!!!

Other bible versions that also follow the reading found in Vaticanus are the Jehovah Witness New World Translation 1961, the New English Bible 1970, Goodspeed 1943, and the Revised English Bible of 1989, put out as a recent joint effort between Protestants and Catholics. All

these versions follow the Vaticanus reading, in spite of the overwhelming evidence that it is wrong.

The NASB does not always follow the Vaticanus readings. Siniaticus differs from it over 3000 times in the gospels alone. In fact in verse 28 the “my” of "MY vineyard" is in B, but not in Siniaticus, but the NASB did not put it in. So the NASB goes back and forth between Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, sometimes following one, sometimes the other, and sometimes changing their opinion from one year to the next. Here in verse 28 both the NIV and NASB have followed Siniaticus and rejected the Vaticanus and Majority reading of “MY vineyard” and have merely "THE" vineyard.

The NASBs then chose to follow the Vaticanus reading (and not the Sinaiticus nor Majority reading) in verses 29-31 in all their editions from 1960 through 8 different editions until 1995 when they again changed their "scholarly opinion", based on the same evidence which they had all along! NOW the 1995 NASB “update” reads as did the King James Bible and many others all this time.

Which NASB was or is the true words of God? Short answer- None of them. There is no “science” in their critical text methods; only the fickle and every changing opinions of men who make change for change’s sake (and perhaps for a few dollars and personal fame tossed in as well.) Their bogus bibles only serve to undermine the authority of God's true words and sow doubt and confusion among God’s people.

Will Kinney

Matthew 21:28-31 - NASB Confusion - The two sons and the Father's vineyard -

Matthew 21:28-31 - "A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to day in MY vineyard. He answered and said, I will NOT: BUT AFTERWARD HE REPENTED, AND WENT. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I GO, sir.; and HE WENT NOT. Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The FIRST."

This is the reading of the King James Bible 1611, Wycliffe 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Bishops’ Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, the Revised Version of 1881, the American Standard Version of 1901, the RSV 1952, NRSV 1989, ESV of 2001, the NKJV 1982, Holman Standard 2003, the ISV 2010, the Catholic Douay 1950 and Jerusalem bibles 1969, 1985, the NIV of 1984 and even the NET version. These readings are found in the majority of all manuscripts and in the Siniaticus copy, one of the so called oldest and best. However

Vaticanus or B, reverses the order of the two sons. Even the Catholic bibles rejected the Vaticanus reading here, and they have it in the Vatican library as one of their treasured possessions. Yet they chose to follow the reading that matches that found in the King James Bible.

When the Father came to the first son and told him to go work in his vineyard, instead of saying "I will NOT: BUT AFTERWARD HE REPENTED, AND WENT." the NASBs from 1962, 63, 68, 71, 72, 75 and 1977 say "I WILL, AND HE DID NOT GO." And when he comes to the second son, in the NASBs from 1962 to 1977, instead of him saying "I GO SIR, AND HE WENT NOT" the NASBs have "I WILL NOT, YET AFTERWARD HE REGRETTED IT AND WENT." Then, when Jesus asks which of them did the father's will, instead of "the FIRST", the NASBs (1963 to 1977) say "the LATTER"!!!

Other bible versions that also follow the reading found in Vaticanus are the Jehovah Witness New World Translation 1961, the New English Bible 1970, Goodspeed 1943, and the Revised English Bible of 1989, put out as a recent joint effort between Protestants and Catholics. All these versions follow the Vaticanus reading, in spite of the overwhelming evidence that it is wrong.

The NASB does not always follow the Vaticanus readings. Sinaiticus differs from it over 3000 times in the gospels alone. In fact in verse 28 the "my" of "MY vineyard" is in B, but not in Sinaiticus, but the NASB did not put it in. So the NASB goes back and forth between Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, sometimes following one, sometimes the other, and sometimes changing their opinion from one year to the next. Here in verse 28 both the NIV and NASB have followed Sinaiticus and rejected the Vaticanus and Majority reading of "MY vineyard" and have merely "THE" vineyard.

The NASBs then chose to follow the Vaticanus reading (and not the Sinaiticus nor Majority reading) in verses 29-31 in all their editions from 1960 through 8 different editions until 1995 when they again changed their "scholarly opinion", based on the same evidence which they had all along! NOW the 1995 NASB "update" reads as did the King James Bible and many others all this time.

Which NASB was or is the true words of God? Short answer- None of them. There is no "science" in their critical text methods; only the fickle and every changing opinions of men who make change for change's sake (and perhaps for a few dollars and personal fame tossed in as well.) Their bogus bibles only serve to undermine the authority of God's true words and sow doubt and confusion among God's people.

Matthew 27:49 A very serious error occurs here in both of these manuscripts, which is not used by the NASB, NIV, or the RSV, though the reading is noted in the RSV footnote as, \*Other ancient authorities insert - "And another took a spear and pierced his side and there came out water and blood."None of the major English Bible translations in history ever included this added verse. This includes Wycliffe 1396, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Bishops' bible, the Geneva Bible, the RV, ASV, NASB, NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, Holman, Darby nor Youngs. It is an obvious textual blunder. Yet there are a couple of wackos going around the internet claiming that the KJB is wrong because it does not include this extra verse! We do live in interesting times. This reading of both Aleph and B has a man killing our Lord rather than He Himself commending His spirit into the hands of the Father and voluntarily giving up the ghost.

This reading also has Christ being put to death at this time, yet we see from the very next verse and the other gospels that He continues to speak. In Luke 23:44-46 Jesus says, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit", and John 19:30 says, "When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost".

It is not until AFTER our Lord said all these things, and He Himself voluntarily gave up His own life that we read in John 19:34, "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water".

Obviously some very careless scribes took this reading from John's gospel and placed it in Matthew 27:49, where it is completely out of order. Yet this reading is found in both of these "oldest and best" manuscripts upon which most modern versions are based.

Mark 1:2. Another error still retained in the NASB, ESV and NIV is found in this verse. The KJB reads: "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."

Here we have two different prophets quoted. One is Malachi and the other Isaiah. That is why it says prophets - plural. It is the reading of the Majority of Greek texts. It is found in many ancient versions and quoted by Ireneaus and Tertullian who lived 150 years before Aleph and B ever saw the light of day. The NASB, ESV and NIV say, "as it is written in ISAIAH..." but only part of the quote is from Isaiah (40:3); the other part is from Malachi (3:1).

In Mark 1:1-2, both Aleph and B change "the prophets" to "Isaiah", and both omit the words "before thee". Sinaiticus omits THE SON OF GOD from verse 1, but it is found in Vaticanus.

Mark 6:22 "And when the daughter of THE SAID (autns tns) Herodias came in, and danced, and pleased Herod..." both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus read, "And when HIS daughter Herodias came in and danced", thus making Herodias the daughter of Herod.

The Nestle-Aland Greek texts previously read like the King James Bible and the Majority of all Greek texts: When the daughter OF THE SAME (or 'the said' autns tns) Herodias came in and danced...". However in the latest Nestle-Aland critical texts they once again have changed their Greek reading and decided to go with that found in Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and D which reads:

"and when HIS daughter Herodias came in..."

The fickle nature of the "science" of textual criticism is seen in the following versions. Reading like the King James Bible that this was the daughter of Herodias by her previous marriage to Phillip (as the context, as well as Matthew 14:6-11 clearly show)- "the daughter of Herodias" v. 6, "instructed of her mother" v.8 "she brought it to her mother" v. 11) - are the RV, ASV, RSV, NKJV, NASB, NIV, ISV, Holman, and the ESV. However the NRSV of 1989 actually says: "When HIS DAUGHTER Herodias came in and danced, she pleased Herod." Notice that the RSV of 1952 went with the KJB reading. Then the NRSV followed Sin/Vat. and then again the ESV of 2003 went back to the KJB reading.

But wait! There's more. Now Dr. Daniel Wallace and company in their NET bible version also follow this bogus reading of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus and their ongoing train wreck reads: "When HIS DAUGHTER Herodias came in and danced, she pleased Herod and his dinner guests." Likewise the Catholic versions are in their usual disarray. The NIV 1984 reads like the KJB here - "the daughter of Herodias" but then the NIV of 2011 came out and though it still reads like the KJB, it now has a footnote that did not appear in the 1984 edition. The NIV 2011 footnote now says: "Some early manuscripts 'When **his** daughter'." This is just another bogus minority reading found in the Vatican mss. that contradicts the clear teaching of other Scriptures and should be rejected immediately.

Luke 1:26 "And the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of GALILEE, named Nazareth." Sinaiticus reads "a city of JUDEA, named Nazareth" - a clear geographical error (one of many). Nazareth is in Galilee, not Judea.

Luke 10:1 "After these things the Lord appointed other SEVENTY also, and sent them two and two before his face." Here, B reads 72 sent and so do the NIV, ESV, Douay and Wallace's NET version but Aleph reads 70, and so do the NKJV, RV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, and NASB.

Luke 11:11 "If a son shall ask bread..."

The perversion of God's word in the present day, began in 1881 with the publication of the Revised Version in England. This is when Christendom began to accept the Westcott-Hort revised Greek text, and literally thousands of changes were made in an attempt to overthrow the authority of the King James Bible. Satan is subtle, and he introduces his changes little by little. The next bible to begin to be accepted was the ASV or American Standard Version of 1901. They still kept all of the "thee"s and "ye"s, and actually the ASV is much closer to the KJB than its later counterpart, the NASB. Each new version departs from the KJB a little bit more. The NKJV is not primarily based on the same Greek text as the NIV, but it does not wholly follow the KJB either in at least 40 instances in the New Testament, and has changed the meaning of hundreds of verses and introduced false doctrines into the Bible.



In Luke 11:11 we read: "If a son shall ask BREAD of any of you that is a father, WILL HE GIVE HIM A STONE? OR IF HE ASK a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent?"

All of the capitalized letters are omitted in the NASB and NIV. The NASB says : " Now suppose one of you fathers is asked by his son for a FISH (not bread), he will not give him a snake instead of a fish, will he?" There is no "now suppose" in any text; they have changed the active verb "ask" to the passive "is asked" and they have omitted "WILL HE GIVE HIM A STONE, OR IF HE ASK". The NIV is similar to the NASB. This is because Vaticanus does not have these words and Vaticanus (B) has substituted "Fish" for "bread". P45 and P75 are also in disagreement with each other, as well as the Majority of all Greek texts. P45, agreeing with Vaticanus, has "FISH" (ixthun not BREAD - arton) BUT P75 has a unique reading not found in any bible version I know of. P75 actually has a completely different word here - isxun - STRENGTH, or MIGHT. These two partial, papyrus manuscripts often differ one from the other, sometimes following Vaticanus and at others Sinaiticus, and sometimes going their own separate ways. For example, both P45 & 75 omit "neither under a bushel" in verse 33, yet the NASB, NIV include these words because they are found in both Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

The reading of the King James Bible in Luke 11:11 is that found in the Majority of all manuscripts including A, C, D and Sinaiticus - one of the "oldest and best" (according to modern scholarolatry).

It is of great interest to note that the KJB reading is also that of the Revised Version of 1881 and the ASV of 1901 which was so highly praised by the NASB as being the Rock of Biblical Honesty. So, why did the NASB change the reading? Hey, they can do whatever they want whenever their fancy strikes them. The KJB reading is also found in the Catholic Douay (1950) and the Catholic Jerusalem bible of 1968. It is the Catholics that posses Vaticanus, yet even they did not follow it in this place, as did the NIV and NASB, until later Catholic versions came on the scene, like the NEW Jerusalem in 1985. BUT now the latest Catholic version has come on the merry-go-round bible scene and guess what. It has gone back to the original reading once again. It is the 2009 The Sacred Bible Catholic Public Domain Version and it now reads: "So then, who among you, **if he asks his father for bread**, he would give him a stone? Or if he asks for a fish, he would give him a serpent, instead of a fish?"

Can we expect the same random changes in the Bible of the Month Club English versions? Most definitely. In fact, it has already happened among those modern versions that follow the ever changing Westcott-Hort, UBS type of fickle scholarship. They are working on a new bible version called the International Standard Version and now in 2010 they have the gospel of Luke finished and "updated" and it too has gone back to the original reading found in the King James

Bible all along. The brand new, updated according to \$scholar's late\$ finding\$, ISV now reads in Luke 11:11 - "What father among you, **if his son asks for bread, would give him a stone, or if he asks** for a fish, would give him a snake instead of the fish?" Modern scholarship is nothing if not consistently inconsistent.

The first version to change the Greek and English text to omit the words "WILL HE GIVE HIM A STONE, OR IF HE ASK" and to change BREAD to FISH was the liberal RSV, then followed by the NASB, NRSV, NIV, ESV, Message, the Holman Standard and Wallace's NET version.

The reading of "if a son shall ask BREAD of any of you that is a father, WILL HE GIVE HIM A STONE? OR IF HE ASK a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent?" is found in the Majority of all manuscripts, and in such Bible translations as: the Anglo-Saxon Gospels Corpus Christi Manuscript circa 1000 A.D., Wycliffe 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Cranmer's Bible 1539, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1557 - 1602, the Douay-Rheims of 1582, the King James Bible 1611, Mace N.T. 1729, Wesley's translation of 1755, Young's, Darby, Hebrew Names Version, World English Bible, Lamsa's 1936 translation of the Syriac, Weymouth Version 1902, the Bible in Basic English 1961, the New Berkeley Version 1969, the Amplified Bible 1987 (put out by the same Lockman Foundation that prints the NASB), the 1994 21st Century KJV, and the 1998 Third Millennium Bible.

Foreign language Bibles that read the same way as the King James Bible are Jerome's Latin translation of 382 A.D., the Latin Vulgate of 405, the Sagradas Escrituras of 1569, the Spanish Reina Valera 1909, 1960, 1995 - "¿Qué padre de vosotros, si su hijo le pide pan, le dará una piedra? ¿o si pescado, en lugar de pescado, le dará una serpiente?", the 2003 Castillian, the 2004 Reina Valera Gomez, La Biblia de las Américas 1997 (by the same Lockman Foundation), Luther's German Bible 1545, the French Louis Segond 1910, the Italian Diodati 1649, and the New Diodati 1991, and the 1997 La Parola e Vita - "E chi è tra voi quel padre che, se il figlio gli chiede del PANE, gli dà una pietra? ", the Portuguese de Almeida, the Chinese Union Traditional, the French Martin 1744, Louis Segond 1910, French Ostervald 1996 - "Qui est le père d'entre vous, qui donne à son fils une pierre, lorsqu'il lui demande du PAIN?", the Modern Greek used throughout the whole world in the Greek Orthodox churches and the Modern Hebrew New Testament.

So if you are trusting the modern "bibles" to give you the complete truth of God, you are getting something "fishy" instead of the bread of God.

Luke 14:5 "an ass" or "a son" or "a sheep"?

Luke 14:5 - KJB - "And (Jesus) answered them, saying, Which of you shall have AN ASS or an

ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the sabbath day?"

NIV, RSV, NASB - "Then he asked them, "If one of you has A SON or an ox that falls into a well on the Sabbath day, will you not immediately pull him out?"

Whiston's Primitive New Testament 1745 - "And said unto them, Which of you shall have A SHEEP or an ox fallen into a pit on the sabbath-day and will not straightway pull him out?" (Manuscript D actually reads "a SHEEP" or an ox)

Let's see....AN ASS, A SHEEP or A SON? Yep, pretty close in meaning, right? What is going on here? Well, as usual, the so called "oldest and best Greek manuscripts" are once again in disagreement with each other and the scholars can't seem to make up their minds which reading God inspired. Sinaiticus reads as does the KJB with "an ASS or an ox", while Vaticanus has "a SON or an ox" and Mss. D reads "a SHEEP or an ox", and the bible versions are all over the board.

The reading found in the King James Bible of "an ASS or an ox" is that found in Wycliffe 1380, 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Cranmer's bible 1539, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1557-1602, the Douay-Rheims 1582, the KJB 1611, Wesley 1755, the Revised Version of 1881, and American Standard Version of 1901, the Douay Version 1950, the New English Bible 1970, New Berkeley Version 1969, New Life Bible 1969, Webster's 1833, Darby 1890, Young's 1898, the Bible in Basic English 1961, the NKJV 1982, KJV 21st Century 1994, and the Third Millennium Bible 1998.

However, beginning with the liberal RSV in 1952 they began to follow the Vaticanus mss.(even though Sinaiticus reads AN ASS and both the RV and the ASV kept that reading) and changed the text from "an ass" to "a son". This was then followed by the NRSV, NASB, NIV, ESV, Holman Standard, the Message and Wallace's NET version.

As usual, the Catholic versions are in a state of constant change. The 1582 Douay-Rheims as well as the 1950 Douay read "an ASS or an ox", but then changed to "A SON or an ox" in the 1969 Jerusalem bible, the 1970 St. Joseph New American Bible and the 1985 New Jerusalem bible. However in the brand new 2009 The Sacred Bible Catholic Public Domain Version they have once again gone back to read "an ASS or an ox".

Foreign language Bibles that read ASS

Jerome's Vulgate 382 A.D., Vulgate 405, Clementine Vulgate 2005 - "vestrum ASINUS aut bos

in puteum cadet”

Anglo-Saxon Gospels, mss. 140 circa 1000 A.D, and mss. 38 circa 1200 A.D. - “eowres ASSA odde oxa befealp on anne pytt”

Las Sagradas Escrituras 1569, Spanish Reina Valera 1909, 1960, 1995, Spanish Reina Valera Gomez 2004 - “¿Quién de vosotros, si su ASNO o su buey cae en algún pozo, no lo saca inmediatamente, aunque sea sábado?”

Italian Diodati 1649, and the Nuevo Diodati 1991 - “Poi, rispondendo loro disse: «Chi di voi se il suo ASINO o bue cade in un pozzo, non lo tira subito fuori in giorno di sabato?»”

Portuguese - O Livro 2000 - “Se o vosso JUMENTO (an ass or donkey) ou o vosso boi cair numa cova, não tratam logo de o tirar? “

French - La Bible de Geneva 1669, French Martin 1744, and the French Ostervald 1996 - Puis il leur dit: Qui de vous, si son ANE (ASS) ou son bœuf tombe dans un puits, ne l'en retire aussitôt le jour de sabbat?”

German Luther 1545, Schlachter 1951 - “Und antwortete und sprach zu ihnen: Welcher ist unter euch, dem sein Ochse oder ESEL (an ASS) in den Brunnen fällt, und er nicht alsbald ihn herauszieht am Sabbattage?”

Russian Synodal Version, Chinese Union Traditional bible and the Modern Greek N.T. used in the Greek Orthodox churches all over the world.

What we see once again is the total confusion of the modern versionists, and their so called “oldest and best manuscripts” (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) differ from each other thousands of times, and the “scholars” who put together today’s conflicting Bible of the Month Club versions keep changing their minds with practically every new version to come down the pike.

Stick with the time tested King James Bible and you will never go wrong.

Luke 22:43-44 - "And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground."

The total hypocrisy of the modern versions is shown by how they deal with these two verses. They are found in the Majority of all texts including D, the Old Latin copies, Syriac Peshitta,

Curetonian, Harkelian, Palestinian, Armenian and Ethiopic ancient versions. Vaticanus omits all these words. Sinaiticus original contained all these words; then a scribe omitted them, and then another scribe put them back in again!

Even though Vaticanus omits all these words, and the modern versions like the NASB, NIV, ESV omit thousands of words because of the Vaticanus readings, yet the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV, ISV and Holman continue to include these two verses in their versions.

Daniel Wallace's NET version also includes them in brackets, but reveals the mindset of many scholars today in his footnotes. Mr. Wallace tells us: "Arguments can be given on both sides about whether scribes would tend to include or omit such comments about Jesus' humanity and an angel's help. But even if the verses are NOT LITERALLY AUTHENTIC, they are PROBABLY HISTORICALLY AUTHENTIC...Nevertheless, because of the SERIOUS DOUBTS as to these verses' authenticity, they have been put in brackets."

So, in other words, even though God may not have inspired them, and they were later added by mere human hands, it may be OK to keep them in our bibles, but we should continue to call them into question!!! Do you see how these guys think?

John 4:1-3 and the ever changing NIVs and UBS Greek texts –

A rather peculiar case of senseless and arbitrary textual changes is found in John 4:1-3. In the King James Bible, as well as the Majority of all texts including Vaticanus, P66, P75, A and C we read: 1. "When therefore THE LORD (ho kurios) knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, 2. (Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples,) 3. He left Judea, and departed again into Galilee."

The reading of "the Lord" was even in the Westcott-Hort Greek text and in the earlier critical text Nestle-Aland editions. I have a 4th edition Nestle text from 1934 and it reads "the Lord". However Sinaiticus and D read "Jesus" instead of "the LORD" and later on the Nestle-Aland, USB critical texts changed their reading to "JESUS knew how the Pharisees had heard..." That is how the Nestle-Aland 27th edition and the UBS 4th edition now read.

This is an example of modern scholarship rejecting even their "oldest" manuscripts and following instead a very minority reading. But wait. There is much more going on here when we compare the various NIV editions to come down the pike lately and how the Catholic bible versions are exerting their influence by producing an "interconfessional" New Testament text through the United Bible Society.

Those Bible translations that read "the LORD knew..." are Tyndale 1525, the Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible 1549, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1587, the Revised Version 1885, the ASV of 1901, the RSV, NASB, NKJV, Darby, Youngs, Rotherham's Emphasized

bible and the NIV editions of 1973, 1977 and 1984, although quite curiously they put this whole reading in verse 3 instead of verse 1.

The NIVs from 1973, 77 and 84 read: 1. "The Pharisees heard that Jesus was gaining and baptizing more disciples than John, 2. although in fact it was not Jesus who baptized, but his disciples. 3. WHEN THE LORD LEARNED OF THIS {all taken from verse 1 in ALL Greek manuscripts; not one of them reads like the NIV has it} he left Judea and went back once more to Galilee."

However the "new" NIV of 2011 now has changed their underlying Greek text once again. Instead of having the words "When the LORD learned of this" in verse 3 as all previous NIVs read, they have now put these words back into verse one and changed "the LORD" to "JESUS". It now reads: 1. "Now JESUS learned that the Pharisees had heard that he was gaining and baptizing more disciples than John -"

Those versions that read "JESUS knew that..." (instead of "the LORD knew that...") are the NRSV, ESV, NET, NIV 2011 and the Catholic versions like the Douay, the St. Joseph New American bible 1970 and the New Jerusalem bible of 1985.

Once again we see the fickle and ever changing nature of the so called "science" of textual criticism at work and these Bible Babble Buffet versions don't even agree among themselves.

John 7:8-10 Here we read of Jesus telling his brethren to go up unto a feast and He says: "I go NOT up YET unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come. When he had said these words unto them, he abode still in Gallilee. But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret." He did in fact go up to the feast.

Vaticanus, as well as P66, 75, and the majority of all texts read as does the KJB with: "I go not up YET unto this feast", and so do the Revised Version 1881, Geneva, Tyndale, Bishops', Coverdale, the NIV, Holman Standard, the 2005 ISV (International Standard Version), Young, Weymouth, Rotherham's Emphasized Bible 1902.

However Sinaiticus says: "I DO NOT GO to this feast", and so do the NASB, ASV, RSV, ESV and Wallace's NET version thus making our Lord a liar. The fickle nature of this so called "science" is also seen in that Westcott and Hort originally read "NOT YET" and so did the previous Nestle-Aland critical texts up until a few years ago. But the more recent ones have "scientifically" changed to now read "I do NOT go to this feast."

Daniel Wallace's NET version has the Lord saying He is NOT going to the feast, and then going. But the thinking of such "scholars" is revealed in his own footnotes where he says: " Most mss (166,75 B L T W 070 0105 0250 1,13 I sa), including most of the better witnesses, have "not yet" here. Those with the reading "not" (ouk) are not as impressive ( D K 1241 al lat), but "ouk"

is the more difficult reading here, especially because it stands in tension with v. 10." So, in other words, because it absurdly makes our Lord Jesus a liar, it must be right!

Wilbur Pickering, who himself is not even a KJB onlyist, comments on this blunder: Serious Anomalies/Aberrations -John 7:8 oupw--P66,75,B,E,F,G,H,L,N,T,W,X,D,Q,Y 070,0105,0141,0250,f1,13,Byz,Lect,syryp,h,pal,cosa "NOT YET" ; ouk --À,D,K,P,lat,syrs,c,cobo "NOT" Problem: Since Jesus did in fact go to the feast (and doubtless knew what He was going to do), the UBS text has the effect of ascribing a falsehood to Him.

Discussion: Since the UBS editors usually attach the highest value to P75 and B, isn't it strange that they reject them in this case? Here is Metzger's explanation: "The reading ["not yet"] was introduced at an early date (it is attested by P66,75) in order to alleviate the inconsistency between ver. 8 and ver. 10" (p. 216). So, they rejected P66,75 and B (as well as 99% of the MSS) because they preferred the "inconsistency". NASB, RSV, NEB and TEV stay with the eclectic text here. (end of comments by Dr. Pickering.)

Also in just these three verses we see that the word "this" of THIS FEAST is omitted by B but found in Aleph, but the NASB and NIV both omit the word, while "UNTO THEM" is in the NASB and B, but not in the NIV or Aleph, and "AS IT WERE" is in B and the NASB, but not in Aleph and the NIV. This is the character of these two manuscripts and bible versions in a nutshell.

John 9:4 - "I must do the works of him that sent **ME**, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work." So read the Majority of all Greek texts. However both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus differ from each other in this single verse. Reading "I" must work' are the majority of all texts, as well as Sinaiticus correction, A and C, while Vaticanus, P66 and P75 say "**WE** must work", but when we get to the latter part of this same phrase, reading "him that sent **ME**" are the Majority as well as Vaticanus, while Sinaiticus, P66 and P75 say "him that sent **US**"!

John 9:38 - The blind man healed and his response to Jesus. In John 9:38-39 we read: "AND HE SAID, LORD, I BELIEVE. AND HE WORSHIPPED HIM. AND JESUS SAID, For judgment I am come into the world, that they which see might not see; and that they which see might be made blind."

This again is just one more of the multiple examples of where the fickle and contradictory "oldest and best" manuscripts upon which most modern versions like the ever-changing NASB, and others like the NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and Holman Standard are based.

The entire verse and part of the next one read: "And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him. And Jesus said..." This is the reading found in the Majority of all Greek texts including P66, A, Vaticanus, D, Sinaiticus correction, plus numerous other uncial copies. It is also the reading found in most Old Latin copies, the Syriac Peshitta, Harkelian, Palestinian, Coptic Sahidic, Boharic, Gothic, Armenian, Georgian, Slavonic and Ethiopian ancient versions.

The entire verse is found in every Bible version I have consulted, including the NASB, NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, and Holman Standard.

However both P75 and Sinaiticus original (it was later corrected to include the verse) omit the entire verse of John 9:38 and part of 9:39. So too do the Diatessaron, and a few of the Old Latin witnesses, though it is included in most of them.

Daniel Wallace's NET version places all these words in brackets, thus casting doubt as to their authenticity. He then footnotes: "Some early and important witnesses lack the words, 'He said, 'Lord, I believe,' and he worshiped him. Jesus said,'" (vv. 38-39a). **THIS IS WEIGHTY EVIDENCE FOR THE OMISSION OF THESE WORDS.** " (Caps are mine). He then continues: "It is difficult to overstate the value of P75 here, since it is the only currently available papyrus ms. extant for the text of John 9:38-39." (Note: this is a lie. P66 also exists and it includes the words Daniel Wallace would have us doubt). He goes on: "Further, Sinaiticus is an important and early Alexandrian witness for the omission." (Note: Then why was it later altered to include the verse?) He continues: "The versional testimony and codex W also give strong support to the omission. Nearly all other mss, however, include these words. The omission may have been occasioned by parablepsis (both vv. 37 and 39 begin with "Jesus said to him"), though it is difficult to account for such an error across such a wide variety of witnesses. On the other hand, the longer reading appears to be motivated by liturgical concerns (so R. E. Brown, John [AB], 1:375), since the verb *proskunew*, "I worship") is used in John 4:20-25 of worshiping God, and again with the same sense in 12:20. If these words were authentic here, this would be the only place in John's Gospel where Jesus is the explicit object of *proskunew*. Nevertheless, a decision is difficult, and the included words may reflect a very early tradition about the blind man's response to Jesus."

Daniel Wallace and men like him are willing to overlook all the evidence, and even to lie about it, and then conclude that the whole verse and more "appears to be motivated by liturgical concerns" and "may reflect a very early tradition". In other words, it probably isn't inspired Scripture, but was later added by well meaning men, so let's keep it in our versions, but continue to cast doubt about its authenticity! This is the type of thinking of we find in the men who continue to churn out the ever changing modern versions, none of which any of them believes to be the complete, inspired and inerrant preserved words of the living God.

John 16 - A few examples. In John 16:9 we read of the Comforter coming into the world to reprove of sin, righteousness and judgment - "Of sin, because they believe NOT on me". However Sinaiticus original says: "Of sin, because they believe on me". Not quite the same, is it? Sinaiticus original also omitted the entire verse of 16:15 - "All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you."

In John 16:16 we read: "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.**" These last 6 words are found in the Majority of all texts, A, plus at least 23 other uncials, the Old Latin, Syriac, Gothic, Armenian, and Coptic manuscripts. All these words are found in the Latin Vulgate 405, Wycliffe 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible 1549, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the



Geneva Bible 1587, the NKJV, Darby, Youngs, KJV 21st Century Version 1994, Third Millennium Bible 1998, the Modern Greek Bible used by the Orthodox churches all over the world today, Lamsa's translation of the Syriac, the French Martin 1744, Louis Segond 1910, French Ostervald 1998, the Italian Diodati 1649, Riveduta 1927, New Diodati 1991, Luther's German Bible 1545, and the Spanish Sagradas Escrituras 1569, Reina Valera 1909, 1960, 1995 and the Reina Valera Gomez of 2004.

Among the Catholic versions we see the usual confusion. The 1582 Douay-Rheims version and the 1950 Douay version include the words in John 16:16 "because I go to the Father", but then the 1968 Jerusalem bible, the 1970 St. Joseph New American Bible and the 1985 New Jerusalem omit these words. But now once again in 2009 the Catholic Public Domain Version has once again put the words back in the text. You can see it online here -

[http://www.sacredbible.org/catholic/NT-04\\_John.htm#16](http://www.sacredbible.org/catholic/NT-04_John.htm#16)

We see the disciples refer to these words again in the very next verse when they ask: "What is this that he saith unto us, A little while and ye shall not see me: and again, and little while, and ye shall see me: and, BECAUSE I GO TO THE FATHER?"

However both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus omit "Because I go to the Father" in verse 16 and so do the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV and Holman versions, but yet they include these words in the next verse when the disciples repeat what Jesus had just got done saying. Why would they ask what Jesus had meant by saying "Because I go to the Father", when, according to the NASB, NIV, ESV, He didn't just say it? Those trying to defend these modern versions tell us that Jesus referred to "I go to my Father" way back in 16:10. However if you read through all the verses here, the KJB reading makes the most sense. Jesus just got done saying in 16:16 "A little while, and ye shall see me no more: and again, a little while and ye shall see me, BECAUSE I GO TO THE FATHER." THEN in the very next verse the apostles ask: "Then said some of his disciples among themselves, What is this that he saith unto us, A little while and ye shall not see me, and again, a little while, and ye shall see me: and Because I go to the Father?" This is what He just got done saying when we include all the words in John 16:16. Not only this, but Sinaiticus also omits the words "A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again" in John 16:16 itself, but are included in Vaticanus and the modern versions. Keep in mind, that these two manuscripts are "the oldest and the best" upon which most modern versions are based.

We see again the fickleness of modern scholarship in John 16:27. Here we read: "For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from GOD." The word GOD is found in the Majority of all texts including the Old Latin, and Syriac. Sinaiticus first read GOD, then a scribe changed it to "the Father", and then another one changed it back to "God". Vaticanus reads THE FATHER and so does the NASB, ASV and the RSV. However the "updated" UBS critical text now goes with "I came out from GOD" and so do the NRSV, ESV, NIV and the Holman Standard.

John 17:15- "I pray not that thou shouldest take them OUT OF THE WORLD". Vaticanus says:

"I do not pray that you should take them FROM THE EVIL ONE."

Acts 10:19 "three men", "two men" or just "some men"?

Further textual confusion both by Westcott-Hort and the two so called "oldest and best" manuscripts is further seen in Acts 10:19. In the King James Bible we read: "While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, Behold, THREE men seek thee." The three men refers back to verses 10:7-8 where we read that Cornelius "called TWO of his household servants, AND a devout soldier of them that waited on him continually...he sent THEM to Joppa." Thus there were three men altogether who went to find Peter.

The reading of "THREE men" is again confirmed in chapter eleven verse eleven where Peter is rehearsing the events that previously occurred in chapter ten. There Peter relates: "And, behold, immediately there were THREE men already come unto the house where I was, sent from Caesarea unto me."

THREE men (andres treis) is the reading found in the TR, Stephanus, Beza, Elzevier, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, C, E, many Old Latin copies, Coptic Sahidic, Boharic, Syriac, Georgian, Vulgate and the Ethiopian ancient versions. It is also the reading of Spanish Reina Valera and the Modern Greek N.T.

THREE men is also the reading found in Wycliffe 1395, Bishops' bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, Revised Version 1881, ASV 1901, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NASB, NKJV, NIV and the Holman Standard.

Quite a few manuscripts completely omit any number here and simply say "Men seek thee". Among these are D, L, P and a few Old Latin copies. Among those versions that omit any number at all are Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535 and the New English Bible 1970.

However where the real confusion comes in is when we look at the Vaticanus manuscript and the early Westcott-Hort, Nestle Aland critical texts. ONLY the Vaticanus copy reads TWO men (andres duo) and Westcott and Hort as well as the Nestle 4th edition 1934 and the Nestle-Aland 1962 editions read "TWO men seek thee", all based solely on the Vaticanus mss.

Later on the Nestle-Aland critical text once again changed their previous reading and the current one now reads "THREE men", and so too do the NASB, NIV, RSV, ESV and Holman Standard.

There are only two bible translations I have found so far that actually contain the Vaticanus reading of "two men". One is Rotherham's 1902 Emphasized bible that says: "Behold, TWO men seek thee.", and the other one is the Catholic New American Bible St. Joseph 1970 which reads: "There are TWO men in search of you."

The Catholic versions present us with the usual hodge-podge of confusion, with the previous Douay 1950 correctly reading "three men", then the 1968 Jerusalem bible came out with the reading "SOME men". Then in 1970 the St. Joseph NAB 1970 went with the Vaticanus reading of "TWO men", but now the latest Catholic bible, the New Jerusalem bible of 1985, has come out and it just omits the number altogether and once again reads: "SOME men have come to see you."

This is the fickle nature of the so called “oldest and best manuscripts” and the men who support them.

Acts 12:25 - The Devil is in the Details

In Acts 12:25 we read: “And Barnabas and Saul returned FROM (ex) Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry, and took with them John, whose surname was Mark.”

This is the reading found in a multitude of Greek manuscripts and Bible versions including P74, Alexandrinus, the Textus Receptus, the Modern Greek N.T., the Vulgate 425, Wycliffe 1395, the Geneva Bible 1599, the Italian Diodati 1649, Riveduta 1927, French Martin 1744, Louis Segond 1910, Ostervald 1996, the Spanish Reina Valera 1602 - 1995, the Revised Version 1881, ASV 1901, Weymouth, Lamsa’s translation of the Syriac 1933, Douay 1950, Darby, Young’s, the NKJV 1982, NASB 1963-1995, RSV 1952, ESV 2003, The Message, Bible in Basic English, New English Bible, the NIV 1984, and the TNIV 2005.

Clearly the whole context tells us that Barnabas and Paul had already gone TO Jerusalem and had now returned FROM Jerusalem. In Acts 11:29-30 we read: “Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea: Which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of BARNABAS AND SAUL.”

Then in 13:1 we again pick up with both Saul (Paul) and Barnabas already at Antioch, and not in Jerusalem. “Now there were at Antioch certain prophets and teachers: as Barnabas....and Saul.”

However the corrupt manuscripts of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus tell us in Acts 12:25 that both Barnabas and Saul (Paul) now returned TO Jerusalem, even though they had already been there as recorded in Acts 11:29-30, and were now in Antioch as found in Acts 13:1.

The total fickleness and inconsistency of the modern Critical text is seen in that Westcott and Hort originally went with the erroneous reading of “returned TO Jerusalem” (eis), but then the Nestle text 4th edition 1934 and the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece 1962 both read “returned FROM Jerusalem (ex). But wait; it gets worse. Now the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum 27th edition and the UBS 4th edition have once again rejected the previous Nestle critical text and have gone back to the reading originally adopted by Westcott and Hort. The UBS 4th edition once again says: “returned TO (eis) Jerusalem.”

Versions that contain this erroneous reading - “returned TO Jerusalem” - and thus contradict the whole context of Acts 11 through 13 are Tyndale 1525 - (one of many reasons why Tyndale was not the perfect English Bible - see <http://brandplucked.webs.com/tyntrorkjb.htm> ) Coverdale 1535, Bishops’ bible 1568, and in modern times Rotherham’s Emphasized bible 1902, the Catholic St. Joseph New American Bible 1970, the NRSV 1989, Holman Christian Standard Version 2003, the ISV (International Standard Version 2003), and Daniel Wallace’s NET version. Notice that the RSV 1952 and the ESV 2001 both read “FROM Jerusalem” but the NRSV 1989 read “TO Jerusalem”. These three are revisions of each other. Can’t seem to make up their minds, can they?

Acts 17:28. An interesting textual blunder is found here in the Vaticanus manuscript, but no

version I am aware of has followed this unusual reading. In the context the apostle Paul is speaking to the Athenians and he quotes from their own poets. He says: "For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of YOUR own poets have said, For we are also his offspring."

Clearly the apostle was referring to certain pagan poets and not Jewish writers. The reading of YOUR own poets is that of the majority of all texts, including Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus. However P74 and Vaticanus actually have the Jewish apostle Paul referring to this saying as coming from "certain of OUR poets".

Acts 19:16

In Acts 19 we are told of SEVEN sons of Sceva, who were vagabond Jews, exorcists, which "took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, WE adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth". There are two blunders found here in the "oldest and best" texts of both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, against the majority of all others. The Majority of all texts, as well as the Syriac Peshitta, read as does the KJB with these seven sons saying "WE adjure you by Jesus". The word "we" is obviously plural, and the evil spirit answers in verse 15 "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are YE?". Now, the word "ye" is plural in all texts answering to the plural "we" of "We adjure thee".

However Sinaiticus and Vaticanus both have only one individual saying: "I adjure you by Jesus, and so read the NASB, NIV, and ESV. Nevertheless, the evil spirit still answers addressing a plural number of persons rather than one individual even in the corrupted Sinaiticus and Vaticanus manuscripts.

The more striking blunder is found in Acts 19:16. There we read: "And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and overcame THEM, (autoon) and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded." There were seven sons and the spirit leaped on THEM.

The single word "them" is the reading of the majority of all texts. However both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus tell us that the evil spirit "overcame BOTH OF THEM, (amphoteris autwn) and prevailed against them."

The Amplified bible brings out this errant reading and even tries to tell us that it is found "in the best texts". The Amplified reads: "Then the man in whom the evil spirit dwelt leaped upon them, mastering TWO OF THEM, and was so violent against them that they dashed out of that house in fear, stripped naked and wounded." Then in a footnote it says: "The best texts read "both of them."

The word for "both" is amphoteris, and always means "both". Yet the word "both" can only refer to the number two, not the SEVEN sons of Sceva. In fact, the NASBs from 1963 through 1972 read "and overcame BOTH OF THEM", and so also do the Revised Version 1881 and ASV 1901.

Not even the RSV, NRSV or ESV followed this bogus reading found in the "oldest and best

manuscripts”, though they do mention it in their footnotes. The RSV and ESV read “mastered ALL of them”, but then footnote: “Or BOTH of them.” Even to this day the ever changing Nestle-Aland critical Greek text used in making up most modern versions still reads “overcame BOTH of them”.

Finally, after several years and numerous editions, it apparently occurred to the NASB scholars that there was a clear blunder in their "oldest and most reliable texts", so in 1977 and again in 1995 the NASB changed their versions to read that the evil spirit overcame "ALL OF THEM" instead of "both of them". The NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, Holman Standard also say "all of them". Actually, the word "all" is not found in any text whatsoever, but the NIV, NASB, RSV, ESV put the extra word in anyway.

Again, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are clearly wrong. The NKJV correctly footnotes that the Nestle and UBS text says "both of them" instead of "overcame them".

Acts 27:37 - “216 souls” or “about 76”?

Vaticanus alone has a silly reading in this verse. The Holy Ghost is relating the shipwreck that occurred when Paul was on his way to Rome. The Scripture says: “And we were in all the ship two hundred and sixteen souls.”

So read the majority of all texts as well as Sinaiticus and C. Alexandrinus uniquely reads “275” instead of “276”, but Vaticanus alone reads “we were in all the ship ABOUT 76 souls”. Now, you can have about 200 or about 300, but it is more than a little silly to say ABOUT 76. The number 76 is an exact number, not a round number.

Westcott and Hort initially followed the erroneous reading of Vaticanus and placed “about 76 souls” in their critical Greek text, but later revisors decided to reject this unique reading, and changed their texts to read 276 souls.

The only version I am aware of that actually followed this bogus reading found in the Vaticanus manuscript is Rotherham’s Emphasized bible of 1902. It reads: “Now we were, in the ship, in all, ABOUT SEVENTY-SIX souls.”

Romans - The book of Romans, just as every other New Testament book, is full of examples where the two so called oldest and best manuscripts (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) are at odds with each other. I could show numerous examples, but for the moment here are a couple of them.

Romans 13:9 "...Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS, Thou shalt not covet..." The words "Thou shalt not bear false witness" are found in multiple manuscripts and ancient versions like the Old Latin, the Syriac Harkelian, Coptic Boharic, Armenian and Ethiopic. They are also in Sinaiticus. They are included in all English Bibles from Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Bishops', and the Geneva. However Vaticanus omits these words and so do the versions from the Revised Version, to the NASB, RSV, ESV, NIV and Holman Standard.

Romans 14:21 - "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, OR IS OFFENDED, OR IS MADE WEAK." The capitalized words are again

found in the Majority of all Greek texts and even in Vaticanus, plus the Sinaiticus correction. They are found in Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Bishops, Geneva, Douay-Rheims, NKJV and the Spanish Reina Valera. Even some modern versions that usually follow the Westcott-Hort text include the words. Among these are the Amplified Bible (put out by the same people who give us the NASB), and the brand new ISV (International Standard Version). However Sinaiticus original had a different reading that said "or is grieved". Then it was corrected to agree with the KJB reading. In spite of all this evidence, versions like the RV, NASB, RSV, ESV, NIV and Holman omit "or is offended, or is made weak" - all done on a strict "scientific method", don't ya know.

For a mind blowing study showing the utter foolishness of the "art and science of textual criticism" please see this factual study of the book of Romans here: <http://brandplucked.webs.com/textcritromans.htm>

I Corinthians 13:3 - Instead of reading, "and though I give my body to BE BURNED, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing", both Aleph and B read: "and though I give my body THAT I MAY BOAST". The NRSV actually adopted this reading, but the RSV, and the new ESV went back to "to be burned".

I Corinthians 13:5- ". . .charity seeketh not HER OWN". Vaticanus alone reads "love does not seek that which IS NOT HERS" - the opposite meaning.

I Corinthians 15:51- "We shall NOT all sleep, but we shall all be changed" in Sinaiticus reads: "we shall sleep but we shall NOT ALL be changed" - the exact opposite.

1 Corinthians 15:54-55- "Death is swallowed up in VICTORY. O death, where is your sting? O grave, where is your VICTORY." In Vaticanus this verse reads, "Death is swallowed up in CONTROVERSY. O death, where is your sting? O grave, where is your CONTROVERSY."

1 Thessalonians 1:1- " Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians which is in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace be unto you, and peace, FROM GOD OUR FATHER, AND THE LORD JESUS CHRIST."

All the capital lettered words are found in the Majority of all Greek texts AS WELL AS SINAITICUS, and A, and Lamsa's translation of the Syriac/Aramaic. This is the reading found in Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible (John Rogers) 1549, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1587, Mace's N.T. 1729, the Living Oracles 1855, Young's 1898, Websters 1833, the Emphatic Diaglott 1865, the NKJV 1982, the KJV 21st Century Version 1994 and the Third Millenium Version 1998. Even the brand new ISV (International Standard Version) has included these words in 2010. Among foreign language bibles all these words are found in Luther's German bible 1545, the German Elberfelder 1905, Las Sagradas Escrituras 1569, the Spanish Reina Valera 1909, 1960, 1995, the French Martin 1744, French Ostervald 1996, the Italian Diodati of 1649 and the New Diodati of 1991, the Afrikaans Bible 1953, the Russian Synodal version, the Romanian Cornilescu and in both the Modern Hebrew Bible and the Modern Greek used in the Orthodox churches all over the world.

However Vaticanus omits the words "from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ" and so do versions like the RV, ASV, NASB, NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NET and Holman Standard. So, the words ARE found in Sinaiticus but not in Vaticanus and once again these so called "oldest and best manuscripts" are in disagreement with each other.

1 Thessalonians 2:7- One of the silliest readings in the New Testament is found primarily in the Vaticanus manuscript in 1 Thessalonians 2:7. This reading was even rejected by the Critical Text editors that came after Westcott and Hort until very recently, when things are now just getting goofier and goofier.

The Majority of all Greek texts as well as Alexandrinus and the corrections to Sinaiticus, C and D all have the apostle Paul telling the saints: "But we were GENTLE among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children".

This is the reading found in Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Cranmer 1539, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, Wesley's translation 1755, the Revised Version 1885, the ASV of 1901, Rotherham's Emphasized bible 1902, Darby, Young's, the Bible in Basic English 1960, the New English Bible 1979, the NASBs 1963 through 1995, the NIVs of 1973, 78 and 84, the NKJVs, the RSV, NRSV 1989, the ESV 2001, the Revised English Bible 1989, the Message of 2002 and the Holman Standard of 2003, the Modern Greek version used all over the world in the Greek Orthodox churches as well as the up and coming ISV (International Standard Version) in 2010.

Among foreign language Bibles, the reading found in the Traditional Greek Texts and the King James Bible of "GENTLE among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children" are the Spanish Reina Valera of 1602, 1909, 1960 and 1995, - "nos portamos con ternura", the 1997 Biblia de las Américas put out by the Lockman Foundation - "benignos entre vosotros" as well as the Traducción en Lenguaje Actual of 2000 put out by the United Bible Society- "los tratamos con mucho cariño", and the Reina Valera Gomez Bible of 2004. Also agreeing with "were gentle among you" are the Italian Diodati 1649 and 1991 New Diodati, the Riveduta of 27, the Italian 1997 La Parola é Vita - "gentili con voi", the French Martin 1744 - "French Louis Segond 1910, the Ostervald 1996 and the 1999 La Bible du Semeur - "tendresse", and the 2000 Portuguese O Livro.

However Vaticanus actually says: "But we were BABIES among you, as a nursing mother cares for her own children." Westcott and Hort first adopted this absurd reading, but very soon the critical text editors deleted this reading and replaced it with the correct reading of "gentle among

you”. This reading lasted through at least 21 separate editions of their ever changing Greek Critical text. However the 27th edition of the Nestle - Aland text 1993 as well as the UBS 1 through 4 editions texts have now removed the previous reading of “GENTLE” and replaced it with the Vaticanus, Westcott-Hort reading of “we were BABES among you”.

Even though the more recent Nestle - Aland, UBS Greek texts have adopted this strange reading, still most modern versions that usually follow the critical text readings have not gone along with them on this.

But there are a few notable exceptions like Daniel Wallace’s NET version. Daniel Wallace’s NET version has actually followed this strange reading. His NET version reads: “although we could have imposed our weight as apostles of Christ; instead we became LITTLE CHILDREN among you. Like a nursing mother caring for her own children...” **But there is more!** The new NIV 2011 has come out and they have changed the underlying Greek text they followed in their first three editions (1973, 78 and 1984 - "but we were GENTLE among you") and now the latest in Scholar\$hip edition now reads: "Instead we were LIKE YOUNG CHILDREN among you."

This is similar to the Catholic Douay-Rheims version of 1582 which reads - “but WE BECAME LITTLE ONES IN THE MIDST OF YOU, as if a nurse should cherish her children”, but this reading is obviously absurd since it defies all reason and logic and turns the apostles into little children and the new believers into their care givers.

The Catholic version of 1979 called the Saint Joseph New American Bible went back to the reading of “we were GENTLE among you”, but then once again in 2009 the latest Catholic version, the Catholic Public Domain Version, has once again changed their underlying texts and have gone back to the reading of - “we became LIKE LITTLE ONES in your midst, like a nurse cherishing her children.”

The New Living Translation of 1998 has “we were as GENTLE among you as a mother feeding and caring for her own children.” But the 2004 New Living Translation has once again changed their text to now read - “we were like children among you.”

It is interesting that even though the NIV 1984 keeps the reading of “but we were gentle among you, like a mother caring for her little children. “ the now discontinued TNIV (Today’s NIV) of 2005 went with the Vaticanus reading and has: “Instead, we were like YOUNG CHILDREN among you. Just as a nursing mother cares for her children.” It will be interesting to see what the



New NIV does when it's upcoming revision comes out in the next year or two.

2 Thessalonians 2:13 Another mind-blower!

"But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath FROM THE BEGINNING chosen you to salvation..."

"From the beginning" is the reading found in the majority of all texts, as well as Sinaiticus, the Old Latin, Syriac Peshitta, Coptic Sahidic, Armenian, and Ethiopic ancient versions. It also was the reading of the previous Nestle-Aland Greek editions, and is still found in the NIV 1973, 1984 editions, NASB, RV, ASV, NKJV, RSV, NET version and the 2003 Holman Christian Standard.

However, the latest Nestle-Aland texts have once again changed their reading, based on Vaticanus, and now reads: "God has chosen you AS THE FIRST FRUITS to be saved" and this is how the NRSV, ESV **and the NIV 2011 edition** now read! So again, it looks like those old NASB, NIV's 1973, 1984 and 2003 Holman Standards are once again out of date and follow the wrong texts according to the late\$ Scholarly finding\$.

Vaticanus also omits the entire verse of 1 Peter 5:3 but it is found in Sinaiticus and the Majority of all manuscripts and Bible translations throughout history - "Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock."

2 Peter 3:10- . . ."the earth also and the works that are therein SHALL BE BURNED UP", reads in both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, "the works that are therein SHALL BE FOUND". The old RSV stayed with the reading of "shall be burned up" as does the NASB, but the NIV, ESV say the works "will be exposed" (ESV) or "will be laid bare" (NIV), while the Holman Standard says "the works on it will be disclosed". The Holman then footnotes that the Greek text they are following, which is the Sinaiticus/Vaticanus reading, says "found" and then tells us "some manuscripts read 'will be burned up' ". "Some"?! How about the vast Majority of all Greek texts including Alexandrinus, the Old Latin, the Syriac, Coptic and Ethiopian ancient versions.

Revelation- The Vaticanus manuscript is missing ALL of the book of Revelation as well as I and II Timothy, Titus, and from Hebrews 9 to the end of the book. However Sinaiticus give us some really strange readings in the book of Revelation.

Revelation 4:8 - "HOLY, HOLY, HOLY, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." But Sinaiticus says: " Holy, holy, holy, holy, holy, holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty..."

Revelation 7:4 and 14:3- Both verses mention the number of 144,000. However Sinaiticus has 140,000 in 7:4 and 141,000 in 14:3.

Revelation 10:1 - "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud: and A RAINBOW was upon his head..." Sinaiticus says: "clothed with a cloud with HAIR

on his head."

Revelation 21:4- "For THE FORMER THINGS are passed away". Sinaiticus reads: "For THE SHEEP are passed away."

Revelation 21:5- "Behold, I make all things NEW", while Sinaiticus says: "Behold, I make all things EMPTY."

These are just a few samples from these two "oldest and best" manuscripts which so many modern versions are based on. It is my firm conviction that God has preserved His inspired, pure, and perfect words as He promised and they are found today in English only in the Authorized King James Bible.

"Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." Jeremiah 6:16

"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Matthew 11:15

Will Kinney

"The Oldest and Best Manuscripts" ?

These portions are taken from an article found at

[http://www.truthquest.free-online.co.uk/vs\\_a\\_mss.htm#history](http://www.truthquest.free-online.co.uk/vs_a_mss.htm#history)

Most modern Versions have followed to a large extent the Greek Text prepared by Westcott and Hort in 1881. The Text of the Revised Version 1881 was influenced greatly by these scholars and the Nestlé Text is a collation of three (3) texts, Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and Bernhard Weiss.

Westcott and Hort recognised, as their supreme authorities, only two (2) manuscripts, Aleph and B, and these are among the five (5) ancient manuscripts appealed to by modern versions.

In contrast to this Westcott-Hort text which first appeared in the Revised Version of 1881 and is now generally followed by such versions as the NASB, RSV, ESV, NIV, and Holman Standard, the older English Bibles like Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, the Bishops's Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, and later on the King James Bible, Webster's, Young's, and the NKJV are based on what is called The Traditional Text or the Textus Receptus.

Dr. Edward F. Hills states that "in all essentials, the New Testament text first printed by Erasmus, and later by Stephens (1550) and Elzevir (1633) is in full agreement with the traditional text (Byzantine text) providentially preserved in the vast majority of the Greek New Testament Manuscripts .... It is from this Textus Receptus that the King James version was made" (Believing Bible Study, Page 37).

Westcott and Hort could not understand why the Alexandrian manuscripts were not copied in vast numbers, as were the Byzantine manuscripts. They propounded the theory that somebody must have produced the Byzantine Text about the 4th Century. Westcott and Hort called it the "Syrian Text." This theory has absolutely no historical foundation. It is a figment of their imagination to excuse them for rejecting the vast majority of manuscripts. Surely such a major recension of the text, if it had occurred, would have been documented in church history. This is

especially so, as major doctrinal issues of that period are recorded in considerable detail, e.g. Council of Nicea 325 AD, which dealt with the Arian heresy. History is silent about any revision of the Text in Syria, Antioch or Constantinople!!

While Westcott and Hort were introducing their so-called "neutral text" to the Revised Version Committee 1881, the true text was strongly defended by such scholars as Dean Burgon and Dr. Scrivener.

Those who have examined the ancient manuscripts, indicate that some of the oldest manuscripts are most carelessly written.

Five of the oldest codices are Aleph, A, B, C, and D, and it is upon the evidence of these, and their small company of allies, that the Greek texts of Lachmann 1842-50; Tischendorf 1865-72; Tregelles 1857-72; Westcott and Hort 1881, rely.

In fact Westcott and Hort, who dominated the Revised Version Committee of 1881, accepted what they called a neutral text. Only Codex Aleph and Codex B, in their opinion, preserve this text in its purest form. Of these two, when they differ, B is preferred to Aleph, in which "the scribe's bold and rough manner has endured all the ordinary lapses due to rapid and careless transcription more numerous than in B. " Scrivener, Page 289, Volume II.

But how carefully written were these great UNCIALS on which our modern versions are based. Let us look at Aleph, B and D.

Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph) (4th Century) "From the number of errors, one cannot affirm that it is very carefully written. The whole manuscript is disfigured by corrections, a few by the original scribe, very many by an ancient and elegant hand of the 6th Century whose emendations are of great importance, some again by a hand a little later, for the greatest number by a scholar of the 7th Century who often cancels the changes by the 6th Century amender, others by as many as eight (8) different later writers. " Scrivener, Page 93, Vol. I.

Codex Vaticanus (B) (4th Century) "One marked feature is the great number of omissions which induced Dr. Dobbin to speak of it as an abbreviated text of the New Testament. He calculates that whole words or clauses are left out no less than 2556 times." Scrivener, Page 120, Volume I. This explains why the modern versions have omitted so much of the scripture -- a fact which is not always apparent due to the practice of grouping verses.

Codex Bezae Graeco-Latinus (D) (5th or 6th Century) "The manuscript has been corrected, first by the original penman and later by 8 or 9 different revisors." And again: "No known manuscript contains so many bold and extensive interpolations (600 in ACTS alone) Scrivener, Pages 128 and 130, Volume I.

The Alexandrian School however, is recognised as one of the greatest sources of corruption, and it is Alexandrian influence which permeates some of the oldest manuscripts (particularly Vaticanus B, Sinaiticus Aleph) upon which the modern versions are based.

Scrivener states: "it is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within 100 years after it was

composed: and that Irenaeus and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used manuscripts far inferior to those employed by Stunica, Erasmus or Stephens, thirteen centuries later when moulding the Textus Receptus."

**THE OLDEST MANUSCRIPTS ARE IN PERPETUAL DISAGREEMENT** If we were to believe that the manuscripts became more corrupt each time they were copied, we would therefore expect the oldest to be the best and also to be in greatest agreement with each other.

**THE FACT IS THEY ARE NOT** -- as the following quote will show: "Ought it not, asks Dean Burgon, sensibly to detract from our opinion of the value of their evidence, (Codex B and Codex Aleph) to discover that it is easier to find two consecutive verses in which the two manuscripts differ, the one from the other, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree? ... On every such occasion only one of them can possibly be speaking the truth. Shall I be thought unreasonable if I confess that these perpetual inconsistencies, between Codd B and Aleph -- grave inconsistencies and occasionally even gross ones -- altogether destroy my confidence in either?"

Or as Srivener writes: "The point on which we insist is briefly this: that the evidence of ancient authorities is anything but unanimous, that they are perpetually at variance with each other, even if we limit the term ancient within the narrowest bounds. Shall it include, among the manuscripts of the Gospels, none but the five oldest copies of Codices Aleph, A, B, C, D? The reader has but to open the first recent critical work he shall meet with, to see them scarcely ever in unison, perpetually divided two against three, or perhaps four against one."

The following figures provided by Kirsopp Lake and his associates (1928), demonstrate that Codices Aleph, B and D are in greater disagreement among themselves than they are with the Received Text!

In Mark Chapter 2 alone-- Aleph, B and D differ from the Received Text 69, 71 and 95 times respectively. B differs from Aleph 34 times B differs from D 102 times D differs from Aleph 100 times.

Hoskier, who studied the differences between the texts of Aleph and B, lists the following differences in the 4 Gospels. These numbers show how often Sinaiticus (Aleph) and Vaticanus (B) DIFFER FROM EACH OTHER!

Matthew: 656 differences, Mark: 567 differences, Luke: 791 differences, John: 1,022 differences. Total for four (4) Gospels 3,036 differences.

In the light of the facts stated above it is clear that we cannot have confidence in any modern version or Greek text which rejects the concordant testimony of the vast majority of manuscripts in favour of a small company of ancient, but discordant witnesses.

**TWO STREAMS OF MANUSCRIPTS HAVE ALWAYS EXISTED** The foregoing comments serve to show that the claim of some modern translations and paraphrases, that the oldest manuscripts are the best, is altogether based on a wrong foundation.

Dr. D. Otis Fuller, in his book "WHICH BIBLE," has shown that Christians of all ages have

recognised that two streams of manuscripts have always existed.

The muddy stream of the corrupt text, including the Western family (characterised by interpolations), and the Alexandrian family {characterised by omissions) has flowed through channels such as Origen (who denied the deity of Christ) Eusebius, Jerome (who produced the Latin Vulgate), and in the last century, through Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort.

The pure stream of the New Testament has flowed to us through the Received Text, which Dr. D. Otis Fuller tells us: "had authority enough to become either in itself, or by its translation, the Bible of the great Syrian Church, of the Waldensian Church of northern Italy, of the Gallic Church of Southern France, and of the Celtic Church in Scotland and Ireland, as well as the official Bible of the Greek Church (BYZANTINE TEXT)." The reformers stood firmly by the Received Text, Luther's German Translation and Tyndale's magnificent English Translation were from it. When 47 scholars translated the Authorised Version in 1611, by Divine Providence the Received Text was used.

Manuscript discoveries since 1611 have NOT altered the picture. The number increased to 3791 in 1881, and since then to about 5,000, BUT STILL ABOUT 90% AGREE WITH THE RECEIVED TEXT!

Here is another good site that documents what Sinaiticus actually looks like. You can see for yourself the actual scribal corrections that litter this so called "oldest and best manuscript"-

<http://www.preservedword.com/article.php?id=237>

Will Kinney

Return to Articles -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm>