

## **Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs**

### ***Introduction***

*Romans – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs* [www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/) has shown the slash-and-burn tactics of the modern Vatican-Watchtower-bogus-evangelical cut-outs, NIVs, NKJV fns, DR, RV, JB, NJB, NWTs, Ne Interlinears on this definitive New Testament letter resulting in some serious omissions.

The same satanic sources have inflicted the same slash-and-burn tactics on the Gospel of Mark.

The verses attacked include Mark 1:2, 24, 2:15, 17, 3:15, 4:9, 6:11, 20, 7:16, 9:24, 29, 44, 46, 10:21, 24, 11:10, 26, 12:23, 30, 13:14, 33, 14:22, 24, 27, 68, 15:28, 39, 16:9-20, 39 verses in all. This work addresses those attacks as the earlier work did for the Book of Romans, explains their significance and summarises the pre-1611 evidence for both the AV1611 readings for the 39 scriptures listed above and the modern cut-outs. The reader may thereby judge for himself the integrity or otherwise of the AV1611 readings for the 39 scriptures listed above and that of the pre-1611 evidence for and against them.

**Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs** lists the AV1611 readings for Mark 1:2, 24, 2:15, 17, 3:15, 4:9, 6:11, 20, 7:16, 9:24, 29, 44, 46, 10:21, 24, 11:10, 26, 12:23, 30, 13:14, 33, 14:22, 24, 27, 68, 15:28, 39, 16:9-20, 39 verses in all that the modern cut-outs omit or seriously alter and lists the pre-1611 evidence for both the AV1611 readings for the 39 scriptures listed above and the modern cut-outs.

INCLUDE(S) in the table means that the version(s) listed include(s) all the words of the AV1611 reading under consideration even if with variations in wording.

OMIT on its own in the table with no part of a reading specified means that all the versions listed for the modern cut-outs cut out all the words of the AV1611 reading under consideration. Otherwise, the term refers to versions listed for the modern cut-outs that are not specified as including the reading or to part of an AV1611 reading omitted by a particular version.

As in the case of the study *Romans – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs* a word of explanation follows to counter the usual excuse for modern cut-outs that only a small portion of the book under consideration has been affected. The Gospel of Mark, after all, contains 678 verses – see the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1297 - so 39 verses is only 6% of the total at most so why all the fuss? See below for the answer to that question.

***“A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump”*** Galatians 5:9

The illustration given for the study *Romans – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs* with respect to the vandalised garden bed of prize rose bushes applies equally to the Gospel of Mark.

It is this writer’s view that as in the case of the Book of Romans the Lord Jesus Christ is not best pleased with His Gospel of Mark having been vandalised in like manner or with any individual who tacitly or otherwise condones or supports that vandalism.

See again the following analyses.

[www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-3607.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-3607.php) *What’s the Big Deal about the KJV? – Episode 1*

Dr Gipp offers one of his students a cup of coffee with a dash of salt. The student doesn’t take it because it has been corrupted, tainted even though it is still mainly coffee. That is the effect of the modern cut-outs on ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21 for the Gospel of Mark. ***“A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump”*** Galatians 5:9. J. Coad states the following on the small %age excuse.

[www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) ‘O Biblios’ – *The Book* p 89

Para 2 [from the anti-AV1611 our critic] states: ***“The measure of agreement between (the Received Text, the Westcott and Hort text and the United Bible Societies text)...is as much as 97%. The real issue for the translator is which of the variants for the 3% of disputed text he should follow.”***

A concerned layman, J. Coad of Totnes, Devon makes some penetrating observations...about the 97%-3% thesis, as it applies to the AV1611 and the NIV, which our critic has failed to appreciate:

*“Is it true that there is only a 3% difference, as Bob Sheehan claims? Yes! It is true. And that 3% makes all the difference! It is “the jam in the sandwich!” It means, for certain, that 17 complete verses belong to the New Testament, as in the Received Text (AV) or otherwise they don’t, as in the NIV. It means, again, the 147 part verses missing from the NIV should be missing - or they should not be missing. It means that a certain 169 names of Our Lord God, retained in the AV are correct, or that they should be omitted, as in the NIV! It means that the words **“The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost”** was either spoken by the Saviour Himself, as recorded in the AV (Matt. 18:11) or otherwise were not spoken by Him, as is missing in the NIV!*

*“Yet wait...consider these NIV 3% short measures. They are not short measures of any secular book out of Egypt. They are part of the sacred measures of the **“Shekel of the Sanctuary”**! \*<sup>2012</sup>...we demand full measure after **“the Shekel of the Sanctuary”**! A 97% salvation is no salvation, and a 97% Bible is not God’s Book. It has no place in the Sanctuary!”*

\*<sup>2012</sup>The expression **“the shekel of the sanctuary”** occurs 25 times in the AV1611, in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. See Exodus 30:13, 24, 38:24, 25, 26 etc.

In sum 94% the Gospel of Mark *has no place in the Sanctuary!* because it is *not* the Gospel of Mark...*we demand full measure after “the Shekel of the Sanctuary”!* for the Gospel of Mark!

## Sources

### Manuscript Evidence

The pre-1611 manuscript and version evidence for and against the AV1611 readings for 33\*of the 39 scriptures listed above has been summarised for this work from *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version* by J. A. Moorman pp 74-85 respectively. \*Dr Moorman has not included Mark 1:24, 2:15, 4:9, 6:20, 7:16, 14:68 in that work. Note that using Dr Moorman's data:

Uncials refers to upper case Greek New Testament manuscripts numbering 274+

MAJORITY refers to lower case cursive Greek New Testament manuscripts numbering 2800+

OL, pesh, harc, Goth refer to Old Latin, Peshitta and Harclean Syriac and Gothic version manuscripts respectively, numbering 55-60, 300+, 60, 6 – see **Appendix 1** - respectively. fam 1, 13 refer to two sets of 4 and 12 cursive manuscripts evidently closely related to each other within each set. mg refers to a marginal change to the text.

The age of the above sources ranges approximately from the 4<sup>th</sup> century to the invention of the printing press by Johannes Gutenberg in the 15<sup>th</sup> century [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\\_of\\_printing](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_printing).

The bulk of the Greek New Testament manuscript witnesses i.e. well over 90% exhibit a relatively uniform text that becomes the printed Received Greek New Testament Texts of the 16<sup>th</sup> century or Textus Receptus. The Textus Receptus is now the AV1611 New Testament in English not 1<sup>st</sup> century Greek. See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) 'O Biblios' – *The Book* Chapter 1 *What is the Bible?*, *Seven purifications of the Textus Receptus*.

The relatively small differences between the AV1611 New Testament and the Received Greek New Testament texts have prompted some Bible critics to use the Greek TR editions to attack the words of the AV1611. Dr Gipp has addressed that particular evil. See [samgipp.com/answerbook/](http://samgipp.com/answerbook/) Question 25 *What is Different Between a 'TR Man' and a 'KJV Man'?*

See Moorman *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version* pp 17-39 for a comprehensive overview of these manuscript sources and the extent of corruption that they have suffered. However, such is their relative trustworthiness that a simple weighting may be used to decide whether on the whole early witnesses to the Gospel of Mark support the AV1611 in Mark 1:2, 24, 2:15, 17, 3:15, 4:9, 6:11, 20, 7:16, 9:24, 29, 44, 46, 10:21, 24, 11:10, 26, 12:23, 30, 13:14, 33, 14:22, 27, 24, 68, 15:28, 39, 16:9-20 or the modern cut-outs.

### AV1611s, Pre and Post-1611 English Versions

The following sites have been used for:

[www.studylight.org/](http://www.studylight.org/) Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Bibles. This site also has the Bishops', Geneva, 1611 AV1611, 2011+ AV1611, RV 1881. The site [thebiblecorner.com/englishbibles/index.html](http://thebiblecorner.com/englishbibles/index.html) is currently inactive.

[www.bibles-online.net/](http://www.bibles-online.net/) Matthew, Great Bibles

[www.unz.org/Pub/Bible-1966](http://www.unz.org/Pub/Bible-1966) JB Jerusalem Bible

[rockhay.tripod.com/worship/translat.htm](http://rockhay.tripod.com/worship/translat.htm) NJB New Jerusalem Bible, NWTs 1984, 2013 New World Translation

[www.e-sword.net/](http://www.e-sword.net/) Bishops', Geneva Bibles, 1611, 2011+ AV1611s, DR Douay-Rheims 1749-1752 Challoner's Revision, RV 1881 Revised Version, 1984, 2011 NIVs, 2011 ESV

NKJV fn New King James Version footnotes, hard copy

Ne Nestle's 21<sup>st</sup> Edition Greek-English Interlinear, hard copy. Nestle is largely the underlying Greek New Testament Text for the 20<sup>th</sup> century cut-outs i.e. NIVs, NKJV fns, JB, NJB, NWTs and most critics use Nestle to attack the AV1611. However Nestle's text is based on a small number of heavily corrupted Greek manuscripts and not fit for purpose. See [samgipp.com/answerbook/](http://samgipp.com/answerbook/) Questions 6,

8 *Don't the Best Bible Manuscripts Support the New Versions?, Where Do Bible Manuscripts Come From?* and *New Age Bible Versions* by Gail Riplinger Chapter 39 *The 1% Manuscripts*.

### Notes on Appendices 1, 2, 3, 4

#### Appendix 1 – Languages of the Four Gospels, Dialogue with Gail Riplinger

Greek New Testament witnesses are numerous compared with those from other ancient sources. See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) 'O Biblios' – *The Book* p 4 and this extract.

#### 1.2.2. New Testament Greek Manuscripts

...Watts [*The Lord Gave the Word* TBS, 1998] gives the following totals for 1989.

Type of Manuscript	Century When Written	Number of Copies
Uncials, upper case	4 <sup>th</sup> -9 <sup>th</sup>	299
Cursives, lower case	9 <sup>th</sup> -16 <sup>th</sup>	2812
Lectionaries, responsive readings	9 <sup>th</sup> -16 <sup>th</sup>	2281
Papyri, fragments	3 <sup>rd</sup>	96
Total:		5488

The majority of the Greek manuscripts conform to the 'Syrian' or 'Byzantine' Text type...essentially the text of the AV1611. The remainder of the manuscripts are of the so-called 'Alexandrian' Text type...[*Let's Weigh the Evidence*] pp 57ff.

#### 1.2.3. New Testament Ancient Versions

Version	Date of Text	Copies, Approx.
Old Latin	2 <sup>nd</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup>	50
Old Syriac	2 <sup>nd</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup>	350
Gothic of Ulfilas, " <i>the Little Wolf</i> "	4 <sup>th</sup>	6 [ <i>The King James Version Defended</i> 3 <sup>rd</sup> Edition Edward F. Hills Th.D.]* p 120.
Armenian	5 <sup>th</sup>	1244
Other, e.g. Coptic, Georgian etc., [ <i>The King James Version Defended</i> 3 <sup>rd</sup> Edition]* p 120		

\*See [wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/](http://wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/) Chapter 5.

A complete Latin Bible, the Italic version, was circulating in northern Italy by 157 AD and contained the Johannine Comma [[kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html](http://kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html) *Which Bible?* 5<sup>th</sup> Edition David Otis Fuller, D.D.] p 213, [*The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* Dr Peter S. Ruckman] p 77, [*God Only Wrote One Bible* Jasper James Ray] p 98. The Johannine Comma is 1 John 5:7, 8 as it reads in an Authorised Version:

**“For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.”**

The same passage in an NIV reads as follows:

“For there are three that testify: the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement.”

The 19 words that have been italicised in the reading from the Authorised Version are either omitted from modern bibles, or disputed in footnotes. The omission is a direct attack on vital Christian doctrines, including the Trinity, or Godhead and the strength of witness to the First Coming in the flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ...

Overall, the texts of the ancient versions agree with the Syrian type text of the majority of the Greek manuscripts...[*The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*] p 81.

**Appendix 1** shows that the excess of extant Greek witnesses notwithstanding, the Lord sought to get the Gospel accounts into **“words easy to be understood”** 1 Corinthians 14:9 by their first readers.

### **Appendix 2 – ‘O Biblios’ Notes on Mark - AV1611 versus Modern Counterfeits**

**Appendix 2** gives manuscript evidence for and against the AV1611 readings for Mark 1:2, 6:11, 20, 7:16, 9:29, 44, 46, 10:24, 13:14, 14:68, 15:28, 39, 16:9-20, 24 verses in all with summary remarks. **Appendix 2** reveals that the historical witnesses in favour of the AV1611 readings for the scriptures listed are overwhelming in comparison with the relatively meagre and undoubtedly contaminated support for the modern departures from them.

**Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs** yields for the 39 AV1611 readings in Mark listed the same conclusion that **Appendix 2** prompts.

*“For my mouth shall speak truth; and wickedness is an abomination to my lips. All the words of my mouth are in righteousness; there is nothing froward or perverse in them. They are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge”* Proverbs 8:7-9.

### **Appendix 3 - KJO Review Full Text Notes on Mark - AV1611 versus Modern Counterfeits**

**Appendix 3** shows with respect to Mark 1:2, 24, 2:15, 4:9, 6:11, 7:16, 9:29, 44, 46, 10:21, 24, 11:26, 15:28, 16:9-20, 25 verses in all that AV1611 arch-critic James White is an anti-Biblical fundamentalist Judas in league with Rome and Watchtower.

**Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs** reinforces that finding for the 39 AV1611 readings in Mark listed.

*“The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart: his words were softer than oil, yet were they drawn swords”* Psalm 55:21.

### **Appendix 4 KJO Review Full Text Notes on Mark 10:21 pp 330-302**

**Appendix 4** is a detailed example of how the 1611 Holy Bible **“the book of the LORD”** Isaiah 34:16 **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 **“the royal law”** James 2:8 and **“All scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16 reveals James White’s anti-Biblical Judas mindset with particular reference to Mark 10:21.

**Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs** follows. \* indicates see **Appendix 2**. \*\* indicates see **Appendix 4**.

Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs

Verse	Words Cut, Changed from the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Pre-1611: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Bishops', Geneva	DR, RV, NIVs, ESV, NKJV where changed from AV1611, NKJV fn, JB, NJB, NWTs, Ne	Manuscript, Version Evidence For 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Manuscript, Version Evidence Against 1611, 2011+ AV1611s
Mk. 1:2*	<i>the prophets</i>	Wycliffe reads <i>Isaiah the prophet</i> Others INCLUDE	<i>Isaiah the prophet</i>	23 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 13, harc	6 uncials, some cursives, fam 1, 9 OL, pesh, harc-mg, Goth
Mk. 1:24	<i>Saying, Let us alone, thou, thee</i>	Wycliffe, Coverdale OMIT <i>Let us alone, thee</i> Great, Bishops' OMIT <i>Let us alone</i> Geneva OMIT <i>Let us alone, thou</i> Tyndale, Matthew INCLUDE	DR OMIT <i>Let us alone, thou, thee</i> RV OMIT <i>Let us alone</i> NIVs, ESV, JB, NJB, 2013 NWT OMIT NKJV OMIT <i>thou, thee</i> 1984 NWT OMIT <i>Let us alone</i> , 1984, 2013 NWTs change <i>thee</i> to <i>exactly</i> Ne OMIT <i>Let us alone, thou</i>	n.a.	n.a.
Mk. 2:15	<i>Jesus</i>	Wycliffe, Coverdale read <i>he</i> Others INCLUDE	DR, RV, NIVs, ESV, NKJV, NWTs, Ne read <i>he</i> JB, NJB INCLUDE	n.a.	n.a.
Mk. 2:17	<i>to repentance</i>	Wycliffe OMIT Others INCLUDE	OMIT	16 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 13, 3 OL	11 uncials, some cursives, fam 1, 9 OL, pesh, harc, Goth
Mk. 3:15	<i>to heal sicknesses</i>	INCLUDE	DR INCLUDES Others OMIT	27 uncials, MAJORITY, most OL, pesh, harc, Goth	5 uncials, few cursives

Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs, Continued

Verse	Words Cut, Changed from the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Pre-1611: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Bishops', Geneva	DR, RV, NIVs, ESV, NKJV where changed from AV1611, NKJV fn, JB, NJB, NWTs, Ne	Manuscript, Version Evidence For 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Manuscript, Version Evidence Against 1611, 2011+ AV1611s
Mk. 4:9	<i>unto them</i>	Wycliffe OMITs Others INCLUDE	OMIT	n.a.	n.a.
Mk. 6:11*	<i>Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city</i>	Wycliffe OMITs Others INCLUDE	OMIT	22 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13, 4 OL, pesh, harc, Goth	8 uncials, few cursives, 6 OL
Mk. 6:20*	<i>he did many things</i>	INCLUDE	DR INCLUDES Others read e.g. <i>he was greatly puzzled</i>	n.a.	n.a.
Mk. 7:16*	<i>If any man have ears to hear, let him hear</i>	INCLUDE	DR, JB, NJB INCLUDE Others OMIT	n.a.	n.a.
Mk. 9:24	<i>with tears, Lord</i>	INCLUDE	DR INCLUDES No NKJV fn Others OMIT	23 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, 7 OL with variation	10 uncials, few cursives, 6 OL, pesh, harc, Goth
Mk. 9:29*	<i>and fasting</i>	INCLUDE	DR INCLUDES Others OMIT	30 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13, 11 OL, pesh with variation, harc, Goth	3 uncials, few cursives, 1 OL
Mk. 9:44*	<i>Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched</i>	INCLUDE	DR INCLUDES Others OMIT	25 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 13, 11 OL, pesh, harc, Goth	7 uncials, few cursives, fam 1
Mk. 9:46*	as above	as above	as above	26 uncials, remainder as above	1 OL, remainder as above

Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs, Continued

Verse	Words Cut, Changed from the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Pre-1611: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Bishops', Geneva	DR, RV, NIVs, ESV, NKJV where changed from AV1611, NKJV fn, JB, NJB, NWTs, Ne	Manuscript, Version Evidence For 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Manuscript, Version Evidence Against 1611, 2011+ AV1611s
Mk. 10:21**	<i>take up the cross</i>	Wycliffe OMITs Others INCLUDE, Great reads <i>my cross upon thy shoulders</i>	OMIT No NKJV fn	25 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13, 2 OL with variation, pesh with variation, harc, Goth	8 uncials, few cursives, 8 OL
Mk. 10:24*	<i>for them that trust in riches</i>	INCLUDE, Matthew reads <i>they that have riches</i>	DR, RV INCLUDE Others OMIT	26 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, 10 OL with variation, pesh, harc, Goth	4 uncials, few cursives, 1 OL
Mk. 11:10	<i>in the name of the Lord</i>	Wycliffe OMITs Others INCLUDE, Tyndale-Bishops' read <i>in the name of him that is Lord of our father David</i> , Geneva reads <i>in the name of the Lord of our father David</i>	OMIT	23 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, 1 OL, harc, Goth	10 uncials, some i.e. 10 cursives, most OL, pesh
Mk. 11:26	<i>But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses</i>	Tyndale-Great OMIT others INCLUDE	DR INCLUDES Others OMIT	27 uncials, MAJORITY, 10 OL with variation, pesh, harc, Goth	7 uncials, few cursives
Mk. 12:23	<i>therefore, when they shall rise</i>	INCLUDE, Wycliffe-Geneva read <i>rise again</i>	DR, ESV, JB, NJB, Ne INCLUDE, read <i>rise again</i> Others i.e. RV, NIVs, NWTs OMIT	22 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13 with variation, 8 OL with variation, harc, Goth	9 uncials, few cursives, 4 OL, pesh



Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs, Continued

Verse	Words Cut, Changed from the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Pre-1611: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Bishops', Geneva	DR, RV, NIVs, ESV, NKJV where changed from AV1611, NKJV fn, JB, NJB, NWTs, Ne	Manuscript, Version Evidence For 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Manuscript, Version Evidence Against 1611, 2011+ AV1611s
Mk. 12:30	<i>this is the first commandment</i>	INCLUDE	DR INCLUDES Others OMIT	24 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13, most OL, 4 cited with variation, pesh, harc, Goth	6 uncials, few cursives, 1 OL with variation
Mk. 13:14*	<i>spoken of by Daniel the prophet</i>	Wycliffe OMITs Others INCLUDE	OMIT	26 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13, 5 OL, pesh, harc, Goth	6 uncials, few cursives, 8 OL
Mk. 13:33	<i>and pray</i>	INCLUDE	DR, RV INCLUDE Others OMIT No NKJV fn	30 with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13, 9 OL, pesh, harc	2 uncials, few cursives, 3 OL
Mk. 14:22	<i>Take, eat</i>	Wycliffe OMITs Others INCLUDE	DR, RV, ESV, NKJV fn, Ne OMIT NIVs, JB, NJB, NWTs read <i>Take, it</i>	19 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 13, 1 OL	16 uncials, few cursives, fam 1, 11 OL with variation, pesh, harc
Mk. 14:24	<i>the new testament</i>	INCLUDE	DR INCLUDES Others read <i>the covenant</i> NKJV reads <i>the new covenant</i>	29 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13, 12 OL with variation, pesh, harc	9 uncials, few cursives, 2 OL
Mk. 14:27	<i>because of me this night</i>	INCLUDE	DR INCLUDES Others OMIT	20 uncials with variation, many cursives, fam 1, 13 with variation, 10 OL, pesh, harc	15 uncials, many cursives, 3 OL

Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs, Continued

Verse	Words Cut, Changed from the 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Pre-1611: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Bishops', Geneva	DR, RV, NIVs, ESV, NKJV where changed from AV1611, NKJV fn, JB, NJB, NWTs, Ne	Manuscript, Version Evidence For 1611, 2011+ AV1611s	Manuscript, Version Evidence Against 1611, 2011+ AV1611s
Mk. 14:68*	<i>and the cock crew</i>	INCLUDE	DR, RV, ESV, NJB INCLUDE Others i.e. NIVs, JB, NWTs OMIT No NKJV fn	n.a.	n.a.
Mk. 15:28*	<i>And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors</i>	INCLUDE	DR INCLUDES Others OMIT	26 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13, 7 OL, pesh, harc, Goth	8 uncials, few cursives, 2 OL
Mk. 15:39*	<i>so cried out, and</i>	INCLUDE	DR, 1984 NIV INCLUDE Others OMIT	28 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13, 8 OL with variation, pesh, harc, Goth	4 uncials, few cursives
Mk. 16:9-20*	<i>Now when Jesus was risen...confirming the word with signs following. Amen</i>	INCLUDE Wycliffe-Bishops' OMIT <i>Amen</i>	DR, RV INCLUDE, DR OMIT <i>Amen</i> Others have text notes, fn's, brackets or italics casting doubt on Mark 16:9-20	30 uncials with variation, MAJORITY, fam 1, 13, 11 OL, pesh, harc, Goth	2 uncials, few cursives, 1 OL with variation

## Observations

**Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs** shows that:

- Variations notwithstanding, see **Table Mark - Variations in Sources For and Against AV1611, Where Appreciable**, the pre-1611 Bibles and the manuscript evidence largely support the AV1611 readings for Mark 1:2, 24, 2:15, 17, 3:15, 4:9, 6:11, 20, 7:16, 9:24, 29, 44, 46, 10:21, 24, 11:10, 26, 12:23, 30, 13:14, 33, 14:22, 24, 27, 68, 15:28, 39, 16:9-20. That result strongly indicates that the AV1611 readings for Mark 1:2, 24, 2:15, 17, 3:15, 4:9, 6:11, 20, 7:16, 9:24, 29, 44, 46, 10:21, 24, 11:10, 26, 12:23, 30, 13:14, 33, 14:22, 24, 27, 68, 15:28, 39, 16:9-20 are the true readings and the modern cut-outs are corruptions.

### **Table Mark - Variations in Sources For and Against AV1611, Where Appreciable\***

\*fam 13 is an exception, Tyndale-Geneva show only slight variation from the AV1611. Pre-1611 Bibles tend *towards* the AV1611. Post-1611 versions rapidly *diverge from* the AV1611. See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/version-comparison.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/version-comparison.php), [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) *English Reformation to Last Days Apostasy, What is the Bible – AV1611 Overview, Table 1*

Source	For AV1611	Against AV1611	% For AV1611
Uncials	547	163	77
fam 1	12	5	71
fam 13	17	0	100
OL	145+	76+	66
pesh	16	6	73
harc	19	4	83
Goth	15	3	83
Wycliffe	18 with variation	21	46

- The modern cut-outs largely in ecumenical oneness against the AV1611 between apostate Anglicans, RV, evangelicals, NIVs, NKJV fns, Greekiolators, Ne, papists, DR\*, JB, NJB, no-hellers, NWTs in addition to the basic evil of cutting out **“the words of the LORD”** Exodus 4:28, 24:3, 4, Numbers 11:24, Joshua 3:9, 24:27, 1 Samuel 8:10, 15:1, 2 Chronicles 11:4, 29:15, Psalm 12:6, Jeremiah 36:4, 6, 8, 11, 37:2, 43:1, Amos 8:11, Acts 20:35, 19 occurrences in all, show utter contempt for:

\*The DR shows closer agreement with the AV1611 than the later Catholic versions JB, NJB but its disagreement with the AV1611 is substantial, 21 instances against the AV1611, 18 for the AV1611 or 46%. That is the same percentage as Wycliffe, Wycliffe’s Bible having been altered to match Jerome’s Vulgate from which the DR is derived [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) ‘O Biblios’ – *The Book* p 14.

- The words of the prophets and the fulfilment of those words, Mark 1:2, 13:14, 15:28
- The power of the Lord Jesus Christ to instil fear in unclean spirits, Mark 1:24
- The Lord’s name, Mark 2:15
- The need for sinners to repent, Mark 2:17
- The power of the Lord Jesus Christ to impart the power to heal, Mark 3:15
- The Lord’s words explicitly to His disciples, Mark 4:9
- The severity of the Lord’s judgement on unbelievers, Mark 6:11
- The Biblical revelation of how unbelievers mask unbelief, Mark 6:20
- The Lord’s invitation to earnest seekers after truth, Mark 7:16
- The father’s love for his son, Mark 9:24

- 2.11. The necessity for fasting to combat the devil's most intense attacks, Mark 9:29
  - 2.12. The Lord's emphasis on the reality and severity of hell, Mark 9:44, 46
  - 2.13. The Lord's only once-recorded exhortation to "*take up the cross*" Mark 10:21
  - 2.14. The Lord's warning on the hindrance of worldly wealth, Mark 10:24
  - 2.15. The Lord's coming kingdom, Mark 11:10
  - 2.16. The Lord's teaching on forgiveness, Mark 11:26, still of practical import, 1 John 1:7
  - 2.17. The explicit nature of the resurrection, Mark 12:23
  - 2.18. The Lord's prior emphasis on wholly loving God, Mark 12:30
  - 2.19. The Lord's exhortation on prayer for His Return, Mark 13:33
  - 2.20. The Lord's particular exhortation on communion, Mark 14:22
  - 2.21. The Lord's particular exhortation on "*the new testament*" Mark 14:24 for communion
  - 2.22. The Lord's particular rebuke for disloyalty to Him, of which all may be guilty, Mark 14:27
  - 2.23. The precise fulfilment of the Lord's words, Mark 14:68
  - 2.24. The precise details of the Lord's death, Mark 15:39
  - 2.25. The record by Mark of the Lord's resurrection and the Great Commission, Mark 16:9-20.
3. The above departures from the AV1611 Text for the Gospel of Mark are serious errors in the modern cut-outs DR, RV, NIVs, NKJV fns, JB, NJB, NWTs, Ne Interlinears that cannot be carelessly glossed over.

### **Conclusion**

It is clear from **Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs** together by inspection with **Appendices 2-4** that the AV1611 readings for Mark 1:2, 24, 2:15, 17, 3:15, 4:9, 6:11, 20, 7:16, 9:24, 29, 44, 46, 10:21, 24, 11:10, 26, 12:23, 30, 13:14, 33, 14:22, 24, 27, 68, 15:28, 39, 16:9-20 are those of the true church and that fundamentalists who support the NIV, NKJV with its footnotes and other modern versions are in apostasy with the **“MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH”** Revelation 17:5 including Watchtower.

It is clear from **Table Mark – The AV1611 versus Modern Cut-Outs** that in addition to the basic evil of cutting out **“the words of the LORD”** Exodus 4:28, 24:3, 4, Numbers 11:24, Joshua 3:9, 24:27, 1 Samuel 8:10, 15:1, 2 Chronicles 11:4, 29:15, Psalm 12:6, Jeremiah 36:4, 6, 8, 11, 37:2, 43:1, Amos 8:11, Acts 20:35, the modern cut-outs have attacked major doctrine and essential Biblical lessons in their omissions from Mark 1:2, 24, 2:15, 17, 3:15, 4:9, 6:11, 20, 7:16, 9:24, 29, 44, 46, 10:21, 24, 11:10, 26, 12:23, 30, 13:14, 33, 14:22, 24, 27, 68, 15:28, 39, 16:9-20. See **Observations**.

It remains only to be re-emphasised what was stated unequivocally above.

In sum 94% the Gospel of Mark *has no place in the Sanctuary!* because it is *not* the Gospel of Mark...*we demand full measure after “the Shekel of the Sanctuary”!* for the Gospel of Mark!

## Appendix 1 – Languages of the Four Gospels, Dialogue with Gail Riplinger

[www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/alan-oreilly/) *The Ten Gospels – or Twelve* pp 14-16

### Divers Languages of the Four Evangelists

The following study is based on James Knox's messages on the four Gospels depicting the Lord Jesus Christ as manifestations of **"the branch"** Jeremiah 23:5, Zechariah 3:8, 6:12, Isaiah 4:2. See **"the branch."**

#### Matthew

Dear Gail...

I have listened to the first two tracks of *The Four Gospels* by James Knox. As you indicated, he certainly has great insights into how the four evangelists have depicted the Lord Jesus Christ as King, servant, man, God. These four themes have of course long been established but James Knox's detailed study is probably definitive.

Presenting the Lord Jesus Christ as King in Matthew e.g. by the genealogy of David and the reference to the priests in the temple profaning the sabbath, Matthew 12:1-5, Knox does emphasise how Matthew is depicting the Lord as the King of the Jews and therefore writing to the Jews. It would make sense that Matthew would first write in Hebrew, Acts 21:40, as you point out in *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* pp 2-6.

It follows that it would not make sense for Matthew first to write in Latin, Greek or Syriac. James Knox's study certainly affirms that conclusion. *Hidden History* records that at least one Hebrew copy of Matthew's Gospel did survive but, aside from statements by the Jewish elders and priests in Acts 23, virtually the last statement that the Book of Acts records from Jews as a whole in Jerusalem is Acts 22:22, directed against Paul. **"And they gave him audience unto this word, and then lifted up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live."**

You would conclude from that statement that any copy of Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew extant in Judaea during the apostolic era would very likely be confiscated and burnt by the Jews, just as Diocletian commanded that throughout his realm, copies of the scriptures be seized and burnt, *In Awe of Thy Word* p 681. That would explain why little evidence of Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew remains and probably provides further explanation of why God permitted the Romans under Titus to sack and burn Jerusalem in 70 A.D., as the Lord prophesied, Luke 19:41-44, a terrible fulfilment from God of Judges 15:11 **"As they did unto me, so have I done unto them."**

Translations of Matthew in Greek and other tongues would follow, no doubt, from surviving Hebrew copies, as you show from Hoskier's work, *Hazardous Materials* pp 1100ff.

Ironically, though, the preponderance of Greek ancient sources, useful as they are as witnesses to the true text of scripture, points to the heretical nature of the Greek Orthodox custodians of the Greek mss, *In Awe of Thy Word* p 955, *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 20. Pure Old Latin sources would have suffered far greater destruction, having been the Bibles of faithful believers during the Dark Ages. Of course, relatively few Old Latin mss therefore survive (although it appears that the text does) and most have evidently suffered some corruption, to line them up with Jerome's Vulgate.

Yet through it all God preserved His words pure and entire, Psalm 12:6-7 even if at times the Devil used the **"furnace of earth"** to destroy the scriptures, not purify them and probably turned up the heat sevenfold in his efforts so to do, Daniel 3:19.

## Mark

Dear Gail

I have just finished listening to the tracks on James Knox's study of Mark. These are very informative, as is his study of Matthew, this time with respect to the details in Mark that a servant would be aware of.

What is of particular interest language-wise is that on track 11, Knox says that Mark's readers won't know the Jewish language or customs, so Mark therefore includes an explanation, for example, of the word *corban*, as in Mark 7:11. Knox also says that Mark is most likely writing to Gentile readers in Rome and he illustrates this point with examples of Latin words found only in Mark e.g. as found in Mark 6:27, where he refers to *executioner*, Mark 7:4, 8 where he refers to *pots* and Mark 15:16 where he refers to *Praetorium*.

All of the above strongly suggests a Latin 1<sup>st</sup> Edition for the Gospel of Mark.

## Luke

Dear Gail...

I've been listening to James Knox's studies on Luke with respect to aspects of the language in which it was written and it appears obvious that Luke wrote in Greek, with respect to the Greek *Theophilus*, Luke 1:3. It's interesting that the entire Gospel should be addressed to a single individual but it underlines the emphasis of Luke on the man Christ Jesus, 1 Timothy 2:5.

Thus far, with Matthew writing to Jews in Hebrew, Mark to Romans in Latin and Luke in Greek to a Greek, Foxe's statement that you kindly forwarded some time ago is vindicated. **Also the four evangelists wrote the gospel in divers languages, as Matthew in Judea, Mark in Italy, Luke in Achaia, and John in Asia. And all these wrote in the languages of the same countries...since Christ commanded his apostles to preach his gospel unto all the world, and excepted no people or language.**

Knox points out that *Theophilus* means lover of God – as the name itself suggests. This is interesting because it is obviously a further refutation, *Which Bible is God's Word?* pp 136-138, [samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=47.htm](http://samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=47.htm), of the notion that a distinction should be drawn between *agape* and *phileo*.

I would suggest that no name meaning lover of God is going to be devised on the basis of an inferior kind of love that would be obvious to a 1<sup>st</sup> century Greek speaker i.e. no distinction exists between *agape* and *phileo* in 1<sup>st</sup> century Greek and no distinction should ever be drawn in English.

## John

Dear Gail...

I've just finished listening to James Knox's studies on John. They are indeed most searching, including his encouraging exhortations about the Lord Jesus Christ interceding for believers, John 17.

However, I fear I may have missed something in that I didn't glean anything explicit about whom John was writing to especially, to give an indication of the language in which the Gospel of John was first written. Nevertheless, my thoughts on that issue are as follows.

Some verses in John point to insertions of translation, as in Matthew 27:46 (where as I suggested earlier, Matthew under the inspiration of God might have included the interpretation for non-Hebrew readers, also in Matthew 1:23); John 1:38, 41, 42, 9:7, 19:13, 17.

What might be inferred from this is that John didn't write in *Hebrew*. This word occurs 5 times in the Gospels, Luke 23:38, John 5:2, 19:13, 17, 20. As indicated, John 19:13, 17 give interpretations of the associated explicit Hebrew term.

We also note that John 1:42, so far as I know, gives an interpretation of an Aramaic word i.e. *Cephas*.

I wonder, though, if the words "***which is by interpretation, A stone***" may have been added by John under the inspiration of God just as, possibly, Matthew, also under the inspiration of God, may have added interpretations to Matthew 1:23, 27:46, for non-Hebrew readers.

That is, noting Foxe's comment that John was in Asia i.e. Asia Minor, and especially noting Revelation 1:4 "***John to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne***" and Revelation 1:11 "***Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea,***" (where the NIVs cut out "***which are in Asia***"), it seems that John most likely wrote first in Aramaic. Aramaic [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aramaic\\_language](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aramaic_language) was a dominant language in this area of Asia Minor. Wikipedia is a secular source, of course, but gives a helpful summary.

In sum, and accepting the possibility of inspired annotations to the four Gospels or at least Matthew and John, this would give for the first writings of the Gospels:

Matthew in Hebrew

Mark in Latin

Luke in Greek

John in Aramaic i.e. Syriac

This would certainly be a realistic possibility when considered along with the polyglot Gospels that Hoskier researched, *Hazardous Materials* pp 1096ff.

### **Stabilising Power of the Global Gospel**

Finally for this work as an encouragement to today's believer, see Paul's definitive statement on the stabilising power of "***my gospel***" Romans 16:25 and its global application.

***"Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith: To God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen"*** Romans 16:25-27.



## Appendix 2 – ‘O Biblios’ Notes on Mark - AV1611 versus Modern Counterfeits

[www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) ‘O Biblios’ – *The Book* pp 46-49, inserted references in blue braces []. \*<sup>2012</sup>The 1978 NIV was used for the original set of readings in this section. Any changes between the 1978, 1984 and 2011 NIVs will be noted in blue, from [biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/](http://biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/). No note means no change, or at least no significant change. As indicated, the 1984, 2013 NWTs match with respect to all departures from the AV1611 in Mark that this work lists.

### Mark 1:2

“**The prophets**” is changed to “Isaiah the Prophet” in the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

The modern reading is incorrect because Isaiah did NOT write the quotation in Mark 1:2, Malachi did. Ruckman [*The New ASV - Satan’s Masterpiece* Dr Peter S. Ruckman] p 38, states that the AV1611 reading is found in all four families of manuscripts (Alexandrian, Byzantine, ‘Caesarean,’ Western) plus citations dating from 202 AD. Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611.

### Mark 6:11

“**Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city**” is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Burgon [[www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/36722?msg=welcome\\_stranger#toc9](http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/36722?msg=welcome_stranger#toc9) *The Revision Revised by Dean John William Burgon*] pp 137, 409, states that the AV1611 reading is attested by 11 uncials and the whole body of cursives, with only nine manuscripts in total omitting the words, including six corrupt Alexandrian uncials (p 410). The AV1611 reading is also attested (ibid.) by the Peshitta and Philoxenian Syriac versions, the Old Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic and Gothic versions, Irenaeus (2<sup>nd</sup> century) and Victor of Antioch (5<sup>th</sup> century). See also Fuller [*True or False? 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* David Otis Fuller, D.D.] p 149, citing Burgon. Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611.

### Mark 6:20

“**he did many things**” is altered to “he was greatly puzzled” or similar wording, in the RV, Ne, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT.

Burgon [*The Revision Revised*] p 69, states that the evidence against the AV1611 reading is only Aleph, B, L and the Coptic version. All other Greek copies, uncial and cursive, favour the AV1611, together with the Old Latin (2<sup>nd</sup> century), Peshitta and Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, Slavonic and Georgian versions. Burgon adds that the Thebaic, Gothic and Curetonian Syriac “*are defective here.*”

More recently, the TBS...*Many Things*, have cited 5 uncials as the evidence against the AV1611. However, the TBS cites as favourable to the AV1611, Codices A and Bezae (D) and most other manuscripts, including the vast majority of cursives. Besides the versions listed by Burgon, they include Tatian’s Diatessaron (2<sup>nd</sup> century) as supporting the AV1611. Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611. Although this passage is not of major doctrinal import, it does illustrate the lengths to which the modern textual critics will go to defy the AV1611 Text.

### Mark 7:16

“**If any man have ears to hear, let him hear**” is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., NWT. The JB, NJB have the reading.

Ruckman [*The New ASV - Satan’s Masterpiece*] p 16, cites D (6<sup>th</sup> century), Tatian’s Diatessaron (180 AD) and the Gothic version of Ulfilas (320 AD) as the earliest authorities for this verse. Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611.

**Mark 9:29**

“**and fasting**” is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n. JB, NJB, NWT.

Hills [*The King James Version Defended* 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition Chapter 5, Edward F. Hills Th.D. [wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/](http://wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/)] p 138, states that Aleph, B and the other Alexandrian manuscripts omit the words, probably owing to the influence of Alexandrian Gnostics. Berry’s Greek text, reflecting the majority of manuscripts, retains the words.

**Mark 9:44, 46**

“**Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched**” is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., NWT, JB, NJB.

Ruckman [*The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* Dr Peter S. Ruckman] p 122, states that A, D, K, X, Theta, Pi and the majority of Receptus Greek manuscripts support the AV1611. Mark 9:44, 46 were omitted in the manuscripts of Origen and Eusebius (i.e. Aleph and B). Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611.

See also Will Kinney’s detailed article [brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm) *Mark 9:44-46 Inspired Scripture or Not?*

**Mark 10:24**

“**for them that trust in riches**” is omitted by the Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Ruckman [*The New ASV - Satan’s Masterpiece*] p 17, states that the words are found in all four families of manuscripts. Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611.

See also Will Kinney’s detailed article [brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm) *Mark 10:24 “Children, how hard it is FOR THEM THAT TRUST IN RICHES to enter into the kingdom of God.”*

**Mark 13:14**

“**spoken of by Daniel the prophet**” has been omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611. Dr J. A. Moorman [*Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* Dr J. A. Moorman] lists Aleph, B, D, L, W as the main sources for the omission.

**Mark 14:68**

“**and the cock crew**” has been omitted from Ne, NIV, NWT, JB. *The NJB has the reading.*

Ruckman [*The New ASV - Satan’s Masterpiece*] p 17, indicates that the words are found in all four families of manuscripts and in the vast majority of extant manuscripts. Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611.

**Mark 15:28**

“**And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors**” is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Ruckman [*The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*] p 110, [*The New ASV - Satan’s Masterpiece*] p 18, states that the verse is found in the vast majority of manuscripts and in the Old Latin and Old Syriac of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries respectively. Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611.

**Mark 15:39**

“**so cried out, and**” is omitted by the RV, Ne, 1978, 1984 NIVs marg., 2011 NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. The NIVs, JB, NJB, NWT change “**gave up the ghost**” to “died” or similar.

Burgon [*The Revision Revised*] p 72, states that Aleph, B, and L are the only manuscripts which omit these words. Berry’s Greek text, representing the majority of manuscripts, supports the AV1611.

## Mark 16:9-20

The 1978 NIV has a note between Mark 16:8, 9 stating that the most reliable early manuscripts do not contain Mark 16:9-20. The 1984 NIV notes only that *“The earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 16:9–20.”* The 2011 NIV notes that *“The earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witnesses do not have verses 9-20.”*

The NKJV has a footnote stating that Aleph and B do not contain Mark 16:9-20 but that most other manuscripts of Mark do.

The NWT ends its text at Mark 16:8 and has Mark 16:9-20 as a footnoted *“long conclusion”* indicating that manuscripts A, C, D include it, while Aleph, B, the Syriac and Armenian versions omit Mark 16:9-20. The NWT also has a footnoted *“short conclusion”* *“And they delivered all these instructions briefly to Peter and his companions. Afterwards Jesus himself sent out by them from east to west the sacred and imperishable message of eternal salvation.”* The JB insists that MANY manuscripts omit Mark 16:9-20. The online NJB has no note to this effect but the NJB hard copy notes that *“The ‘longer ending’ of Mark 16:9-20 is included in the canonically accepted body of inspired scripture, although some important MSS (including Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) omit it, and it does not seem to be by Mark. It is in a different style, and is little more than a summary of the appearances of the risen Christ, with other material, all of which could be derived from various NT writings.”* See also Will Kinney’s article [brandplucked.webs.com/esvcatholicpart2.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/esvcatholicpart2.htm) *Undeniable Proof the ESV, NIV, NASB are the new “Catholic” bibles Part TWO.* The NJB is subtly raising doubts about the authenticity of Mark 16:9-20, stating that it *“is included in the canonically accepted body of inspired scripture”* but suggesting that perhaps it shouldn’t be. In other words, **“Yea, hath God said...?”** Genesis 3:1.

The evidence in favour of the authenticity of Mark 16:9-20 is overwhelming. The TBS publication...*The Authenticity of The Last Twelve Verses of...Mark* is an excellent summary, drawing mainly from Burgon, [*The Revision Revised*] pp 36-40, 422-424 and Burgon’s work cited by Fuller [*Counterfeit or Genuine? Mark 16? John 8? 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* David Otis Fuller, D.D.] pp 25-130. See also Burton [*Let’s Weigh the Evidence* Barry Burton] pp 62-63, Fuller [*Which Bible? 5<sup>th</sup> Edition* David Otis Fuller, D.D.] pp 168-169, Hills [*The King James Version Defended 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Chapter 6*] pp 161-162, [*Believing Bible Study* Edward F. Hills, Th.D, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition] pp 133-134, Ruckman [*The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*] p 132.

The TBS publication - see above - states that only two Greek manuscripts (Aleph and B) out of a total of 620 which contain the Gospel of Mark, omit Mark 16:9-20. See Burgon, cited by Fuller [*Counterfeit or Genuine? Mark 16? John 8? 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*] pp 60-61. Moreover, Burgon, *ibid.* p 67, states that a blank space has been left in B, where the Mark 16:9-20 should have been but where the scribe obviously omitted them.

As further evidence in favour of Mark 16:9-20, Burgon [*The Revision Revised*] p 423, [*Which Bible? 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*] p 169, cites:

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Century: Old Latin and Peshitta Syriac versions, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Century: Coptic and Sahidic versions, Hippolytus, Vincentius, ‘Acta Pilati’ - by an unknown author, Apostolic Constitutions
- 4<sup>th</sup> Century: Curetonian Syriac and Gothic versions, Syriac Table of Canons, Eusebius, Macarius Magnes, Aphraates, Didymus, The Syriac ‘Acts of the Apostles’, Epiphanius, Leontius, Ephraem, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine
- 5<sup>th</sup> Century: Armenian version (some copies), Codices A and C, Leo, Nestorius, Cyril of Alexandria, Victor of Antioch, Patricius, Marius Mercator
- 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Centuries: Codex D, Georgian and Ethiopic versions, Hesychius, Gregentius, Prosper, Archbishop John of Thessalonica, Bishop Modestus of Jerusalem.

The TBS also cites the Philoxenian Syriac of the 5<sup>th</sup> century as containing Mark 16:9-20. Hills and Ruckman also cite Tatian (2<sup>nd</sup> century) as quoting Mark 16:9-20. Hills [*The King James Version Defended 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Chapter 6*] p 162, [*Believing Bible Study, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*] p 134, states that besides Aleph and B, the Sinaitic Syriac - from the same source as Aleph, two manuscripts of the Georgian version and 62 of the Armenian version omit Mark 16:9-20. The Old Latin manuscript k has the “*short conclusion*” instead of Mark 16:9-20. Burgon [*Counterfeit or Genuine? Mark 16? John 8? 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*] pp 81-82, explains how this short ending has been obtained solely from Codex L, an 8<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> century manuscript “*with an exceedingly vicious text*”, *ibid.* Hills explains the omission of Mark 16:9-20 from the above handful of documents as indicative of the work of heretics, especially docetists who sought to de-emphasise post resurrection appearances of the Lord from the Gospel record, *ibid.* pp 138-141, pp 166-168.

Burgon [*Counterfeit or Genuine? Mark 16? John 8? 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*] pp 49-60 also demonstrated that the supposed adverse testimony of ancient writers is spurious, resting on a quotation from Eusebius, which does NOT deny Mark 16:9-20. Berry’s Greek text supports the AV1611.

***“Prove all things; hold fast that which is good” 1 Thessalonians 5:21.***

### Appendix 3 - KJO Review Full Text Notes on Mark - AV1611 versus Modern Counterfeits

[www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php) KJO Review Full Text. See **Table A1a** listing from **Table A1** pp 750-752 of selected scriptures from the Gospel of Mark that James White attacks in agreement with the NIV, Rome and Watchtower, namely Mark 1:2, 24, 2:15, 4:9, 6:11, 7:16, 9:29, 44, 46, 10:21, 24, 11:26, 15:28, 16:9-20, 25 verses in all. **Page** refers to page references where White attacks those scriptures in his book. **Notes** refers to page references in *KJO Review Full Text* where White's attacks have been answered e.g. see **Appendix 4 KJO Review Full Text Notes on Mark 10:21 pp 330-302**. NIV, NWT refer to 1984, 2011 NIVs, 1984, 2013 NWTs respectively.

**Table A1a**

#### AV1611 vs. Modern Readings, Cited in The King James Only Controversy

\*JB, NJB read with DR, Douay-Rheims Challoner Revision, 1749-1752 and Jesuit Rheims 1582 NT, JR

#DR, JR reads with AV1611

Otherwise, DR, JR readings differ from both AV1611 and JB. **JB, NJB** readings are JB readings, NJB varies only slightly

Verse	Page	Notes	AV1611	NIV	JB, NJB	NWT
Mark 1:2	166-8	342-348	<b>the prophets</b>	Isaiah the prophet	the prophet Isaiah*	Isaiah the prophet
Mark 1:24	253	323	<b>Saying, Let us alone, thou, thee</b>	OMIT	OMIT*, DR, JR include 'saying'	OMIT 'Let us alone,' changes 'thee' to 'exactly'
Mark 2:15	45, 194	395-396	<b>Jesus</b>	OMIT	Jesus, DR, JR omit 'Jesus'	OMIT
Mark 4:9	155	307	<b>unto them</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Mark 6:11	158	327-328	<b>Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomor-rha in the day of judgment, than for that city</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Mark 7:16	155, 189	307-308	<b>If any man have ears to hear, let him hear</b>	OMIT	If anyone has ears to hear, let him listen to this#	OMIT
Mark 9:29	155	302	<b>and fasting</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT

**Table A1a, Continued**  
**AV1611 vs. Modern Readings, Cited in The King James Only Controversy**

Verse	Page	Notes	AV1611	NIV	JB, NJB	NWT
Mark 9:44, 46	155	304-307	<b>Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Mark 10:21	158-62, 166	327-332	<b>take up the cross</b>	OMIT	OMIT*	OMIT
Mark 10:24	168	350-352	<b>for them that trust in riches</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Mark 11:26	155	309-311	<b>But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Mark 15:28	155	310-314	<b>And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors</b>	OMIT	OMIT#	OMIT
Mark 16:9-20	150, 255-7	621-634	<b>Now when Jesus...with signs following. Amen</b>	NIV inserts 'The most reliable early manuscripts do not have Mark 16:9-20'	JB has a footnote that 'Many MSS omit vv. 9-20'#. <a href="#">2016 Note: The online NJB has no note, the NJB hard copy is equivocal. See Appendix 2 on Mark 16:9-20</a>	NWT inserts passage in smaller type with heading Long Conclusion

#### Appendix 4 KJO Review Full Text Notes on Mark 10:21 pp 330-302

Updated and inserted references are in blue and blue braces []

White [*The King James Only Controversy, Can You Trust the Modern Translations?* by James R. White pp 158-162, 166] uses Mark 10:21 to attack his preferred target yet again, Dr Mrs Riplinger.

*“Gail Riplinger alleges that while the KJV calls believers to “take up the cross,” the new versions “OMIT” this call. Though she does not give a specific citation to back up her claim, she is referring to Mark 10:21.”*

White is lying. He also lies [*The King James Only Controversy*] <sup>p 189</sup> in his note, *“Riplinger has confirmed in her second book, Which Bible is God’s Word that I was correct in assuming she was referring to Mark 10:21.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger [*New Age Bible Versions* by G.A. Riplinger] <sup>p 22, 159</sup> expands on her summary page with reference to the omission of **“take up the cross”** in Mark 10:21 by the modern versions.

*“The ‘New’ Christianity has put down their cross to follow Pied Piper preachers who present Christ carrying a credit card instead of a cross: ... “Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits” Isaiah 30:10...Christians are rejecting the cross now, because they want the crown ‘now’ not ‘later’. They shop the bible for bargains and deals, dodging...2 Timothy 2:12, “If we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he also will deny us” ...”*

Confirmation of the reference was not delayed until the publication of Gail Riplinger’s second book [*Which Bible is God’s Word?* by Gail Riplinger] <sup>p 37</sup>, in which she states, *“In Mark 10:21, the King James Version says, “take up the cross, and follow me”; the new versions just say, “come follow me.” We do not like to take up our cross daily. “My people” (not the heathen) love pied piper preachers who say, “Follow me, I won’t remind you of the cross.””*

The reference was in *New Age Versions*. Dr Mrs Riplinger comments further on the reading in her response [[www.avpublications.com/avnew/content/Critiqued/james1.html](http://www.avpublications.com/avnew/content/Critiqued/james1.html)] to White’s initial attack on *New Age Versions*, her emphases.

*“Page 158 of New Age Bible Versions pointed out the fact that the phrase “take up the cross” has been **completely** omitted in the NIV and NASB. Yet James White tries to put readers in doubt, as the whites of his eyes bulge out and he shouts,*

*““Mrs. Riplinger **does** want people to think that this phrase is deleted from the Bible on the basis of Mark 10:21, and she **still** does not deal **honestly** with the presence of **the phrase** in three other places in the modern version.” [emphasis mine]*

*“There is a \$10,000 prize, if he can back up his lies. Readers of White won’t applaud...He has put his credibility in question by confusing his own inability to read, with the honesty of the author he reads. The three places to which he points are references to “**his** cross,” not “**the** cross” (Matt. 16:24, Luke 9:23, and Mark 8:34). These three parallel passages **do not** relate **at all** to those in Mark 10:21, Matt. 19:21, and Luke 18:22. The cross to which Jesus was referring in the former verses (“his cross”) is that **daily** crucifixion of the fleshly and self-serving desires of the Christian. The phrase immediately preceding it says, “let him deny **himself** (and take up his cross).” The word “**his**,” and its corresponding emphasis, also occurs in the verses which immediately follow it. Mark 15:21 was a foreshadowing of this daily crucifixion of the flesh as Simon was compelled to bear “**his** cross.” The following **other** verses expound this theme.*

*““I die daily” I Cor. 15:3*

*““[T]ake up **his** cross daily” Luke 9:23*

*““And they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh...” Gal. 5:24*

*““I am crucified with Christ” Gal. 2:20*

“On the other hand, “**the** cross,” omitted in new versions in Mark 10:21, refers to “**the** cross of Jesus” (John 19:25), “**the** cross of Christ” (I Cor. 1:17), and “**the** cross of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Gal. 6:14). “The preaching of **the** cross is the power of God unto salvation” (I Cor. 1:18). Taking up “**his** cross” daily will not **save** a person. “**The** cross of Christ” will. It is only **after** we have taken our sins to **the** cross, that our redeemer can help each of us bear **his** own cross.

“When someone like James White spends only a few **days** or even **months** writing a critique of a book which entailed six **years** of research, this reckless, broad brush approach results - painting its con artist into a corner...The vast majority of Greek MS **have** “take up the cross.” These include the uncials A (E) F (G) H, K, M, N, S, U, V, W, X, Y, Gamma, Pi, Sigma, Phi, Omega, fam 13 and the majority of all cursives. It is in the Old Latin: (a) q, Syr: (pesh) sim harc, Cop: (sa-mss) bo-mss, Goth (Arm) (Eth). It is also extant in 047, 05, 0211, 0257. The few corrupt manuscripts which omit it are Aleph, B, C, D, Theta, Psi, 0274, [almost no cursives], c, f, fz, g1 [of the Old Latin], and Vulg.

“**Every** word of God is important. The serpent added **ONE** word and changed the entire course of history. God said, thou “shalt surely die.” The serpent added **ONE** word and said, “Ye shall **NOT** surely die.” When Jesus **FIRST** met him in Luke 4:4, he brought this to his attention saying, “It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by **EVERY** word of God.” (New versions omit this last part.) Liberals have always said the Bible **CONTAINS** God’s **MESSAGE**. The Bible however says that it **is** the very **words** of God. New versions and their advocates, like White, **miss** the importance of **each** individual word. They are rapidly moving into the liberal camp where the serpent adds a word here and there, or like Eve, drops a word (“freely”). Paul preached a sermon on the importance of **one** letter(s) (Gal. 3:16). Those who are not concerned that there are 64,000 words missing in the NIV would invariably overlook the distinction between words like “**T-H-E**” and “**H-I-S**.” Since their NIV omits “but by **EVERY** word of God” (Luke 4:4), it’s no wonder. White is wrong. The new versions **do** omit “take up the cross”! Verses that say “his cross” are no substitute. His accusation that I am not “honestly” dealing with the topic is legally actionable.”

That is, White lied. But he continues.

“The NIV and other modern translations do not include this phrase because the Greek texts they utilized in their work do not contain the words “take up the cross”...It is the judgement of the scholars who compiled [the Nestle-Aland] text that the phrase was not part of the original Gospel of Mark...

“It is important that the phrase “take up the cross” appears four times in the King James Version of the Bible: Matthew 16:24; Luke 9:23; Mark 8:34; and the disputed passage at Mark 10:21....”

In a lame effort to counter Dr Mrs Riplinger’s response, see above, White [[The King James Only Controversy](#)]<sup>p 189</sup> takes refuge in ‘textual variants’ again, his emphases.

“The other three passages have “take up **his** cross” rather than “take up **the** cross,” but even here the textual variant found at Mark 10:21 shows some manuscripts that have “take up **your** cross” as well.”

Which manuscripts and how many, compared to the total that support the AV1611 reading? White studiously avoids these questions. He continues.

“The first three all recount the same incident in the teaching ministry of the Lord Jesus. If there is indeed some “conspiracy” on the part of the modern translators to get rid of the call to take up the cross, surely they will delete this phrase in these passages as well...yet the modern translations have all three occurrences in their translations...

“It is difficult to see how a charge of “conspiracy” can be made against the modern translations, unless one believes that theology is based on how often the Bible repeats a command. That is, if the Bible says “take up the cross” only three times, rather than four, this somehow makes the command less important...This kind of thinking is muddled. God’s truth is not decided by counting how many times He says the same thing. When God says, “Before me no god was formed, nor will there be one after me” (Isaiah 43:10, NIV), we do not ask that He repeat himself three or four more times before



*we will accept the great truth of monotheism...In the same way, Scripture records Jesus' call to take up the cross in three places, and this is sufficient."*

His self-centred arrogance aside about what "is sufficient" with respect to what God says – see remarks under *Revision's Romanizing Aftermath* - White has lied three times in the above citation. The AV1611 has the expression "**take up the cross**" once, in Mark 10:21. The modern versions that White favours, NASV, NIV, do not contain the phrase at all. It is White's thinking that is "muddled." Moreover, he would have done better to have cited his favourite, the NASV, in Isaiah 43:10, because, even along with the NWT, it is in agreement with the AV1611, which has "**God**" in this verse, not "god," which reading, as also found in the JB, does allow for polytheism.

White tries to justify the omission from manuscript evidence as follows [*The King James Only Controversy*] <sup>p 161</sup>.

*"The oldest manuscripts of the New Testament [Aleph and B] do not contain the phrase."*

He adds that "*many others [and] entire translations in other languages lack the phrase*" and further attempts to justify its omission by reference to the parallel passages, Matthew 19:21 and Luke 18:22, neither of which "*records the phrase "take up the cross".*"

Thus White confidently concludes, his emphasis, that the omission of the phrase from "*Matthew and Luke...in all manuscripts further verifies the propriety of not including it in Mark 10:21*" and he further insists that bible believers "*who would charge the modern texts with "heresy" for not including the later insertion at Mark 10:21 are hard pressed to explain why they do not make the same charge against both Matthew and Luke! Nearly all the charts produced by KJV Only advocates suffer from this same kind of double standard.*"

Once again, it is White who is exercising a 'double standard.' He should question why the word "**daily**" was 'inserted' into Luke 9:23, when the parallel passages – as even White acknowledges them - Matthew 16:24, Mark 8:34 don't contain the word but Luke omits the Lord's rebuke to Peter, although it is found in Matthew 16:22, 23 and Mark 8:32, 33. White should really complain that the 'inconsistencies' between these three accounts demonstrate that somebody, somewhere has tampered with "*what was written by the original authors.*"

Dr Moorman [*Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* by Jack A. Moorman] <sup>p 27, 80</sup> reveals that the 13+ manuscripts of Family 13, which has "*affinities with the Caesarean type of text...current in Caesarea in the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> centuries*" contain "**take up the cross**" in Mark 10:21. Although as Dr Mrs Riplinger indicates, the words are lacking from most of the Old Latin, 8 of the 10 extant copies, they are found with variation in the Peshitta Syriac. The question remains, therefore, how did the phrase "**take up the cross**" find its way into Mark 10:21 in a texts of approximately the same age as the manuscripts that White chooses to call, "*The oldest manuscripts of the New Testament [Aleph and B]*" or even earlier (the Peshitta)? White does not address this question.

But as Dr Moorman notes, "*There has always been an attempt to take the cross out of discipleship.*"

On this occasion, Tischendorf and Tregelles [*The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, Stephens's 1550 Edition*, edited by George Ricker Berry] influence Westcott and Hort and Nestle in removing the phrase, aided by Lachmann, who regards it as doubtful. Nevertheless, the reading, "**take up the cross**" in Mark 10:21 has support from the pre-350 AD Gothic Bible. Wycliffe omits the words but Tyndale, Geneva, Bishops' [[www.studylight.org/](http://www.studylight.org/)] all have them with minor variation, in agreement with the AV1611.

Burgon states [[www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/36722?msg=welcome\\_stranger#toc9](http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/36722?msg=welcome_stranger#toc9) *The Revision Revised* by Dean John William Burgon] <sup>p 217, 510</sup>, his emphasis, and in part in his reply to Bishop Elliott, "*What we complain of is that, misled by a depraved Text, our Revisers have often made non-sense of what before was perfectly clear: and have not only thrust many of our Lord's precious utterances out of sight, (e.g. Matt. xvii. 21: Mark x. 21 and xi. 26: Luke ix. 55, 56); but have attributed to Him absurd sayings which He certainly never uttered, (e.g. Matt. xix. 17) [i.e. the "stale crumb of*

Greek philosophy.” See Dr Hills’s remarks [[The King James Version Defended by Edward F. Hills wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/](http://wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/)]<sup>p143</sup> at the end of Chapter 6]...

*“We entirely miss many a solemn utterance of the SPIRIT, - as we are assured that verses 44 and 46 of S. Mark ix. are omitted by ‘the best ancient authorities,’ (whereas on the contrary, the MSS, referred to are **the worst**). Let the thing complained of be illustrated by a few actual examples. Only five shall be subjoined. The words in the first column represent what **you** are pleased to designate as among “the most certain conclusions of modern Textual Criticism” (p. 78), - but what **I** assert to be nothing else but mutilated exhibitions of the inspired Text. The second column contains the indubitable Truth of Scripture, - the words which have been read by our Fathers’ Fathers for the last 500 years, and which we propose (GOD helping us,) to hand on unimpaired [not if James White has his way] to our Children, and to our Children’s Children, for many a century to come:- [S. Mark x. 21]*

*“REVISED (1881),*

*AUTHORIZED (1611),*

*““And come, follow me.”*

*“And come, **take up the cross and follow me.**””*

Burgon’s four other examples are Luke 9:54-56, 22:64, 23:38, 24:42, none of which White addresses in his book.

James White’s book notwithstanding, King Solomon understood James White confronted with Dean Burgon’s researches.

*“Wisdom is too high for a fool: he openeth not his mouth in the gate”* Proverbs 24:7.