

The Perfect Holy Scriptures

Pastor David Ministries

Ezekiel 34:10, 23

www.pastordavidministries.com

Revised
January 2026

- SEE -

- THE PERFECT ORIGINAL GREEK NEW TESTAMENT on page 50
- THE PERFECT ORIGINAL HEBREW OLD TESTAMENT on page 57

← (reads from right to left) ←

<<< (מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד יְהוָה רְעִי לֹא אֶחְסָה) <<<
<<< (lack, want < not < my shepherd <the Lord is < of David < Psalm) <<<

Psalms 23:1 – In English, left to right:

>>>(A Psalm of David. The LORD is my shepherd;
I shall not want (lack anything).)>>>

My Testimony –

When I was a teenager I started to read the Bible regularly. It was a Bible that was given to me years earlier when I was a child in a different church. The Bible was a Revised Standard Version, RSV. Right away I noticed that it had many footnotes at the bottom of EVERY PAGE of the New Testament. Each footnote indicated an alteration of content between the RSV I was reading and other Bibles. This bothered me a lot, because I knew that the Bible wasn't supposed to have changes in it. So, I started to study this subject to find out what had happened. Why were there changes?

Well, I discovered that back about ~150 years or so ago a few expert Bible scholars had found some old copies of the Bible which were older than any other copies anywhere. And those copies were different than any of the others. But, since they were older than any of the other ones, it was assumed that they must be better than the other ones because the explanation of why they were much different was that there must have been some copy errors over the years. However, they were also very much different from each other. So, if indeed they were closer to the originals and supposedly more accurate, how could they be so different from each other?

At first, it sounded good that they were the oldest. It was a very logical conclusion that they were better because they were older. And it seemed good that those

experts were in the process of recovering a more precisely copied NT. However, I soon learned to test the spirits, as the Bible says. 1John 4:1 “Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try (test) the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.” KJV

Then, I realized that **almost all** modern books are produced from book publishing companies with zero type-set errors. Not only is it possible to make a book with zero copy errors, but it is most probable to have zero errors. But, those oldest copies of the Bible had lots, and lots, and lots, and lots of changes in them, multiple changes on EVERY PAGE of the NT. They have thousands of individual words missing or altered. They have hundreds of half-verses missing. They have sixteen entire verses missing. (This number varies in different Bibles.) And they have two half-chapters missing. (Most Bibles that were translated from this Greek text borrow a different text to fill in these passages. Mark 16:9-20, John 8:1-11) (The RSV puts John 8:1-11 as a footnote in small letters. So, the main text starts with John 8:12.....)

Everybody knows, if you try typing on your cell phone, you get lots of misspelled words and lots of sentences that don't make sense. But, among those old Bible changes, there is not one misspelled word, and not one sentence that doesn't make sense. So, how could the changes be due to accidental errors if there were no errors? All of the changes looked like perfect correctly formed sentences. Obviously, none of the changes were caused by “accidental” copy errors. It must also be remembered that those old time scribes who made those old copies were professional copiers, very much the same as a modern type-set person who works making books cover-to-cover with zero copy errors. If indeed there were any alterations due to accidental mistakes, they would be rare, maybe one or two for the entire NT, not a multitude on every page. And the cause of the errors would have to be something out of the ordinary, abnormal conditions, like the type-set person being drunk on the job. Also, in order to be accepted there would have to be no proofreader, a highly unlikely situation. Under normal conditions we should expect zero mistakes, a cover-to-cover copy with not one error.

In addition, those “Bible Scholars” who found those oldest copies, when they see a passage with only one word changed, they claim that the change was caused by an “accidental” copy mistake, but when they see an entire verse added or missing, they have to change their claim. Then, they have to claim that the change must have been caused by a deliberate alteration. Because, it is **not possible** to “accidentally” add an entire verse to the content. But, if the changes were caused by deliberate alterations, then being the oldest copy is irrelevant. And, it most likely means that ALL of the changes were caused by deliberate alterations. Those changes were made deliberately and could have happened very early as well as very late. So, the year it was copied has nothing to do with the quality of the copy.

There is also the unique attribute that always applies to Bibles which are in regular use. The book wears out from constant usage. This trait doesn't apply to other

books..... only the Bible. But those oldest Bibles were not worn out from constant use. They were very well preserved. So, what does that mean? It means that those Bibles were never used on a regular basis. It also means that super old Bibles should not exist. What kind of a person would keep a Bible so carefully preserved and yet never use it? That is a contradiction. Something is wrong with that. It seems even stranger when you see that those super old copies have a multitude of changes compared to ALL the other Bibles. This situation looks more like they knew something was wrong with it, so they put it away in a closet and forgot about it for 2,000 years.

When I was young, the idea that a very old Bible copied close to the time of the originals sounded good to me. I thought it must be better..... shouldn't it? No. A very old Bible in good condition is a Bible that never got used. And, along with the package comes this idea that human beings are incapable of copying any book without making lots of errors. Lots and lots, and lots, and lots, and lots, and lots, and lots of errors. They tell you, it's impossible to be any other way. When you look at the history of the Bible, they tell you that nothing else is possible. Any child could copy better than those guys. They tell you that ALL of the old Bible copiers were not capable of anything but making copies with lots, and lots, and lots, and lots of mistakes.

And.... you have to ask yourself, did any other ancient book have this problem? Is there any other ancient book copied with a multitude of alterations? NO! This way of thinking is how they present their case, when they say that the oldest copies are the best because, over the years, what is actually found are Bibles with a multitude of changes, which they call "accidental mistakes".

Well, they don't give any explanation of why modern books are always printed cover-to-cover with zero mistakes. Any experienced reader should know that. Since there are no misspelled words or sentences that don't make sense, the multitude of changes which they call "accidental errors" are not errors at all. Those alterations were caused by deliberate sabotage, so that people will have contaminated Bibles. The presence of a multitude of alterations is only identifiable when they can be compared to other Bibles, which was rare back in those days. All books were rare in those days. The absence of spelling and grammar errors gets people to accept those contaminated Bibles as authentic. If they were loaded with spelling and grammar errors nobody would ever accept them as legitimate. It is the work of Satan. However, that sabotage is so well done that it is understandable that it would fool a young person. This is one reason why church leaders should be experienced. Both Jesus Christ and John the Baptizer waited until they were thirty years old before they started their ministries. That was a good example for all church leaders.

So, if you **test** the spirits, you should expect to be able to find copies of the Bible in the original language that were made just as precisely as the typical modern book, copied cover-to-cover with zero errors. You should NOT expect to find copies with a multitude of obviously deliberate alterations in them. The rest of this article shows how to find the perfect copies of the New and Old Testaments in their original

languages. Jesus said: [Mat 5:18](#) “For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.”

The Holy Scriptures

Acceptable books of the **Old Testament**. (From the time of creation, up to just before the birth of Jesus Christ.) – Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1st & 2nd Samuel, 1st & 2nd Kings, 1st & 2nd Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Song of Songs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

Acceptable books of the **New Testament**. (From the birth of Jesus Christ, to Revelation = Apocalypse.) – Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Romans, 1st & 2nd Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1st & 2nd Thessalonians, 1st & 2nd Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, James, 1st & 2nd Peter, 1st & 2nd & 3rd John, Jude, Revelation.

The Books commonly called “Apocrypha” (additional books found in the Roman Catholic Bible, mixed in with the other Old Testament books) (sometimes called: Deuterocanonical books) are **not** of Divine inspiration, should have **no** part of Scripture, and therefore are of no authority to the Church of God, nor to be anyway made use of, then other human writings. They should **not** be in the Bible.

The Apocrypha could be accepted as general history books on the same standing as any other history books, such as those written by Flavius Josephus, (which are: “Antiquities of the Jews”, and “The Wars of the Jews” or AKA “The History of the Destruction of Jerusalem”) but **not** equal to the Bible. Those history books by Josephus are translated into English and can be downloaded free from www.e-sword.net.

The Apocrypha books are: 1st & 2nd Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), additions to Esther, Baruch, several additions to Daniel, 1st & 2nd Maccabees. (Also, a few other books in some Bibles from the Eastern Orthodox Church.) These books are also occasionally, but not usually, found in Bibles printed for non-Roman Catholic churches. The first printing of the King James in 1611 included those books. They were not removed from the KJV until many years later.

The book of Mormon and the Muslim Quran are **not** Holy Scriptures. (A good

web search will give lots of reasons.) The Quran is extremely beautiful as a poetical masterpiece, (which is probably the main reason for its popularity) but it contradicts the Bible, especially concerning salvation. True salvation must include primarily a blood sacrifice as a substitution for a person's sins. (See article listed below on: Salvation.) The Quran does not recognize a need for a blood sacrifice for salvation, nor does it recognize that Jesus Christ was that sacrifice. In fact, it denies that Jesus Christ was ever on any cross, that he died or that he was raised from the dead.

What does the Quran say? [9:5](#) -- "Slay the unbeliever wherever ye find them, and take them captive, besiege them, lay in wait for them with every kind of ambush." The "unbelievers" are anyone who is not a Muslim. [9:29](#) -- "Make war on those who have been given the Scripture (Christian Bible) as believe not in Allah" They are most famous for making war on the Jews, but here we see the Quran tells them to make war on Christians, too. [8:39](#) -- "Slay the unbeliever until there is no more unbelief, and all believe in Allah". Here is a command to kill anyone who is not a Muslim. But, the Bible says: [Rev 21:7-8](#) "He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. 8- But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and **murderers**, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone....."

Well, there are lots of Muslims in U.S. and they don't go around killing people. That's because they are a minority, they're outnumbered. However, the Muslims always have lots of children, so it's only a matter of time before they will be a majority. Also, they had to be lukewarm in their Muslim faith anyway, just to go to the US looking for prosperity. They are **not** really completely dedicated to the Quran. Those Muslims are similar to the average Lukewarm Christian in the US who is only about 50% dedicated to their religion.

The rest of the world is trying to reduce the over-population by having fewer children. Not the Muslims. When they become the majority, they will change their manner. When they become the majority, they will also control the government, in every country that is stupid enough to give them equal votes. Plus, they are very successful at converting other people to their religion. Just like the communists (socialists), as soon as they gain political power they change very much. As long as they are a minority they act like good-guys. But EVERY TIME they gain power, they become tyrants. The sodomites are like that, too. (see [Gen 19](#))

Ishmael was the father of all the Arabs. The Bible says about him, [Gen 16:12](#) "And he will be a wild ass (wild donkey) man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him;..... "

The Quran also contradicts the Bible concerning marriage, divorce and re-marriage. Likewise, most Christian churches can't agree on a correct Bible interpretation for marriage, divorce and remarriage. Only a hundred years ago the Christian perception of divorce and remarriage was very much different than it is today. (See article listed below on: Marriage Misunderstandings Explained.)

The Quran and the prophet Mohammad permit divorce and remarriage freely for any reason. (On one occasion, their prophet Mohammad wanted another man's wife. So, a divorce was arranged specifically so that he could marry her.) (On another occasion Mohammad married an under age 9 year old girl, which they also permit openly. Mohammad wanted her at 6, but her father insisted they wait until she was 9.) (See article listed below on: Marriage Misunderstandings Explained.) The phrase "see article" means to "see article". When people have questions, those questions have been answered in the designated article.

Also, it should be noted here that there are parts of the Quran which are indeed in agreement with the Bible. Whoever wrote the Quran was already familiar with the Bible. There are many references to Biblical names in the Quran. It should also be noted that almost all religions have at least a few characteristics about them that are in agreement with the Bible. In some cases, those other religions even outdo the Christians in what ought to be considered faithful practices, like praying regularly as the Muslims do. But, on the other hand, **who** are they praying to? Is the Muslim God the same as the Christian God? If so, then why does their Quran command them to kill Christians? That doesn't sound like God to me. It sounds more like Satan.

The Muslims always pray towards the Kaaba in Mecca. To them, it is very important which direction they face, every time they pray. Most people don't know that there are a lot of other gods (idols) in that place. So, it is possible that they could be praying to those other god's without anyone knowing. What is in their heart is secret, nobody can really know what a person's inner thoughts are. So, what god are they really worshipping? They can worship whichever one they want, secretly.

In the Bible, marriage represents the spiritual relationship between the church and Jesus Christ, who is God, the Son. By saying that a woman can get a divorce and legitimate remarriage is to say that there is another legitimate god other than the one true God, which consists of: the Father, the Son (Jesus Christ) and the Holy Spirit. (1John 5:7) (See article listed below on: The Trinity.)

The Quran also rejects Jesus Christ as being God, the Son, by stating very clearly that Jesus Christ was only a great prophet, yet at the same time rejecting what Jesus Christ taught. Islam accepts Jesus Christ as a true prophet from God and at the same time rejects what he says (in the Bible), the miracles He did (in the Bible), His resurrection after His Crucifixion and His claim to deity (in the Bible). Or, more specifically, they claim that the NT has been corrupted, and that the Bible account of Jesus Christ cannot be trusted. The Quran was also never confirmed by God with miracles as the NT was.

In the Bible, Jesus said, Rev 1:17,18 "..... Fear not; I am the **first and the last**: 18- *I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.*" In the Quran 57:3, Allah is called the "**first and the last**". Jesus said, John 5:22 "**For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:**" In the Quran 22:56, Allah will be the judge. In John 5:21 Jesus said that both he and the Father will raise the dead. In the Quran

22:7, Allah will be the one who will raise the dead. How could these things be true if Jesus was nothing more than a mortal prophet?

The Muslims ought to be accusing Jesus Christ of blasphemy, the same way that the religious leaders did when Jesus lived in Jerusalem, just before they crucified him. [Mat 26:65](#) “Then the high priest rent (tore) his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy.” Jesus Christ was accused of blasphemy. That’s why they crucified him. And if their claim that the Bible is so much corrupted, then how is it possible that the Quran is not so much corrupted?

As stated in the article “The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible” **all** of the bad “shepherds” must be removed. In the NWO there must be one, and only one religion. **All** of the shepherds from those other false religions must also be removed. It is very important that all those people following those false religions know that God has rejected those false religious leaders. They must turn to the true religion of Christianity, after it has been purified by the removal of all the satanic spy leaders who are now inside the Christian churches. (See article listed below on: “The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible” **And** “Wolves in Sheep’s Clothing”.)

The Mormon Church's claim that their leaders are equal to the Apostles, starting with Joseph Smith, is false. If their Book of Mormon is really true, then it needs to be confirmed by God with the supernatural gifts of the Spirit, the same way that God confirmed the writing of the New Testament. Their leaders, who they claim are equal to the Apostles, must do miracles like the Apostles did. But, neither the Book of Mormon nor the Quran have been confirmed by God as the New Testament has.

The removal of the originals (Book of Mormon) and the defiance of the rules of translation are unbelievable. Everyone who is bilingual knows that a translation cannot replace the original. There are always things that are difficult to explain in a translation into any different language. And there are some things that may be close, but the exact translation cannot be put so equal in any different language, without a lengthy explanation. There are also certain words in every language that have no equivalent in a different language. The **unnecessary** removal of the originals, which supposedly were written on gold plates, renders the whole occurrence dishonest. A translation never replaces the originals, except in small sections or individual sentences. A word-for-word translation can never be exactly equal to the originals. Even computer languages are this way. That's why Microsoft puts out all of their software in binary (computer language); they don't want anyone to see their original source code.

The Jehovah’s Witnesses have twisted their Bible through incorrect translation so that it coincides with their teachings. They have also blasphemed the Holy Spirit by

teaching that the Holy Spirit is nothing more than an “active force”. [Mat 12:31,32](#) “Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Spirit) shall not be forgiven unto men. 32- And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost (Spirit), it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.” There is no hope for the Jehovah’s Witnesses, they cannot be saved. They are indeed a temple of Satan masquerading as faithful followers of God. It is not possible to blaspheme an “active force”. They reject the Holy Spirit as a person who can be blasphemed. An “active force” cannot be blasphemed. Is it possible to blaspheme a chair? NO! Is it possible to offend a chair? NO!

The original language of the Old Testament was Hebrew (עברית), with some small sections written in Aramaic, during the Babylonian captivity. Aramaic was the Babylonian and Assyrian language. [Mat 5:18](#) “For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one **jot** or one **tittle** shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” The “**jot**” (יֹד, יוֹד) is the smallest Hebrew letter and the “**tittle**” (קוֹץ, קוֹץ) is the smallest part of a Hebrew letter. At the time of Christ, the Hebrew OT was the only Bible in existence. And a Greek translation had been made of it, called the “Septuagint”. Hebrew was the spoken language at the time in Israel, not Aramaic.

Many years before Christ, when the Babylonians were ruling the empire, Aramaic was the most common second language for bilingual speakers in Israel, but it most certainly did not replace Hebrew as the main language spoken in Israel. Since the Babylonians had conquered the empire, obviously communication with them had to have been done in their language, Aramaic. Finding a few writings in Israel in Aramaic does not mean that the Hebrew language had been abandoned. Most of those Aramaic writings in Israel were from the time of the Babylonian empire, which was hundreds of years before the life of Jesus Christ. The common people at the time of Christ did **not** speak Aramaic.

One time, in the Old Testament, the subject of the Aramaic language was mentioned directly. The Syrian (Assyrian) army had surrounded the tall city walls of Jerusalem. Their army was much stronger than the Hebrew people, at that time, but they couldn’t get through the big walls. Back then, they didn’t have siege works for destroying walls, so they sent a person (**Rabshakeh**) to speak to the Hebrews on the walls, in the language of Hebrew, and try to intimidate them and get them to surrender voluntarily. [2Kings 18:26-27](#) “Then said Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, and Shebna, and Joah, unto Rabshakeh, Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it: and talk not with us in the Jews’ language in the ears of the people that are on the wall. 27- But Rabshakeh said unto them, Hath my master sent me to thy master, and to thee, to speak these words? hath he not sent me to the men which sit on the wall, that they may eat their own dung (excrement), and drink their own piss

with you?" Back in those days, sometimes a strong army would surround a walled city for a long time and starve the people into surrendering.

Here, we see that there were indeed some people among the Jews who spoke Aramaic. And obviously, they could read and write in Aramaic. But most of the common people could not. The only way, in modern times, that we can know for sure what language anyone spoke, back then, is to find old writings from those days. And, sure enough, there do exist many Aramaic writings all over the place, back then. But, that doesn't mean that everyone was speaking Aramaic, back then. The Syrians, who spoke Aramaic, had a conquering army that dominated all of the surrounding countries. And, as would be expected, all of the written communications to and from the people that they had conquered would be in the conqueror's language, just as it was done in all of the modern British and Spanish colonies around the world. That's why we're speaking English right now. And, that's why this article is in English.

But, all of the people who were conquered did not speak the conqueror's language immediately at the beginning. For an entire society to switch to a different language, it takes a long time, especially back in the days before they had public schools that could teach foreign languages. But, in the case of the Jews, they had their Hebrew Bible to keep them from abandoning Hebrew. And, there's no reason why they couldn't be bilingual, back then. But, at the time of this writing in, [2Kings 18:26-27](#), Aramaic was only spoken by a few people, none of the common people spoke Aramaic.

The original language of the New Testament, which was written after the resurrection of Jesus Christ, was done entirely in Greek. At that time Israel was part of the Roman Empire. But shortly before being the Roman Empire, it was the Greek Empire, conquered by Alexander. So, before it was the Roman Empire, most people had already learned Greek. Even the Romans learned Greek, as their second international language. Therefore the international language at that time and place was Greek, even though it was the Roman Empire. Back then, many people were bilingual, Hebrew was the local language in Israel and Greek was the international language for speaking to whatever foreigners who were from outside of Israel. [Luke 23:38](#) **"And a superscription also was written over him (Jesus on the cross) in letters of Greek (Ἑλληνικοῖς), and Latin (Ρωμαϊκοῖς), and Hebrew (Ἑβραϊκοῖς), THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS."** Aramaic was not among the top 3 languages spoken in Israel at the time of Jesus Christ. The three most spoken languages were Greek, Latin and Hebrew.

I have even seen a translation into English, of this verse, that the word "Hebrew" was translated "Aramaic", because the translator was taught that the people were speaking Aramaic at the time of Christ. Errors, errors, errors, errors. But, in this case: lies, lies, lies, lies. They know they're lying. The *supposed* "experts" going around saying that Aramaic was the common spoken language back then, know that they are

lying. (They're part of the "wolves in sheep's clothing" trying to discredit the original New Testament Bible language.) The people in those days, in Jerusalem spoke Greek, Latin and Hebrew, **not** Aramaic. A few people knew Aramaic, but the majority did not. There have been found some writings from that time in Aramaic, but the majority of the people could not read them.

The native Roman language, in Italy, was Latin (Ρωμαϊκοῖς), but their international language was Greek (Ἑλληνικοῖς). **Act 21:37** ".....May I speak unto thee? Who said, Canst thou speak **Greek**?" (ἐλληνιστι γινωσκεις – do you know Greek?) The Romans usually spoke to the Jews in Greek. Most Romans could not speak Hebrew and most Jews could not speak Latin, but they both usually spoke Greek, as their second language. **Rev 9:11** ".....whose name in the **Hebrew** tongue is Abaddon, but in the **Greek** tongue hath his name Apollyon." **Act 21:40** "....And when there was made a great silence, he spake unto them in the **Hebrew** tongue, saying,....." **Act 22:2** "(And when they heard that he spake in the **Hebrew** tongue to them, they kept the more silence: and he saith,....)" **Act 26:14** ".....I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the **Hebrew** tongue, Saul, Saul," **Rev 16:16** ".....a place called in the **Hebrew** tongue Armageddon."

When the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus was hired by the Roman government to write a history of the people of Israel called: "Antiquities of the Jews", he wrote it in Greek. He also wrote the history of the Roman conquest of Israel, called the "Jewish War" including the "Siege of Masada", in Greek. These books have now been translated into English, and are available **free** on www.e-sword.net.

All of the new places that the Romans conquered, which were not conquered by the Greeks, like Western Europe, were taught Latin, as their international language. The people in Spain completely switched to Latin. Modern Spanish is nothing more than Latin, which has changed, little by little, over 2,000 years. This is why modern Spanish speakers are often called "Latinos".

Especially, before the invention of the printing press, when there were no public schools and most common people couldn't read, language changed much more, from one generation to the next. Italian is also modern Latin, but since it was in a different location, it changed differently than it did in Spain. This is why modern Italian is very similar to modern Spanish. (Yet they are different enough so that they cannot speak to each other and be understood.)

In modern times, the international language around the world is English. All over the world, most people who learn a second language usually learn English. In modern Israel, when Jews (who speak Hebrew עברי) want to talk to Palestinians (who speak Arabic أَرَابُ), they usually do it in English. When Egyptians (who speak Arabic أَرَابُ) want to talk to Spanish speakers, they usually do it in English. When Italians want to go on vacation in South America they usually make the reservations in English, etc. (The Italians usually don't speak Spanish, and the South Americans usually don't speak Italian, but they both usually speak English, as their second international lan-

guage.)

There is another problem of certain individuals going around saying that at the time of Jesus Christ everyone spoke Aramaic in Israel. (Example, the 2004 film: The Passion of the Christ.) This is done by dishonest people for no other reason than to discredit the original language (Greek) texts of the New Testament. It's about as ridiculous as someone telling a new immigrant, in the US, that Richard Nixon was the first president of the United States. Normally, that would be a funny gag on the new immigrant, because the new immigrant would probably believe it. But, if it was done by a real history teacher in a real history classroom, you would wonder what the teacher's motives were for doing such a thing.

Any supposed "expert" going around saying that Aramaic was the original language of the New Testament and the main language spoken in Israel at the time of Christ is a liar and is easily disproved. **Luke 23:38** "And a superscription also was written over him (Jesus on the cross) in letters of **Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.**" Here, we see that the three languages commonly spoken in Israel at the time of Christ are clearly stated: Greek, Latin and Hebrew. Aramaic was not even among the top three.

This absurd teaching of Aramaic has gone so far as to alter the definition of the word "Hebrew" in an interlinear of the New Testament. An interlinear has lines of writing in the original language, and then an English word below each Greek word showing the definition of each Greek word into English. The person doing the translating in this case used the word "Aramaic" under the Greek word for "Hebrew" because they had been taught that everyone at the time of Jesus Christ were speaking Aramaic. But, the Greek word for "Hebrew" (Ἑβραϊκοῖς) means "Hebrew". The New Testament specifically states that they were speaking Hebrew, yet because of this false teaching, the supposedly professional translator used the word "Aramaic" for "Hebrew", thereby altering the clear statement that it was Hebrew which was spoken in Israel at that time. This Greek/English interlinear NT, with the "Aramaic" substitutions, is the one available free on "Play store" for smart-phones.

Most of the people following this teaching don't even know where Aramaic comes from. Most of the people following this teaching are usually completely ignorant of what is going on, like a new immigrant who accepts the idea that Nixon was the first president, because he knows absolutely nothing about American history.

Aramaic was the language that the Jews learned during the Babylonian captivity. The Jews were conquered by the Babylonians. (2Kings 24) The Assyrians also spoke Aramaic during their empire, later on. When the Jews returned to Israel after living in Babylonia, obviously they had already learned to speak the language of the Babylonians. By then, they were probably all bilingual. But, there is no reason to

believe that they abandoned their native language of Hebrew. It must also be understood that when they first returned from Babylonia to Israel, they were still under the authority and rule of the Babylonian Empire.

Obviously, it would be expected to find a few documents written in that language, but this does not mean that they were speaking Aramaic as their only language. There are also many more documents that can be found written in the Hebrew language. Later on, they learned to speak Greek because the Greeks had conquered the empire, but that does not mean that they abandoned their native language of Hebrew. They were bilingual. This was a common condition in those days, many people learned the language of the ruling empire at that time, and also continued speaking their native language.

Another result of the Babylonian captivity was that from that point on, they began writing all of their Hebrew using the Aramaic alphabet. This may be one of the leading reasons why some people have concluded that they continued speaking Aramaic and abandoned Hebrew altogether. But, this was probably more of an artistic change; the Babylonian letters were more attractive than the old Hebrew letters. (see: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Hebrew_alphabet)

When Jesus read from the book of Isaiah in the temple, obviously he was reading from the original Hebrew OT. (Luke 4:16-19) Jesus also said that the Hebrew jots and tittles would not fail. Mat 5:18 “.... Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise (no way) pass from the law.....” If they were all speaking exclusively Aramaic, why would he talk about the Hebrew jots and tittles in this manner? When Paul spoke to the people in Jerusalem, he spoke in Hebrew, Acts 22:2 “And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence....”

But, the main subject of this article is not about what language they were speaking at the time of Jesus Christ. The question is, what language was the New Testament originally written in? At that time, the international language was Greek. Even the Romans spoke Greek. (Acts 21:37) If they wrote in ANY other language, nobody outside of their own little area could have read it. Most of the people following this teaching about Aramaic probably don't even know what Hebrew jots or tittles are. In fact, they probably don't even know that when Jesus was talking about the jots and tittles, he was referring to the original Hebrew OT. And, most people who follow this teaching don't know that the purpose of claiming that Aramaic was the only language spoken in Israel at that time is done for no other reason than to make an attack on the original Greek NT, and an attack on the Hebrew OT; they want to discredit the original language of the Bible, and claim that their Aramaic translation was the original language Bible text.

After Alexander conquered the empire, they all learned to speak Greek. So, why would anyone insist on claiming that in Israel they continued speaking exclusively the language of the previous empire, which was long gone for hundreds of years, while all the other countries in the Greek empire were speaking **Greek**? Even the Romans

were speaking Greek. [Act 21:37](#) “And as Paul was to be led into the castle, he said unto the chief captain, May I speak unto thee? Who said, Canst thou speak **Greek?**”

Yet another difficulty with the New Testament is the abundance of original language Greek copies with variations in the text. When the NT was translated into English, it was necessary to select an old copy of the NT from the original language to translate from. However, when they look at the old original language copies of the NT, those copies are not in agreement with each other. There are many passages where the content is different. One copy says something and another copy says something else. So, the question is, which copy should be used to translate into English?

It must be understood that many years ago all books were copied by hand. The first printing press was not invented until 1440, by Johannes Gutenberg in Germany. Some people even go so far as to say that it is impossible for anyone to copy an entire book without making **lots and lots and lots and lots and lots** of mistakes. However, more than 99.99% of modern books are printed with zero typeset errors. By which, we know that it is not only possible, but probable (99.99%) that a book can be copied cover to cover without errors. In modern times, they use very advanced machinery to print books. But, a human being still has to arrange the words that go on the pages, equally as much as they did back then.

Notice that there are many different writing situations which will produce many different writing results. For example, someone writing a text message on their cell phone will produce a much different quality of writing, as compared to someone doing type-setting for a book. Not only that, but a more extreme case is when someone has so many text messages that they don't even have enough time to read them all, much less answer them all. In such cases, they would have to guess at which ones would be the most important ones and ignore all the rest. Then, all the answers would have to be speed-typed, with no time to re-check the quality of their answers. Even worse would be trying to do it on a cell phone with an on-screen keyboard and auto-correct making unknown changes as you are typing along. And, add to that, using two different languages, in which the auto-correct tends to go crazy. This is why, from time to time, we sometimes get messages that are hardly readable, that have to be interpreted by analyzing the most probable meaning.

Comparing quality of writing results between different writing situations is not really fair. You can expect higher quality results from a book type-set expert as compared to someone rushed for time typing on their cell phone keyboard along with auto-correct making changes along the way. (Please notice that when auto-correct makes inappropriate changes, many times the sentence does not even make sense. But, all of the variations in NT copies ALL make sense. Not one of them looks like an error.)

But, in real life hand copying situations, when a person is speed copying by

hand, what do the errors look like? Most of those errors form sentences that don't make sense. Right? Yes, right. So, then why do ALL of the variations in the old copies of the NT look like normal sentences? Obviously, because they are NOT speed copying mistakes. The person copying deliberately changed it.

However, the situation regarding the Bible is that all the supposed "Bible experts" who are handling Bible translating and the original language copies, are telling us that it's normal to have **lots and lots and lots and lots and lots and lots** of mistakes in Bible copies because human beings are not perfect and it's impossible to expect us to have a perfect copy of the Bible. But the truth is that almost all modern books are printed cover-to-cover with zero typographical or content errors.

And Jesus taught us that, [Mat 5:18](#) ".....Till heaven and earth pass, one **jot** or one **tittle** shall in no wise (no way) pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." (The "**jot**" and "**tittle**" are Hebrew. The "**jot**" (יֹטֵט, יוֹטֵט) is the smallest Hebrew letter and the "**tittle**" (קֶרַיִם, קֶרַיִם) is the smallest part of a Hebrew letter.) The only people who make lots and lots and lots of mistakes are people who write very carelessly, and are sloppy and negligent. In addition, if it was true that those people were making so many mistakes, it wouldn't take very long, over the years, before the entire text would no longer make any sense whatsoever. But, it does make sense, because those changes were NOT caused by "accidental mistakes" in copying. Those changes were caused by the copiest deliberately altering the text. And ALL of the changes were natural sounding sentences which always made perfect sense. None of the alterations were "accidental" copy mistakes. ALL of the alterations were due to deliberate sabotage.

If a person was working for a book publishing company, and they were making lots and lots and lots of mistakes, they would get fired. If any person working for any company doing any type of work with that level of low quality, they would get fired. The real reason why those supposed "Bible experts" say stuff like that is because they are the type of people responsible for the abundance of alterations in the NT Bible copies in the original language. They are what Jesus called "wolves in sheep's clothing". (See article listed below on: [Wolves in Sheep's Clothing](#).) None of the variations in those original language Bible copies are due to accidental mistakes. None of them look like errors. ALL the variations were caused by deliberate acts of sabotage. The copier wanted the copy to be accepted as true and accurate. If the copy was full of spelling mistakes and sentences that made no sense, who would accept it as a correct copy of the authentic New Testament? Nobody.

Please notice, when a person makes a mistake while copying, it normally looks like a mistake. Either it is a misspelled word or a grammar mistake which makes the sentences not make sense. Such mistakes don't look like a natural normal sentences. But **ALL** of the variations in the Greek NT do **not** look like mistakes. Every last one looks like a normal natural correct sentence. It is very obvious that the cause of the variations is not due to copy mistakes. ALL the variations were caused by deliberate acts of sabotage. And, they wanted it to look normal and be accepted as a

correct copy. And, the discrepancy couldn't even be noticed unless the reader had access to the original text and could read them both side by side, which was very rare back in those days, when books were scarce. In those days most churches didn't have more than one copy of the Bible for the entire congregation.

The "Bible scholars" who always say that Bible copying must always be expected to contain **lots and lots and lots and lots and lots and lots and lots** of mistakes are making unjustifiable comparisons. It ought to be expected that high-quality professional copying will produce cover-to-cover perfect copies with zero errors. Almost all modern books published from a book publishing company are printed cover-to-cover with zero errors.

But, if you want to find a modern book with typeset errors, you have to look for special unusual conditions. The most common kind of books with typeset errors would be the best books about spiritual life, because the person doing the typeset for the printing of the book usually was not interested in the spiritual message of the book and wanted to avoid reading the content. And, who knows, maybe they were even drunk on the job. Two examples of this phenomenon would be books about Charles Finney, an early American evangelist or Watchman Nee, a Chinese evangelist. Notice that all of the errors are either spelling errors, or grammar errors which leave a sentence not making sense. Notice – all of the Greek copies of the NT make perfect sense. All of the variations look like normal natural sentences. The variations are ALL due to deliberate alterations by the copiers. None of the differences are due to accidental mistakes. The copier wanted the copy to be accepted as true and authentic.

If indeed the copy had a lot of obvious mistakes, it never would have been accepted as a correct copy. It probably would have gotten burned. So, the copier made sure that no errors were detectable.

Another case of finding typeset errors was back, years ago, when the first black man, namely Scott Joplin, started to write and publish his music on paper. In this case it was a racist problem. The printers were white people who resented the idea that black people were capable of writing quality music. At that time most black musicians could not even read music, much less could they write quality sheet music. Scott Joplin was the first black man to publish his music on paper. At first, he would send it to the publisher, but the print would come back loaded with errors. So, he had to switch to a different publisher. But later, after he was long dead, his music was used as background music in the 1973 film "The Sting", for which it won an Oscar for music. And in 1976, his opera "Treemonisha" was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for music. (See "Treemonisha" on youtube.)

Those typeset errors in Joplin's music probably weren't caused by deliberate sabotage. It was probably due to negligence, laziness, disrespect or even lack of interest. But, regardless of the cause, printing with lots of errors was not their normal

habit. These are the types of conditions for copying documents, which would produce non-understandable errors; sentences that don't make sense.

But, we do **not** find non-understandable sentences in those corrupted Greek NT copies. **All** of the alterations make sense. They are **all** grammatically correct, with no spelling errors. So, it must be concluded that the cause of the alterations in those Bible copies was due to deliberate sabotage. The copier deliberately changed it.

Believe it or not, many book collectors actually pay extra money for old books with print errors in them. In most cases the errors are in first editions of old books. Those errors were always corrected in later revisions. So, keep in mind, that in book publishing, older is usually NOT better. Even the KJV Bible, when it first came off the printing press, had type-setting errors in it. The reason why the "critical text" people say that the older hand written Bible copies are better is because they assume that the alterations are an accumulation of the accidental mistakes of many copiers down through the years. They also assume that those copiers were always bad at the job, as though it had to be that way.

Or, they compare them to someone speed-typing text messages on their cell phone, who doesn't even have time to double check their own writing. Instead of comparing them to modern book publishing, where that same type of bad copying would get the type-set person fired. Why do they insist that the old time copiers must always have been bad at the job of copying? It sounds more like those old time copiers were usually "wolves in sheep's clothing". And all of these modern Bible "experts" always talk as though there is no enemy attacking the Bible. (Satan)

But now, with the example of book type-setting perfection, we can see that the age of the copy is irrelevant. What matters is the professionalism of the copier. In some cases, there have been hand written Bible copiers who checked and rechecked the accuracy of their copies with such extreme precision that, with confidence, they used to burn the older copies after they finished making the new ones. And, in some cases, they even counted the letters and got an exact number. The old time *masoras* who made the Masoretic Hebrew Text were famous for making their copies with such perfection that, with confidence, they used to burn the old previous text.

And indeed, their copies were the best, not because of being either older or being younger, but because of the accuracy of the professionalism with which they did their job. And also, those copiers who used to burn the old ones never had to worry about somebody coming along years later with another older different copy saying that the newer copy had something wrong with it. If all the older copies were burnt, there could never exist any older copies of any kind. It was their professionalism that made their newer copies to be high quality, with confidence. They knew that a book can be copied letter-for-letter perfect, and that it was best not to leave old copies laying around, which could have been contaminated by bad people a long time ago.

Even in computer programming, they have a similar type of condition. Pro-

gramming errors come in two different forms, bugs and viruses. Bugs are accidental errors made by the programmer while writing the computer code. **Most** (but not all) of those errors are grammatically incorrect (in computer code) and cause the program to crash before even starting to run. (It won't even start to run.) But, occasionally a bug, which must be grammatically correct, in order to start running, will not cause a crash at the beginning of running the program, but it will cause a problem, in the results of the program. It is very rare that a bug will even permit the program to run at all. Most bugs don't make sense in computer code, therefore they don't run.

Viruses, on the other hand, are deliberate acts of sabotage. Both bugs and viruses cause problems. But, normally viruses have a characteristic about them that identifies them as being a deliberate act of sabotage; extra code must be written in order to cause the effect of the virus. To anyone who can read the code, the deliberate intent of sabotage is obvious. The extra code itself is clearly made to cause trouble. As compared to Bible copying, the reader would have to be able to compare the new copy with the old copy to see that the new copy did not match the old copy. Unfortunately, back in those days the readers usually did not have the opportunity to make that comparison. Back then, nobody had their own personal copy of the Bible as they do in modern times. Normally, there was only one copy for each congregation.

In modern times, when people read the Bible in church services, it is obvious that the Bibles don't match. But now, the people just sit in confusion because they have no idea which one is closer to the originals. Plus, they have their satanic spy pastors telling them that it doesn't matter anyway. And, in some cases, the pastor tells them that there is no possible means to make any correct determination on the matter.

However, in the copies of NT Greek, they must be grammatically correct with correct spelling, or else the first readers would immediately see the errors and know that the copy was flawed. Obviously, the saboteur wanted their bad copy to be accepted, so it was important that their new copy was grammatically correct with no spelling errors. So, **ALL** of the sentences had to make perfect sense.

However, all the modern Bible "experts" have been taught so effectively that all the variations were caused by accidental mistakes that the idea of deliberate sabotage is not even thought of. And the truth is, that most accidental errors, like computer code bugs, will leave the text **not** understandable, and the computer program won't even run. In comparison, the alterations in the Greek Bible NT copies are never non-understandable. Therefore, those alterations in content are **NOT** due to accidental copy errors, they are **ALL** due to deliberate sabotage.

Of course, in some special cases, it is possible for the saboteur to write a computer virus in such a way that it looks like a legitimate accidental mistake (a bug). For example, in Linux and Macintosh there are no viruses because all their programs are always checked before being placed into the repository. However, if a saboteur were to write the error so that it looked like a bug instead of a virus, then it would never

be suspected as a deliberate act of sabotage. If a saboteur were to write a virus the way most viruses are written, it would be identified clearly as a virus, a deliberate act of sabotage, and the saboteur would be identified for who he really is.

The saboteur would also have to get inside the organization. In Linux, that's easy. Anyone can join Linux. The door is always open for anyone to become a member. So, if a saboteur could make his viruses look like bugs, he could do a lot of damage from the inside of the organization, without anyone suspecting that he is a saboteur.

But, in the case of those copy errors in the Greek NT, none of the errors are grammatically incorrect. All of the content is understandable with no apparent grammar errors and no spelling errors. **ALL** of the sentences make perfect sense. Therefore, it can be concluded that the copier (saboteur) intended that the reader should accept the copy as authentic. **All** of the alterations were made with no grammatical or spelling errors of any kind. Remember that in those early days, the reader usually had no access to any other copies. Each church had only one copy of the Bible. So, they could not compare what they were reading to anything else, and not even be aware of any variations.

Well, isn't an "honest error" possible? Not to the people who want to criticize me. If I have even so much as a comma out of place they will reject my entire work. They'll reject it for the smallest mistake, like maybe if I put two spaces instead of one. Meanwhile, all the Bible copiers who made lots and lots and lots of "variations" (which they call "honest errors") are treated by them as normal and acceptable. They claim that those people who put "variations" in the Bible were closest in time to the originals, and therefore those must be the best copies. And, they think that the "alterations" came later. So, they say that the earlier "variations" were the correct reading, because they were the closest in time to the originals. They claim that their multitude of "variations" is normal and ought to be accepted.

Actually, the problem here is a failure to recognize the definition of the word "error". The supposed Bible "experts" call the "variations": "honest accidental errors". But that's not what they are. An "error" is something like a misspelled word or a grammar mistake, which makes the sentence to **not** be understandable. But none of the alterations found in all those multitude of Bible variations is a misspelled word or grammar mistake. **ALL** of their sentences are understandable. They are **NOT** "errors". They are **ALL** deliberate alterations of the content in the text. The copier changed the content deliberately. And obviously, if their alterations were sentences that didn't make sense, it would have been rejected, immediately.

But, the people who believe in the "critical text" say that all of the variations are due to "honest mistakes" while copying. Whatever was the intention of the copier, the "critical text" can never be anything other than what is **NOT** the original Bible. So, why do so many of the modern Bible "experts" believe in the "critical text"? Obviously, they must be "wolves in sheep's clothing". They recognize it as a bunch of alterations,

which is exactly what they want. They're working for Satan.

And, in modern book publishing, "honest errors" are unacceptable negligence and carelessness. The person responsible would absolutely get fired. How often do you see "errors" like that in modern books? Well, usually those kinds of "honest errors" made by beginners in a modern book publishing company would get caught by proof readers before the work went to press.

Most "honest errors" due to negligence of the copier are not understandable. Whereas, **ALL** of the Greek NT variations are **always, always, always** perfectly understandable normal sentences. Why? Because they're **not** "errors". They are **ALL** deliberate changes. The copiers were saboteurs.

All of those old hand copied "supposed" mistakes in the Bible, from before the invention of the printing press, were grammatically correct. For example: if the word "Bible" was repeated two times in a row in the previous sentence, it would be grammatically incorrect, and the error would be obvious, along with the obvious real meaning. However, if the word "Bible" was missing, the sentence would also be grammatically incorrect, but the meaning would not be obvious and the reader would know that a mistake had been made; the sentence itself would not make sense. The reader would know that something is wrong with it.

But in those many variations of different copies of the original language Greek New Testament, none of them have the type of grammatical error in them that would leave them not making sense. Example: [Rev 22:19](#) "..... his part out of the **book** of life...." **KJV** as compared to the same verse in the WEB translation: [Rev 22:19](#) "..... his part from the **tree** of life....." **WEB** The word "**book**" (βιβλου) is altered to the word "**tree**" (ξυλου). Obviously, this was **no** accidental copy mistake. Somebody deliberately changed it. Both sentences are grammatically correct; both make sense. (Interestingly, the context of this passage is talking about the very subject of deliberately altering the content of the Bible, while copying.)

Remember, **most** accidental copy mistakes make no sense. However, **all** of the variations in those many Greek texts are always grammatically correct; they **all** make sense. This absolutely confirms that the variations were **not** due to accidental copy mistakes. Copy mistakes usually do not make sense, don't make sense, don't make sense, make sense, make sense, mayq sence, mayk cents. These errors are obvious, and grammatically incorrect. But, the alterations in the Bible are never obvious errors; they **ALL** make sense..... **NONE** of the alterations are accidental mistakes. In fact, if it is true that all those variations were due to accidental errors during copying, soon the entire text would not make any sense whatsoever.

In fact, if the alterations were indeed caused by accidental mistakes, by now, after so many years of re-copying lots and lots of mistakes, the entire New Testament would **not** make any sense at all. If their explanation of the alterations was really due

to honest accidental copy mistakes, then the entire New Testament would be nothing but a mass of non-understandable writings which nobody could read.

The cause for the variations is that certain persons deliberately tampered with the content; changing it on purpose while copying it by hand very shortly after the originals were written. (These were possibly even copied directly from the first originals.) Those copyists did not respect it as the Holy Word of God and felt free to alter it any way they wanted. All of the modern, supposed “experts” that insist that the alterations are due to honest accidental mistakes, refuse to recognize that there is an enemy attacking the Word of God. They are pretending that Satan, and his workers, don’t exist. Therefore, they themselves are workers from Satan. They have clearly identified themselves. **ALL** of the “critical text” Bible scholars are enemies working for Satan. Jesus called them “wolves in sheep’s clothing”. (Mat 7:15)

Interestingly, no other ancient writing was treated with such disrespect. Why are none of the other ancient writings loaded with these types of alterations? Notice – I did not say that other ancient texts never have errors. Well, I never took the time to examine them, but the safest bet is that they don’t have one single error. (If they have any errors at all, those errors always look like errors. Real errors usually make no sense.) Those ancient writings don’t have a **multitude** of obviously deliberate alterations, which are always grammatically correct; which always make sense.

Making a hand written copy was a big and expensive job in those days. (The writing materials themselves were very expensive back then. Cheap paper is exclusively a modern reality.) So, why would anyone value the text so much to go through all that work and expense, yet at the same time mistreat the content of the text in this manner? Back when the writing materials were expensive, the only people who would be handling it would be expert copyists, NOT negligent sloppy people who are incapable of copying a single page without errors. Those errors could NOT have been accepted unless there was nobody checking for errors.

In addition, most of the time, after those deliberate alterations were made, another problem was that, later on, many times the copier had more than one text of the Greek NT in front of him that he was copying from, which were different. As a result, most of the later copies were actually a combination of several of the previous texts. The person copying literally mixed them together by selecting from a different previous text in each passage, whichever one the copier felt was best in each passage..... and obviously, from that point on, it is impossible to tell which words were in the originals. But, modern “Bible experts” always say that they can know somehow from their abundance of knowledge how to determine which words are correct. **NO!** And every time they make another “critical text” using their “expert” methodology, they come up with a completely different text. There is no such possible “expert” methodology that they could possibly use to arrive at the perfect originals.

Therefore, the big question is: Which text is closest to the original? Also:

Which text should be used for translation into English? Which of our present English translations should be respected as the best? The oldest Greek copies have certain obvious flaws in them, on two occasions, half a chapter was missing. (Examples: John 7:53 – 8:11, Mark 16:9-20. (Both of these had content that was very radical and obviously was rejected by the copyist because the content was not accepted by the copyist.) In the Weymouth NT English translation from those texts, both are missing. In the TCNT translation only John is missing. Some English translations, which use those corrupted Greek old copies (the critical text), borrow these passages from the “Received Text”, but italicize or gray letter the text.) Obviously, the copier felt free to alter the text, and therefore such a copy should not be trusted as being faithful to the originals. These same copies also have many full sentences and phrases missing, hundreds of them, changes **on every page** throughout the entire NT.

Again, the same question has to be asked: Which text is closest to the original? That would be the one which was faithfully copied correctly down through the years, without making any alterations of any kind. Any “critical text” conglomeration which uses **ANY** “expert” methodology of making selections from the “oldest” copies (which are the ones in the most disagreement) cannot ever arrive at the same content as the original text from the authors of the New Testament. **ALL** of their “expert” methodology is incapable of producing an equal text to the original content of the NT authors. And, those people who claim to be “experts” are really “wolves in sheep’s clothing” who deliberately want to promote the wrong text of the NT.

This mindset (the older copies are the best) is based on the assumption that the cause of the changes, over the years, is due to accidental mistakes by the copiers. (Can adding half a chapter be an accidental copy mistake? NO) (And they ignore the fact that the most extreme alterations were made in those texts considered closest (in time) to the originals, which completely disproves the theory that the alterations are the result of honest accidental mistakes by the copiers over many years. If their mindset is true then the biggest changes should have happened as late as possible, not as early as possible. It should not be expected that if you compare several of those texts, which were very close in time to the originals, to find them in very extreme disagreement with each other.)

Those supposed “experts” who insist that the alterations were due to honest accidental mistakes by the copiers, while copying by hand, are forced to change this premise when they come to an entire verse added. (Likewise, when half a chapter is added.) But, when it’s an individual word which is altered, they switch back to saying that it must have been an accidental copy mistake. And why do they insist that **ALL** of the copiers were **ALWAYS** extremely bad at the job of copying? Any child could do a better job of copying than they did.

This “accidental mistake” mindset is indirectly stating that God has no enemy. Satan does not exist, according to them. Nobody is attacking the Word of God. They

are insisting that **ALL** of the people involved in copying the Bible are good and honest, yet at the same time the copiers were hopelessly incompetent and disqualified for the job. Therefore, this “older is better” mentality should be considered as one of those bad doctrines (teachings) spoken about in 1Timothy. **1Tim 4:1,2** “Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and **doctrines of devils**; 2- Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron;” The teaching that the oldest copies are the best because they are closest in time to the originals, is indeed a “**doctrine of devils**”. ALL of the Bible scholars who teach this “critical text” way of thinking must be avoided. They are ALL workers of Satan.

And ALL modern English Bibles which are based on the “critical text” should be avoided. **Very few** modern English Bibles, which use a modern English way of speaking, are not translated from the “critical text”. Obviously, any church that attempts to rid its members from this contamination will experience a tremendous conflict. The churches know that in order to keep the peace, it is necessary to avoid this subject. Well, those churches are lukewarm in the faith. Jesus Christ will vomit them out of his mouth. **Rev 3:16** “So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue (vomit) thee out of my mouth.”

Also, since many centuries have passed, it is assumed that the alterations have accumulated over the years, each copier contributing a little, which is why there are so many alterations on every page of the NT. (And they ignore the fact that other ancient writings don't have this problem. If they want to read Plato or Josephus, they don't find a **multitude** of these kinds of deliberate alterations in content. Notice – I did not say that other ancient texts never have errors. I said that they don't have a **multitude** of obviously deliberate alterations. However, it's reasonable to say that if you tried to find an error in one of those other ancient writings, you would spend a lot of time and work, and the odds are that you would more than likely never find even one error. [Remember, errors look like errors, but deliberate alterations don't look like errors.] This means, that any errors that those other writings have would usually be grammatically incorrect, spelling errors or errors that leave the text not making sense.) All of these modern supposed “experts” who examine the old Greek NT copies have been well trained to accept the very, very, very bad workmanship of the old Bible copiers as being normal. And that they accept the idea of deliberate sabotage of Satanic workers in the church doesn't exist.

And, how about their Latin translation, which was originally made at the beginning of the Roman Catholic Church? Is there a multitude of the same type of alterations in that, as well? Or, were the Latin Bibles copied more like almost every modern book..... cover to cover with not even one error? I myself don't read Latin, so I don't know. So, why don't they notice the difference? Why is their Latin Bible not loaded with a multitude of the same type of errors? Well, their Latin Bible was translated according to those oldest Greek New Testaments that have all those alterations in them. But, has their Latin Bible been changed since it was translated? Is it loaded

with a lot of additional alterations? (Probably not.)

So then, in the Greek original language NT, **ALL** of the alterations make sense. Therefore, the cause of the changes must be due to someone deliberately changing the content, very shortly after it was written; someone who wanted their copy to be accepted as true. And, don't forget the problem that later copiers combined several previous texts together. That is, almost always, when somebody made a copy, they had more than one text that they were copying from. So, every time those copies were different, the copier would just pick whichever words they wanted. And who knows, maybe creating a few new changes whenever they wanted.

Those oldest corrupt Greek NT Bibles were also kept packed away in closets and not used for a long time (2,000 years) by people who really didn't care about the Bible. People who love the Bible always wear the book out from constantly using it.

During the European Renaissance, when there was a revival in Christianity, and many people were starting to break away from the Roman Catholic domination (corruption) of Christianity. Along with the revival there appeared a new (different) Greek copy of the New Testament, which was different from the Roman Catholic Latin translation, which had been the only Bible used for many years. (They considered Latin to be a sacred language, even though it was a translation. It was **not** the original language of the Bible.)

This different copy of the Greek NT was, from then on, exclusively used for translating into many European languages, at that time, thereby sparking the revival. This Greek New Testament was called the "Received Text" (in Latin: "Textus Receptus"), which was copied with the idea of simply making an identical copy of the previous "received" text without any changes. And amazingly, it seems to have appeared out of nowhere. The providers were always anonymous. Those were the days when the Roman Catholic Church used to kill anyone who spoke against their church. Most commonly they would burn people at the stake.

Strange thing, all those "experts" who say that the variations are due to accidental mistakes, when they see the RT, they insist that the variations in the RT must be due to someone deliberately altering the content. But, they don't stop and think, if the alterations are due to someone making deliberate changes, then the "time" factor is irrelevant. Then, the alterations could have been made very early equally as well as very late.

But, one thing is for sure; during the renaissance revival **ALL** of the translators who translated the Bible into the commonly spoken languages used the RT. It was unanimous, **none** of the revivalist translators trusted the oldest copies of the Greek NT, which were from the Roman Catholic Church. Neither did they translate from the Latin Bible.

At that time, none of the Roman Catholic Greek or Latin Bibles were used for

translating into any commonly spoken language. All of the people who translated the NT into the common languages, at that time, unanimously rejected the Latin Bible that came out of the Roman Catholic Church or the Greek texts from the Greek Orthodox Church.

In modern times, almost all of the modern English translations use primarily those oldest corrupted Roman Catholic Greek NT Bibles as their main texts. There are very few exceptions. As compared to the time of the Renaissance revival translations when those older Greek and Latin Bibles were unanimously rejected for translating, back then. It's also important to know that the Roman Catholic Church did not want anyone translating into any commonly spoken language. They considered Latin to be a sacred language, and they expected people to learn Latin if they wanted to read the Bible.

I repeat, ALL of the Greek New Testaments that come from the Roman Catholic Church must be rejected as a source for translating. It doesn't matter that they are older than the RT. The alterations were **NOT** caused by accidental mistakes while copying. ALL of these corrupt modern English translations which were translated from those oldest corrupt Greek texts must be rejected and considered unsuitable for spiritual use. Which ones are those? Amazingly, most modern pastors can't tell the difference, yet there are alterations on every page of the NT. The most faithful translation in English is the King James Version.

There are some people who say things like: "Those changes are only small things and don't really alter anything important in the real message of the Bible." Well, that is a comment made by someone who has never even made an investigation into the matter, and who obviously doesn't really care about the Bible. The truth is that some of the changes are indeed part of the important message of the Bible. **Rev 22:19** "And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the **book of life**, and out of the holy city,....." Those people who don't care about words being altered from the Word of God will not be found written in the "**book of life**", nor will they be able to enter into the "holy city", which is the New City of Jerusalem. It's very interesting how; in this same verse an alteration has been made. In those bad translations the word "**book of life**" has been changed to "**tree of life**". And all of the people who don't care about this discrepancy will not have their name written in the "**book of life**", nor will they have any part in the New City of Jerusalem. (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.)

(Notice – It must not be interpreted that every person who uses a good Bible is always good in the faith. Nor can it be interpreted that every person who uses a bad Bible is always bad in the faith. Most people who read the Bible don't have any idea whether the Bible they're reading is good or bad. Even the worst Bible still contains the basic message of salvation. People need to be informed on the subject. Martin Luther (not M.L.King. Martin Luther King was named after this man.) started out with the corrupt Latin translation from the Catholic Church, but later he changed to the Received Text, and translated it into German in 1522.)

This European Renaissance revival represents the age of the church of Philadelphia in Rev. 3:7-13, which was a faithful church, yet a weak church. The seven churches mentioned in chapters two and three of the book of Revelation represent epochs in which, through history, a particular church was the most common type of church found at that particular time. (..... not denying the existence of the other types of churches in other places.) We are now living in the age of the lukewarm church of Laodicea (Rev. 3:14-21), especially in the US. (See article listed below on: The Luke-warm Church.)

Unfortunately, despite the idea of simply making an identical copy, the bad habit of combining different previous texts managed to lightly contaminate the “Received Text” as well. But please notice, that it was changed after it was put into the hands of the people who were already accustomed to comparing and adjusting the text while copying. Obviously, this was due to the fact that the people who got it, immediately made copies of it on the printing press (which was new at that time), and, as was their habit, they made alterations in it, combining it with other texts which they already had. They were accustomed to thinking that the Latin Bible was correct, and whenever the new Bible was different, they assumed it was wrong. And therefore, whenever they put it on the printing press they made deliberate alterations in the text. The idea that it was a perfect copy of the original New Testament was completely inconceivable to them. They were taught from their youth that the Latin Bible was the most correct, and so anything different must be wrong.

The name “Received Text” must have been tacked on by the people they got it from who didn’t like them changing it when they put in on the printing press. (Remember, the people who provided it stayed anonymous.) Yet, for translating, the translators trusted it more than any other text. However, the variations are much less than the other Greek texts, the older more corrupt copies. (As you get closer to the originals, in time, the variations are more extreme; the opposite of what should be expected, according to their theory.)

The name “Received Text” did not appear in writing until after the first people who got it (from an anonymous source) had made alterations in it. Those first publications of the RT were made by people in the main-line Catholic Church, who had gotten it from an unknown source. Where did it come from? The only thing that is known is the name of the person who put in on the printing press, who was NOT the originator of the text. We know the date of the print, and we know the style of the type-set, but we don’t know where it came from.

So, it wasn’t until after the people who had loaned them their hand copied RT text of the Greek New Testament, that they noticed that those people who were supposed to copy it correctly, on the new printing press, had made alterations in it. Every one of them made changes in it. Only years later after all those bad copies were already in print, finally in 1633, the anonymous providers found the printers called the Elzevir brothers who agreed not to change it. That’s when they put the name “Receiv-

ed Text” on it. The anonymous people who loaned them their original language NT Greek Bible had to tell them not to make changes in it. The Elzevir brothers were NOT Bible experts, they were only printers. They could not even read Greek. And they did not know how to make changes in it. The only people who made changes in it were the Greek scholars who could recognise that it didn’t say the same thing as their Latin Bible.

The name “Received Text” implies the understanding of copying it as it is without making any changes. But, those anonymous people, who had to stay in hiding due to the reputation of the Roman Catholics to burn anyone at the stake who opposed their church, previously could not stop those people who they loaned it to from altering it. So, by the time the RT made it to the printing press, in all of the previous prints, before 1633, it had already gotten altered. But, those alterations were very few in comparison to the ones in the corrupt oldest copies from the Roman Catholics. (Which is usually called the “critical text”, the one that was used to translate the Latin Bible, back then.) All of the prints of the Received Text have only very few alterations, in comparison.

The “critical text” is a combination of the oldest Greek texts found in the Roman Catholic Churches using a special methodology from their “expert” knowledge and education, that supposedly permits them to be able to reproduce the original content of the New Testament from the hands of the Apostles. However, it must be understood that once the content of a text has been changed, it is no longer possible for anyone to know what the original content was from any altered text. Their “expert” methodology is a false claim. Furthermore, it must be noted that the people who make this claim to be able to reproduce the original content of the first text, every few years they make another copy of their “critical text” which is always considerably different than their previous publication. So, if it is true that they are capable of reproducing the same content as the original text of the New Testament, then why would they change it? How can anyone have confidence in their ability to reproduce the same content as the original text if they later make changes in it?

Notice – in modern times everyone who refers to the “Received Texts”, which come from the same source, call it the “Received Text”. However, the people who put the words “Received Text” in the preface of their print wrote it claiming that all of the other ones had been contaminated with alterations. Therefore, there is a need in this article to specify between the one true RT and all the contaminated RT’s. So, from now on I will have to specify by stating either (true) RT or (contaminated) RTs.

The King James translators recognized that there were alterations in ALL of the copies of the RT at that time. When they translated the New Testament, in 1611, before the Elzevir 1633 had been printed, they did not use only one print of the Greek NT to translate from. They actually reconstructed the original (true) RT, which was from those anonymous providers by comparing several copies of the contaminated RTs together. Using this tactic of comparing several of the other corrupted prints, they could very easily identify where each printer made changes. (All of those changes

were also places where the Latin Bible was different from the (true) RT.) As a result, the content of the KJV (which was later printed by Scrivener) was identical to the content of the Elzevir 1633, the (true) RT.

Please notice, ALL of the variations in the (contaminated) RT were made by deliberate alterations. None of the variations were due to accidental mistakes; the same as all the other contaminations in **ALL** of the NT Greek texts, you know, the “critical text”.

Just here, we see a part of history which was never written down. The identity of the people that they got the (true) RT from was never stated, as far as I know. The only thing that clearly came from those unnamed people was the term “Received Text”, accompanied with the idea of just making a direct copy without tampering with the content. (They had to let people know that all the other prints had been contaminated) Because, the Catholic people who they loaned it to, for printing onto the new printing press, did not like it when it was different than their Latin Bible. So, whenever they noticed that it was different, they deliberately changed it. They assumed that the Latin Bible was correct and the new Greek Bible must be wrong.

For a long time, every time those Catholic Bible “experts” copied the New Testament of the Greek Bible, they had several copies in front of them which they were copying from. And, whenever those copies disagreed with each other, the copier would just select from whichever previous copy they wanted to fill in the discrepancy. So, when they obtained the faithful (true) RT, they were already in the habit of mixing previous copies together. But, the (contaminated) RT was never altered as much as those other oldest Catholic Bibles. The alterations in the (contaminated) RT were very few in comparison.

Can anyone identify who those people were who introduced the RT to the general public? At that time, they had to keep in hiding, because the Roman Catholic Church used to burn people at the stake, back then. They used to **murder** anyone who opposed the Catholic Church. **Rev 22:15** “For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and **murderers**, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.” **And 1Cor 6:9,10** “Know ye (y’all) not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, 10- Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.” The fact that the Roman Catholic Church used to **murder** people who were opposed to their corruption proves that they shall NOT “inherit the kingdom of God”. Any modern Roman Catholics who want to “inherit the kingdom of God” must renounce their allegiance to that bloody church, and its corrupt teachings. (See books like: “Babylon Mystery Religion: Ancient and Modern” by Ralph Woodrow. This book is on-line at: [https://archive.org/details/Babylon-Mystery-Religion-Ralph-Woodrow/.](https://archive.org/details/Babylon-Mystery-Religion-Ralph-Woodrow/))

The translation of the English King James NT 1611 (22 years before the Elzevirs 1633 print) uses a combination of several Greek texts, all considered to be part of the “family” of the “Received Text” with very few variations. (The KJV translators knew that the RT prints had been contaminated.) The KJV translators used mostly Theodore Beza's 1598 print, but occasionally borrowed from Robert Stephen's 1550 and 1551 prints, as their main Greek texts for translating the NT into English. (Notice how R. Stephen made a new print with a few alterations only one year after his first print. Altogether he made nine different publications, each one with a few alterations.) (I suspect that he knew exactly where all of the alterations were, because he himself was the person who altered the RT when he first put it on the printing press. Stephen also invented the system of chapters and verses, which is now used by all the New Testaments.)

The KJV translators also, occasionally used other editions made by Beza and Stephen. They also used the 1527 and 1535 editions of Erasmus, the Complutensian Polyglot of 1514/1522 and Colinaeus 1534, all considered to be part of the “family” of the “Received Text”. **After** the KJV was published in 1611, the Elzevir brothers Abraham and Bonaventure printed a Greek NT, which was the first time the term “Received Text” had ever been seen in print, which was put into the preface of their 1633 publication. So..... when the KJV was first published in 1611 the name “Received Test” had not yet been seen in print.

The King James translators were in a very unique situation. They had access to recent publications of several (contaminated) RT's. And they knew that indeed each publication was a contamination from the same identical RT, then they knew it could be concluded that wherever each print had made changes, it would be obvious that their alteration would be unique, and that all the other publications, in each spot, would be unanimous. In addition, all of the alterations were in locations where the Latin Bible was different from the (true) RT.

In other words, if all the publishers of those Greek (contaminated) RT New Testaments (used for translating the KJV) started with the same identical (true) RT, the alterations would be obvious just by seeing that each alteration was the only one not unanimous with the other (contaminated) publications of the RT. (It would also be a spot where the Latin Bible was different.) If we could get a copy of all those publications of the RT from back then, we could do the same thing today. But, supposedly, that's what the KJV translators did. This is very strong proof that ALL of the (contaminated) RT publications started from multiple hand written copies of identical NT Greek texts. It was clearly understood that the source of the (true) RT was a perfect copy of the original NT. That is to say, all over Europe, ALL of the hand-written copies of the RT were **identical**; a perfect copy of the original NT. The exact same as what the Apostles wrote, in the first century of the church.

In 1894, (283 years after the 1611 KJV was first printed) F. H. A. Scrivener made a composite Greek text that was the same combination of what they used to translate the King James NT in 1611. It is the Greek text that can be read side by side

with the English KJV NT, with the content being exactly identical. (Found at: www.esword.net.) (And after doing all that work, going the long way around, Scrivener never noticed that his finished work of the Greek content of the KJV, was the same as the Greek content in Elzevir 1633, 1641.)

The first time the name “Textus Receptus” was seen in print was in the preface of the 1633 Elzevir Greek edition of the NT. (22 years after the King James 1611 was first published. When the KJV was first published in 1611, the term “Received Text” had never been seen in writing before that time. And, the Greek content of the Scrivener is the same as the Greek in Elzevir 1633, 1641 and later reprints.)

Notice that Scrivener, 283 years later, shows NO indication of recognizing the reason why the King James translators decided to alternate passages between different texts. This is because the KJ translators used alternate passages for the **reverse** reason as compared to the people who put the changes into the previous (contaminated) RT prints. The KJ translators wanted to re-construct the identical content of the original (true) RT, and **exclude all of the alterations which the printers had made**.

Those Roman Catholic Bible experts were all accustomed to making changes in the text whenever making a new copy, because they had no concept that any text could possibly be an accurate reproduction of the originals better than their Latin Bible, and equal to what was written by the New Testament Apostles.

Scrivener never knew that his Greek NT for the KJV 1611 was identical to the Elzevir 1633, 1641 printed 22 years after the KJV. Scrivener did not know why the KJ translators kept switching and selecting from different Greek copies. Scrivener never knew that he had reproduced the Elzevir 1633, 1641 without knowing what it was, or why. He didn't know that if he had simply used a copy of the Elzevir 1633, 1641 (true) “Received Text” all of his heavy work of reproducing the Greek text that the KJ translators had used would have been unnecessary. And likewise the modern people who say they believe in the RT, have no idea that most of the copies of the RT had been corrupted.

Since there are some people who have developed an inappropriate doctrine that the KJV in English replaces the original languages, it would be a good idea to state very clearly here that no bilingual person would agree that **any** Bible translation could replace **any** original language copy. From one language to another there are always some things that are difficult to say in another language without a very lengthy explanation. (This means that a word-for-word and verse-by-verse translation is impossible.)

And **always, always, always**, there are certain words that do not have any equivalent in the other languages. So, it can be said that those people who hold to this teaching have thrown the originals in the trash and have replaced them with their inferior KJV English translation. They are worshiping the work of man more than the word of God. The KJV translators themselves would not agree that their translation

replaces the original language copies, or that the original language copies should be thrown away and completely replaced by the KJV. Yet, it needs to be said that the KJV is definitely the best translation into English and should be respected as better than all of the other English translations.

It should also be noted that most of those people who have such a high esteem for the KJV don't even know what most of those old English words mean in the KJV. Words like "thence" (from there) and "whence" (from where), "hither" (to here) and "thither" (to there), "whither" (to where) or phrases like "by and by" (soon), or even simple words like "ye" which they interpret as being no different than "you". The word "ye" is plural for the word "you". In modern times the word "ye" would be said using "y'all" or "you guys", not simply as "you". It was used when the speaker was addressing a group of people.

There are numerous variations of the word "thou". The form "thou" is the universal nominative case for one person only. The form "thee" is the objective case, but sometimes the subjective case, and sometimes the same as "thyself". The form "thy" is the possessive case, the same as modern "your". The form "thine" has three cases. As an adjective like modern "yours". Or the same as "thy" when followed with a word which starts with a vowel. Or as a pronoun possessive, "that which belongs to thee".

And then, there are a few people who dislike the KJV because they are irritated by those old English unknown words. Those few words which are never used any more in modern English can easily be found in any good dictionary. So, why should anybody complain that they can't understand the KJV? (Notice that despite its inferiority to learning the original languages, the KJV is definitely by far the best translation into English.) (The free Bible software at <https://e-sword.net/> has an instantaneous dictionary which can give you instant definitions as you read along. Just point your mouse arrow at any word to get an instantaneous definition.)

It should also be stated that in 1611 the original KJV was first published including the Apocrypha (books found in the Roman Catholic Bible, mixed in with the other Old Testament books, as mentioned at the beginning of this article.) Also, in 1769 the KJV was altered. At that time, the entire English language went through some spelling changes. Words that now start with the letter "J" used to start with the letter "I". The letters "u" and "v" were usually switched. So, the name "Jesus" was spelled "Iesus" or "Iesvs", in the 1611 KJV. The word "give", used to be spelled "giue".

Those were also the days before everyone had a dictionary. Back then, people spelled words however they wanted. Some people would even spell the same word different ways on the same page, and nobody thought anything was wrong with that. There were also other changes in 1769 to the original first print of the KJV. The people who are so fixed on the perfection of the KJV should examine the history of the KJV before they make unfounded claims about it. (See: "18 Ways the Bible has Changed throughout History", at <https://historycollection.com/18-ways-the-bible-has-changed-throughout-history/>. This web page is only about the KJV.)

Some people even say that the KJV letters themselves won't fail, as though they are the same as the **"jots"** and **"tittles"**, from the original Hebrew. [Mat 5:18](#) **"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."** (The **"jot"** and **"tittle"** are Hebrew, which the King James only people inappropriately apply to the English KJV, while they throw the real **jots** and **tittles** from the original Hebrew into the trash. The **"jot"** (יֹטָא, יִי) is the smallest Hebrew letter and the **"tittle"** (קֶרְאִיא, יִיִק) is the smallest part of a Hebrew letter.) Thereby, those KJV people have thrown the real **"jots"** and **"tittles"** in the trash for their inferior English KJV translation.

Nobody who knows anything about translating would do such a thing. [Mat 5:19](#) **"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."** Notice that this verse follows the previous verse in the same context about the **jots** and **tittles**. Obviously, those KJV people who have thrown the real **jots** and **tittles** in the trash will be: **"called the least in the kingdom of heaven"**.

What's more, in the following verse Jesus says, [Mat 5:20](#) **"For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."** The righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees was a religiosity of arrogance. And so it is with all those KJV people who throw the Hebrew **"jots"** and **"tittles"** into the trash, their religiosity consists of arrogance, just like the scribes and Pharisees. They think that the KJV replaces the original language copies because they know nothing about translating. This is a "doctrine" or "teaching" from ignorance (lack of knowledge, dull-witted). It is an error only made by people who know no other language than English, and who are blinded by their own arrogance. It is a teaching based on lack of knowledge (ignorance) and low intelligence. (The "wolves in sheep's clothing" like this teaching, too. But in their case, it isn't caused by arrogance. The wolves love spreading errors in the churches. Whereas, the arrogant people can't figure out that it's an error.)

A good example of an original language Greek word that has no equivalent in English is the difference between the Greek words **"ἀγαπάω"** and **"φιλέω"**, both of which were translated using the English word "love" in the KJV. ([John 21:15-17](#)) In Greek, the word **"ἀγαπάω"** (love) is very strong, like when a person gives without expecting anything in return. Whereas, the Greek word **"φιλέω"** (love) is more of a friendly fondness type of "love", kind of half way between the word "love" and the word "like". In English there are many times when most people would feel uncomfortable saying to a friend, "I love you", but they feel much more comfortable saying, "I like you".

In [John 21:15](#) Jesus asked Peter **"lovest thou me?"**, using the strong word **"ἀγαπάω"** for "love". (Don't forget that Peter had denied knowing Jesus three times during the crucifixion. [John 13:38](#); [18:17,25-27](#)) So, Peter was afraid to use the strong word for "love", and he answered using the weaker word **"φιλέω"**, **"Yea, Lord; thou**

knowest that I **love** thee.” So, Peter's response would be better translated saying: “Yes, Lord; you know that I **like** you.” Jesus asked him again the same thing, the same way a second time and Peter responded the same way. But, the third time Jesus asked him differently. He used the weaker word for “love” in his question, “**lovest** (φιλέω) thou me?”, which would be better translated saying: “do you **like** me?”. Peter's response: “Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, do you **like** (φιλέω) me?” This passage is usually interpreted in English to mean that it grieved Peter because Jesus asked him a third time the exact same question, because in the KJV it was written the same way the third time. But, when you know the difference between the two Greek words for “love”, it is obvious that what grieved Peter was that Jesus used the weaker word for “love” when he asked the third time. Instead of asking, “do you **love** me?”, he asked, “do you **like** me?”. This understanding was totally lost in the 1611/1769 KJV. Whereas, in some other languages that have two different words for “love”, the meaning would not be lost in the translation.

An example of an un-translated word from Hebrew would be “selah”. It is used in the book of Psalms (71 times) at the end of a verse. It is also used in the book of Habakkuk (3 times). Many of the Hebrew poetical books were originally put to music, but only the text remains in our day. In Hebrew music, “selah” indicates to pause the music for the purpose of meditating on the subject at hand. It's kind of like telling the reader to “stop the music and meditate on the message”. In Hebrew music sometimes they thought that the subject being sung about was so important that the listener needs to stop the music and meditate on it. But, since English has no word for that, the translators just wrote the Hebrew word “selah” (שְׁלֵחַ) using English letters, which has no meaning in English.

Another example of a mistranslation due to an inappropriate word, in the KJV, is the name of **Yehováh** (Jehovah), (For more information, see article listed below on: The Messiah for the Jews.) **Exo 3:15** “And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, **The LORD** God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.” Name.... what name? No name for God is mentioned in this verse. That's because the name was replaced with the words “**The LORD**”. This was done in accordance with the Jewish custom of substituting God's true name of **Yehováh** (Jehovah) with the word **LORD**. The Jewish Rabbis teach their people never to say the name of God, supposedly to eliminate the chance of someone using the name of God in vain. **Exo 20:7** “Thou shalt not take the name of ~~the LORD~~ (Yehováh (יהוה)) thy God in vain; for ~~the LORD~~ (**Yehováh** (יהוה)) will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.” So, even in the English translation itself, they substitute the name of God (**Yehováh** (יהוה)) with the word **LORD** inappropriately.

However, it could also be said that, since those Jewish spiritual leaders (Rabbis) reject their own Messiah (Jesus Christ, which **name** is an interlingual translation of the **name** Yehováh), they don't want to hear that **name** any more. **Deut.**

12:3,4 “And ye shall overthrow their altars, and break their pillars, and burn their groves with fire; and ye shall hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy the names of them out of that place. 4- Ye shall **not** do so unto the-LORD YEHOVÁH (יהוה) **your God.**” It is the names of the other gods that must be destroyed out of the land, not the **name** of the one true God. This **name** problem is explained in more detail in the article listed below: “The Messiah for the Jews”. Exo 9:16 “And in very deed for this cause have I raised thee up, for to shew (show) in thee my power; and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth.” This will happen during the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The name Yehováh must be proclaimed throughout all the earth. Salvation comes through faith in his **name**. Joel 2:32 “And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the **name** of the-LORD Yehováh (יהוה) shall be delivered (saved).....” (...whosoever shall call on the **name** of Yehováh shall be saved.....)

It should also be stated here that, despite the shortcomings of the old KJV, it is still the best translation of the Bible in English today. It also has the advantage of using old style English. When a Bible translation uses modern, commonly spoken style of English, it doesn't sound like it came from an old authoritative source. Modern Bibles that use modern sounding English sound common and no different than any other modern writing. Most of the people who use modern translations say that they can't understand the old English in the KJV. But, there are only very few words that are not understandable from old English, and those words can easily be found in any good dictionary. The Bible is an old book, and should be respected differently than other modern books. Old sounding English effects the human mind differently than regular commonly spoken modern English does. That old style English also has a beautiful poetical sound to it, like Shakespeare or “Pilgrims Progress”.

And then, there are some extremist people who are called “King James Only” who even prohibit other “Received Text” English versions for the wrong reasons. (The RT contamination has nothing to do with this.) In most cases the primary reason they hold to the KJV is because it was translated from the “Received Text”. But, if you examine them a little closer, you discover that they don't have any idea what the “Received Text” is. They don't even know that the name “Received Text” was never even seen in writing until 22 years after the KJV was printed. And the Greek NT that has the name “Received Text”, they don't even know which one it is. They can't recognize it, they can't read it nor do they really care about it. Nor do they have any idea why the different copies of the (contaminated) “Received Text” have alterations. They get so caught up in supporting the KJV for the wrong reasons that, many times, they end up scaring other people away who might have otherwise used the KJV for the right rea-

sons. This is the cause of the error when they even throw the Greek “Received Text” into the trash and claim that the KJV completely replaces it. This type of error is a contradiction.

The emphasis of this article is supposed to be the importance of faithful Christians learning the original languages of the Bible instead of being totally dependent on the translators. If a person truly loves God, they should learn the language in which God speaks to them.

In romantic love, if a man and woman in love spoke different languages, would they want to be forced to have a third person between them always translating every word they say to each other? No. If they truly love each other, they need to speak the same language.

Also, one of the problems encountered regularly is that, from time to time, the translation may be inaccurate and lead to an unfortunate misunderstanding. Weak, unstable, tricky, careless or sloppy translations cause unnecessary problems. In international businesses that handle transactions worth a lot of money, they can’t afford to have one of those misunderstandings caused by a misinterpreted language translation.

Occasionally, erroneous Bible teachings start from mistakes in Bible translations. This is one of the causes for inappropriate divisions in the churches. The church is supposed to be united and walking in harmony and unison in spirit, with Jesus Christ and with each other.

But, if the “Received Text” is really better, then why are there no old early first generation church copies of it? Two reasons. First, people who are really interested in, and dedicated to the Bible always wear the book out simply from constant usage, reading it all the time. Wearing a book out from constant usage is not common for any other book other than the Bible. It's just like a favorite piece of clothing which is worn constantly; it literally starts to get holes and falls to pieces, and has to be thrown away and replaced eventually. Another example, is back before digital audio recordings, old type “polyvinyl chloride” or “vinyl” records or cassettes used to wear out if they were played many times. People who don't read the Bible are not familiar with this phenomenon. In modern times, expensive Bibles use leather bindings and superior paper in order to make them more durable and last longer.

Therefore, since people who use the Bible regularly know about this problem that the book wears out on a regular basis, they know that finding an old copy of the Bible is irrelevant and unnecessary. The important thing is getting a new Bible which is accurately copied. The only reason that a Bible could be well preserved for many, many, many years is that nobody was using it. Obviously, the people who had an old, old, old Bible were people who really didn't care about the Bible. In fact, you could say that the reason it was well preserved was due to a mistake more than intention. They

just put it in a closet and forgot about it. They really intended to throw it away, but they just forgot about doing it. In one case, they discovered an old copy because the janitor was using the pages to light his kindling.

In comparison, those oldest entire copies of the corrupt Greek NT Bible (Roman Catholic) were found packed away in closets, gathering dust, not used for many years, by people who didn't really care about the original language Bible. (Their lack of interest accurately describes the spirit in which those Bibles were copied. A corrupted Bible will never produce a deep down love for the Word of God that a faithful Christian ought to have.) They were found in good condition because they were only used one time; to make the first corrupt translation into Latin.

However, there are still bits and pieces of the (true) "Received Text" from that early era, but no entire old copies of the NT. In addition, sometimes quotes from the RT can be found in other writings, such as personal letters, from that era. A multitude of these can be found in both English and in their original languages in "The Apostolic Fathers", a large 9 volume collection of personal writings from that era available for free download at: www.e-sword.net.

Second, back in the dark ages, the enemies of Christian revival had a custom of burning Bibles, books and the faithful Christians who loved the Bible along with them. The most famous martyr, who was burned at the stake, was William Tyndale, who translated the Bible into English, using the Greek "Received Text" for the NT. (His English Bible had to be printed outside of England.) The king of England (Henry VIII, who was more famous for executing his wives) charged Tyndale with heresy in 1536. He also tried to get every copy of Tyndale's translation, hoping to exterminate the book and the man at the same time. (But he failed to get the original typeset. So, the Tyndale Bible continued to be printed in Europe after Tyndale's execution, and many new copies were later illegally smuggled into England. See Tyndale's story on youtube-.com. "God's Outlaw: The Story Of William Tyndale" (1986)) Back in those days, it was offensive to use English instead of Latin for Bible reading. It was illegal. Latin was considered the sacred language.

England was dominated by the Roman Catholic Church at that time. They only had the Bible translated in Latin back then. They thought that Latin was a sacred language. And the Catholic Church refused to permit any translation into the common English language. (Also see documentary on youtube: "William Tyndale A Man and His Mission" **And** "TYNDALE (2025) | Documentary".) They demanded that the Bible must always be spoken in the Roman Latin language; never in English. On the same day that Tyndale left England to print his English Bible in Europe, there was a man who was burned at the stake because he was caught with a small piece of paper with the Lord's prayer written in English. (Luke 11:2-4) Tyndale had to go to Europe because the printing press was something new at that time, and there was not even one of them in England. But, he couldn't do it in England anyway, it was illegal in England.

Years later, when King James ascended to the throne of England, he ordered a new translation of the Bible into English..... And he specifically told the translators

not to put anything from that horrible Tyndale Bible into it. Of course, if he had taken the time to make a comparison, he would have discovered that the King James Bible is very similar to the Tyndale Bible. (The translators had a copy of the Tyndale NT. Most of the KJV NT is nothing more than a direct copy of the Tyndale NT. However, the offensive parts, which were only found in Tyndale's marginal notes were completely removed.)

The Roman Catholic Church also wanted to burn Martin Luther (M.L.King was named after this man.) at the stake, in Germany, who had also translated the NT into German (1522) using the Erasmus 1519 (contaminated) "Received Text", but the king of Germany protected Luther. The most common reason why the Catholic Church murdered people was that, like Luther, they spoke out against the corruption of the Roman Catholic Church, using the Bible as their guide. In 1517 Martin Luther put a paper on the door of the church stating 95 points in which the Roman Catholic Church was in error. This had an enormous effect throughout all of Europe. (This document can be easily found on the Internet. "The 95 theses".)

Martin Luther was the first survivor of the European Renaissance, that is, the first revival church leader who was not murdered (burned at the stake) by the Roman Catholic Church. Before Martin Luther, many faithful Christian leaders, who loved Jesus Christ and the Bible, were burned at the stake..... And many times their Bibles and other books were burned with them, by the Roman Catholic Church, most commonly because they spoke out against the corruption of Rome. (Read: Fox's Book of Martyrs, available free at www.e-sword.net.)

In those days, many of the faithful Christians thought that the Roman Catholic Church was the "Great Harlot" found in: **Rev 17:5,6** "And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. 6- And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus:" (Since marriage is a symbol of true Christianity, in the Bible, prostitution is a symbol of false religion.) They also thought that the Pope was the anti-Christ (the beast). (Rev 13) The Roman Catholic Church is the bloodiest church that has ever existed. (See books like: "Babylon Mystery Religion: Ancient and Modern" by Ralph Woodrow. This book is on-line at: <https://archive.org/details/Babylon-Mystery-Religion-Ralph-Woodrow/>.)

The most notorious case of persecution was "bloody Mary", the daughter of king Henry VIII. King Henry VIII had started a new church in England which made a few corrections of the errors of the Roman Catholics. There was a general mentality among the people in those days that the corruption of the Catholic Church needed to be corrected. But later, after Henry VIII died, when his daughter Mary took the throne, she ordered to change back to the corrupt Roman Catholic Church as the official state religion. But then, it had to be decided what to do with all the leaders of her father's new church, so she ordered to have them all publicly burned at the stake.

As a result..... to this day the majority of the British people have a bad habit of

constantly using the word “bloody” or “bleeding” as their most habitual adjective, every time they turn around. Someone even invented a drink of Vodka and red tomato juice and hot sauce, called: “Bloody Mary”. (Which looks like blood) [Rev 17:6](#) “**And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus:**”

Amazingly, most modern Roman Catholics deny any church responsibility for those bloody murders of faithful followers of Jesus Christ. A few Catholics even laugh about it. (Laughing identifies them as co-participants, in spirit, with the murderers.) One time, I told a Catholic woman what “Bloody Mary” had done, and immediately she started to laugh hard, as though I had told her a very funny joke. (Laughing also expresses their erroneous belief in the Roman Catholic teaching of the infallibility of the Pope.) The Apostle Peter himself, who was appointed by Jesus Christ as the head of the church ([Mat 16:18](#)) and considered to be the first Pope by the Roman Catholic Church, was once rebuked by the Apostle Paul for being in error. ([Gal. 2:12-14](#)) The teaching of the infallibility of the Pope is itself an error.

Sometimes, they even accept the Pope's word over the Word of God. They do not treat the Word of God as above the leadership of their church. (They treat the Word of God as though it was written by men who were less significant, than the current leaders of their church. And most of them don't even read the Bible anyway.)

The Apostle Peter was also married; he had a wife and a mother-in-law. ([Mat 8:14](#)) This shows another error of the Pope, in that their church denies marriage to the church leaders, the priests and nuns. The Pope is in error concerning the opportunity of marriage for church leaders. According to the Roman Catholic **Latin** translation, church leaders are supposed to be: (translation from the Roman Catholic Latin Bible into English) [1Tim 3:2](#) “**The bishop therefore must be the husband of one wife**”(In the original language Greek, the word for “bishop”, translated into Latin, then into English, is understood as a general term for church leader. It is not a specific hierarchal rank, as it is used in the modern Catholic Church.)

In the past, when I have told a few Catholic people about this passage, they usually say something like, “Oh, that's from your Bible, our Bible is different.” No. This is from their Catholic Bible. Catholic people rarely read their own Bible. They don't care about it.

On the plus side, the modern Roman Catholic Church has always had a reputation of helping poor people with good charitable works. This can be seen in the example of the church of Thyatira in [Rev. 2:18-29](#). The church of Thyatira, which had a golden candlestick in heaven ([Rev. 1,2](#)), was known to have good charitable works. [Rev 2:19](#) “**I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and thy patience, and thy works; and the last to be more than the first.**” Nevertheless, despite this good reputation, they also had a bad reputation of idolatry. (Idolatry is spiritually compared to fornication and adultery because it is as though a wife was with some other man

besides her husband. Thus, it is compared to the worship of some other gods besides the true God; which is idolatry. Their churches are loaded with false images which they should **not** be worshipping.) Am I saying that modern Catholics, who bear a resemblance to the church of Thyatira, actually have a golden candlestick in heaven, in the presence of Christ? Well, possibly a few of them. There are a few who recognize that they shouldn't worship those false images. (See article listed below on: Salvation.)

Rev 2:20 "Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest (you permit) that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols." Jezebel, the false prophetess, is represented by the idol which is falsely called the image of the virgin mother of Jesus. (Notice how the Catholic Church exaggerates her virginity by claiming it to be eternal. They refuse to recognize that after the virgin birth of Jesus, she had other children through her natural husband Joseph, thereby losing her virginity after the virgin birth of Jesus. Mark 6:3) (Again, this is also found in the Catholic Bible.)

Would you accept the photo of an unknown woman as a reminder of your own mother? Would Ceaser have been happy if they filled Rome with statues of him that didn't look like him? (During the first generations of the church, no statues of Jesus or his mother were ever made. There were many statues of Caesar, other gods and images of other famous people, but none of Christ or his mother. Also, in different Catholic churches, those images of Jesus and his mother don't look like the same person. Nobody knows what Jesus or his mother looked like because no images of them were ever made until many years after Jesus and his mother were gone.)

The phrase: "eat things sacrificed unto idols" is a clear reference to the manner in which they offer up the communion bread of the Lord's Supper to those false images just before they partake of it. Those images of Jesus Christ and his mother in the Roman Catholic Churches are false.

Nowadays, there are only a few translations in English in common print which were translated from any Greek "Received Text". (In software there are more available, from old Bibles that are no longer in print, at places like: www.e-sword.net and included in the software at other places.) The King James Version (KJV 1611/1769), the New King James Version NKJV, the Modern King James Version MKJV, the King James Version Clarified New Testament KJVCNT (NT only) and the KJ2000.

Most other modern English Bibles in print use the corrupted oldest Roman Catholic Greek texts to translate from. This "critical text" is produced by Bible "experts" who claim not to be Catholics, but give more respect to the old Catholic Greek Bibles simply because they are older than anything else. (Those are the Greek copies found gathering dust, packed away in closets for almost 2,000 years.)

Notice that most of the English Bibles that use the "Received Text" are some sort of "King James" version. **Few** of the other modern English Bibles in common print

use the Received Text. This makes it quite easy to know which one is which. (There are a few older English translations that use an RT, but not many in modern printed book form. Exceptions: Third Millennium Bible, New Cambridge Paragraph Bible, Modern English Version, Literal Standard Version. I have not evaluated these Bibles. Some of these you can get “.pdf” for free from the internet.)

A few modern English translations (like the WEB or EMTV) were translated from a Greek text called: the “Majority Text”, which, if you read the preface in that Greek print, you discover that they evaluated the “majority” by the lineage or “family” of each text. In other words, they only considered the “Received Text” to count for just one “family” or only one “lineage”. Otherwise, a “Majority Text” would be nothing more than just a copy of the (contaminated) “Received Text”, because during the European Renaissance revival, the (contaminated) RT was in mass production. It was the only one used at that time for translating. Nobody trusted the Roman Catholic Bibles or the Greek Orthodox Bibles. There are more copies of the (contaminated) RT in existence than all of the others combined. But, since the people who published the “Majority Text” did not want to admit that the (contaminated) “Received Text” was indeed the “Majority Text” they invented a deceptive dishonest tactic to minimize the value of the massive production of the (contaminated) “Received Text” in order to disqualify its true identity as the real “Majority Text”.

Another way of explaining the “Majority Text” is that they count exclusively the number of Greek copies hand written before the invention of the printing press. It was after the invention of the printing press that the (contaminated) RT became much more popular. Before the printing press, no RT was ever seen. (The hand-written copies of the RT were only seen by the few people in their own group.) The (true) RT appeared mysteriously from an unknown source soon after the printing press was invented. Before that it was the Greek Orthodox NT that was indeed the majority of hand-written copies. (This is what the “Majority Text” consists of.)

The (true) RT was indeed a mysterious text that almost seems to spring out from nowhere. But, it must be understood that the people who had it probably wanted to keep themselves in hiding. After all, the Roman Catholic Church had a reputation for many years of murdering (burning at the stake) anyone who spoke out against their church. And so, those first few people who introduced the (true) RT into the hands of a few people in the Catholic Church wanted to remain anonymous.

The fact that there were no older copies fits the characteristics of faithful true believers in the Word of God who would wear the book out from constant usage. People who don’t read the Bible are not familiar with this phenomenon. But, they’re very familiar with the concept of a favorite piece of clothing that wears out when it’s used all the time. Whereas the clothing that’s not their favorite just sits in their closet, and usually looks new, even if it’s old and dusty. In addition, those faithful people were sometimes burned at the stake, and their Bibles were burned with them.

Sometimes, the faithful people who copied the Bible letter-for-letter perfect, like how it is done in modern book publishing, they would even burn the old copies. So, there weren't any old copies lying around. They knew perfectly well that if they copied it correctly, there was no need to have old copies lying around. Having old copies around would do nothing but cause trouble later on. It was best to copy them correctly, and then burn the old ones.

Those "Majority Text" Bibles were mostly copied and preserved by the Greek Orthodox Church, which is sometimes called the Eastern Orthodox Church. They were very good at copying and preserving hand copied Greek New Testaments on quality writing materials, and keeping them in good condition for a long time. (Which does **not** mean that they were copies equal to the originals.) But, that reminds me of a woman who had a little fancy table in her house that she put a Bible on for show. The Bible was always kept in the original plastic wrap from when it was new. It was never opened, and never read, not even once. Obviously, she loved her Bible for a different reason than a person does who reads it all the time. And, in the end, her Bible was the best preserved of all, but she probably didn't even know what it said, nor did she care. So, are the oldest well preserved Bibles better just because they are older? NO. The best Bibles are the ones copied the most accurately, letter-for-letter perfect, just like modern book publishers do.

But, getting back to the introduction of the (true) RT into the hands of people in the Catholic Church.... just as soon as the RT was placed into the hands of people in the Roman Catholic churches, the first thing they did was to make a copy of it on the printing press, and..... as their custom was, they made alterations in it, while copying it. (That doesn't mean that it didn't come from a faithful source.) But, the variations in the (contaminated) RT were noticeably fewer than any of the other old Greek texts. The difference in quantity is about 100/1.

Where did they get it from? Those copies seem to have appeared from nowhere. But, one thing was for sure; the people who put it on massive production on the new printing press trusted the people they got it from much more than any of those other older Greek texts. Even though the others were either the "majority", or "older", the people doing the printing did not trust them. Being the "majority" or "oldest" does not make them the most correct and equal to the originals.

The word "majority" is misleading anyway. Now, that the "majority" of churches are "lukewarm"..... the "majority" of English Bibles are "lukewarm". A lukewarm church will select lukewarm Bibles. So, what's the value in being the "majority"? The true important issue is whether a Bible is correct, not if it is the most popular in print. (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.) It doesn't matter that the Lukewarm church is now the majority, Jesus Christ will still reject them. **Rev 3:16 "So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue (vomit) thee out of my mouth."** (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.)

Funny thing, all of the opponents to the RT base their analysis on the as-

sumption that the alterations were caused by “accidental mistakes” over a long period of time, during the old manner of copying the texts by hand. They have gotten accustomed to Bible copiers who did a horrible job of copying, a job that would have gotten them fired from any modern book publisher; a job that any child could have done better. They assume that Bible copying had to always be done poorly. They also assume that there is no enemy attacking the Bible. They claim that Satan doesn’t have anything to do with these changes in the Bible. That’s because they are the ones working for Satan.

But, when they are faced with the additional passages in 1John 5:7 or the additional half chapters in Mark 13 or John 8, they are forced to change their premise of “accidental mistakes” and admit that it is exceedingly obvious that those changes had to have been caused by somebody deliberately altering the content. It is impossible to “accidentally” put in an additional verse, especially one like 1John 5:7. However, if they admit that, then the time factor is irrelevant. Then, **ALL** of the alterations could have been made at any time, late or early, and **ALL** of their system of analysis collapses. Their claim that the oldest copies which are very close in time to the originals are the best, is not true. The oldest ones are not necessarily the best. The best copies are the ones which were copied the most faithfully, cover-to-cover perfect, like almost all modern books are printed, cover-to-cover with zero errors.

The ESV was translated from a conglomerate Greek text which their group of “experts” invented by picking from whichever previous Greek text they wanted in each passage, however they thought best, using their “expert” scholarly evaluation methodology. Which means that their text is just another “critical text”. This, in truth, is based on the system of analysis mentioned in the previous paragraph. They say that all of the variations in content were caused by accidental honest copy errors by the people copying down through the centuries. They also assume that everyone who makes a copy by hand of anything always makes lots and lots and lots and lots of mistakes always, always, always, always. Remember, this way of thinking is another one of those “**doctrines of devils**”. (1Tim 4:1)

And, don’t forget, part of this bad copying is the absence of rechecking what was written. ALL those errors could NOT be there unless nobody checked it for errors right after the copy was made. Who would do such a thing with the Bible. Isn’t it obvious by now that those errors were all made deliberately?

Whereas, everyone knows that the people who do type-setting for making modern books rarely make even one mistake in an entire book. Most modern books (99.99%) are printed cover-to-cover with not even one error. The only people who make lots and lots of mistakes while copying are careless and negligent people who are not fit for the job. In modern book publishing, anyone who is so careless doing type-setting would get fired. So, why is it always accepted among Bible “experts” that ALL of the old-time Bible copiers ALWAYS were this kind of careless worker who

always made lots and lots of mistakes while copying? Why was this type of flagrant negligence perceived as automatically the manner of every old-time Bible copier? Why? Because all the “wolves in sheep’s clothing” who are in the position of Bible “expert” recognized it as the handiwork of other fellow “wolves in sheep’s clothing”, and therefore they want to keep the project going.

Since the old time copiers had a habit of combining previous Greek texts down through history, it is impossible to use any “expert” method to confidently determine what was the exact content of the originals. This “expert” methodology for picking out what they claim is the best combination of passages from the old texts is a big fat lie. They think that the alterations are due to “accidental mistakes” by the copiers during their hand-written copying. It is also amazing how they imagine that the people who copied by hand **always** made lots and lots and lots and lots of mistakes, while the people who do the type-setting for the printing press later on were somehow immune from making mistakes. If they are incapable of recognizing that the cause of the alterations is due to the copiers deliberately changing the text, then they most certainly are incapable of figuring out which alteration, in each passage, is the closest to the original text.

The only people who make lots and lots and lots of mistakes while copying are careless people who don’t really care about the material they are copying. Anyone who is careful during copying is just like someone doing type-setting for the printing press, who can copy an entire book, cover to cover, 100% perfect with zero errors. The only errors found in printed books are made by somebody who was probably drunk on the job, after which, they would probably get fired for their obvious negligence.

Try an experiment. Make a copy from a page of any book. And in the copy make alterations similar to the ones found in those corrupt Bibles. Notice – in order to be like the changes in the Bible, there must be multiple sets of alterations. Only one set of alterations is not the situation we have with those Bibles. Then, see if the people who say they believe in the “critical text” methodology can apply their methodology to determine what was written in the original page. You will definitely discover that their methodology can **never, never, never** render the original content of the page. You will discover that they don’t have any methodology at all.

However, if you have only one set of random alterations made on numerous copies by numerous people, then this is the only case that is fixable. But, the alterations must be made only one time on at least three different copies of people making random changes. This is the only situation which can be fixed. It is better with more than three copies. But multiple alterations made after the first set won’t work. When you compare the copies, each of the random changes will become obvious, because all of the other copies will say the same thing.

Their “critical text” of the Bible can **never** be anything close to the original text of the New Testament. Since the old time copiers had a habit of combining previous

Greek texts down through history, it is impossible to use any “expert” methodology to confidently determine what was the exact content of the originals. This “expert” methodology for picking out what they claim is the best combination of passages from the old texts is a big fat lie. Their “methodology” is not a methodology at all. Since they have a degree from a great big university, they expect everyone to believe everything they say. But the truth is that their “methodology” is not a methodology at all. They just make up whatever they want, which can NEVER be anything close to the original NT.

But, does there exist any other “methodology” that could possibly render an accurate reproduction of the original? Yes. First of all, there must be multiple people making alterations. And each alteration must be unique. Each set of alterations can’t have later alterations added afterwards. It must be understood that everyone involved started from the exact same original text. (This disqualifies all of the “critical text” copies because they all come from different, unidentifiable sources, which do NOT start with the same thing.)

Then, after all the alterations are made, by comparing them all together in each sentence one by one, it will definitely be clear where every one of the alterations is. Every place where somebody made a random change, all the other texts will be unanimously the same. This methodology cannot be applied if the people who made the alterations started from a different source, which did not say the same thing.

This is a description of the same circumstance that the King James translators had when they had multiple copies of the (corrupted) RT Greek New Testament. They all started from the exact same text. All over Europe, every time a hand-written (true) RT was given to a Greek “expert” who put it on the printing press (who made changes in it), those hand-written copies were ALL identical. Letter-for-letter perfect, just like 99.99% of modern books are printed letter-for-letter perfect. Then, when they put it on the printing press, each publication had unique changes made to it by each one of those NT Greek “experts”. So that, as the King James translators were comparing the different publications of the Greek (corrupted) RT, they could see exactly where each one of the changes was made.

And, this is the content which Scrivener used to print his copy of the Greek RT many years later. It must be understood that if a quality job was done, the Scrivener RT should be identical to the Elzevir RT 1633, 1641 and later reprints. But, Scrivener went through a lot more work to make his copy. Nonetheless, a comparison needs to be made between these two texts to see if indeed they are identical. In the event of a variation, it should be noted at the bottom of the page, and the Elzevir copy must be considered superior. Any future publications of the RT should simply use the Elzevir 1641, but not in shorthand. It needs to be printed with normal Greek letters.

Here, it needs to be emphasized that the most important characteristic of the proof of the faithfulness of the “Received Text” is that ALL of the hand-written copies were indeed identical. The King James translators recognized this. It is the most important aspect of the nature of the “Received Text” that is necessary to verify its

accuracy. If indeed it is an accurate perfect copy of the Greek NT, equal to the content of the original writings of the apostles New Testament, then ALL of the copies MUST be identical.

There may be a few other modern English translations which I have not been able to evaluate, but you can confidently evaluate those by simply applying the proper analysis which is given in this article. Most importantly recognizing that the few texts which have been found that are very close in time to the originals are all in disagreement with each other. Why are they so close in time to the originals, and yet so much different from each other? But, the bigger question is, why do all those other modern “experts” misevaluate the whole thing? Are they working for Satan? Yes! Remember, the faithful people who really love the Word of God are always reading it constantly, and so, their Bibles always wear out from constant usage. The people who had the Bible packed away in closets for many years gathering dust, didn’t really care about it. So, the oldest ones are NOT the best ones.

The reason why the other “critical text” Greek NTs were rejected for translating during the European Renaissance revival was that they all came from either the Roman Catholic Church or from the Greek Orthodox Church, both of which the Renaissance revivalists did not trust. Remember, the Catholics at that time did not want anybody translating into any other language. They insisted that everyone must learn to read the Bible in Latin. And, the “critical text” had not yet been published at that time. The Catholics only had the Latin Bible then, which had been translated many years earlier from those same corrupt Greek Bibles used to produce the “critical text”.

And obviously, the people who made the “Majority Text” trusted those other Bibles more, and wanted to discredit the massive publication of the “Received Text” during the Renaissance revival.

It must also be noted that there has **never** been any true spiritual revival among the people who hold to those corrupted Greek texts (it is very rare that the Catholics or the Greek Orthodox even show interest in reading the Bible at all). Therefore, most of the people promoting those texts are “wolves in sheep's clothing” who understand very well the value of those texts for corrupting the church.

It is true that some of those churches that use those corrupt Bibles have increased their missionary success. (They have had successful missionary growth over the years.) But, that was more like a club expanding and increasing their membership list. It wasn't really true spiritual revival. They put more emphasis on religious ceremony and the worship of false statues than on reading and loving the Bible. (During the first generation of the church, no statues of Jesus or his mother were ever made. Many statues of Caesar, other gods and other famous people were made, but none of Jesus

or mother Mary. In modern times those statues in different Catholic churches don't look like the same person. They don't know what Jesus or his mother looked like.) None of those people in their increase of membership have any interest at all in reading and loving the true Word of God. They value the word of the Pope more than the Word of God.

For many years, the Roman Catholic Church did not even permit their members to read the Bible in any other language than Latin. For a long time they didn't even translate the Bible into any of the commonly spoken languages. For many years, their church services were spoken in Latin, so the common uneducated people could not even understand the church's teachings. The only Bible available for Catholics, back then, was the Latin (Vulgate) Bible translated from those corrupt Greek copies, the ones that were found packed away in closets, not used for almost two thousand years.

A corrupted Bible cannot produce a true spiritual revival. But amazingly, many modern pastors don't even know how to tell the difference, yet there are changes on every page of the NT. Sometimes, some pastors will even say that they hold to the "Received Text" (just because they read somewhere that it was the best) and then use an English Bible translated from a corrupted Greek text, because they can't tell the difference, neither do they really care, because they are lukewarm in the faith.

When I was a teenager, I had a Bible that was given to me by the church I was attending as a child. It was the RSV the Revised Standard Version. But, as I read along, I noticed that it had notations in it at the bottom of the pages about changes in the content. There were multiple changes on every page of the New Testament. I had no idea at that time what it meant. But, I knew, even as a teenager, that there was something wrong with that. It bothered me. However, what bothered me even more was the unconcerned attitude of other people about this issue. Why was everybody else unconcerned about it. Nobody cared at all about it. So, I started to make an investigation about it. This article is the result of that in-depth investigation.

The reason the "modern English" Bibles translated from those corrupted Greek texts have become more popular within the last half century is because we are living in the age of the lukewarm church. (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.) Therefore, the lukewarm church wants to use lukewarm Bibles..... Bibles watered down with changes on every page..... the lukewarm Christians don't know and they don't care. Why don't they care? Because they are lukewarm in the faith. [Rev 3:17](#) "Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked....." They don't know that they're lukewarm because they're blind in the faith. It is their love of money, material wealth and luxury that has blinded them. (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.)

Most commonly, the lukewarm Christians who don't care about the alterations in the Bible are more concerned with keeping the peace in their church meetings.

They know that pressuring people for decisions on a point like this would only cause conflict in their church. So, they would rather keep the peace than have a correct Bible.

The original Bible, both New and Old Testaments, did not have the present day chapter and verse number system. The verse and chapter number system was made during the European Renaissance revival when many people were starting to show extreme interest in reading the Bible regularly. The verse and chapter number system is very helpful for finding specific locations in the Bible during teaching or discussion. (Notice – only the people using RT translations were interested in reading or discussing the Bible regularly. No other Bible got this kind of interest, back then.)

Since that verse and chapter numbering system was made using the Greek “Received Text”, occasionally the other corrupted Greek texts (critical text) have entire verses missing (16 entire verses), or half verses missing (hundreds of half verses) and thousands of individual words missing or altered. Alterations on every page of the NT.

In the modern English Bibles that are translated from those corrupted Greek texts (critical text), when they get to those entire missing verses, they have to borrow from the “Received Text” in order to fill in the missing verses, in order to avoid the embarrassment of having entire verses missing. (Some of them just leave the entire verse missing, and skip to the next verse number. Most of the people who use those Bibles do not really care or even notice it anyway.)

But, if it is only a half verse missing, they usually just leave it the way it is in the corrupted Greek text (critical text); they leave out the half verse without letting you know. Examples: Mark 9 verses 44 & 46 are both completely missing in the “critical text”, so some of the English Bibles that translate from those corrupted Greek texts have to skip to the next verse number and leave those verses blank. Talking about hell: Mark 9:44,46 “Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” Some translations borrow from the RT to fill in the blank, but use italicized letters, gray letters and/or brackets to indicate that it is some sort of special case. However, Mark 9:49 is only half missing, so they translate only half a verse into English, in accordance with the corrupted Greek (critical text), but they don't tell you that half of the verse is missing. Mark 9:49 “For every one shall be salted (seasoned) with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted (seasoned) with salt.” (The additional words from the RT are in blue letters.)

There are some English translations that just leave the missing verses (44, 46) missing and skip to the next verse number. (A few of the English translations put notes at the bottom of the page indicating the changes. In those Bibles, there are notes of alterations on every page of the NT. Not one page of the entire NT has no alterations. Any faithful Christian who loves the Word of God ought to be bothered by seeing a list of alterations like that at the bottom of every page of the NT.)

One of the most important verses altered is 1John 5:7 which **most** modern translations say something like: “**For there are three who testify.**” WEB..... and nothing more. Whereas, the (true) “Received Text” says: “**For there are three that bear record** (testify) **in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.**” KJV (The additional words from the (true) RT are in blue letters.) Notice the obvious purpose of this alteration concerning the Trinity. How could it possibly be more obvious that the person, back then, making the hand written copy deliberately altered the text because he didn’t like or understand the content. It is NOT possible to accidentally add this verse to the text. This change was absolutely NOT accidental.

Yet, all of these modern scholars translating modern Bibles insist on saying that the reason for these discrepancies is due to accidental hand written copy errors. But, when they get to this verse, even they have to confess that the variation absolutely must have been due to someone deliberately changing it. Yet, because they are so accustomed to their “older is better” mentality, they insist that the newest one (RT) must be the corrupt one. They insist that someone among the RT people added this verse.

The reality of faithful Christians always wearing out the book due to constant usage never even occurs to them. It is the faithful Christians who always read their Bibles regularly. It is the unfaithful Christians who let their Bibles gather dust in a closet for many years. It is the unfaithful Christians who have the oldest Bibles. Any normal person will agree that the reason for alterations like these are NOT due to accidental hand-written copy errors.

They used to understand that when an expert copier does a proper job, any book can be written cover-to-cover with zero mistakes. Modern book publishers know this very well. More than 99.99% of all modern published books are made cover-to-cover with no errors. The only time you can find a mistake is when the copier was negligent and careless. In modern book publishing companies, that type of negligent person would get fired.

Those people who oppose the RT, who insist that all the alterations were caused by accidental mistakes, and therefore the oldest ones are the closest in time to the originals, and are consequently the best. But, when they see entire verses added to the text, and on two occasions half chapters added, they are forced to recognize that those alterations must have been done deliberately. And, if they say that, then why can’t it be the other way around? The texts that leave things out are the ones who made deliberate changes. Deliberate changes can be made at any time, late or early. So, the closest ones, in time, to the originals are not necessarily the most accurately copied. Therefore, the oldest ones are **NOT** automatically the most correct.

So then.... where did the RT come from? Obviously, those first few hand-

written copies of the (true) RT, back in the 14th and 15th centuries, came from unknown people who were in hiding for many years. The Catholic Church used to murder anyone who opposed them, for a long time. They used to burn people at the stake. Alive! So, why would anyone, in modern times, trust the Bibles from the murderers, who didn't even care enough about their Greek Bible to use it at all for 2,000 years, and not trust the people who had to stay in hiding?

Please notice that the source of the (true) RT in the 14th and 15th centuries was anonymous. The names of the people who put it on the printing press were known. The Catholic Church dominated Europe at that time, so those Bible scholars who had access to the printing press all had to be in the Catholic Church. But, all those Catholics who knew how to read the original languages of the Bible were already accustomed to mixing different copies together whenever they made a new copy. So, as they were already accustomed, when they put the RT on the printing press for the first time, they made some alterations. Those alterations were **NOT** caused by accidental mistakes!!! As far back as the copies go of the NT, **NONE** of the alterations were ever due to accidental mistakes. ALL of the alterations were always caused by deliberate changes.

There are some people in modern churches who say things like, "All those alterations in modern English Bibles are small, and don't really effect any important Bible teaching. All the important things are the same in all the English translations." Really? Is the trinity not an important Bible teaching? The trinity has been removed from those corrupt translations. (1John 5:7) They say things like that because their church leaders say it. **ALL** of those people who say that, never even bother to make an evaluation of the problem. They are **more** concerned about keeping the peace in their church meetings than about having a correct Bible.

The Bible says: Rev 22:19 "And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the **book** of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." The word "**book** of life" of life is changed to "**tree** of life" in corrupt Bibles.

And Mat 5:18-19 "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. 19- Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

It must be understood that as the years pass by, many things change, especially the way people have access to books. With our modern computers it is possible for anybody to have a gigantic library on their computer. But, only a few decades ago, the only way anybody could have access to a gigantic library would have been to go to

a public library. Unless, of course, if somebody was wealthy enough to buy a lot of books.

Before we had the modern public school system, over a hundred years ago, most people couldn't even read and write. And, before the invention of the printing press, when books used to be copied by hand, they were always very expensive. Plus, back then, the cost of a book also had to include paying a person for many long hours to copy a book by hand. Only rich people could afford any books at all. Paper itself has only become cheap and easy to get in the last century. Through the 1800s paper was gradually getting cheaper and cheaper, as progress was being made in paper production.

Back in the days when the "Received Text" was first getting started, the "critical text" was not yet published. The only Bible available to the public, in all of Europe was the Latin Vulgate. But, almost all of those were kept locked in churches, only accessible to the Roman Catholic priests. And there were no translations in any of the languages commonly spoken in any country. So, as soon as the (contaminated) "Received Text" came off the printing press, scholars started to translate it into the common languages. But, at that time, the Roman Catholic Church dominated all of Europe, and they always taught the people that the only sacred language was Latin. In England, it was illegal to use English for anything regarding the Bible.

In England, on the same day that William Tyndale left to print the first English Bible NT in Europe, there was a man who was burned at the stake because he was caught with a small piece of paper with the Lord's Prayer written in English. Tyndale had to go to Europe because the printing press was something new at that time, and there was not even one of them in England. But, even if there was one in England, it was illegal to print a Bible in English. The printers would have been burned at the stake for printing a Bible in English. And, when he brought his Bibles back to England, he had to be very careful, because he knew they were illegal. (See free film on youtube: "God's Out-law: The Story Of William Tyndale" 1986.)

Eventually, Tyndale was burned at the stake. When they burned him, he prayed: "God, please open the eyes of the king of England". And then he died. Shortly afterward, the same king Henry VIII of England ordered a new Bible to be printed in English. And he ordered that a large copy should be put in the vestibule entrance of every church in England. Soon, many people were constantly standing around every day in the church entrances just to read the Bible. It got so popular that when they had a regular church service, the people wouldn't come in. They stayed in the entrance and continued reading the Bible. So, the king had to make a new law that during the regular church service, it was not permitted to stand in the entrance and read the Bible.

Years later, when the King James translators were translating the New Testament, they had several different publications of the (contaminated) "Received Text". They knew that the men who put them on the printing press were all Greek scholars, they were all in the Roman Catholic Church and they were all accustomed to making

changes in the text whenever they made a new copy of the Greek Bible. And they were all accustomed to reading the Roman Catholic Latin translation of the Bible. They were all taught from early childhood that the Latin language was somehow “sacred” and that it was the most correct. So, it was understandable that every time the new Bible was different from the Latin Bible, they changed it when they put it on the printing press.

The King James translators also knew that every one of those Greek NT publications fresh off the newly invented printing press started out from **identical** hand-written manuscripts. (They were all from the anonymous people in hiding.) So obviously, it was the men who put them on the printing press who were responsible for making the changes. In fact, most of those manuscripts, when they were sent to the printer, had notations written in the margins telling the printer where the “scholar” wanted to change the text. (Obviously, the alterations were NOT caused by accidental mistakes!!!)

This was a very unique situation, because in almost all of the alterations, usually all of the other publications were unanimously in agreement with the **identical** hand-written manuscripts that they all came from. None of those people who changed the text bothered to change every place where it was different; only the few place where they happen to notice it being different. So, it was easy to tell where the corrupt alterations were, because each alteration was unique. Each print had their alterations in different spots. ALL of the source hand-written copies of the “Received Text” were **identical**. It was the “Bible experts” who put them on the printing press who made the alterations, deliberately. None of the changes were due to “accidental mistakes”.

The King James translators mainly used the 1598 Beza print, as their primary text. (They thought Beza made the fewest alterations.) But, whenever they suspected an alteration, they consulted all the other prints and usually it was easy to see what was the right text. All of the other prints would be unanimous against one lone alteration, in each passage where there was an alteration. Any alteration would also be in agreement with the Latin Bible. If they had diligently made a comparison of every verse of the NT, obviously they re-constructed the original text of the hand-written manuscripts that it came from.

Many years later, in 1894 (283 years after the 1611 KJV was first printed) F.H.A.Scrivener made a composite Greek text that was the same combination of what they used to translate the King James NT in 1611. It is a Greek text that can be read side by side with the English KJV NT, with the content being exactly identical. (Found at: www.e-sword.net.) The first time the name “Received Text” was seen in print was in the preface of the 1633 Elzevir Greek edition of the NT. (22 years after the King James 1611 was first printed. When the KJV was first published in 1611, the term “Received Text” had never been seen in writing before that time.)

THE PERFECT ORIGINAL GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

The Elzevir brother's published three editions of the Greek New Testament. The dates being; 1624, 1633 and 1641. The Elzevir 1624 text is practically a reprint of the Beza 1565 with about fifty minor differences in all. This was done before they were aware of the fact that ALL of the previous prints were contaminated with alterations. But later, in 1633, they agreed to copy the "Received Text" without making any alterations to it, directly from the hand-written manuscript. So, along with the phrase "**Received Text**", they wrote in the preface that it had "..... **nothing altered or corrupted**".

The Elzevir's were good printers, and their editions of the Greek New Testament were accurate. But, they were NOT Bible scholars. They were only printers. They were exactly what was needed to simply make an honest accurate copy without making any changes. But, they could not read the ancient Greek.

It wasn't until this time that attention was brought to the fact that every one of the other prints of the previous (contaminated) "Received Text" had ALL been corrupted with alterations in the copy. ALL of the "Bible scholars" who were responsible for getting it on the printing press took the liberty of making changes in the text. At that time, the Roman Catholic Latin Bible was the Bible everyone was accustomed to. So, when those "Bible scholars" noticed that this new Greek NT was different than the Latin Bible, when they put it on the newly invented printing press, they deliberately made changes in it, to make it agree with the Latin NT that they were accustomed to. However, they did not make alterations every time the Latin was different. Each "scholar" only made a few changes which they happen to notice, at different places in the text.

The text of the Elzevir 1633 edition became known as the "Textus Receptus" because of the comment in the preface that said (in Latin) "**Textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum: in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus**", which means in English: "Therefore you have the **text** now **received** by all in which we give **nothing altered or corrupted**." No alterations and no corruptions. (They had to write the preface in Latin because that was the international language at that time.) But nowadays, that so much time has gone by, very few people know which print the title "Textus Receptus" came from. And, even fewer people know that ALL of the other previous prints of the "Received Text" had been contaminated with deliberate alterations.

ALL of the other printed copies which were considered in the "family" of the "Received Text" had been contaminated with deliberate alterations. (Stevens, Beza, Colinaeus, Erasmus, [Elzevir 1624] were all printed with incorrect alterations in them. Those Bible "experts" were trying to make it match the Latin NT, which they assumed to be the most correct.) However, to this day, everybody else can't tell the difference, one from another. Nobody else understood that this statement "**nothing altered or corrupted**" was an accusation against **ALL** the other prints which were corrupted.

Instead, it became the custom to refer to ALL of those prints as the "Received

Text". They could not understand that this title, "Received Text" in the 1633 Elzevir preface was a direct accusation against ALL of the other previous prints. And now, almost everyone thinks the title "Received Text" is referring to all of them. In modern times, they don't know that the term "Received Text" was an accusation of corruption.

It's hard to believe that the anonymous providers continued to stay anonymous through the whole thing, over 100 years. Not even one was ever burned at the stake. Not even one was ever named. Who were they? Notice how these anonymous providers all thought that the Elzevir 1641 print was an accurate copy of the perfect Greek NT. Finally, they could stop trying to get it on the printing press. Success! Before that, every time, it got printed wrong. These people had to keep on trying to get it printed by somebody else. They started with Erasmus in 1516, and he made another 4 prints, each with a few changes, until the Elzevir 1633. A total of 117 years of trying to get it printed correctly. But after this, they stopped looking. Perfection accomplished!

Please notice – because of the circumstances, the Elzevir RT was actually printed in two stages. The first problem was that the original text was written by hand. Most modern publishers won't even look at anything written by hand. If someone sent them anything written by hand, they would just send it back without even reading it. The second problem was that it was written in shorthand. The third problem was that it was written in a language that the printers could not read. So..... after its first print in 1633, it had to be revised, and then only very few minor spelling errors had to be corrected. Under these circumstances it is difficult to guarantee a perfect copy, the first time. That means the second print in 1641 was the most faithful copy. They needed time to check it and make the necessary corrections. I myself found one small spelling mistake in the 1633 print, which was corrected in the 1641 revision.

And..... rest assured somebody is going to use this as an accusation against the 1633 print. So, it was the 1641 print that was perfect, not the 1633. But, it was the 1633 which had the name "Received Text" on it. However, the 1633 had all the correct words, but only very few words had the wrong spellings. In the 1633 the content was all perfect with **no** deliberate alterations.

There is no problem with using two stages for printing. The goal of making a perfect letter-for-letter print was achieved. Perfection accomplished with two stages! The difference is that other people who don't care about this goal wouldn't care if they did not achieve it in 1633. Those anonymous people who provided the (true) RT did care. They obviously set the appropriate goals that other people don't have. They achieved perfection, in the Elzevir 1641 revision. **1John 4:1 "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try (test) the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." KJV**

But, later on, somehow it fell out of use. The people (Bible scholars) did not consider it any different than any of the other ones in the "family" of the "Received

Text.” And, they inappropriately used this title, “Received Text” for ALL of the prints equally, with no regard of the Elzevir 1641 being any different than the other prints. The Bible scholars did not want to admit that they contaminated **ALL** of the other prints. So, they avoided even talking about it.

The Elzevir 1633 and 1641 were printed with a lot of the old time abbreviations and contractions. Back in those days, everyone had a custom of writing with what you might call “shorthand”. In English, we use a lot of contractions and **a lotta** strange abbreviations in order to make writing less laborious. Another example is the symbol “&” instead of the word “and”. In Greek they invented **a lotta** unusual symbols and different letters to shorten the task of writing. This made reading the 1633 and 1641 editions very difficult for beginners. (Get a PDF photocopy of the Elzevir 1633 and 1641 texts at: <https://archive.org/>. The searching on this page is difficult. The foreign spelling of the name was Elzevier and the language of the title page and preface was in Latin. So, even though it is a Greek New Testament, it cannot be found searching for “Greek” or “New Testament”. You must search in Latin for: “Elzevier 1641 Novi Testamenti”)

In modern times, the 1633 and 1641 editions are practically non-existent. People talk about the “Received Text” a lot on the internet, but if you try to get a copy of it, they usually substitute the Elzevir 1624 edition for it. Either that or they substitute the Scrivener 1894 for it. Nobody recognizes that the 1633 and 1641 are any different from any of the others. And even the people who say they hold to the RT usually don’t know that the other RT’s are different/contaminated. Very few people can even read NT Greek..... and even fewer can read NT Greek shorthand.

I also found another photocopy of an “Elzevir” print on the Internet, which was a little different. The front title pages did not have the name “Elzevir” nor the number 1633 or 1641 anywhere. The preface was completely missing, with the words “Textum Receptum” (Received Text). And the pages of the NT were in double columns instead of single column, but it has identical type-style and shorthand as the Elzevir 1641. My other photocopy of the 1641 has the Elzevir name and the proper year written in the title pages. Obviously, the other one was a later reprint of the 1641. The writing is Greek shorthand, but it wasn’t identical to the other which had single column. The double columns means that it was required to make a second analysis looking for mistakes.

The photocopy of the Elzevir 1624 looks very similar to the photocopy of the 1633. As far as the style of type-set is concerned, it looks identical. It has the Elzevir name on it, the year 1624, and it has the same emblem on the title page. The paper and the type style look identical, with the same single column. So, that other one with the double columns must be a later reprint, after the Elzevir brothers were past on.

On the internet, you can find a print with normal letters copy of the 1624 without the “shorthand”, but **not** the 1633 or 1641. The 1633 and 1641 have never been printed without “shorthand” because nobody ever uses them anymore. Even the people who believe in the RT don’t have any idea what’s going on.

Most of the people who follow the RT think ALL of the RT’s are all the same thing, but they are not. ALL of the people who support the RT don’t even know what it is or how to identify it. They can’t even read it. Nor do they care about reading it. Most of the RT supporters even throw the Greek RT in the trash, because they claim that the KJV English Bible replaces it. They know nothing about translating.

The Elzevir 1624 edition was a reprint of the Beza 1565, which had about fifty alterations. The Elzevir 1633 and 1641 (and later reprints) were the only RT’s that were correctly and accurately copied directly from the hands of those anonymous providers without making any changes.

But somehow, it has fallen out of use. This is probably due to the fact that the “Bible scholars” all know what it is, and they avoid it. As I said before, almost all of the “Bible scholars” are “wolves in sheep’s clothing”; they are working for Satan. Even the people who say they follow the RT don’t know that all of the other printed copies have been contaminated. There is only one other print which was made with no alterations. The Scrivener 1894 text. The Scrivener text was a composite text of the same combination of what the KJV translators used. But, not even F.H.A.Scrivener had recognized the difference between the Elzevir 1624 and the Elzevir 1633 or 1641.

In his 1877 Greek text with listings of variations, Scrivener used the Stevens 1550 as the main text and the 1624 was the only Elzevir copy among several variations listed. The Elzevir 1633, 1641 were not used at all. In 1887, Scrivener made a revision of this same work, in which the Elzevir 1633, 1641 were likewise **not** included. None of the “Bible scholars” made any distinction between any of the prints. You have to remember, it was the “Bible scholars” who contaminated most of the prints. All except the Elzevir 1633 and 1641 prints. (and their later reprints after the Elzevir brothers passed on.) Scrivener never noticed that his 1894 composite text for what was used to translate the KJV was practically identical to the Elzevir 1633 and 1641. Nor did Scrivener understand that the KJV translators were trying to undo the contaminations of the other publications which everyone now inappropriately calls the “Received Text”.

It’s funny how the people who are opposed to the RT claim that because those printed editions have alterations in them, therefore they are no good. However, in comparison to the “critical text” all the (contaminated) RT’s have very few alterations. So, if those people reject the (contaminated) RT because of a few alterations, then why would they accept the “critical text” which has a multitude of alterations? The “critical text” has at least one alteration on every page of the NT. (Most pages have more than one alteration.) Those are alterations that are not just different from the RT. Their alterations are even different from their own previous “critical texts”. Every few years

they make a new “critical text”. And every time there are many changes in them. ALL of the “critical texts” are in disagreement with each other.

They are always contradicting themselves. The “critical text” people only use the oldest Greek NT’s as their sources, which are in the most disagreement with each other. ALL of their new prints are just re-combinations of those oldest copies. Supposedly, their “expert” knowledge of the language enables them to come the closest to the original NT authors as possible. However, any honest half-witt can clearly see that the only way to obtain anything close to the NT authors is to use copies made from copiers who were as accurate as modern book publishers who print books with cover-to-cover perfect accuracy.

And then they insist that the RT’s are bad because they have a few alterations. ALL of the “critical texts” have more than 100 times more alterations than any of the (contaminated) RT’s have. And who were the people that contaminated the RT? They were the same type of “Bible scholars” who otherwise would be supporting the “critical texts”, later on. (When the RT first came out, there was no “critical text” in print yet. They only had the Latin Bible, which was translated from the same “oldest” texts which were used for the sources of the “critical text”.)

The biggest mistake of the previous RT anonymous manuscript (hand-written copy) providers is that they picked the wrong people to print their texts. The Elzevir brothers were not Bible scholars, only printers, which they did correctly. They did it the same as any other modern-day book publisher, cover-to-cover perfect with not even one mistake. This is normal for book publishers. It is the “Bible scholars” who always make the **deliberate** alterations. **ALL** of those changes were made **DELIBERATELY**, in **ALL** of the Bibles that have alterations. And none of the changes look like errors. All of their changes look like normal sentences without mistakes. The Elzevir 1641 and later reprints are the only perfect copies of the original language Greek New Testament.

To avoid future misunderstandings, it must be stated here that it is understandable that their **1633** edition has a few (very few) minor spelling differences. Those printers could not read Greek, so the minor spelling alterations were legitimate honest mistakes.

After the **1633** print, they revised it and corrected the few minor spelling differences in the **1641** print. I, myself, made a comparison between numerous chapters of the Scrivener text and the Elzevir **1641** text. This was the only difference I could find. It was the name of a city, which was probably correct in the Elzevir text and wrong in the Scrivener text. The city name in John 4:5 was spelled **ΣΙΧΑΡ** in the Elzevir **1633**, and it was spelled **ΣΥΧΑΡ** in the Scrivener. In the English KJV it was spelled **Sychar**. The Elzevir was most likely how they spelled it in the first century original.

Funny thing, none of those people who printed the RT ever said anything at all about where they got it from. The (hand-written text) providers successfully stayed 100% anonymous. And nobody else even seemed to care where the RT came from. But those anonymous providers claimed to have copied the NT accurately without errors, just like modern book publishers, cover-to-cover with not even one mistake. And they kept trying over and over again to get those “Bible scholars” to copy the RT correctly on the printing press. But, those “Bible scholars” always insisted on making changes when they put it on the printing press. Until finally, the anonymous providers got the Elzevir brothers to do it correctly, then they no longer had to search for somebody else to do it.

If we could possibly find the pages of those hand-written copies in some sort of museum somewhere, I would expect that ALL of them would have notations written on them, in the margins, where the “Bible scholar” who sent it to the printer instructed the printer to make changes in the text. Every one of them..... except for the Elzevir 1633 and 1641 prints. I would expect to see no change notations on that hand-written copy.

And now, the Elzevir 1641 needs to be taken out of shorthand and written with normal letters. But, it is very important that this must **NOT** be done by any “Bible scholar”. They are the people who have always contaminated the Bible deliberately. Also, as in the old time originals, capital letters should be used. They didn’t use spaces back then, but it’s best to continue to use spaces now. The spaces don’t change the meaning of the text. The forward and backward comma above the first letter of some words must be changed. Those commas indicate an un-written “H” sound which started the word. These marks are not in the original text. The forward comma indicates the absence of the “H” sound. It is completely unnecessary and must be removed. When the print is small, it is impossible to distinguish between the forward and the backward comma anyway. So, to avoid confusion it is best to drop the forward comma altogether.

The backward comma should be replaced with a mark convenient for our modern keyboards above or before the first letter of the word to indicate the “H” sound. I suggest an apostrophe [‘o], this would be pronounced “ho”. The original text was all capital letters. This mark was not part of the original text, and over the years could have even changed from the way they used to pronounce it in the first century. Remember, the most important thing is understanding the meaning of the passage. Pronunciation is of secondary importance. Pronunciation is only necessary for verbal communication with other people.

A stress accent should be automatically assumed at the end of every word during pronunciation. Nothing needs to be written for that stress accent. Every word should automatically have the last syllable stressed. This makes it very easy for beginners to learn. None of the punctuation was part of the original text, not even spaces

between the words. However, it is much easier to read with spaces between the words, so we should continue using spaces. Without spaces it is impossible to read quickly. All stress accents should be removed. They were added years later. They were not part of the original text.

Also, a print of a close comparison should be made between the Elzevir 1641 RT and the Scrivener RT. Any variations must be listed in the footnotes. In theory, these two should be practically identical. If there is any difference, the Elzevir 1641 RT must be considered the better of the two. (Both are good for reading side-by-side with the KJV.) As I said, not even Scrivener recognized anything special about the Elzevir 1633 or 1641. All he knew was that the other prints were more popular, and that they were all equally part of the “family” called the “Received Text”.

The name “Textus Receptus” (Received Text) was NOT just a name that applied to all the similar texts (which is how most people apply it now). The title “Received Text” was stating clearly that it was a word-for-word perfect copy of the original New Testament Holy Scriptures, which did not apply to any of the other prints contaminated with deliberate alterations.

I repeat, the way people use the term “Received Text” now, in modern times is **not** correct. And most of the people who support the RT can’t tell the difference. But, that is the way everyone understands it now. This term “Received Text” is now incorrectly used to refer to the “family” of similar texts which were printed at that time. (All of which came from the same source.). They say that all the printings which are in that same “family” of Greek New Testaments are all called “Received Texts”.

But, this was not the intended reason of why the Elzevir publishers wrote the words “Received Text” in their preface. They were NOT talking about all those other Greek New Testaments, which other people considered to be in the same “family” of RT Greek New Testaments. When they said that their 1633 print had “No alterations and no corruptions”, they knew that ALL of the other prints (including their own 1624 reprint of Beza’s 1565) were made with deliberate alterations and deliberate corruptions in their publications. The 1633 and 1641 Elzevir prints (and later reprints) were the ONLY publications which had NO deliberate alterations made in the text.

Generally speaking, the best copies are the ones made with the most professional copying methodology, just like we’re accustomed to seeing in modern book publishing. Modern books are normally published cover-to-cover perfectly with no mistakes. ALL of the oldest copies (critical text) of the Bible should be burned. They were ALL contaminated by bad people who deliberately sabotaged the content. They are not necessary. They open the door for confusion and errors.

The experts who tell you that it is normal that there are lots and lots and lots of mistakes are the ones who are causing the problem. It is always the “Bible scholars” who are working on the inside who are the true saboteurs. They are what Jesus called “wolves in sheep’s clothing”. The only time that there are lots and lots and lots of mistakes is when the copier is careless, sloppy and negligent. If such a person was

working for any modern book publishing company, they would surely get fired.

THE PERFECT HEBREW OLD TESTAMENT

ALL of the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament which the Christian churches have access to were obtained from the Jews. And all of those texts have a few errors in them. However, the Jews don't have a reputation of having errors in their Bible. Quite to the contrary, they have a reputation of being equally as diligent as any modern book publisher that puts out books cover-to-cover with zero mistakes. The Jews have a reputation of even counting the number of letters in their copies as part of their diligence to make sure that their copies are indeed cover-to-cover with zero mistakes. So.... why would the copies they gave to the Christians have some errors in them? Isn't it obvious?

The Jews don't even want to tell the Christians the correct pronunciation of the name of their God, "Jehovah". ("Jehovah" is **NOT** correct pronunciation. The "J" sound doesn't even exist in Hebrew.) This **name** problem is explained in more detail in the article listed below: "The Messiah for the Jews". Their Rabbis teach all of their own people not to ever say that name out loud. They tell them that it's blasphemy to even pronounce that name.

Whenever they need to say that name, they always substitute the word "Lord" instead of saying the correct pronunciation of the name "Jehovah". They even go so far as to claim that the correct pronunciation has been lost over the years. You see, in Hebrew only the consonants are written. The vowels have to be learned from hearing them being spoken from other people.

They have never liked sharing such things with the Christians. You see, Christianity only serves to remind them that they have rejected their own Messiah, Jesus Christ. They don't like Christians. So, why would they ever give the Christians the correct pronunciation of the name "Jehovah" or a quality (correct) copy of their Hebrew Bible?

But, rest assured they've got it. And it's just as Jesus described it when he said, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." [Mat. 5:18](#). Not even the smallest part of the smallest letter shall pass from the Hebrew Old Testament "till all be fulfilled".

And soon, the OT prophecy that needs to be fulfilled is the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on all flesh. [Joel 2:28-31](#) "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: 29- And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit. 30- And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of

smoke. 31- The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of ~~the LORD~~ **YEHOVÁH** (יהוה) come.”

However, it could also be said that, since those Jewish Rabbis reject their own Messiah (Jesus Christ, a **name** which is an interlingual translation of the **name** ~~Jehovah~~ **Yehováh**), they don't want to hear that **name** any more. Deut. 12:3,4 “And ye shall overthrow their altars, and break their pillars, and burn their groves with fire; and ye shall hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy the **names** of them out of that place. 4- Ye shall **not** do so unto ~~the LORD~~ **YEHOVÁH** (יהוה) your **God**.” It is the **names** of the other gods that must be destroyed out of the land, not the **name** of the one true God, Yehováh. This **name** problem is explained in more detail in the article listed below: “The Messiah for the Jews”.

The **name** Yehováh must NOT be destroyed from the land. And likewise, the perfect Word of God must no longer be kept hidden from the people. All flesh must receive the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. And therefore, all flesh must receive the perfect Word of God, both the Old Testament and the New Testament.

Funny thing, most of the changes in the Old Testament are spelling errors, which look like errors. Unlike the New Testament changes, which never look like errors. In most Hebrew OT publications the printers write the correct spelling in parentheses next to any misspelled word. Other than that, there are very few changes in content. In Hebrew they call it “Qere and Ketiv” when the text is obviously misspelled, and then they write the correction next to it, in parentheses. So, if you want to learn Hebrew, make sure you get a text that has these corrections written in the appropriate places. Some of them put the correction in a footnote, which is less convenient while reading.

When they do this, they write the misspelled word as though it is the correct word, simply because it is the one written in the oldest text. And then they write the correctly spelled word in parentheses as though it is a questionable add-on that should not be trusted. Here again, we see this same mentality that the older text is better just because it is older. But, since deliberate alterations can be made at any time, early or late, the age factor is irrelevant.

Other than the obviously misspelled words, there are only a few other alterations in content. Those other alterations are very selective, and clearly have a designated purpose. They could not have been made by a drunk. They are obviously not random changes. Furthermore, they were done in a manner very much different than any of the other copies ever made. I am talking about the text which is recognized as the oldest surviving Hebrew Old Testament in existence. It was a onetime deal. Never before or after was anything like it ever made. All of the other texts at that time were always burned after the new copy was made. But, this one was the first which never got burned. Whoever was handling it treated it very much differently than any of the other Hebrew OT texts.

So, why didn't it get burned? Obviously, all the texts that got burned were all faithful copies. The new copies were always diligently checked for errors. They were

checked, and rechecked, and rechecked, and rechecked, many different ways. Those Jews even counted the number of letters. When the copiers were very confident that the new copy was absolutely perfect, only then was the old copy burned. Well clearly, whoever made all those deliberate errors in that one copy knew that there was no purpose to check it diligently for errors. In this case, they wanted the errors to be there. And, the previous copy could not yet be burned. Not until a correct copy could be made. At that time, it was the only one that never got burned.

So then, it was just the copy they wanted to give to the Christians. They hate the Christians. The perfect Hebrew Bible belongs to them, and they feel no need to give away a perfect copy to anyone else. Why should they? So, they gave everyone else the copy with all the deliberate errors in it.

Under normal conditions, that oldest text which has all the errors in it would have been thrown in the trash. It should have been burned a long time ago. But, instead, it is given the highest respect simply because it is the oldest in existence. Again, we see this incorrect modern mentality that the oldest one is automatically assumed to be the best simply because it is old. This mentality is based on the assumption that the cause of the differences is that all human beings are prone to make errors, and therefore they consider it normal that, over the years, any written text must be expected to have changes in it, after a lot of time goes by.

Well then, why don't other ancient writings have this problem? I've already mentioned the fact that 99.99% of modern books are printed without even one type-set error in them. The only time errors are found is under certain out-of-the-ordinary unusual conditions. Like, suppose that the type-set person is drunk on the job. Well, that is a possibility. However, it is **not** a possibility that such a type-set person would keep his job, and NOT get fired, while the problem of drunkenness goes on and on and on and on. (Don't forget that there are also other unusual conditions possible like this one: like trying to type on a cell phone, with auto-correction making changes while you type. Even worse is when you write in two different languages. The auto-correction goes crazy and makes totally non-understandable corrections.)

Likewise, it is NOT possible that the old time Bible copiers went on and on making lots and lots and lots of errors. And, it is NOT normal to assume that ALL the old Bible copiers were automatically super bad at copying. Any child could have done better. That is not a normal situation. And, this type of corruption should **not** be automatically expected. In this case, it is a one-time event. About a thousand years ago, they made one copy loaded with errors. Since then, the correct copies have ALL disappeared and that one copy with errors has been accurately copied with perfection ever since then. ALL of the errors have been copied exactly as they were written back a thousand years ago without one single difference. (Perfection at its finest.) The errors that are printed, down through history, in every copy of the Hebrew Bible are absolutely identical to that one oldest copy, which was the only one ever found like it. And through it all, no other copy without those errors has ever been found. This is very

much different than what has happened to the New Testament.

But, if the Jews are capable of copying with such perfection, then how did that one old copy loaded with errors happen? That copy didn't have just a few errors in it. It was loaded with hundreds of copy mistakes. Isn't it obvious? Those Jews hated the Christians and didn't want to give them a copy of their perfect Hebrew Bible. So, they deliberately made a bad copy just for the Christians. And secretly they kept the good copy for themselves hidden. This was definitely not God's will. And it will definitely bring a curse from God down on them for doing it. **Amos 8:11** "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord GOD, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the LORD:"

Don't the enemies of Israel need the Word of God? And, if they had the true Word of God, why would they need a Bible like the Koran? The Koran teaches them to attack and kill Jews and Christians. The Rabbis who keep the true Word of God in hiding should be removed. They should not have anyone following them. They should be treated like the bad shepherds in: **Eze 34:2** "Son of man, prophesy against the shepherds of Israel, prophesy, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD unto the shepherds; Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! should not the shepherds feed the flocks?" **Eze 34:10** "Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I am against the shepherds; and I will require my flock at their hand, and cause them to cease from feeding the flock; neither shall the shepherds feed themselves any more;"

And the name of **Yehováh** (Jehovah) must be proclaimed in all the world. **Exo 9:16** "And in very deed for this cause have I raised thee up, for to shew in thee my power; and that **my name** may be declared throughout all the earth." These are the same shepherds who hide the name of **Yehováh**. They need to be removed. Nobody should follow their teachings.

But, the modern Bible "experts" keep telling us that it **IS** normal, and errors ought to be expected. This is the result of the modern mentality of the teaching that the oldest text is automatically the best. And, that perfect copies are impossible, and should **not** be expected. Then, why was that oldest Hebrew copy so accurately copied, with perfection down through the years? ALL of those errors have been copied absolutely perfectly, with not even one alteration, ever since it was found, a thousand years ago.

This way of thinking, that the oldest copy is automatically the best, is one of those "**doctrines of devils**" spoken of in **1Tim 4:1,2** "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and **doctrines of devils**; 2- Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron;" The teaching that the oldest copies are automatically the best

because they are closest in time to the originals, is indeed a “**doctrine of devils**”. The truth is that despite the fact that unusual conditions are indeed possible under which errors could occur, nonetheless it is **most** probable that letter-for-letter perfect copies ought to be expected and not the other way around, as those “experts” keep telling us.

The truth is that they themselves do not want it to be exposed; that the cause of the problem was that certain “wolves in sheep’s clothing” deliberately made changes in it. And they don’t want to admit that they themselves are indeed part of the wolves. And, as wolves, of course they want to promote the projects of other wolves in order to continue corrupting the people.

This is a strange thing alright. Why were the Jews so accurate in copying all of those errors so perfectly? Copy after copy. Generation after generation. All the errors copied exactly, with perfection. Not even one slip-up. (It smells fishy.) That’s because they wanted to keep their own perfect Bible to themselves, the same way they keep the correct pronunciation of the name **Yehováh** (Ἰεϋὠῶḅḅ) to themselves. They don’t like sharing it with the Christians. They don’t want to admit that they have rejected their own Messiah. How can we know the correct pronunciation of Ἰεϋὠῶḅḅ **Yehováh**? There are very old writings from Rabbis many years ago that state exactly how to pronounce it.

With the help of computers, we can do searches on large “data bases” covering many of the old Rabbinical writings, so it’s easy to find something, if you have a “data base” covering most of the old Hebrew writings. (A good “data base” is provided by Bar-Ilan University in Ramat Gan, Tel Aviv District, Israel. A Hebrew speaking university.) (The term “data base” means that it is possible to do searches on a computer to find specific subjects. Some people call that “indexing” documents. Their “data base” has over 100,000 old Hebrew books. And of course, Bar-Ilan University charges a lot of money to use their data base. They also have on-line classes and on-line library with about one million books, total. <https://www.biu.ac.il/en>) This **name** problem is explained in more detail in the article listed below: “The Messiah for the Jews”.

And when did all this start? It was about a thousand years ago that they have the oldest copy of the Hebrew OT. Why aren’t there any copies older than that? Because before that, they used to burn the previous copy after making a super precise analysis of the quality of the new copy (proof reading). After they were sure the new copy was perfect, the old one was always burned. Notice – if there was any error, that page was always re-copied before it was accepted as a perfect copy. The most important step of this methodology was the inspection (proof reading) before acceptance. It is not possible that all those errors got on the final copy unless the inspection step had been eliminated. Why would they accept any copy as the final copy without inspecting it first? The obvious conclusion is that the errors were deliberate sabotage,

made by the enemies of God. They wanted those errors to be there.

But nowadays the Bible “experts” always say that the oldest copy is the best. NO! The oldest copies should be burned! The correct question is: Did they do a perfect job of copying? Did they inspect each verse before they accepted it as authentic? If they did, then they should burn the old one. Along with this way of thinking (the oldest is the best) is the idea that a perfect copy is impossible. The thinking that a perfect copy is NOT possible is a “**doctrine of devils**”. ([1Tim 4:1,2](#))

If the errors were made deliberately, then obviously, the inspection step was unnecessary. If they intended to sabotage it, then there was no need to inspect each page. (And then that copy probably sat in a closet somewhere, just like what happened to some of the copies of the NT. If it had been read by anyone else, at that time, they would have recognized it immediately as being full of spelling errors. So obviously, it had to have been hidden away for a long period of time, not being read by any native Hebrew speaker.) This is truly a weird abnormal situation. By that time, the only Hebrew speakers were the Rabbi’s who were copying the text. So, there was nobody else who could read it.

How could a copy loaded with spelling errors ever get to be accepted as anything other than garbage? Especially among people who were accustomed to perfection in their copies. Remember, these were people who used to burn the old copies because they were absolutely confident in the perfection of their new copies. This could not have happen except for only one case: they did it deliberately for a specific purpose. They wanted to give the Christians an erroneous copy, and keep the perfect one for themselves.

However it happened, there is no need to believe that a perfect copy ceased to exist anywhere. (And, something like the Dead Sea scrolls should be unnecessary, unimportant and irrelevant.) If their copies were perfect and they burned the old ones, then the Dead Sea scroll Bibles should be burned as well.

Then, those Jews realized that the contaminated copy would be just what they wanted to show the Christians, while they kept the good ones for themselves. But, in order to prevent any of the good copies from leaking out, they had to keep them from even being seen by most of their own people, just like they have done with the pronunciation of the name of God. And, with the perfect copies, as they continued copying them from generation to generation, they continued their proper custom of burning the old ones as soon as a perfect new copy was made, secretly in private.

The idea of passing time in a closet somewhere should remind us of the Dead Sea Scrolls. When something like that is found, we should NOT think that it **must** be the most correct automatically simply because it is the oldest. We are dealing with the Word of God, and God has an enemy. That enemy should be expected to attack! We must test the spirits. [1John 4:1](#) “**Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try (test) the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.**” KJV

The reason that contaminated copy had to spend time in a closet was that if it had been seen right after it was made, it would have been rejected as garbage. And, another one would have had to be made immediately to replace it. But, they wanted it for the purpose of giving it to the Christians.

THE OLDEST IS NOT AUTOMATICALLY THE BEST. THAT CONTAMINATED COPY WAS GARBAGE THEN, AND IT IS GARBAGE NOW. IT SHOULD BE BURNED, ALONG WITH THE DEAD SEA SCROLL BIBLES.

This is the second offence against God. First, they hide the name of God, which is NOT God's will. And second, they contaminate the Word of God. Don't you think that there is a curse that goes along with such conduct? These things are all being done by the Jewish Rabbis, their spiritual leaders. This is the result of them rejecting their own Messiah. Isn't there a punishment that goes along with such rebellion? Is it possible that the Israeli wars are part of that punishment? Yes, those enemies need the perfect Word of God. They should not be following the Koran, which teaches them to kill Jews and Christians.

Unfortunately, most modern Christians are not concerned enough about this to even care. Most of the modern churches are too lukewarm to care. But, the perfect Word of God is necessary to produce the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on all flesh. It will spark the great revival that represents the great harvest of souls in the latter days just before Jesus Christ, the true Jewish Messiah, returns. (Acts 2Joel 2)

Nowadays, the few Christians who are faithful (not lukewarm) should now start praying everywhere for this letter-for-letter perfect Bible to be published, in a usable manner, in the original languages. Mark 16:17 "And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues;" The "new tongues" must be the languages of the Bible. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit will cause the people to learn the true Words of God in the original languages. The perfect Bible is necessary in order to spark the prophecy in: Acts 2:17 "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams:" (This is a NT quote from Joel 2:28 and Eze 36:26-27 about the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on all flesh. This is also necessary to start the NWO. See article listed below on: The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible.)

Notice the importance of learning the original languages, in Hebrew and Greek. Most people who have never learned a foreign language before need to learn in some sort of school; they need a teacher. But, people who are familiar with foreign languages can learn from well written grammars and lexicons (bilingual dictionaries) (Some grammars are user-friendly but most are not. My favorite user-friendly grammar for NT Greek is: NEW TESTAMENT GREEK FOR BEGINNERS by J. GRESHAM MACHEN, which is available on-line, at numerous places. The grammars made for beginners are the ones that are the most user-friendly.

Keep in mind that grammar explanations for other languages use grammar terminology not used for English, however the definitions of those terms can be found in English dictionaries. For example, in Greek a common grammatical term is “aorist”, which is not used for English, at all. But, a good English dictionary might give a definition like: “aorist – an inflectional form of a verb typically denoting simple occurrence of an action without reference to its completeness, duration, or repetition.” In other words, in Greek they use additional inflectional forms not used in English, and the term “aorist” indicates that none of those additional inflectional forms apply, in that case. An example of an additional inflectional form used in English would be adding “-ing”, “-er” or “-s” on the end of a verb. (speakinging, speakerer, speakss)

However, this is an over-simplification of the meaning of “aorist”. Don’t forget, this grammar form “aorist” doesn’t exist in English. In English, most of the time we are accustomed to talking in past, present or future tense. But, “aorist” is the absence of time. The closest formation in English would be the present-perfect form. Example: John 4:18 “For thou hast had five husbands”. In modern English we would say, “for you have had five husbands”. In Greek, the term “have had” is written with only one word. To explain..... suppose that instead of talking about her husbands, they were talking about her brothers. We would simply say, “for you have five brothers” or “for you have had five brothers”. Even though it is written in present tense, the time factor is irrelevant, unless any of her brothers had previously died. Then, we would probably use past tense, “for you had five brothers”. It is well understood that as long as the brothers are still alive, the sister/brother relationship never ends. Therefore, the time factor would be irrelevant. So, in Greek those irrelevant time situations would get the “aorist” grammar form.

Years ago, when people made their wedding vows, they used to say, “till death do we part”. Only in modern times do people think of marriages as terminating when they get a piece of paper from the government stating “divorce”. Back then, marriage was considered equally as permanent as any other family relationship. So, when Jesus was speaking in John 4:18, he used the aorist word for “have”, which was **not** past, **not** present and **not** future, just the same as if he was talking about her brothers. “For you have five brothers”. (See article listed below on: Marriage Misunder-

standings Explained.) So, in this passage Jesus was saying that marriage was equally as permanent as any other family relationship, “till death do they part”. In Greek those irrelevant time situations get the “aorist” grammar form. This explains why Paul tells us in Romans: **Rom 7:3** “So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an **adulteress**: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no **adulteress**, though she be married to another man.” But, in modern lukewarm churches, they accept the new teaching of the government and reject the teaching of the Bible. (See article listed below on: The Lukewarm Church.) **And** (See article listed below on: Marriage Misunderstandings Explained.) The government is wrong and the Bible is right. When any church has an “**adulteress**” come in to participate in the church activities, she should be thrown out. ALL women who are remarried while their first husband is still alive are living in **adultery**.

For Hebrew, my favorite user-friendly beginning level grammar is: “Essentials of Biblical Hebrew” by Kyle Monroe Yates. Most Hebrew grammars are not as user-friendly for beginners as the one by Yates. Most grammars assume the student is already an experienced language learner, and already knows the basics. Those grammars were not made for students learning their first foreign language. The grammar by K.M. Yates is at: <https://archive.org>. However, it has only limited online-only access.

Another good beginner grammar is: AN INTRODUCTORY HEBREW GRAMMAR. by A. B. DAVIDSON. This one is much easier to find in many places on the internet. It comes in several editions. The 18th edition was modified to be easier (more user-friendly) for beginners. The earlier editions were NOT user-friendly. It is also available at <https://archive.org>, along with many others. This one can be downloaded from <https://archive.org>. But, the one by Yates cannot. The downloadable books are in the public domain; they have no more copyrights. In most countries copyrights expire after 50 years. (A little longer in the USA.)

In Greek, the small abridged/condensed version of Liddell-Scott Greek-English lexicon is best for quick definitions. The large one is confusing sometimes, because the list of different uses of each definition are often very long, and hard to locate specific cases. The large version of Liddell-Scott Greek-English lexicon is only necessary now and then for special cases. Most of the time the abridged (condensed) version works best, for speed. The small lexicon that comes in Strong’s concordance is good at explaining compound words, and it is also faster to use for simple definitions, which is the majority of words. (It is the one integrated in the free Bible study software from <https://e-sword.net>, which can give definitions instantly.) But the giant LS lexicon is best for complex, multi-definition words.

You can also find Hebrew **audio** on-line with someone reading the OT at:
<https://mechon-mamre.org/p/pt/ptmp3prq.htm>
http://www.aoal.org/hebrew_audiobible.htm
<http://www.torahclass.com/audio-bible-in-hebrew>

<https://archive.org/details/HebrewOldTestamentReadByAbrahamSchmueloff>

(The VLC **free** audio player can slow down the audio and make it easier to understand for beginners.)

Most of what you need can be found on the Internet at places like www.e-sword.net, **free**. This www.e-sword.net has the largest **free** public domain library available for **free** download on the Internet. Old books usually go into the public domain after about 50 years of publication, in most countries. (a little longer in the US) And, there are other places on the internet that offer lessons on learning Hebrew or Greek. But in most cases, the Hebrew is modern Hebrew for conversation with people in Israel, which is a little different than biblical Hebrew. It's about the same difference as British English is as compared to American English.

Most people have a very difficult time doing something like this on their own. So, if you can't find some sort of institute near where you live to learn those languages, you can definitely find something on the Internet to get the help you need. Learning a language is a big project which requires a lot of time, effort and assistance. It also helps if you have friends who can study along with you. Having friends doing it with you will help you to keep from losing motivation to continue. Most people lose motivation when they see the size of the job. Unfortunately, most churches are too lukewarm to care about this.

If you try to learn on your own, start with **several** good beginning level grammars. If you are new to languages, it is best to read more than one. This will explain the unusual sentence structure and word formations in the other languages, which is very much different than in English. The grammars will also give the pronunciation. After you have finished that, you could either go on to more advanced level grammars, or start reading the original language text of the Bible. It is best to start by reading a word-for-word interlinear, which has an English translation directly below each word in the original language, and a natural English translation like KJV in the margin next to it.

If you attempt to pass up the first step of reading the grammars, you will not be able to pronounce the Biblical language and you will not understand the unusual sentence structure, and at times even the English word-for-word translation will be hard to understand. And..... you will become fixed on the English translation in the interlinear. When you read an interlinear, the objective is to spend more and more time reading the Biblical language and, as time goes by, spend less and less time peeking at the English. Eventually, you **must** be able to read the whole thing without ever peeking at the English, and understand everything. (There is an excellent inter-linear Hebrew/English text accompanied with Hebrew audio on www.youtube.com, chapter by chapter titled: "Psalm 1: Hebrew interlinear audio Bible". The underlined "Psalm 1" is replaceable with whatever chapter of the Hebrew OT you want. The entire Hebrew OT on www.youtube.com. And now there is another one: "Genesis 1 -- Hebrew Bible Speaker with English Captions". This one is the best, but it does not have the entire Hebrew OT.... yet.) (Remember, a few short sections of the OT are in

Aramaic, (Written with the same alphabet.) which should be avoided while learning Hebrew.) (Youtube also has a speed control in settings to slow down the audio, which makes it easier for beginners.)

One thing that might help is, if it is an interlinear in book form instead of computer screen, you could cover up the English line below the words with a piece of paper, and, after practicing, try to read the Hebrew without peeking at the English, to test your progress. In software you can position the text with your mouse to make the English stay off the bottom of the screen. Or, you can put a piece of paper on the computer screen, to cover up the English translation. Each verse must be repeated again and again until you can understand it without peeking at the English.

This can help you to force yourself to think about the Bible language instead of concentrating on the English translation too much. But, in theory, you should be able to keep your eyes fixed on the language that you are trying to learn. Another trick to help remember the words that always seem to give you difficulty would be to write down those words on a separate piece of paper. The purpose of the interlinear is to avoid the time consuming task of looking up the definitions every time you forget a word. At the beginning, the time spent looking up words would be the majority of the total time spent of learning the language. If you have a bad memory, the time spent looking up words would be very, very long without the help on an interlinear.

But, the danger of using an interlinear is that you might end up letting your mind concentrate on the English translation, too much. You must practice thinking about the new words until you can remember them. Repeating them to yourself several times would also help to remember them. Don't just go on and on reading the interlinear translation in English. If you read nothing but English, then you will never know anything other than English.

You must speak the Bible language. Pronouncing the words of the Bible language will keep your mind on the new words. If you want to speak the Bible language then you must move your mouth and enunciate the words. If you don't speak the words, then you will never speak the language. **NEVER!!! NEVER!!! NEVER!!! NEVER!!!** Not in 50 years of practice. If you concentrate on the English, all you will ever know is English. You must articulate the pronunciation of the language you want to learn, or else forever speak English only.

Then, after accumulating a good quantity of vocabulary, a side-by-side text with the original language next to the English translation in two columns would be good. This can be found free on the <https://e-sword.net> software, or English/Hebrew text at <https://mechon-mamre.org/p/pt/pt0.htm>.

The **free** e-sword software also provides Greek and Hebrew texts with a number next to each word, so that when you point to the number with your mouse arrow, a little pop-up dictionary window gives the definition and pronunciation of each word. With Hebrew, it's a good idea to listen to the audio recordings along with reading the text. This is when, at the beginning, slowing the audio down is very

helpful. (The **free** VLC audio player software has a speed control. Even the VLC audio player for smartphones has a speed control. And the youtube player has a speed control.)

Each verse must be read and re-read out loud until you completely understand everything. Do not go on to the next verse until each one is well written on your brain. The interlinear does the work of searching for definitions for the student. However, sometimes the definition word(s) in English below a word might be different in different cases. For example: In Exo. 34:29 it says: “.... that Moses wist (knew) **not that the skin of his face shone while he talked with him.**” The original Hebrew word for “**shone**” (קָרַן – karan) literally means “horn..... to shoot out horns of light”. But, in English we would say: “to send out beams of light”. Well, what’s the difference between “beam” and “horn”? Therefore, some interlinears might say below the Hebrew word “קָרַן” – “shone”, but others might say “sent forth horns of light”. So, the confusing thing is when, in other contexts, this same Hebrew word may be translated: “horn”. Each verse in the original language must be read and re-read out loud until the student can understand it without peeking at the English translation. Without practicing pronouncing the enunciation, the student will **never** be able to read the language. **NEVER!!! NEVER!!! NEVER!!!**

There are four parts of learning languages, reading, writing, listening and speaking. If the student wants to speak and write in Hebrew, then it would be a good idea to practice writing each verse in Hebrew. Microsoft Word has the ability to use a Hebrew keyboard, and can switch back and forth between English keyboard and Hebrew keyboard, using hotkeys for easy access fast switching. (The youtube page has instructional videos on how to do this.) Being able to write well in Hebrew helps the student to speak well. If the student only learns to listen and read, then writing and speaking are **not** automatic. Both writing and speaking have several aspects about them that are **not** done while reading and listening.

Eventually, you can move on to reading an original language “readers edition” of the old and new testaments. This type of book has exclusively the original language text with no interlinear English. At the bottom of the page or along the margins it has notes of the definitions written of only the least use words. This type of text can only be used by someone familiar with the majority of the vocabulary most common in Bible reading. This will force you to concentrate on the Biblical language, and stop thinking in English.

After the student has a good vocabulary, it would also be a good idea to select a list of favorite verses to memorize. There is a big difference between simply reading as compared to memorizing. Memorizing fixes the words in your memory, and it gives you a capacity for speaking the language in a manner that just reading will **never, never, never** produce. Since Hebrew is a spoken language in modern Israel, memorizing Hebrew verses will enable you to speak it as a real language. In **modern** Hebrew, there is a good on-line dictionary at:

<https://doitinhebrew.com/Translate/default.aspx?kb=IL%20Hebrew%20Phonetic>

You can get a Hebrew interlinear at: www.github.com/stefankmitph/hiot It is also available from Play Store on Android for smartphones.

Also at: www.scripture4all.org/download/download_ISA2.php. This software has both OT Hebrew and NT Greek. Unfortunately, the Greek interlinear (version 3) from this place is not the Received Text. Version 3 uses a modified mixed combination Greek text. Neither the web page nor the software tells you which Greek text they use. Version 2 is better, it has better NT Greek RT and KJV.

The free “Interlinear Scripture Analyser” **version 3** at scripture4all.org does **not** use the RT Received Text. So, Version 2, on a different web page, (www.scripture4all.org/download/download_ISA2.php) uses the RT Received Text and the KJV, but version 3 does **not**. And, version 2 (which is **not** found on their regular web page. You must go to www.scripture4all.org/download/download_ISA2.php) This uses the original CAPITAL letters, which is how they used to always write back at the time of the NEW TESTAMENT. LOWER CASE LETTERS WERE NOT INVENTED UNTIL LATER ON. Neither did they have punctuation or accents, and no spaces between the words, so the last sentence would have been written: LOWERCASE LETTERSWERENOTINVENTEDUNTILLATERON And, at the end of a line they would even cut a word anywhere in the middle to continue on the next line, with no hyphen. This style of writing (especially without spaces) made it impossible to read anything quickly.

Therefore, a study of New Testament Greek would best be done disregarding accents and punctuation. Besides, even though they added that stuff later on, it was all in reference to how Greek was spoken at the time of the add-on’s, many years after the NT was written, and probably different than how people used to speak in the first century.

When I read it, I just use a simple stress accent on the last syllable of each word. (Easy to learn.) In addition, to help avoid repeating the same sound for several different letters, I changed some of the sounds for certain letters. Nobody speaks that language anymore, so it doesn’t matter anyway. For the **Greek** letter **η** use a as in cat, the **Greek** **ι** is always as ee in meet, the **ξ** is like sh in she, the **ο** (omicron) is as o in spoke, but the **ω** (omega) is as o in coffee or auto, **χ** is as the guttural throat sound used with **ך** in Hebrew. This sound doesn’t exist in English, it’s usually written in grammars as kh. The rest is how they say in the grammar. There is also an H sound in Greek written with a backwards comma above the first letter of a word, which is not written when the letters are all capital. It was added later on. It is usually written above a vowel (**ᾰ, ᾱ, ῀, ῁, ῂ, ῃ**), but sometimes above an r (**ῄ**). Only the small letters include this strange backwards comma. When reading the capital letters the reader must have this H sound memorized, which words have it and which words do not. Remember, this sound was NOT written in the original “capital letters” text, and therefore could have changed over the years.

Version 2 (ISA2) starts with the OT Hebrew in reverse reading, (left to right) but you can change the direction in the “View” menu using “right to left”. The Hebrew will stay on “right to left” after the first time you switch, while the Greek will stay on “left to right”. Version 2 has better NT Greek than version 3. Also, in the “View” menu, it has 2 good layout options, “Layout 1” **L1**, or “Interlinear” **Int**.

And, you can use the software for free at <https://e-sword.net/>. There are also other web pages that have modules (additional books) made to use on the e-sword software. There are also interlinears you can read online, like at: <https://biblehub.com/interlinear>.

Another good Bible software is <https://www.stepbible.org>. The instantaneous dictionary is outstanding. Just point your mouse arrow at any word, and instantly a dictionary window opens with the original language word and definition. On some youtube tutorial videos they show that it has a Hebrew OT interlinear, but the version which I got only has an interlinear in NT Greek, not in OT Hebrew.

But, their NT Greek interlinear has something wrong with it. The English word-for-word translation that goes along with it, is supposed to be word-for-word and also be a standard translation at the same time, which results in occasional errors. A natural sounding translation can never be a word-for-word translation. The best interlinears always have an English word directly under each word from the original language, and then, on a side column they put a separate natural sounding English translation KJV. So, it is best to not use the interlinear from Stepbible. But, the parallel layout is excellent. Each verse of Greek next to the same verse in English.

You can use this Stepbible software either on-line, on your web browser or they will let you download it and install it for off-line use. If you choose to install it, then they only give you part of the Bibles and commentaries. If you want the rest, you must download them and install them after installing the main program for Stepbible. The best layout is to put one verse of the original language followed by one verse in English. This means, avoid the interlinear; it has something wrong with it. There are many different possible installations of each Bible version. Some of them have the instantaneous pop-up dictionary and some do not. Some will also mark the translated word in English when you point to a word in the original language. (Which is **not** 100% accurate. The pop-up dictionary is accurate, in English.) There are “how to use Step” videos on [youtube.com](https://www.youtube.com).

The best (most recommendable) software for studying Hebrew and Greek ***used to be*** “BibleWorks 8”, but unfortunately, it has been discontinued. (Possibly a copy of this software can be borrowed from somewhere.) Their web page says: “[As of June 15, 2018 BibleWorks ceased operation as a provider of Bible software tools.](#)”

Another page that has it at: <http://www.bmssoftware.com/bibleworks8.htm>. I

don't know anything about this page, or if they are even the same people. It's possible that it is a hacked version. I don't know if they are selling it legally.

With the "BibleWorks 8" software, no other materials are necessary for learning the original languages of the Bible. (except for the Hebrew audio recordings and the user-friendly Hebrew grammar mentioned above.) Probably, the Hebrew grammars which come with this software won't be very user-friendly. I have not taken the time to examine them. Many grammars were written for people with advanced knowledge of language study. Those grammars were not made for beginners.

The <https://e-sword.net/> software can put the Greek and English texts side-by-side in parallel columns. The Logos.com software has interlinear Greek texts with a word in English directly below each Greek word, for the easiest word-for-word translation. You can also buy these texts as a book in many Christian book stores, or online. (1965 Interlinear Greek/English Textus Receptus, with KJV in the margin)

You can also find Hebrew music videos from Christian churches in Israel, with dual subtitles in Hebrew and English both together, on youtube.com.

For learning modern Hebrew there are new videos on Youtube called: "Good News in Easy Hebrew". These videos have separate text documents available with Hebrew/English translations for each video.

The Muslims put a lot of emphasis on learning the original language of their Koran, in Arabic. They teach that anyone who is completely dedicated to God will learn the language in which God speaks to them. (A translation always loses some of the original meaning.) (The Mormons do the reverse. They say to forget about the original language, and use the English translation instead.) Faithful Christians should start learning the original languages now.

But, it's too bad that those Muslims are mistaken about the Koran being the word of God. (They put most Christians to shame by learning the original language of their Koran. Christians are rarely so dedicated.) It should also be noted that the Arabs are famous for their outstanding poetry..... and that the Koran is a beautiful poetical masterpiece, like Shakespeare, which explains the vast popularity it has received. Parts of the Koran are in accordance with the Bible. Certain parts of the Bible are also very beautiful, poetically speaking, (like Psalms and Song of Solomon) but that poetical beauty has been mostly lost in every English translation. The extreme beauty of it can only be experienced in the original Hebrew language.

Another aspect of the original languages that is, for the most part, lost in every English translation is the different styles of writing that each man used. John was a fisherman, and as would be expected he wrote the books of John using very

simple words with very easy to understand Greek. Therefore, the books of John would be very good for beginners to start learning Greek with. Paul, on the other hand was highly educated, and as would be expected, all of his writings were considerably more complicated, and difficult to understand. Even the Roman governor Porcius Festus noticed the highly educated level of Paul's manner of speaking. (Acts 26:24) And Peter says the same: 2Peter 3:16 "As also in all *his* (Paul) *epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood.....*"

But, what is not seen in any English translation, is that the books of Peter, who was also a fisherman, which would be expected to have been written with similar simplicity as the books of John, was actually written similar to the difficult books of Paul. The answer to this problem is probably very easy. Peter, as a fisherman, was probably so poorly educated that he needed help writing. So, someone like Paul was probably assisting Peter to write those books. Peter probably couldn't do it on his own.

Another explanation is that Peter could have written first in his own native language of Hebrew (not Aramaic, see 2Kings 18:26-27), and then someone like Paul could have translated it right away into Greek.

Recommended free Bible software:
www.e-sword.net or www.theword.net or
www.scripture4all.org/download/download_ISA2.php
or www.stepbible.org/

Also free Bible audio recordings at:
www.audiotreasure.com
Hebrew OT audio recordings at:
<https://mechon-mamre.org/p/pt/ptmp3prq.htm>
Also KJV read by Alexander Scourby free on
[youtube.com](https://www.youtube.com) search for scourby audio bible.
Alexander Scourby has a very pleasant voice.

e-mail: pastor_david@tutaimail.com

OTHER ARTICLES at
www.pastordavidministries.com

The Messiah of the Jews

The Trinity

The Holy Scriptures

The Lie of Evolution

What About Deborah

Fatherhood

The Role Of Women Throughout History

The Consequences of Using Incorrect Terminology

Domestic Discipline

The Lukewarm Church

Correct Divorce

Baptism

The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”

The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible

Self-Love and Self-Esteem

Angels are Aliens, Aliens are Angels

Wolves In Sheep's Clothing

Slavery

The Virtues of the Spirit

The Babylonian and Egyptian Captivity

The Suffering Of The Great Depression

Salvation

Marriage Misunderstandings Explained
