

THE
NEW TESTAMENT
OF
OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR
JESUS CHRIST

TRANSLATED OUT OF THE GREEK:

BEING THE VERSION SET FORTH A.D. 1611
COMPARED WITH THE MOST ANCIENT AUTHORITIES AND REVISED
A.D. 1881.

PRINTED FOR THE UNIVERSITIES OF
OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1881

Long Primer Crown 8vo.

All Rights reserved.

PREFACE

For centuries an all-powerful Roman Church condemned millions to genocide, torture and enslavement based largely on belief. In some senses the inspiration for these atrocities was drawn directly from the context of the Old and New Testament. Whilst the 'Holy Bible' has indeed inspired thousands into engaging in morally up righteous work, it also stands as a book accepted as "divine", by many in ignorance. How many Christians have delved into examining the authentic sources from where the Holy Writ originates from?

At the outset, the writer of this booklet is not an enemy of the Bible, nor seeks to solicit Christians in discarding a book which still remains an inspiration for millions. In fact the contents of this book may be shocking to many at first glance. The quotations are culled directly from the primary sources of the Church, hence the reader cannot accuse the compilers of misleading the public. Our reason in writing this treatise is a simple appeal to Christians to reason and ponder upon the facts presented.

BY: THE TRUTH WILL SET YOU FREE INSTITUTE

POINT NUMBER 1

According to Britannica 1929 Edition, they claim:

“GREEK MSS. - The original autographs of the New Testament books have long since perished, and (except for a few fragments, all from upper Egypt) the same fate has overtaken all the MSS used by Christians in the ante-Nicene period. When in the 4th century the empire became Christian and the Church established, copies of the Scripture were multiplied in a substantial form” [Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 3, p. 515.]

In spite of the above claims there is no evidence to substantiate that Greek manuscripts are in existence from that time. If one examines the preface of the 1881 KJV then one will discover that when the Greek Bible was revised in order to create the 1881 version of the New Testament they had to consult the **Latin Vulgate in order to rectify the Greek Version of the New Testament**, which proves that the so called Greek Version of the New Testament is not an original manuscript. However, unfortunately for the

Church it is not possible to substantiate that there ever existed a Latin Vulgate though they report that one existed.

Let us give the history of the most valuable and precious New Testament of Christianity, which is the “Greek version” of the Bible: According to the creators of the King James Version, they state:

“1. With regard to the Greek Text, it would appear that, if to some extent the translators exercised an independent judgement, it was mainly in choosing amongst readings contained in the principal editions of the Greek Text that had appeared in the sixteenth century. Wherever they seem to have followed a reading which is not found in any of those editions, their rendering may probably be trace to the Latin Vulgate. Their chief guides appear to have been the later editions of Stephanus and of Beza, and also, to a certain extent, the Complutensian Polyglott. All these were founded for the most part on manuscripts of late date, few in number, and *used with*

little critical skill. But in those days it could hardly have been otherwise. Nearly all the more ancient of the documentary authorities have become only within the last two centuries; some of the most important of them, indeed, within the last few years. Their publication has called forth not only improved editions of the Greek Text, but a succession of instructive discussions on the variations which have been brought to light, and on the modes of distinguishing original readings from changes introduced in the course of transcription. While therefore it has long been the opinion of all scholars that the commonly received text needed thorough revision, it is but recently that materials have been acquired for executing such a work with even approximate completeness.”¹ [our emphases]

The above is a big blow to the so-called “original” New Testament in the Greek language! Nay, it makes

1 : The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Translated out of the Greek: Being the version set forth A.D. 1611 Compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A.D. 1881 page VI. (*Kindly note: We have this Bible in our possession*).

a mockery of the entire Christian Scriptures! After studying the preface of the **1881 New Testament**, one is forced to believe The New Apostolic Church who revealed that during *sixteenth century* of the Reformation there ‘...***existed in no other language but Latin...***’² a Bible of the Roman Catholic Church. This fact is further supported as follows:

“A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work; but it did not fall within our province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text. In many cases the English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of two competing readings in the Greek, and then the question of the text was usually not raised. A sufficiently laborious task remained in deciding between the rival claims of various readings which might properly affect the translation. When these were adjusted, our deviations from the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version had next to be indicated, in accordance with the

2: “History of the Kingdom of God”; New Apostolic Church, [Hereafter the following abbreviation will be used: N.A.C.] Dortmund, Germany. Vol 1, 1st edition 1971. [1998 Edition]

fourth rule; but it proved inconvenient to record them in the margin. A better mode however of giving them publicity has been found, as the University Presses have undertaken to print them in connexion with complete Greek texts of the New Testament. In regard of the readings thus approved, it may be observed that fourth rule, by requiring that 'the text to be adopted' should be 'that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating,' was in effect an instruction to follow the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of modern times, and therefore to employ the resources of criticism for estimating the value of evidence. Textual criticism, as applied to the Greek New Testament, forms a special study of much intricacy and difficulty, and even now leaves room for considerable variety of opinion among competent critics. Different schools of criticism have been represented among us, and have together contributed to the final result. In the early part of the work every various reading requiring

consideration was discussed and voted on by the Company.³ (Our emphases)

POINT NUMBER 2

Those who claim to believe that the Bible is the word of God must also consider the following arguments:

Let us assume that Prophet Mûsâ (Christians call him Moses) could have spoken Hebrew⁴ or even Aramaic, then, we must also agree that Pharaoh would never have spoken with him in Hebrew or Aramaic, which must have been the **slave languages**, as the Children of Israel were the slaves of Pharaoh at that time. **Therefore, it stands to reason that Prophet Mûsâ and Pharaoh must have communicated in the Egyptian Arabic language.**

“A further implication is that Moses would have an Egyptian education, one of

3 : 1881 Bible page xli.

4: According to Peake's Commentary of the Bible the word **Hebrew is a Greek word**: See Peake's Commentary on the Bible 1919, p. 34. Peake is a world renowned Biblical Scholar. [His full details are: Professor Arthur S. Peake. Rylands Professor of Biblical exegesis in the University of Manchester; Prof. in Hartley College, Manchester; Sometime fellow of Merton College, Oxford. His voluminous works have been printed by Thomas Nelson & sons Ltd of London].

the best available in his day.” *New Bible Dictionary 1988, p. 305.*

Be that as it may, ***Pharaoh would never have spoken with him in the language of the slaves!*** Even if we want to agree that Prophet Mûsâ spoke Hebrew, then we must also agree that the communication with Pharaoh must have been in the **Egyptian language.**

POINT NUMBER 3

The New Testament’s authenticity from the Vatican Catholic Church’s official records state:

The Catholic Church states:

“Bible, Manuscripts of the. Copies of the Biblical text, written by hand. The text of the Bible has been handed down to us through handwritten and printed copies of the original writings and through translations into various ancient and modern languages. **None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist**, but there are many ancient copies of the originals.” [Our emphases] (*J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the*

Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30)

Never mind the Old Covenant's problem, (as Christianity is not really based on it) we have the same problem with the New Testament. According to the Catholic Bible (1959), the language of Jesus is said to be **Aramaic**, which was the spoken language in Galilee at that time. Already, one can see that much confusion exists about the mother tongue (language) of Jesus, since: “... **no contemporary literary remains of this dialect, [Aramaic] remains we cannot determine precisely the dialect he (Jesus) spoke**” [our emphases]. (*J. P. O'Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30*)

The Protestants kill two birds with one stone and concur with the Catholics because they do not possess any so called 'original manuscripts.' The significant point to remember is that these so called original 'manuscripts' are in Greek, which

Jesus never spoke. So what truth can one extract from such unworthy manuscripts that are in tiny bits and pieces in a foreign language? Refer above: “in the early part of the work every various reading requiring consideration was discussed and voted on by the Company.”

“Since no autograph of any book of the Bible has survived, textual criticism plays an important part in Bible study. The material on which *textual critics of the Bible work* includes not only manuscript copies of the books of the Bible in their original languages but also ancient translations into other languages and quotations of biblical passages by ancient authors.” (New Bible Dictionary, 1978, p. 151)

Pope Damasus who was the “Pontifex Maximus” for the state entrusted this task to St. Jerome. The following statement bears the information from which this inference is drawn:

“*The Vulgate* is the translation of the Bible into Latin by St. Jerome (340-420). About 383 A.D, at the request of Pope Damasus, he began revising the Old Latin version of

the Gospels according to the Greek. He probably revised the other books of the New Testament at the same time. Beginning about 387 in Bethlehem, he revised the Latin version of the protocanonical books... of the Old Testament according to the Greek in the Hexapla of Origen. About 390 Jerome began a new Latin translation of the whole Old Testament (except 5 deuterocanonical books) from the original Hebrew. The Vulgate is made up largely of Jerome's work in these three revisions and versions. Thus in the Vulgate, the New Testament is his first revision according to the Greek. The Psalms are from his revision of the Old Testament according to the Greek in the Hexapla of Origen. The protocanonical books of the Old Testament are from Jerome's translation of the Hebrew. The five deuterocanonical books omitted by Jerome (Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, 1 Machabees, 2 Machabees) are from the Old Latin version."

PROTESTANT VIEW POINT OF THE VULGATE

As has been mentioned earlier, Jerome was assigned to revise the Bible:

“He was commissioned by the then Pope to produce a Latin rendering of the whole of the Bible, and he began by revising for the NT and the Psalter the existing translations into Latin, the so-called Old Latin texts, to bring them into line with the LXX [Septuagint].” [Peake’s Commentary on the Bible, 1962 edition, 1962, 58c, p. 75]

Hence, the Vulgate of Jerome became his original work, which means that no other Vulgate existed before his time. It could also mean that the original Vulgate could have existed between 340 and 420 C.E and therefore had to be translated from a non-vowel text if there was one, as the vowel system only emerged in the 7th century C.E or during “C.E 500 to 1000”. However, the point in question is that the Vulgate of Jerome had to be *“in line with the LXX”*. If this is so, then the Vulgate of Jerome is also an unreliable source as the Septuagint is said to have been the work of **‘ignorant’⁵** scribes.

5: Peake’s Commentary on the Bible, 1962 edition, 49c, page 63

A study of Textual Criticism is necessary to understand the significance and impact with the most recent information at hand, namely the Dead Sea Scrolls, had on Biblical history and understanding. The Catholics explained it as follows:

“The science that seeks to determine as **nearly** as possible the original biblical text as it was written by the authors themselves. This science applies to other literature besides the Bible, for example, to the Latin classics such as the works of Horace or Cicero, or to the plays of Shakespeare. In each case, all the available evidence is gathered to determine the history of the transmission of the text, and then compared **to establish what seems to be the original text**. There are two kinds of evidence which the textual critic uses in order to determine the text: external (documents) and internal (conjecture). As regards external evidence for both the Old and New Testaments, there are thousands of Hebrew and Greek manuscripts which have been preserved through the centuries. Besides, there are many copies of the old translations of the

Bible, such as the **Greek Septuagint**, the **Latin Vulgate**, and the **Syriac Peshitto**. All these versions are important because they tell us about **the state of the biblical text at a time not long after the original text was written**. Hence the textual critic must master all these Languages in order to use these sources, and then by comparison of text and translations he strives to reach the original reading. Some parts of the Bible have been corrupted (i.e., the original reading has been lost) during the course of its history. **If the corruption occurred very early, it may be impossible for the textual critic to arrive at the original by use of documents**. Then he must resort to conjecture: taking into account the context, and various possibilities of error in the script, he strives to restore the text as he conceives it was originally written. For example: “Return, O Lord, you who ride upon the clouds,” in Numbers 10:36 is a conjectural emendation of a corrupt Hebrew text. While the substantial integrity of biblical text has been preserved by the providence of God; **there is still a place for textual criticism**, as the Church recognizes. In the

Divino afflante Spiritu... Pope Pius XII said that the art of textual criticism is “quite rightly employed in the case of the sacred books... to ensure that the sacred text be restored, as perfectly as possible, and be purified from the corruptions due to the carelessness of the copyists...” [*Our emphases*]⁶

In essence, Textual Criticism forms the basis of Biblical establishment and compilation. From the aforementioned, we deduce that the authors or Textual Critics mastered the languages of copies or at least translated copies of an unknown Bible. What pertinence can be embodied in the works of the Textual Critics if no knowledge about the original text exists? Is it possible to accredit constructive significance to a text, which is said to be **near** to the original without the latter being available? **Since when can a piece of work based on a copy of some book, which is claimed to be a copy of the lost original in translated form, project valid support in favour of the meaning of the original?** It is strange to refer to the term “corrupted” as “the

6 : J. P. O’Connell, et al. *The Holy Family Bible* Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, pp. 242-243.

original reading has been lost,” again implying that corruption became due to “carelessness of the copyists.” The corruption could only be due to the reproduction of verses, which were non-existent.

“There are no very ancient MSS. [MSS = Manuscripts] of the Hebrew Bible, and of such as have come down to us, all belong to the same family or recension. The earliest dated Hebrew manuscript known was written in **916 A.D.** another, undated, which has recently been bought by the Trustees of the British Museum, is probably a little older. Many were destroyed in the Middle Ages, and others were buried through the pious, if mistaken, reverence of the Jews. That other recensions were at one time in existence is shown by the variations in the ancient versions, especially the Septuagint, by means of which we are able in some cases to reconstruct the original which they represent” [‘The Holy Bible 1896 Oxford: Printed at the University Press’.][our emphases]

POINT NUMBER 4

The Catholics deny the claim that Matthew wrote 'The Gospel according to Matthew.' We refer to the Catholic claim:

“It is true that this Gospel was largely dependent upon an earlier Aramaic writing, which tradition assures us was composed by St. Matthew. But this work of St. Matthew no longer exists, and the Gospel which now bears the name of Matthew was written in Greek and based on the work of St. Mark.”⁷

For the reason that Matthew's text is non-existent, and the latter is a primary source used to derive Jesus' name, we deduce that **none of the names are divine.**

We remind again what the Catholic and Protestant Churches states:

“Bible, Manuscripts of the. Copies of the biblical text, written by hand. The text of the Bible has been handed down to us through handwritten and printed copies of the original writings and through translations into various ancient and modern languages.

7 : Virtue's Catholic Encyclopedia Vol. 1, 1965 page 141.

None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist, but there are many ancient copies of the originals” [*Our emphases*].⁸

“Since no autograph of any book of the Bible has survived, textual criticism plays an important part in Bible study. The material on which textual critics of the Bible work includes not only manuscript copies of the books of the Bible in their original languages but also ancient translations into other languages and quotations of biblical passages by ancient authors” [*Our emphases*].⁹

According to the Virtues Catholic Bible (1959), the language of Jesus is said to be Aramaic, which was the spoken language in Galilee at that time.¹⁰ If this is so then the Essenes could also have spoken

8 : J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30.

9 : New Bible Dictionary First Edition, 1978, p. 151. In the 2nd edition 1988, page 140.

10 : J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30.

Aramaic, as Jesus grew up amongst them in his boyhood years.¹¹ Already, one can see that much confusion exists about the mother tongue [language] of Jesus, since “...no contemporary literary remains of this dialect, [Aramaic] we cannot **determine precisely the dialect He spoke**” [*our emphases*].¹² At this point, we would emphasise that the fact that Jesus’ dialect of Aramaic is unknown, one can already realise the daunting task the Textual Critics face in completing the NT, which at this point in time remains a “vast and unfinished” task. In fact this is what they have stated:

“Thus the task of New Testament textual criticism is vast and unfinished.”¹³

This means that the words in the New Testament do not belong to him, but to the hundreds of Textual Critics over the past 1,500 years!

11 : See Peake 1962, p. 734:639h.

12 : J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30.

13 : New Bible Dictionary 1978, p. 1269.

The Children of Isrâ'îl, are the off-spring of Prophet Yaqoob [Jacob], **and the Jews are the offspring of the Greeks and Romans**¹⁴.

In the same way the Jews are the offspring of the women of the Children of Isrâ'îl who were raped by the Pagan Greeks whose children became known as the Sons of Darkness¹⁵, then came the Pagan Romans who raped the women of the Sons of Darkness and their offspring became known as the Jews¹⁶.

This would imply that not one Gospel contains the truth!!! We are very sorry to point out this very important truth! Until proven otherwise, the Old and New Testaments are not Divine books. The important point to understand is the fact that the history of the Old and New Testaments has a well-known undisputed history of its reconstruction. This is true only amongst the readers – especially those who are truthful. It is a known undisputed fact that there is not one copy of any of the original manuscripts of the two books, the O.T.&N.T of the Bible, known to exist in the world. Even if one

14: Refer to: 'The History of The Jews' by Al-Hajj Mofsowitz Potashnickh [ex Jewish Rabbi from Romania]

15: Ibid

16: Ibid

claims that there are only copies of the originals, then such a claim has no evidence to support it.

We refer to the Real Christians who have in one part of the Bible **46 books**, and states under the rule of 'His Holiness Pope John xxiii' the following:

“None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist...”¹⁷

Never mind the manuscripts, the language in which the original came is unknown. After examining the above information one find it difficult to consider the Bible as a source of divine revelation or a book of inspired contents.

It is important to state the Biblical History as reported by those who broke away from the Roman Catholic Church. The Holy Bible opens with the following words:

“To the most high and mighty prince James, by the grace of God, King of great Britain, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c.”

This 1896 Bible reveals that Genesis chapter one began in the year 4004 BC. According to the

17 : Catholic Bible. page. 30

book 'The Reader's Digest Great Encyclopaedic Dictionary' Jesus was born '(c 4 B.C. – c A.D. 30)'.

According to John Blanchard, who states:

“Strictly speaking, the Bible is not a book at all, but a collection of sixty-six documents brought together over the course of about 1,500 years, the most recent dating from about A.D. 95.”¹⁸

Then the Jehovah's Witnesses claim: “The Bible was written over a span of some 1,600 years, from 1513 B.E.C. to about 98 C.E.”¹⁹

We have the first oldest manuscripts dated 916 AD which is the Massoretic text. Then we have the Dead Sea Scrolls which brings the date a thousand years backwards. Blanchard reports as follows: “...the Dead Sea Scroll manuscript of a particular important chapter of the Bible is more than 1000 years older than the earliest copy we previously possessed...”²⁰

18 : 'Why Believe The Bible' by John Blanchard – Evangelical press USA Fifth impression August 2007, p. 5.

19 : 'Awake! November 2007 Special issue Can You Trust The Bible?' page 7.

20 : 'Why Believe The Bible' by John Blanchard – Evangelical press USA Fifth impression August 2007, p. 9.

What does this mean? It means that the Jehovah's Witnesses seems not to tell the truth. If the Dead Sea Scrolls is a thousand years older, then the Bible cannot be older than about 100 BC. **Even though the Dead Sea Scrolls are supposed to be the oldest, there is not one Bible that contains its contents.** They were forced to keep the documents for fifty years in secret and had to kill John Marco Allegro²¹ - in order to protect the secret of their manipulations of the Scrolls. So many controversial things were written about the Scrolls, but till today they have not been released, or even used in any of the Bibles. We believe strongly that the creation of Israel in 1948 was as a direct result of the Scrolls. It seems to have been the bargaining chip for Israel and its protection. Before 1947 the Jews and Christians did not see eye to eye but suddenly after the discovery of the Scrolls things changed dramatically and so quickly and Israel was created under the auspicious of the Christian nations.

21: The new book 'The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English Translated by Geza Vermes' only mention his name on page 5, and on page 21, Vermes says 'This trend was continued with loud media support by J. M. Allegro's speculation about the role of amanita muscaria, a hallucinogenic fungus, in the genesis of the Christian Church.' but kept quiet about him being murdered. This fact tells a huge story!

The English Revised Standard Version -1980, on page iii. states:

“The first English version of the Scriptures made by direct translation from the original Hebrew and Greek, and the first to be printed was the work of William Tyndale. He met bitter opposition. **He was willfully perverting the meaning of the Scriptures, and his New Testament were ordered to be burned as “untrue translations.”** He was finally betrayed into the hands of his enemies, and in October, 1536, he was publicly executed and burned at the stake. **Yet Tyndale’s work became the foundation of subsequent English version”** [our emphases].

If Tyndale’s work was burnt and rejected as “untrue”, the question remains what was left. Assume the remains of his work were preserved, then it means the English version of the New Testament is based entirely on parts of his work. Our concern is that it would be extremely difficult to ascertain what an author articulated in his research if only a section of the research was used. Hence, if the English version of the New Testament is based entirely on a piece of incomplete work, how valid can such

a version be? On the other hand, if none of his “untrue translations” could be retrieved, on what is the English version of the New Testament based? What is important to realize is the fact about the new claims Christians have produced. Today, every Christian believes that the original Scriptures of theirs are preserved in the original revealed language, which they are taught to believe that Jesus spoke.

Therefore, without any truthful investigation they are made to believe that it was the Greek language that he spoke and therefore their Scriptures are in Greek. However, their own information is the source that a truthful investigator will discover that the established claims are not the truth! Every denomination of Christians has its own claims. Yet, collectively they seem to make the equivalent claim about the Greek Scriptures! After one has studied the formation of the first Church by Constantine, then it ought to be clear that it was impossible to retain the original Message brought by the Israelite Prophet because his Message did not concur with what Constantine wanted for his Empire. Therefore, if the original Message was still in existence at

the time when Constantine began to develop his new religious ideology, then it must have been destroyed at that time. It could be that Arius (the leader of the Unitarians) had access to the original Message which led him and his people to oppose Constantine, but it was kept a close secret by the Christians. The reason for this assumption is clear as the various denominations own different versions of Biblical history which reveals that the Bibles did not originate from one source. Nor did the Bible translations originate from one source. The point about the divinity of Jesus says it all, which began in the year 381 AD which made him the 'son of God'!

From the above analysis it is clear that from the time of **the reformation** which led to the establishment of the Reformed and Protestant Churches only in the 16th century, the Catholics had only one Bible in the **Latin language**. This admission means that there was neither a Greek Bible nor the 916 AD Massoretic text from which the teachings of the Bible could be developed, as there were no original sources from which they could develop their teachings, hence their claim that the Greek version of the Bible is the original source is not true!

Let us again reiterate that the Bible was only in Latin:

“In those days only a few wealthy people possessed a Bible, which existed in no other language but Latin, for the Bibles had to be copied by hand as the printing press had not yet been invented. Consequently a Bible cost an enormous sum of money. Moreover not many were able to read at that time. Therefore the only way the common people could hear about the Gospel teaching was through itinerant preachers.” [N.A.C., op. Cit, pp. 98-99.]

Any claim that God is the author of the Bible must be rejected. Our reasons for saying so is because the Bible has these verses:

Death to those who piss against the wall:

Piss Crimes: “therefore, behold, I will bring evil upon the house of Jerobo’am, and will

cut off from Jerobo'am him that pisseth against the wall..." (I Kings 14:10)

Note, the word <pisseth> translates from the Hebrew word <shathan> [shaw-than] which means to make water, i.e. urinate, or piss.

"And it came to pass, when he began to reign, as soon as he sat on his throne, that he slew all the house of Baasha: he left him not one that pisseth against a wall, neither of his kinsfolks, nor of his friends." (I Kings 16:11)

Eating of Human dung

"And thou shalt eat it as barley cakes, and thou shalt bake it with dung that cometh out of man, in their sight. And the LORD said, Even thus shall the children of Israel eat their defiled bread among the Gentiles, whither I will drive them." (Ezekiel 4:12-13)

Eating of Human Dung and Drinking of Piss

"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, and drink their own piss with you?" (II Kings 18:27)

Cannibalism

“And the king said unto her, What aileth thee? And she answered, This woman said unto me, Give thy son, that we may eat him to day, and we will eat my son tomorrow. So we boiled my son, and did eat him: and I said unto her on the next day, Give thy son, that we may eat him: and she hath hid her son....”
(II Kings 6:28-29)

Below are a few quotations from Rev. Dummelow, which proves the alteration of the Bible text beyond all doubt:

“On close examination, however, it must be admitted that the Pentateuch reveals many features inconsistent with the traditional view that in its present form it is the work of Moses. For instance, it may be safely granted that Moses did not write the account of his own death in Dt. 34. The statement in Dt. 1:1 that Moses spoke these words beyond Jordan is evidently made from the standpoint of one living in Canaan, which

Moses never did Other passages which can with difficulty be ascribed to him are Ex. 6:26, 27; 11:3; 16:35, 36; Lv. 18:24–28; Nu. 12:3; Dt. 2: 12” (Bible Commentary, p. xxiv). And again: “A careful examination has led many scholars to the conviction that the writings of Moses formed only the rough material or purport of the material, and that in its present form it is not the work of one man, but a compilation made from previously existing documents” (p. xxvi). Still again: “Similarly in the legislative portions of these books we find apparent contradictions and these not in minor or insignificant details, but in fundamental enactments” (p. xxvi).

The same author says the text of the New Testament is still more unreliable.:

“To begin with, the writers of the Gospels report in Greek ... the sayings of Jesus Christ, who for the most part probably spoke Aramaic ... Not even in later centuries do we find that scrupulous regard for the sacred text which marked the transmission of the Old Testament. A copyist would sometimes

put in not what was in the text, but what he thought out to be in it. He would trust a fickle memory, or he would even make the text accord with the views of the school to which he belonged” (p. xvi).

Cape Town

November 2009