



The Inspired Word of God

Part 14

More than 50 years ago, Jack Chick made a decision to use the King James Bible for the Scripture references in his tracts. Some disagreed with that decision and tried to persuade him to use modern Bible versions, contending that they would be easier for an unbeliever to understand. For those of you not familiar with Jack Chick, he is the originator of those little tracts you have seen around laundromats, rest rooms, restaurants, interstate rest stops, bus stations, airports, etc. Jack went to be with the Lord on October 23, 2016.

If Jack would have agreed, what would he have done when referencing a Bible verse that has a footnote, saying that verse does not belong? For example, the following verse from Mark 16:19:

"So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God."

Most modern Bibles have a footnote indicating that the entire ending of Mark chapter 16, verses 9-20, are not found in the "oldest and best" manuscripts. This means that the eyewitness account of Jesus' ascension was removed.

The Greek text that scholars say is the oldest and best, the Codex Sinaiticus, does not include them. These missing passages are Mark 16:9-20 and Luke 24:51 and are the only accounts of Jesus' ascension in the Gospels.

Because the authenticity of Mark 16: 9-20 had been questioned, the passage had not been included in some Bibles. **Ivan Panin showed, through the richness and continuity of its Gematria, that the passage really does belong in the King James Bible.** Gematria, then, is a type of watermark or seal of authenticity. In fact, because the Apocrypha, Book of Mormon, Qur'an, etc., do not have rich Gematria multiples, we know that they are not from God. Below are some of the 75 features of "seven" that Ivan Panin found in these twelve verses. The information below is also found in chapter 13 of this study series, and its truth and relevance is being reprinted here for readers. The very fact that Dr. Ivan Panin showed 75 features of the

“Heptadic” Design Feature in Mark 16:9-20 is proof positive that it was in the Greek Textus-Receptus, and is properly included in the King James Bible. Further, it clearly reveals this text as evidence identifying the authenticity of its Author.

1.	The number of words in this passage is 175 (7 × 25)
2.	The vocabulary has 98 words (7 × 14)
3.	The number of its forms is 133 (7 × 19)
4.	The numeric value of its 133 forms is 89,663 (7 × 12,809)
5.	Of these 133 forms 112 (7 × 16) occur but once; and 21 (7 × 3) occur more than once
6.	The 98 words of the vocabulary have 553 letters (7 × 79)
7.	Of which 294 (7 × 42) are vowels, and 259 (7 × 37) are consonants
8.	Of the 98 vocabulary words 84 (7 × 12) are found before in the Gospel of Mark, and 14 (7 × 2) are found only here
9.	Of the 98 vocabulary words 42 (7 × 6) are used by Messiah in His address to the disciples; and 56 (7 × 8) form no part of His vocabulary
10.	Messiah's speech has 56 (7 × 8) words, and the rest of the passage has 119 (7 × 17) words
11.	The vocabulary is not only seven, but of seven sevens (7 × 7 × 2)
12.	The same is true of 294 (7 × 7 × 6)
13.	Of 84 (7 × 2 × 2 × 3), itself is a multiple of seven, and the sum of its factors, 14, (7 × 2)
14.	The sum of the figures in 133 is 7
15.	The 21 forms occurring more than once have 231 letters (7 × 11 × 3), itself has 33 sevens
16.	With the sum of its factors 21 (7 × 3)
17.	The 175 words are distributed among three natural divisions in the narrative: verses 9-11 have 35 (7 × 5) words, verses 12-18 have 105 (7 × 15) words, and verses 19-20 have 35 (7 × 5) words
18.	The total numeric value of the letters of all the words in the passage is 103,663, or 14,809 × 7
19.	The numeric value of verse 9 is 11,795 (7 × 1,685)
20.	The numeric value of verse 10 is 5,418 (7 × 774)
21.	The numeric value of verse 11 is 11,795 (7 × 1,685)
22.	The numeric value of verses 12 to 20 is 86,450 (7 × 12,350)
23.	The first word of verse 10 has a value of 98 (7 × 14), the middle word, 4,529 (7 × 647), and the last word, 791 (7 × 113).
24.	The word “deadly” in verse 18 is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. With a numeric value of 581 (7 × 83), deadly is preceded in the vocabulary by 42 (7 × 8) words, and in the passage by 126 (7 × 18) words.

This is so very important for understanding how the “Heptadic” Design Feature functions as a means of validating Biblical accuracy. Modern translations include a foot note indicating something to the effect that the entire ending of Mark chapter 16, verses 9-20, are not found in the "oldest and best" manuscripts. **This means that the eyewitness account of Jesus' ascension is removed.** It is a subtle attack attempting to undermine the deity of Christ and the validity of His Divine nature linking to His redemptive work here on earth.

The Greek text that scholars say is the oldest and best is the Codex Sinaiticus; it does not include these verses and is now in question and suspected as a fake. This is just one of several

issues bringing into question the legitimacy of the Codex Sinaiticus'. David W. Daniels of Chick Publications has authored a scholarly analysis of this and related issues in his new book, *'Is The World's Oldest Bible, A Fake?'* Daniels is a trained translator and scholar in Biblical languages.

Modern Bibles have changed many verses because of the discovery of an "ancient" manuscript in a monastery on the Sinai Peninsula. The manuscript, called Sinaiticus, is claimed to be the earliest complete copy of the New Testament. Its discoverer, who was a world leading Bible scholar in his time, told the world Sinaiticus was from the 4th century and that it was the "oldest and best" Bible available. Publishers rushed to make new Bibles with many changes to match it.

But not everyone agreed. When a famed 19th century Bible scholar and a well-known Greek calligrapher, Constantin Von Tischendorf claimed the ancient date, he said, *"No! I made that document!"* But why did no one believe him? Maybe it's because pages of the manuscript were stored where no one could view them, archived in exclusive collections across several continents.

Now, an international group has carefully photographed each page of Sinaiticus and is displaying it on the internet as high-quality digital images. For the first time, Bible scholars and students can see the entire manuscript together; this was never possible before. And what they are seeing with their own eyes is shocking. Some of the pages are white and look quite new, while others have been darkened to make them look very old. If they are all from the same "old" Bible, how can this be?

Researcher David W. Daniels proves with easy-to-understand evidence that the Sinaiticus is not the oldest manuscript and certainly not the best. His argument is also convincing when showing how the manuscript is not really that old after all and that the Greek calligrapher did, in fact, **make it in the 19th century.**

The textual (and doctrinal) changes in modern Bibles are based upon a fake — a shadowy scheme worthy of Satan's hatred for the preserved words of God. Mr. Daniels' new 350-page book will severely impact the sale of copyrighted modern Bibles, once it becomes public knowledge. It will be attacked for sure because it raises serious question about the validity of Sinaiticus. Push-back from the theological and academic community will attempt to discredit Daniels' new book to soften the impact and to preserve the volume of sales on modern translations because that will drastically hurt sales and affect royalties. The egregious misrepresentations and flaws of Sinaiticus will further bring into question the other Roman Catholic Codex, Vaticanus since the heretics Westcott and Hort had access to both Codices. This was, of course, all with the Papacy's blessings in their work we now know as the Corrupt Critical New Greek Text, which was used to translate all modern translations since 1900.

I am going to extract a few pages from David W. Daniels' new book for readers to show how the Bible reading public have been deceived. What follows is from his new book, *'Is The World's Oldest Bible, A Fake?'*

Would God have withheld the truth for 1800 years, only to have it show up in an Orthodox monastery in the desert? And then would God arrange for it to be stolen, first 43 leaves of it in 1844, then the rest of it, with Russian help, in 1859? And then would He have it only "released" to the public in 1862 —but not directly, only as an altered, printed copy?

Would He have His people see only a typeset text that covers up thousands of erasures, write-overs, marginal notes and optional readings? Would it be missing over 1/3 of the Old Testament? And after that, would it be mixed with fairytales like Tobit and Judith, Bel and the Dragon, Susanna, and 4th Maccabees, the non-historical, fanciful writings of men?

If the apocryphal Epistle of Barnabas, and the Christ's deity demoting Shepherd of Hermas were supposed to have been scripture, would God have held them back from His people? And to top it off, would He have then secretly added them to the real New Testament?

That's not my God. The Bible says this about my God:

"Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever." -(Hebrews 13:8)

And:

"God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?" -(Numbers 23:19)

The trustworthiness of God is at stake. God said, recorded in three places:

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." -(Matthew 24:35, Mark 13:31; Luke 21:33)

So when God promised that His word would never pass away, He either lied, and His words crumbled up and passed away, for over 1800 years, —or there's something wrong with this famous "oldest and best text" of the Bible.

The following has been the famous narrative about the discovery of Sinaiticus, from the 1860s until today. It has been taught in universities, seminaries and even churches.

Supposedly, a world renowned text collector and Greek expert, Constantin von Tischendorf, discovered a number of Greek parchment sheets older than any he had ever seen in a waste bin and destined for the fire. He then dramatically rescued them from the flames in 1844 and took 21 1/2 sheets back to Germany and called them the Codex Friderico-Augustus (CFA). In 1853 Tischendorf returned, but claimed he couldn't find any more sheets.

He returned in 1859 with a Russian Orthodox delegation, and there gave a monk one of Tischendorf's own printed Septuagints. In return Tischendorf received the monk's prized possession, wrapped in a red cloth. This was the Codex Sinaiticus.

Tischendorf claimed he had the codex sent to him in Cairo. Then he transcribed the entire text, with the help of two unnamed Germans who "happened" to be in Cairo, and one of whom just "happened" to read Greek, all completed in the near miraculous space of just two months.

Then with the help of printing experts in his adopted town of Leipzig, Germany, Tischendorf made typeface replicas of the letters, both large and small. He decided which words should be in the text, and which should be in footnotes, and prepared and published all but the CFA, for grand exhibition in 1862.

As a result, Tischendorf received numerous accolades, commendations and honoring compliments, including by the pope himself. After that, the pope, with his Jesuit Cardinal Mai, invited Tischendorf to see the grand prize of the Vatican, Codex Vaticanus, which Tischendorf transcribed and printed in 1867.

These two texts (the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) became the basis for a new Greek text, picked by Westcott and Hort, as their basis to create new English Bible versions, such as the Revised Version of 1881, the American Standard of 1901, and hundreds of changed Bible versions ever since.

Sounds too good to be true, doesn't it?

Well, it is too good to be true.

In this book we will find the clues that show us that the Sinaiticus, which changed Protestant and Baptist faith forever (though it didn't change Catholic or Orthodox faith), is not what it is claimed to be.

It is a fake.

And whether it was made for all the right reasons, for all the wrong reasons, or for reasons we do not yet know, the Codex Sinaiticus, which suddenly appeared in its tattered form in 1844, is not the oldest; it is certainly not the best, and it is not an ancient manuscript at all.

And, to top it all off, no one has even been allowed to do scientific tests to date the ink or the parchment.

* * *

My journey started with a simple question.

I woke up one morning and went into prayer, as I usually do. Then I heard these words: "What if they're fakes?" And I saw a mental image of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus.

I had thought they were counterfeits, but ancient ones, from Alexandria, Egypt. I never considered seriously that they were actually modern fakes.

A few days later, I was praying about the next video I would make for our YouTube channel, [youtube.com/c/chicktracts](https://www.youtube.com/c/chicktracts). My mind was filled with one thought: Codex Sinaiticus.

I thought, "Okay, that may be good for one or two videos." I was about to be surprised by a number of hints and facts, which then became a number of videos!

A few weeks later, during devotions, the thought came to my heart: "Simple answers to even simpler questions."

And then one more event really got me started. I prayed and asked God, "What question should I ask?"

And I heard, "What color is it?"

And that was the beginning of all that you are about to read. Please, check the facts all you want. Dogged research is how I got to be where I am now, and why I wrote this book. I want you to see it and answer the question for yourself.

"Is the 'Oldest and Best Bible' a fake?"

God bless you as you read.

No Doctrine Affected?

The Codex Sinaiticus was the Greek manuscript that tipped the balance away from the historical, preserved Bible and changed hundreds of scriptures in crucial places. **Did you know that Sinaiticus casts doubt on the resurrection of Jesus Christ?**

See it for yourself!

- ◆ 152 Figure 58 Q77 F5r, Page of Sinaiticus showing gap in text missing Mark 16_9-20 - Labeled.tif
- ◆ Figure 58 - Q77 F5r. Page of Sinaiticus showing gap in text missing Mark 16:9-20
- ◆ 152 Figure 59 Vaticanus pp 1302-1303, showing gap in text missing Mark 16_9-20.tif
- ◆ Figure 59 - Vaticanus pp. 1302-1303, showing gap in text missing Mark 16:9-20

See those blank spaces? Neither Sinaiticus nor Vaticanus in its present form contains Mark 16:9-20. Do you know what that means? For the last 150 years, to a textual critic, or a Bible-doubter, it has meant two things:

1. Jesus in His resurrected body is not in the Gospel of Mark. Textual criticism then claims that Mark is the first gospel, not Matthew. That would mean that the first Gospel did not have a resurrected Jesus.
2. They say, since Mark was the first gospel written, then the whole doctrine of Christ's bodily resurrection is not part of the original Gospel. They say it was added later, by the church! That's funny. Jesuit-educated Norman Geisler said "none of these [changes] affect any basic doctrine of the Christian faith." [49]

I think the resurrection of Christ is a pretty basic doctrine. Don't you? Want to see more of what happens when you trust the Sinaiticus, and how you can answer those critics? I know that it's essential to their theories that Mark has to have been written first.

Everywhere, even in Wikipedia, they will tell you that it was in the 5th century, the 400s AD, that people got the idea that the gospels should be "Matthew, Mark, Luke and John," in that familiar order. They even go on to list what they say are 5th century documents that have that order.

But what they don't tell you, and that would hurt their theory —is that their beloved Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are also in the order of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John! Shh! Don't tell them I told you. Let them look it up for themselves!

But they don't stop there. What comes after the resurrection? The ascension, right? Get ready for this. The Sinaiticus and Vaticanus obviously don't have the ascension from Mark 16:19, since they remove verses 9-20. But Sinaiticus doesn't stop there. It does not have the ascension of Christ in the Gospel of Luke, either. Here is the page of Sinaiticus that has Luke 24:51.

- ◆ 154 Figure 60 Q79 F7v, Page showing missing phrase in Luke 24_51.tif
- ◆ Figure 60 - Q79 F7v. Page showing missing phrase in Luke 24:51
- ◆ 154 Figure 61 Arrow showing spot for missing phrase.tif
- ◆ Figure 61 - Arrow showing spot for missing phrase

It says in English: *"And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them."* But can you see that arrow? That refers to words at the top of the page.

- ◆ 154 Figure 62 Missing phrase in top margin of page
- ◆ Figure 62 - Missing phrase in top margin of page

They show the rest of the verse: *"and [was] carried up into heaven."* But you can see it for yourself that it was not something the original scribe wrote in the text. Someone wrote it, in a different ink, at the top of the page.

What does this mean? Let me ask you: once you remove Mark 16:9-20, in how many other verses of the four Gospels do you find Christ's bodily ascending into heaven? Just this one. So if Luke 24:51 doesn't belong, according to 20th century text critic C.S.C. Williams:[50] *"...there is no reference at all to the Ascension in the original text of the Gospels."*

It's a one-two punch! They say Mark is the first Gospel. Their Sinaiticus/Vaticanus Mark is missing the bodily resurrection. So they say the doctrine of Jesus' resurrection from the dead is a later addition.

But there is no ascension left in Mark, either. Then here in Luke 24:51, Sinaiticus is missing the ascension into heaven of our risen Saviour. So they say the doctrine of Jesus' ascension into heaven is ALSO a later addition!

Oh, and let me add that by "first gospel," they also meant that the "first gospel" was written about the year 80 AD, after the fall of Jerusalem and after most of the Apostles and eyewitnesses were dead.

Still think no basic doctrine of the Christian faith is affected? Now let's turn the tables on the text critics. Please get out a King James and look at Luke 1:1-3. It's important. ***"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us,"***

Luke says that ***"many have"*** written accounts of the Gospel story. So there were Gospels — **plural** — **before Luke wrote.**

Verse 2: ***"Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word;"*** Here Luke said that eyewitnesses back to the beginning **were still alive,** and **ministered the word,** and **passed the information to Luke and others.** So they were obviously still alive for the earlier gospels, like Matthew and Mark.

But text critics like my old professor, the late Dr. Ralph Martin, said Luke was written in the 2nd century, after they all were dead!

Verse 3: ***"It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus,"*** So Luke took it in hand to check on the story from the very first scene, **talking with eyewitnesses,** and to write it down in order as it happened.

So get this, these modern scholars are calling the very first verses of the Gospel of Luke a lie! Do you trust Luke, or the text critics? Now go to Acts 1:1-2. You need to see this. ***"The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach,"*** Nobody I've found disputes that the same guy wrote both Luke and Acts. Luke here is referring to his Gospel.

Verse 2: ***"Until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen:"*** Whoops! ***"Until the day in which He was"*** what? ***"Taken up!"*** Luke just told us his gospel ENDS with the ascension! Imagine that!

The original New American Standard, from 1963 until 1994, actually removed those words from Luke 24, "**and was carried up into heaven,**" copying Sinaiticus! They may have copied the Westcott and Hort 1881 English Revised Version and 1901 American Standard Version. But that's no excuse for taking out God's words. So the Lockman Foundation translators followed the Sinaiticus on this — even though Vaticanus and Alexandrinus and almost every other manuscript in existence has those words! And on top of it, **Luke himself TOLD us they were there!**

Who are you going to believe, the text critics, or the author Luke himself?

Gail Riplinger pointed it out in *'New Age Bible Versions'*. People saw the blunder. And in 1995 an embarrassed Lockman Foundation released the Updated NAS with even more mistakes, but — they put the ascension back into Luke 24:51.

So Sinaiticus is wrong. The text critics were wrong. And someone removed those words, gutting the doctrine of Christ. I think I see Satan's claw prints.

Here's the summary:

1. Only Sinaiticus and Vaticanus remove Jesus' bodily resurrection and ascension, by removing Mark 16:9-20.
2. Only Sinaiticus —not even Vaticanus— takes away Jesus' bodily ascension into heaven out of Luke 24:51, the only reference to Jesus' bodily ascension in the four gospels.
3. Two of the most basic, foundational doctrines of the Christian faith, Jesus physical resurrection and Jesus' physical ascension into heaven, are totally removed from crucial Gospel passages in the Sinaiticus.

Then unsuspecting Bible college and seminary students, the future pastors and leaders, are taught that they don't belong. Then they will teach those same Bible-doubting lies to their congregations or classes. It's just another step in creating a Bible flexible enough for anyone to believe in: one world Bible for one world religion. This is the fruit of textual criticism. And this is the fruit of trusting Sinaiticus. If this is what the pro-Sinaiticus guys want, they can have it. I refuse to bow down.

I'm going to trust God's holy and preserved words in the 400+ year tried, tested and proven King James Bible supported by thousands of manuscripts that agree. Let them show me their doubt based so heavily on one or two confusing documents, and I'll show them my faith. And we'll see who stands on judgment day.

David Daniel's new book will soon become associated with the great Bible scholar Dean John William Burgon, author of *'The Revision Revised'*, the foremost defense of the Authorized Version of the King James Bible. Keep mindful of the fact that Dean Burgon was a contemporary of Westcott and Hort. He called them out for their corruption, their methods of interpretation, and their loose handling of the two Codices that differed from each other in over 3,300 places. Dr. D.A. Waite, Ph.D, Th.D, has been president of the Dean Burgon Society, and since 1978, has published over 700 scholarly articles, booklets, books, dedicated to refuting the Westcott and Hort Corrupt Critical Greek New Testament.

The chief obstacle that we face really becomes a matter of pride: People don't want to acknowledge the truthfulness of the King James Bible **because to do so means one faces an obligation to live by what it says!** Proverbs 16:18 states it in crystal clear language: ***"Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall."*** To add a bit of irony on this matter of pride, the word itself ***"pride"*** actually appears 49X (7 x 7) times in the King James Bible. It is found 46X in the Old Testament, and 3X in the New Testament. Strong's Number (**H1347**) matches the Hebrew (***"ga'own"***), which occurs 49X (7 x 7) times in 45 verses in the Hebrew concordance of the KJV.

The argument against the reliability of the New Testament texts can be stated very simply. How can we know that the documents we have in our possession accurately reflect originals destroyed almost two millennia ago? Communication is never perfect; people make mistakes. Errors are compounded with each successive generation. By the time 2000 years pass, it's anyone's guess what the original said.

It's easy to state the problem, and some may think merely raising the objection makes the argument itself compelling. Yet offering evidence on its behalf is a bit more difficult. Usually the complaint is raised by people who have little understanding of the real issues. In cases like this, an appeal to common knowledge is more often than not an appeal to common ignorance. Like many questions about Christianity, this objection is voiced by people who haven't been given reliable information.

The objection at first glance is compelling. When we try to conceptualize how to reconstruct an original after 2000 years of copying, translating, and copying some more, the task appears impossible. The skepticism, though, is based on two misconceptions about the transmission of ancient documents like the New Testament.



The first assumption is that the transmission is more or less linear, as in the telephone example—one person communicating to a second, who communicates with a third, etc. In a linear paradigm, people are left with one message and many generations between it and the original. Second, the telephone game example depends on oral transmission, which is more easily distorted and misconstrued than something written.

Neither assumption applies to the written text of the New Testament. First, the transmission was not linear but geometric—e.g., one letter birthed five copies, which became 25, which became 200, and so on. Secondly, the transmission in question was done in writing, and written manuscripts can be tested in a way that oral communications cannot be. This is where the “Heptadic” Design Feature becomes a mathematical method to establish accuracy.

The science of textual criticism is used to test all documents of antiquity—not just religious texts—including historical and literary writings. It's not a theological enterprise based on haphazard hopes and guesses; it's a linguistic exercise that follows a set of established rules. Textual criticism allows an alert critic to determine the extent of possible corruption of any work. The ability of any scholar to do effective textual criticism depends on two factors.

- ◆ **First**, how many existing copies are there to examine and compare? Are there two copies, ten, a hundred? The more copies there are, the easier it is to make meaningful comparisons.
- ◆ **Second**, how close in time are the oldest existing documents to the original?

If the numbers are few and the time gap is wide, the original is harder to reconstruct with confidence. However, if there are many copies and the oldest existing copies are reasonably close in time to the original, the textual critic can be more confident that he's pinpointed the exact wording of the autograph.

To get an idea of the significance of the New Testament manuscript evidence, note for a moment the record for non-biblical texts. These are secular texts from antiquity that have been reconstructed with a high degree of certainty based on the available textual evidence.

The important First Century document: *“The Jewish War”*, by Jewish aristocrat and historian Josephus, survives in only nine complete manuscripts dating from the 5th Century—four centuries after they were written. *“Tacitus' Annals of Imperial Rome”* is one of the chief historical sources for the Roman world of New Testament times, yet, surprisingly, it survives in partial form in only two manuscripts dating from the Middle Ages. *“Thucydides' History”* survives in eight copies. There are 10 copies of *“Caesar's Gallic Wars”*, eight copies of *“Herodotus' History”*, and seven copies of *“Plato”*, all dated over a millennium from the original. *“Homer's Iliad”* has the most impressive manuscript evidence for any secular work with 647 existing copies.

Bruce's comments put the discussion in perspective: *“No classical scholar would listen to an argument that the authenticity of Herodotus or Thucydides is in doubt because the earliest manuscripts of their works which are of any use to us are over 1300 years later than the originals.”*

For most documents of antiquity only a handful of manuscripts exist, some facing a time gap of 800-2000 years or more. Yet scholars are confident of reconstructing the originals with some significant degree of accuracy. In fact, virtually all of our knowledge of ancient history depends on documents like these.

The Biblical Manuscript Evidence

By comparison with secular texts, the manuscript evidence for the New Testament is stunning. The most recent count (1980) shows 5,366 separate Greek manuscripts represented by early fragments, uncial codices (manuscripts in capital Greek letters bound together in book form), and minuscules (small Greek letters in cursive style)!

Among the nearly 3,000 minuscule fragments are 34 complete New Testaments dating from the 9th to the 15th Centuries.

Uncial manuscripts provide virtually complete codices (multiple books of the New Testament bound together into one volume) back to the 4th Century, though some are a bit younger. Codex Sinaiticus, purchased by the British government from the Soviet government at Christmas, 1933, for £100,000, is dated c. 340. The nearly complete Codex Vaticanus is the oldest uncial, dated c. 325-350. Codex Alexandrinus contains the whole Old Testament and a nearly complete New Testament and dates from the late 4th Century to the early 5th Century.

The most fascinating evidence comes from the fragments (as opposed to the codices). The Chester Beatty Papyri contains most of the New Testament and is dated mid-3rd Century. The Bodmer Papyri II collection, whose discovery was announced in 1956, includes the first fourteen chapters of the Gospel of John and much of the last seven chapters. It dates from A.D. 200 or earlier.

The most amazing find of all, however, is a small portion of John 18:31-33, discovered in Egypt known as the John Rylands Papyri. Barely three inches square, it represents the earliest known copy of any part of the New Testament. The papyri is dated on paleographical grounds at around A.D. 117-138 (though it may even be earlier), showing that the Gospel of John was circulated as far away as Egypt within 30 years of its composition.

Keep in mind that most of the papyri are fragmentary. Only about 50 manuscripts contain the entire New Testament, though most of the other manuscripts contain the four Gospels. Even so, the manuscript textual evidence is exceedingly rich, especially when compared to other works of antiquity.

Ancient Versions and Patristic Quotations

Two other cross checks on the accuracy of the manuscripts remain: ancient versions and citations by the early church Fathers known as "patristic quotations."

Early in the history of the Church Greek documents, including the Scriptures, were translated into Latin. By the 3rd and 4th Centuries the New Testament was translated into Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, etc. These texts helped missionaries reach new cultures in their own language as the Gospel spread and the Church grew. Translations of the Greek manuscripts (called "versions") help modern-day textual critics answer questions about the underlying Greek manuscripts.

In addition, there are ancient extra-biblical sources—characteristically catechisms, lectionaries, and quotes from the church fathers—that record the Scriptures. Paul Barnett says that the *"Scriptures...gave rise to an immense output of early Christian literature which quoted them at length and, in effect, preserved them."* Metzger notes the amazing fact that *"if all other sources for our knowledge of the text of the New Testament were destroyed, [the patristic quotations] would be sufficient alone for the reconstruction of practically the entire New Testament."*

The Verdict

What can we conclude from this evidence? New Testament specialist Daniel Wallace notes that although there are about 300,000 individual variations of the text of the New Testament, this number is very misleading. Most of the differences are completely inconsequential—spelling errors, inverted phrases and the like. A side by side comparison between the two main text families (the Majority Text and the modern critical text) shows agreement a full **98%** of the time.

Of the remaining differences, virtually all yield to vigorous textual criticism. This means that our New Testament is **98.2%** textually pure. In the entire text of 20,000 lines, only 40 lines are in doubt (about 400 words), and none affects any significant doctrine.

Greek scholar D.A. Carson sums it up this way: "The purity of text is of such a substantial nature that nothing we believe to be true, and nothing we are commanded to do, is in any way jeopardized by the variants."

This issue is no longer contested by non-Christian scholars, and for good reason. Simply put, if we reject the authenticity of the New Testament on textual grounds we'd have to reject every ancient work of antiquity and declare null and void every piece of historical information from written sources prior to the beginning of the second millennium A.D.

Has the New Testament been altered? Critical, academic analysis says it has not. But after reading David W. Daniels new book, *Is The World's Oldest Bible A Fake?*, this can now be disputed with credible objections.

Here is a list of facts David W. Daniels raised in his book:

1.	Someone darkened Sinaiticus
2.	Tischendorf lied about how he got the Sinaiticus
3.	Sinaiticus is not even a trustworthy copy!
4.	Sinaiticus sections were colored differently
5.	You can't tell by looking which is and isn't scripture
6.	Some whole sections were changed
7.	Sinaiticus could not possibly be one of the Bibles made for Emperor Constantine in the early 300's
8.	Sinaiticus had unique mistakes in place names
9.	Sinaiticus can't be as old as they say it is
10.	Sinaiticus and Vaticanus do not agree, so they would not be what Constantine wanted
11.	The text-critical scholars accepted Tischendorf's early date for Sinaiticus, no questions asked
12.	Bible making is big business
13.	It is a bold-face lie that none of these changes affect any basic doctrine of the Christian faith
14.	All the top Greek scholars were fooled into trusting Category I Codex 2427 of Mark's Gospel, until it was proved to be a fake
15.	Until 2004-2009, almost nobody saw actual pictures of more than a single page of Sinaiticus
16.	The Greek Old Testament "Septuagint" copied 48 words in a row out of Romans into Psalm 14:3 (13:3 in the so-called "Septuagint")
17.	There are no physical copies of a "Septuagint" earlier than the 4 th century A.D.
18.	Textual critics made three big mistakes
19.	There was no B.C. Septuagint. It was created before 50 A.D., probably by Philo of Alexandria. And the letter of Aristeas, that claims it was made in the 280's B.C., is a fake
20.	The Apocrypha is being added to Bibles all over the world, even though the King James translators gave seven good reasons for keeping them out of the Old and New Testament.
21.	The Apocryphal books contain false doctrines that are taught by the Roman Catholic religion, but that contradict the actual Scriptures.
22.	The King James translators had a Vaticanus-Alexandrian-type text. They used it for the uninspired Apocrypha, but rejected it for any actual scriptures.

It does not end there and David W. Daniels does great investigative work in exposing the Sinaiticus as a fake and dates it not earlier than the 1800's and definitely not from the 300's as the world has been led to believe. He deals with each of the above points of contention and the collective evidence mounts suggesting the world has been deceived with a fake, motivated by greed on the part of Tischendorf.

The fact that chemical analysis of the inks is the final nail in the coffin of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus proves to be no earlier than 1820 A.D. **The inks used simply did not exist in the 300's or 400's.** Several suspect segments were proven fake as recent as 1989 when Professor Mary Virginia Orna tested suspicious iron content in the decorative art work and illustrations. She proved it was Prussian blue pigments in pictures on certain folio pages. Prussian blue

was invented in 1704 A.D. and not available for sale until the 1720's. Other scientists proved the earliest date for Sinaiticus to be no earlier than 1820 A.D. In 2006, Margaret Mitchell of the University of Chicago made high-resolution digital photographs available on line for others to study. She asked Abigail Quandt, an expert in art restoration, to analyze the codex. Here are the results:

1. The Prussian blue was not a touch up and therefore made after 1720 A.D.
2. They also found ultramarine blue. It was only available as a pigment since the 1820's.
3. The white was a zinc white, and it too had to be made after 1825 A.D.
4. But then they found another pigment that was fluorescent, called zinc sulfide. It was made by a special process, but not available until 1874 A.D..

Another researcher Stephen Carlson had been working on another copy of the Gospel of Mark and he researched libraries to see if he could identify the copy of the segment in question. Mr. Carlson visited the Jesuit Georgetown University Library, the Library of Congress, Catholic American University in Washington, D.C. where he hit paydirt. He found out **it was a copy of a particular edition of the Greek New Testament by Philipp Buttmann, dating to 1860 A.D.** The details of his analysis are quite lengthy and formal, but in the end, it confirmed what we now know to be the truth – **the Sinaiticus codex is a FAKE.**

There are so many more details in David W. Daniel's *'Is The World's Oldest Bible A Fake?'*; and **there is absolutely no question that Codex Sinaiticus is a FAKE! The evidence would suggest that Codex Vaticanus is also a FAKE.** At this point in time all modern English translations are per-versions of counterfeit Codices. Readers can obtain a copy of David W. Daniels book from Chick Publications, PO Box 3500, Ontario, CA 91761-1019. It was published in January, 2018. Readers can also view a series of video blogs relative to Mr. Daniels research at Chick Publications. His videos are viewable at www.chick.com/bible

David W. Daniels notes in his book that modern scholars hate the Antiochian stream of Bible texts. They call them "Byzantine". There are over 1,200 minuscules alone! But you will not see them listed in a critical Greek text. According to Kurt and Barbara Aland: *"These were omitted to restrict the list to manuscripts with a **significance** for textual criticism."* In other words, they won't have a job if all they have are the preserved texts to work with. In everything that I have read in the past twenty years, **anything linked to the Alexandrian line of manuscripts, including the Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are corrupt, and this includes the works of Westcott and Hort, Nestle-Aland, and the various Bible translating societies.** **This means every modern translation has been corrupted.** The reason for this was to attack the Majority text, or known as the Textus-Receptus New Testament.

The new *"Pure Word" Bible* is just coming out now in early 2018 and so we have not had a chance to study it. Brent Miller of Ingenuity Films, along with 30 scholars devoted over twenty years to working on this project. I eagerly await a chance to study and review it. We are told that this group worked from the Antiochian stream documents of the Majority Text, i.e., Textus-Receptus, in order **to give us the purest and most accurate English translation.** Remember, it was the Majority Text, i.e., Textus-Receptus that was used to give us the King James Bible.



Maranatha,

Pastor Bob
EvanTeachr@aol.com