

Preface

TO THE DOC FOXX TRANSLATION® OF THE HOLY BIBLE

- Did you know that the *name* of the God of the Bible is neither *God*, *LORD*, nor *Jehovah*? His name is YHWH (pronounced *Yahweh*). He put His name in His Book, the Bible, some 6,800 times, but scribes and translators have removed it as many times.
- Did you know that your Bible may be missing many whole verses, words, and titles of Deity of Jesus Messiah? They were removed by people who did not understand the triune nature of God or believe that Jesus Messiah is Yahweh who came in human form to save us. In this preface, I'll show you the verses, words, and titles of Deity of Jesus Messiah that may be missing from your version of the Bible.
- The Doc Foxx Translation is an **accurate**, **complete**, and **readable** translation of God's Holy Word: It has been faithfully rendered and is perfect for the serious student of God's Word; YHWH's name has been fully restored, just as He intended; there are no missing verses, words, or titles of Deity of Jesus Messiah; and the English is modern and flowing.

This preface explains why this particular translation of God's Word is necessary. My goal was to create the most **accurate**, **complete**, and **readable** translation of the Bible in the English language, based on the *Byzantine manuscripts* – God's preserved Word. My desire is that each soul might come to know YHWH Elohim: Father, Son, Holy Spirit; receive Jesus Messiah as their personal Lord and Savior; live their life to God's glory; and teach others to do the same. May this most precious and God-honoring translation of YHWH's Word help to achieve those goals.

On June 6, 2011, I began what would become a daily labor of love and dedication. My goal was multifaceted. First, I wanted to create the most **accurate** translation of the Bible in the English language, which meant spending untold amounts of time on each word of each verse to understand what the Holy Spirit was communicating – its meaning in the original context to its original recipients; its spiritual context, application, and underlying meaning to whoever might read it in any generation; and its prophetic implications when compared to the whole of Scripture and known world history. My goal was absolute fidelity to the original languages, searching for the perfect balance of word-for-word accuracy and coherent meaning. I believe that the Doc Foxx Translation® of the Holy Bible is the most accurate translation in the English language. My desire is that the time, effort, scholarship, and prayer that went into this labor of love might richly bless you, the reader.

Second, I wanted to create the most **complete** translation of the Bible in the English language. I remember when, decades ago, I realized that there are irreconcilable differences between the Bible versions following the God-preserved *Byzantine manuscripts* and those following the corrupt *Alexandrian manuscripts* (many of these irreconcilable differences shall be explored in this preface). Most modern translations of the Bible follow the *Alexandrian* family of manuscripts, which have been corrupted by ungodly men of the past and made popular in modern times by dishonest pseudo-scholars who, not understanding the triune nature of God or the Divinity of Jesus Messiah, glorified the corrupt *Alexandrian manuscripts* that the Church had already rejected some 1,500 years prior.

Once they convinced academia, they succeeded in infiltrating the Church with their corrupt "Bibles," which are missing whole verses, titles of Deity of Jesus Messiah, and references to the Trinity. This is unacceptable to me, and I pray that it is unacceptable to you, too. In the Doc Foxx Translation® of the Holy Bible, not a single verse is missing; not a single title of Deity of Jesus Messiah is missing; and not a single reference to the Trinity is missing. The Doc Foxx Translation® of God's Word is a God-honoring, complete Bible.

Another travesty that has occurred over time is the removal of YHWH's name from His book. The Author's name has been removed from His Book some 6,800 times. Most people today believe that God's name is *God*, *LORD*, or *Jehovah*. If YHWH placed His name in His Book some 6,800 times, then how many times would you expect to find it in your copy of the Bible? This is inexcusable. In the Doc Foxx Translation® of God's perfect Word, YHWH's name has been fully restored, both in its full form, *YHWH*, and in its abbreviated form, *Yah*, exactly as the Author Himself, the Holy Spirit, intended when He transmitted His Word to us.

Third, I wanted to create the most *readable* translation of the Bible in the English language. Some translations are very accurate and faithful to their source manuscripts, but they tend to be less than readable because of archaic words, syntax, or uncomfortably wooden phrasing. Others are very readable, having achieved a beautiful, flowing, modern English, yet they are less than accurate and virtually useless for the serious study of God's Word, because in order to improve the readability, accuracy was sacrificed, making proper hermeneutics an impossibility for the serious student of God's Word. I am convinced that the Doc Foxx Translation® of the Holy Bible is the best balance of accuracy and readability currently available. Much time, effort, scholarship, and prayer have gone into ensuring this balance. My prayer is that this translation might be a blessing to you, the reader, and that it might become your preferred translation, as you "grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Messiah. To Him be glory both now and forever. Amen" (2 Peter 3:18).

I. YHWH

YHWH put His name in His Book, the Bible, some 6,800 times. This is how it appears in the extant Hebrew manuscripts: יהוה. Keep in mind that Hebrew is read from right to left. There are no vowels, because Hebrew was originally a vowelless language. The almost universally accepted pronunciation of His name is *Yahweh*. The vowel sounds were implied, understood by those who spoke the earlier forms of Hebrew. His name, *YHWH*, is undisputed, because copies of the original manuscripts are readily available, and YHWH's name is plainly visible some 6,800 times.

Jewish scribes systematically removed YHWH's name. Though their motives are well documented, they have hindered generations of Bible students from knowing God's name. If YHWH put His own name in His own Book some 6,800 times, then how many times would you expect it to appear in your copy of the Bible? If YHWH did not want people knowing, reading, and proclaiming His name, then He would not have included it in His Book, but He did, some 6,800 times. They replaced YHWH's name with various substitutions, such as *Ha Shem* (*The Name*), *Adonai* (*My Lord*), and *Yahowah* (*YHWH* with the vowels of *Adonai* between each letter). Since then, most Bible translators in the English language have adopted *LORD* or *Jehovah* as their preferred replacement for YHWH's name. But where did the name *Jehovah* come from?

Jehovah is a transliteration of *Yahowah*. By the time it was transliterated to English, it became *JeHoVaH*, because going from Hebrew, to Greek, to Latin, to German, and finally to English, most *Y*'s became *J*'s (keep in mind that there is no *J*, or even the *J* sound, in the Hebrew alphabet, immediately rendering *Jehovah* an impossibility), and most *A*'s became *E*'s. The Hebrew letter װ, or *Vav*, can be transliterated as a *V* or a *W*, depending on the destination language. *Yahowah* is not God's name. *Jehovah* is not God's name. YHWH, or *Yahweh*, is God's name. We do not say *Halelu-Jeh*; we say *Halelu-Yah*.

Yah, found some 48 times in the copies of the originals, is the standalone, abbreviated form of *Yahweh*. Exodus 15:2, Psalm 68:18, and Isaiah 38:11 are three examples among the 48 of *Yah* being used as the standalone abbreviation of His name. Psalm 135 alone contains *Yah* four times. Again, if His name were *Jehovah*, then the abbreviation would be *Jeh*. His name is *Yahweh*; therefore, the abbreviation of His name is exactly what we find in the copies of the originals: *Yah*.

Yah is also used as a prefix or a suffix many times. As a prefix, it is found every time a proper name begins with *Jeh* in an English translation. *Jehoshaphat* is actually *Yahoshaphat*, or *Yah has judged*. *Jehoiada* is actually *Yahoiada*, or *Yah knows*. *Jehu* is actually *Yahu*, or *Yah is*. *Jehoram* is actually *Yahoram*, or *Yah is exalted*. The list goes on and on.

As a suffix, *Yah* is found every time a proper name ends with *iah* in an English translation. *Isaiah* is actually *YshaYah*, or *Yah is salvation* (most interestingly, this is the perfect inverse of our Lord and Savior's name, *Yahshua*, which means *Yah saves*). *Jeremiah* is actually *YirmeYah*, or *Loosened by Yah*. *Zechariah* is actually *ZkarYah*, or *Remembered by Yah*. Again, the list goes on and on.

For a modern example, the last name of Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin NetanYahu, means *Yah has given*. The point is, notice how every time *Yah* is transliterated in English, it is changed to *Jeh* as a prefix or *iah* as a suffix. Thus, not only has His proper name, YHWH, been removed some 6,800 times, but even the abbreviations of His name have been obscured. This is the point: You hold in your hands a faithful, complete translation that proudly restores YHWH's name to His Book.

In the Doc Foxx Translation® of the Holy Bible, YHWH's name has been fully restored. Wherever YHWH put His name, you shall find it in the Doc Foxx Translation® of the Holy Bible. Because the original Hebrew did not contain vowels, and because there is not absolute, universal agreement as to the pronunciation, I felt it was fitting to leave God's name exactly as He revealed it to us: YHWH. The 48 verses containing the abbreviated form, *Yah*, have also been restored. Great care has been taken to restore YHWH's name exactly as He intended. To YHWH be the glory.

II. JESUS

Our Lord and Savior's name has been transliterated from Hebrew into many languages. *Jesus* has been the most common way to transliterate His name in the English language for the past 400 years or so. Keep in mind that the English transliteration, *Jesus*, is not found in any of the copies of the original manuscripts. A *transliteration* is a linguistic adaptation of a foreign word to make it easier to pronounce in a different language. *Jesus* is borrowed from the German transliteration of the Latin *Iesus*, which is a transliteration of the Greek *Iesous*, which is a transliteration of the Hebrew name *Yahshua* / *Yeshua* / *Y'shua*.

As to our risen Lord's true, original name, there are many views and opinions – *Yahshua*, *Yeshua*, *Y'shua*, *Yehoshua*, or *Yahoshua*. Regardless of which English transliteration of our Lord's name you consider to be best, there are three undisputed facts: First, in Hebrew, His name is the same as Moses' assistant, whom, in English, we call *Joshua*; second, His name means *Yah Saves*; and third, the ending is *shua*. The *meaning* of His name – *Yah Saves* – is the most important aspect. He is *Yahweh*, who came in human form to *save* us (see Matthew 1:21).

Seeing that the English transliteration of Moses' assistant is *Joshua*, remembering that in the translation process – going from Hebrew, to Greek, to Latin, to German, to English – the *Y's* were changed to *J's*, and knowing that the name means *Yah Saves*, consider this: God's name is *Yahweh*, and *Yeshua* means *salvation*; therefore, *Yahshua* (*Yah Saves*), makes a great deal of sense for our intents and purposes in the English language, and it sounds a lot like its traditional transliteration, *Joshua*, a name we are familiar with. *Yahshua* could very well be *the perfect blend of transliteration and meaning in the English language*. Our beloved brothers, the Jewish people, wholeheartedly disagree. They all but demand that we transliterate our Lord and Savior's name as anything but *Yahshua*. They support *Joshua*, *Yeshua*, and even *Jesus* – anything but *Yahshua*. They have their reasons, and there is much debate.

Remembering that Hebrew is read from right to left, this is what the name *Yahshua* / *Yeshua* (the shortened form of the name we translate as *Joshua*) looks like in the vowelless Hebrew: יהושע. The first two letters (in **bold** type for clarity) are **YH**, which are the same two letters in YHWH's name: יהוה. They are pronounced *Yah*, as in *Halelu-Yah*. Why is *Joshua* acceptable but not *Yahshua*? Again, they have their *modern-Hebrew* reasons.

Though somewhat convincing arguments can be made both for *Yahshua* and for *Yeshua*, neither can be definitively proven, which is why I didn't bother to document anything in this section. All roads lead to a dead end. One can *prove* their desired outcome, as long as they don't give too much credence to the other side's argument (see Proverbs 18:17). Though a semblance of satisfaction can be reached on either side of the argument, certainty is, in my opinion, out of reach.

The Jewish captivities, the evolution of the Hebrew language – from Paleo-Hebrew, through the various changes throughout Israel's history, to modern Hebrew – and the hostile destruction of so much Jewish history have rendered the precise pronunciation of our Lord's name, in its original Hebraic form, all but uncertain. But there is light at the end of the tunnel: The Holy Spirit did not write the New Testament in Hebrew; instead, He saw fit to write it in Greek. That fact alone, for all intents and purposes, makes the precise, certain pronunciation of our Lord and Savior's name, in its original Hebraic form, somewhat of a moot point. The Holy Spirit is absolutely wise.

There are countless examples of the Holy Spirit's approval of transliteration, Revelation 9:11 being a prime example. YHWH, after all, invented language. Israel, as it could be argued, is the primary audience of the Old Testament; therefore, it makes sense that the Holy Spirit would write the Old Testament in Hebrew, the language of Israel. The Church, however, is the primary audience of the New Testament; therefore, it makes perfect sense that the Holy Spirit would write the New Testament in Greek, the concurrent language of the Gentiles. Obviously, the Holy Spirit had no problem transliterating our Lord and Savior's name from Hebrew to Greek.

In Greek, our Lord's name is *Iesous*. Just as people who speak English might find it difficult to pronounce *Iesous*, the Greeks had trouble saying His name in Hebrew – whether *Yahshua* or *Yeshua*. The *I* comes from the

phonetic attempt at reproducing the *Y* sound in Greek, and, in many circumstances, the *ous* ending is mandatory for a male's name in the Greek language to make it declinable. The Hebrew *Yahshua* / *Yeshua* became *Iesous* in Greek, *Iesus* in Latin, and *Jesus* in German. We borrowed the Germanic rendering, albeit with a slightly different pronunciation.

Because the Holy Spirit allows the transliteration of names all throughout the Bible, it seems rational and culturally acceptable to stick with *Jesus*, the name that virtually every English speaker has embraced now for some 400 years. Plus, His original name in Hebrew, as explained earlier, is uncertain, so perhaps it is best to forgo the polarizing problems associated with choosing sides in a battle that is all but unwinnable and, regardless of your preferred transliteration, simply remember what His name means, which is virtually undisputed: *Yah Saves*. His name says it all. *Yahweh*, our Creator, is also our *Savior*.

Therefore, because of the insurmountable, polarizing controversies surrounding His name, two decisions have been made concerning the Doc Foxx Translation® of the Holy Bible: First, in the main text, His name shall remain *Jesus*. Unlike *LORD*, which is an unwarranted replacement of YHWH's name, or *Jehovah*, which is an undeniable corruption of His name, *Jesus* is a logical, proper, and accepted transliteration of our Savior's name in the English language, surrounded by very little controversy. Second, this section of the preface has been written to serve as an explanation of the roots, meaning, and controversies surrounding our Lord and Savior's name. In conclusion, regardless of one's preferred transliteration, His name in Hebrew means *Yah Saves*.

Christos, or *Christ*, is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew term *Mashiach*, or *Messiah* – the two words (*Christ* and *Messiah*) have the same meaning. Both words can mean *The Anointed One*, *The Son of God*, *The Savior of the World*, etc. One who follows the *Christ* is, from a Greek perspective, called a *Christian*; one who follows the *Messiah* is, from a Hebraic perspective, called a *Messianic*. The words are synonymous; therefore, for the sake of continuity between the Old Testament and the New Testament, and to be faithful to the Bible's Hebraic roots, the Doc Foxx Translation® of the Holy Bible renders the familiar *Jesus Christ* as *Jesus Messiah*.

III. WILL VS. SHALL

In the English language, there is a difference between the words *will* and *shall*. Both are auxiliary verbs used to express the simple future verb tense. Unfortunately, in modern English, *shall* is typically considered merely the formal version of the two and is usually reserved for emphasis, comedy, or to sound dramatic or overly formal. *I shall see you tomorrow* is more typically rendered in modern English as *I will see you tomorrow*.

Technically, *I shall see you tomorrow* means that the two of you are to be in the same place at the same time tomorrow, and it is simply a matter of fact that the two of you *shall* see each other. It has nothing to do with desire. *I will see you tomorrow* means that it is your will to see that person tomorrow. It is not a fact; it is your will. Because you are not God, you cannot guarantee that your will *shall* be done. When God says that He *will* do something, it *shall* happen; in fact, nothing can prevent it from happening.

We *will* work together as a team, and great things *shall* come of it. *Will* is a matter of the will. It implies one's determination, desire, or will. We *will* work together as a team – it is our will, our desire, our determination – and great things *shall* come of it – the results of working as a team are anticipated.

Shall is not a matter of the will; instead, it is something that happens as a matter of course. This is important, because it helps the reader understand what YHWH's *will* is and what *shall* happen as a result. Consider Genesis 9:11, where YHWH says, "I *will* establish My Covenant with you: Never again *shall* all life be cut off by the waters of a flood. Never again *shall* there be another flood that destroys the entire Earth." It is YHWH's *will* to establish His Covenant with Noah. Protection against another world-wide flood is the result of YHWH's will. It is YHWH's *will*; another world-wide flood *shall* never again occur.

Consider Acts 2:18, which quotes Joel 2:28, where YHWH says, "In those days, I *will* pour out My Spirit upon My male and female servants, and they *shall* prophesy." Are you getting the hang of it? It is YHWH's desire – His will – to pour out His Spirit; therefore, it is certain to happen. Those who *shall* prophesy do so as a matter of course; they *shall* prophesy, because it is God's will.

The difference between these two words is profound. It is very important to understand the ramifications of these two words in the context of God's Word. I gave you one example from the Old Testament and one example from the New Testament. Understanding how these two words differ *shall* help you to understand God's Word with more clarity. There is a difference between *will* and *shall*. If you *will* keep this in mind as you read, then it *shall*

deepen your understanding of God's Word. In the Doc Foxx Translation® of the Holy Bible, great care has been taken to render *will* and *shall* correctly.

IV. HELPFUL HEADINGS

Locating a particular passage can sometimes be tricky, depending on the reader. To aid in Bible navigation, I have added completely original headings at the beginning of every chapter and at the beginning of many passages. So that no one confuses my *helpful headings* with God's inspired Word, all of my *helpful headings* are ***bold and italicized***, whether at the beginning of a chapter or within the chapter to introduce a new passage or theme. Whenever they introduce a new passage or theme within a chapter, a space has been added to separate my *helpful headings* from the text of the Scripture so that they might be easily identifiable.

Whenever possible, the main point, theme, or even a direct quote has been used for the *helpful heading* so as not to interpret but merely to help direct. Some *helpful headings* are provided to aid the reader in finding certain passages; others are there to draw attention to amazing details in the corresponding passage. Two good examples of this would be Genesis 1 and Isaiah 53. May the *helpful headings* be a blessing to you, the reader, in your study of God's Word.

V. DEFINING WORDS

Having studied God's Word as long as I have, I am convinced that even the numbers, places, and names appear by deliberate design, because they contain and convey meaning, helping the student of God's Word to delve deeper into the Bible's richness. I believe and trust every word of the Bible – its divinely inspired nature, its flawless historicity, its scientific revelations, its prophetic nature, etc. I am convinced that it is YHWH's divinely inspired Word, and that there are no errors or contradictions in the whole of Scripture. I am also convinced that YHWH is not enslaved by space-time-matter; thus, He can see the future as clearly as He sees the past and the present. The fact that the Bible contains thousands of precise prophecies – many of which were fulfilled dozens, to hundreds, to thousands of years later – speaks to its divinely inspired nature and to its transmission from beyond our space-time-matter continuum.

The point is this: When it comes to studying the Bible, those who speak Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek have a distinct advantage over those who do not, because so many names in the Bible – both of people and of places – have clear, obvious meanings in the Bible's original languages. There is so much richness that is lost in so many passages when reading God's Word in a translated language. Because of this, most translations transmit less information to the reader than the Holy Spirit intended. It could be argued that less information is being transmitted in the translation than in the original language.

Genesis 6:4 would be a good example. When the original Hebrew is read, this is what it says to someone who understands Hebrew: "Now, there were *fallen ones* on the Earth in those days, and afterward as well, when the sons of God came into the daughters of mankind, who bore children to them; their children became the mighty men of old – they became legends." Unfortunately, in English, instead of *fallen ones*, we typically get *giants* or *nephilim*. *Nephilim* is the Hebrew word, but most English speakers get nothing from that, which means that the verse has more meaning in Hebrew than it does in English. *Giants* is a bad translation taken from the Septuagint translation and in no way conveys the meaning of the word.

Therefore, in circumstances such as this, I have defined the word so that the English reader may receive as much richness and information as the Hebrew reader; after all, a translation should transmit as much information as the Holy Spirit intended, not less. Here is the rendering in the Doc Foxx Translation®: "Now, there were *nephilim*, or *fallen ones*, on the Earth in those days, and afterward as well, when the sons of God came into the daughters of mankind, who bore children to them; their children became the mighty men of old – they became legends." Notice that the Hebrew word *nephilim* is italicized, which means that I am aware that this word shall not be readily understood by the typical English reader. To avoid replacing it with a bad translation, such as *giants*, or leaving it in Hebrew, which English readers would not readily understand, I have italicized the Hebrew word and then simply defined it, italicizing the definition, too, so that the English reader may recognize the original word and its definition, as a unit, for their understanding.

This way, the English reader shall get as much out of that verse as a Hebrew reader. This way, the information communicated by the Holy Spirit is not limited to the original languages but transmitted clearly in the

translation as well. There are also times when the Holy Spirit gives a hint to the meaning of a word in the context of the verse, such as Genesis 11:9, which says: “They named the city *Babel*, because it was there that YHWH *confused* the language of the entire Earth. And from there, YHWH scattered them across the face of the Earth.”

A Hebrew reader needs no help here, because they know the meaning of the word *Babel*, but it means little to readers of other languages. Notice that the Holy Spirit says that He named it *Babel*, “because it was there that YHWH *confused* the language of the entire Earth.” *Babel* means *confusion*. Throughout the Bible, where the Holy Spirit defines a word, or hints at its definition, I have italicized the word and its definition, as seen in the example above.

Another example would be Matthew 1:21, which says: “She shall give birth to a Son, and you shall name Him *Jesus*, for *He* shall *save* His people from their sins.” The casual reader might not understand why the fact that *He* shall *save* His people from their sins would require His name to be *Jesus*. Knowing that I have italicized the word and its definition should help the English reader gain more clarity. *He* refers to YHWH. YHWH came to *save* His people from their sins. In Hebrew, the name *Jesus* – whether transliterated *Yahshua* or *Yeshua* – means *Yah saves*. YHWH came to *save* His people from their sins. You will find this method throughout the Doc Foxx Translation®. May it be a blessing to you.

VI. STANDARD WEIGHTS & MEASURES

The United States has by far the largest population of people who speak English as their primary language. In fact, as of 2023, even if you were to combine the populations of the other top ten countries whose primary language is English, the United States still has over twice as many English speakers (<https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/english-speaking-countries>). Therefore, the decision to use the *standard units of measurement* for size, weight, time, and capacity was an easy decision to make. The desire for clarity in the English language was the driving force behind the decision to convert archaic and foreign units of measurements – *handbreadths*, *spans*, *cubits*, *gerahs*, *talents*, *hins*, *baths*, *homers*, etc. – to units of measurement that would be clearer to the reader.

The archaic rendering of Genesis 6:15-16 describes the ark as **300 cubits long, 50 cubits wide, and 30 cubits high**. It describes the window as being finished to **one cubit** from the top. Is that clear? Do you understand how big the ark was? The Doc Foxx Translation® describes the ark as **450 feet long, 75 feet wide, and 45 feet high**. It describes the window as being finished to **18 inches** from the top. Notice the difference in clarity between the two renderings.

Using the archaic measurements for Goliath, we learn that he was **six cubits and a span**. Do you have any idea how tall Goliath was? Understanding that the Jewish *cubit* was 18 inches, and a *span* was nine inches, the Doc Foxx Translation® renders Goliath’s height as **nine feet nine inches**. That is now vividly graphic for the reader. So many passages of the Bible – the building of the Tabernacle in Exodus, the details of the Temple in 1 Kings, the Millennial Kingdom’s Temple Complex in Ezekiel, the details of Armageddon in Revelation, etc. – shall be so much clearer and vivid because of the modern renderings. May the *standard units of measurement* used in the Doc Foxx Translation® be a blessing to you, the reader.

VII. SOURCE MANUSCRIPTS

John 17:17 says, “Sanctify them through Your Truth; Your Word is Truth.” Proverbs 30:5-6 says, “Every Word of God is pure; He is a shield to those who put their trust in Him. Do not add to His Word, or He will rebuke you, and you shall be found to be a liar.” Psalm 12:6-7 says, “YHWH’s Word is pure, like silver tried in a clay furnace, purified seven times; You shall protect them, O YHWH; You shall preserve them from this generation forever.” Psalm 119:160 says, “Your Word is absolute Truth from beginning to end, and each of Your righteous Judgments is eternal.” Mark 13:31 says, “Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but My Word shall never pass away.” There are many other verses that teach the inerrancy of God’s Word and God’s promise to preserve His Word. Unfortunately, a careful examination and comparison of the plethora of English Bible versions might cast doubt on that fact. There are, if one takes the time to thoroughly investigate the matter, irreconcilable differences between the two primary families of manuscripts (the God-preserved *Byzantine manuscripts* and the man-corrupted *Alexandrian manuscripts*) used to produce Bibles.

In my opinion, most of the modern translations are beautifully translated. The problem is not with their quality of translation; the problem is in the family of manuscripts they chose to translate. As stated earlier, there are irreconcilable differences between the *Byzantine manuscripts* (God's preserved Word, used to create the King James Version and the Doc Foxx Translation®) and the corrupt *Alexandrian manuscripts* (used to create most of the modern translations). On one of the opening pages of your Bible, where it discloses the manuscripts used, if you see sources such as *Byzantine*, *Majority Text*, or *Textus Receptus*, then you can rest assured that your Bible was translated using God's preserved Word. But if you see sources such as *Alexandrian*, *Critical Text*, *Westcott/Hort*, *Nestle/Aland*, *Sinaiticus*, or *Vaticanus*, then your version of the Bible, as beautiful as its translation may be, was translated from corrupt manuscripts and is missing words, phrases, titles, whole verses, and, in some cases, whole passages.

God preserved His Word, and His preserved Word exists and is available. Unfortunately, the enemy's desire is to corrupt and pervert God's Word. Evidence of the enemy's corruption and perversion of God's Word should be obvious to those who care enough to investigate the matter. The question for every serious student of God's Word should be, "Is God's Word faithfully preserved in the *Byzantine manuscripts* or in the *Alexandrian manuscripts*?" This treatise shall prove that God preserved His Word in the *Byzantine manuscripts* – the manuscripts trusted for the Doc Foxx Translation®.

A. The Damage Done: 45 Missing Verses

Check your translation of the Bible. If you have an *Alexandrian manuscript*-sourced Bible, corrupted by the Arians/Westcott/Hort/Nestle/Aland, etc., then you are most likely missing the verses below. If your Bible is missing these verses (in part or in whole), or if they have been bracketed, or if they have been relegated to the footnotes, then you probably have a version based on the corrupt *Alexandrian manuscripts*. Again, the differences are irreconcilable.

Below are the verses that are completely missing or have been shortened in most modern versions. I have supplied the Doc Foxx Translation® renderings, representing the complete, preserved *Byzantine manuscripts*. Compare these verses with your version of the Bible. If your Bible is missing these verses, or if they have been shortened, or if they are in brackets or a footnote – casting doubt on their legitimacy – then you may have an incomplete, adulterated version of God's Word. The rest of this treatise shall explain why the *Byzantine manuscripts* are to be trusted, while the *Alexandrian manuscripts* – those responsible for removing / adulterating verses from God's Word – should not. Special attention has been given later in this treatise concerning the legitimacy of 1 John 5:7, Acts 8:37, Mark 16:9-20, and 1 Timothy 3:16.

- 1. Matthew 6:13** – "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever and ever. Amen."
- 2. Matthew 17:21** – "This kind of demon, however, only comes out by prayer and fasting."
- 3. Matthew 18:11** – "The Son of man has come to save that which is lost."
- 4. Matthew 20:16** – "Therefore, the last shall be first and the first shall be last, for many are called, but few are chosen."
- 5. Matthew 23:14** – "Woe to you scribes and Pharisees – hypocrites! You defraud widows of their possessions under the cloak of long, self-righteous prayers; therefore, you shall receive the greater condemnation!"
- 6. Matthew 25:13** – "Therefore, watch, because you know neither the day nor the hour when the Son of man shall come."
- 7. Mark 1:1** – The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Messiah, the Son of God.
- 8. Mark 2:17** – Jesus heard them and replied, "Those who are well have no need of a physician; those who are sick have need of a physician. I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance."

9. *Mark 6:11* – “If someone does not receive you or listen to you, then you shall shake the dust from your feet when you leave that village as a testimony against them. Truly, I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah on Judgment Day than for that city.”

10. *Mark 7:16* – “Whoever has ears to hear, let him hear.”

11. *Mark 9:44* – ‘Where their worm never dies, and the fire is never quenched.’

12. *Mark 9:46* – ‘Where their worm never dies, and the fire is never quenched.’

13. *Mark 11:26* – “For if you do not forgive, then your Father in Heaven will not forgive your trespasses either.”

14. *Mark 15:28* – Thus fulfilling the Scripture that says, “He was numbered with the transgressors.”

15. *Mark 16:9-20* – After having risen, Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene early on the first day of the week (out of whom He had cast seven demons). She then went and told those who had been with Him. They were mourning and weeping, and when they heard that He was alive, and that she had seen Him, they did not believe it. Jesus later appeared in a different form to two of them as they were walking to the country, but when those two went and told the others, they did not believe them either. After that, Jesus appeared to the eleven disciples as they were sitting at the table. He scolded them for their unbelief and their hardness of heart, because they did not believe those who had seen Him after He had risen. Then Jesus said to them, “Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; those who believe and are baptized shall be saved, but those who do not believe shall be condemned. These signs shall follow those who believe: In My name, they shall cast out demons; they shall speak in new languages; they shall pick up serpents; should they drink anything deadly, it shall not harm them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” Once the Lord Jesus had finished speaking to them, He was taken up to Heaven and sat at the right hand of God. They went and preached everywhere, the Lord Jesus working with them and confirming the Word through the accompanying signs. Amen. **[This important passage is discussed later in this treatise.]**

16. *Luke 2:33* – Joseph and Mary, Jesus’ mother, were amazed by Simeon’s words.

17. *Luke 4:4* – Jesus replied, “It is written: ‘Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every Word of God.’”

18. *Luke 4:8* – Jesus replied, “Get behind Me, Satan, for it is written: ‘You shall worship YHWH your God, and Him alone shall you serve.’”

19. *Luke 9:55-56* – But Jesus turned and rebuked them, saying, “Neither of you know of what kind of spirit you are. The Son of man has not come to destroy people’s lives but to save them.” Then they went to another village.

20. *Luke 17:36* – “Two men shall be working in the field: One shall be taken, and the other shall be left.”

21. *Luke 23:17* – Now, it was a tradition for Pilate to release a prisoner at the feast.

22. *John 3:15* – “So that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.”

23. *John 5:3-4* – Under which a great multitude of disabled people would lie down, including the blind, the lame, and the paralyzed; they were waiting for the moving of the water, for an angel would come down into the pool at certain times and stir the water, and whoever entered the water first, after the angel had stirred the water, would be cured of their ailment.

24. *John 7:53-8:11* – Then they all went home, each to his own house. That night, Jesus went to the Mount of Olives. Early the next morning, He returned to the Temple, and all the people came to Him, so He sat down and taught them. Then the scribes and Pharisees brought to Jesus a woman who had been caught committing adultery; they brought her to the center of the group and said to Him, “Master, this woman was caught committing adultery – in the very act! In the Law, Moses commands us to stone someone like this, but what do You say?” They said this to test Him so that they might have something to charge against Him. Jesus stooped down and began writing on the ground with His finger, as if He had not

heard them. When they continued questioning Him, He stood up and said to them, “Let the one among you who has no sin throw the first stone at her.” Then Jesus stooped down once again and continued writing on the ground. When the scribes and Pharisees heard this, they were each convicted by their own conscience and left one by one, beginning with the oldest down to the youngest. Finally, Jesus was left alone with the woman in the center of the group. Jesus stood and saw no one but the woman, so He said to her, “Woman, where are your accusers? Has no one condemned you?” She answered, “No one, Lord.” Jesus replied, “Neither do I condemn you. Go and sin no more.”

25. Acts 2:30 – “That is why David, being a prophet, knowing that God had sworn an oath to him – that the Messiah would come as a descendant of David concerning the flesh, and that He would rule from David’s throne.”

26. Acts 8:37 – Philip answered, “You may, if you believe with all your heart.” The eunuch replied, “I believe that Jesus Messiah is the Son of God.” **[This important verse is discussed later in this treatise.]**

27. Acts 9:5-6 – Saul answered, “Who are you, Lord?” The Lord replied, “I am Jesus, whom you persecute. It is ill-advised for you to continue kicking against the goads.” Saul, trembling and astonished, said, “Lord, what do You want me to do?” The Lord said, “Rise, go into the city, and you shall be told what you must do.”

28. Acts 15:34 – Silas, however, decided to stay with them in Antioch a little while longer.

29. Acts 23:9 – The entire crowd was now in an uproar, and the Pharisaic scribes stood and contended, “We find nothing wrong with this man! And if a spirit or an angel has indeed spoken to him, then let us not fight against God!”

30. Acts 24:6-8 – “This man was in the process of profaning the Temple, so we seized him, and we would have judged him according to our Law, but the chief captain Lysias moved in and violently confiscated him out of our hands, and he commanded us, the prosecution, to appear before you. By interrogating him yourself, you shall certainly discover all the reasons for which we bring these charges against him.”

31. Acts 28:29 – After Paul had said these words, the Jews left and continued arguing among themselves.

32. Romans 8:1 – Therefore, there is now no condemnation to those who are in Jesus Messiah, who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Holy Spirit.

33. Romans 14:6 – Those who consider certain days to be special do so in the Lord’s honor; those who do not consider any particular day to be more important than any other day do so in the Lord’s honor. Those who eat all things eat in the Lord’s honor, for they give thanks to God; those who do not eat all things do so in the Lord’s honor, and they also give thanks to God.

34. Romans 16:24 – The grace of our Lord Jesus Messiah be with you all. Amen.

35. 1 Corinthians 6:20 – You have all been bought at a price; therefore, glorify God with your body and with your spirit, both of which belong to God.

36. 1 Corinthians 10:28 – But if someone informs you that the food was sacrificed to idols, then do not eat it for the sake of the one who informed you and for conscience’ sake, for the Earth and everything in it belong to YHWH.

37. Ephesians 3:9 – And bring everyone to the understanding of the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hidden in God, who created all things through Jesus Messiah.

38. Ephesians 3:14 – For this reason, I kneel before the Father of our Lord Jesus Messiah.

39. 1 Thessalonians 1:1 – Paul, Silas, and Timothy: To the church of the Thessalonians, which is in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Messiah: Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Messiah.

40. 1 Timothy 3:16 – The mystery of godliness is undeniably great: God was manifested in the flesh, vindicated by the Holy Spirit, seen by angels, preached to the Gentiles, trusted throughout the world, and taken up into glory. **[This important verse is discussed later in this treatise.]**

41. 1 Peter 4:1 – Therefore, just as the Messiah suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same mentality, because sin is restrained for whoever has suffered.

42. 1 John 4:3 – But any spirit that does not confess that Jesus Messiah has come in the flesh is not of God – this is that spirit of antichrist, which all of you have heard would come and is now already in the world.

43. 1 John 5:7 – For there are Three who testify in Heaven: the Father, the Logos, and the Holy Spirit; and these Three are One. **[This important verse is discussed later in this treatise.]**

44. 1 John 5:13 – I have written these things to you who believe in the name of the Son of God so that you may know that you have eternal life, and so that you may continue to believe in the name of the Son of God.

45. Revelation 11:17 – “We give You thanks, O YHWH God Almighty! You are, were, and shall forever be! You have asserted Your awesome power and begun to reign!”

B. The Damage Done: 123 Missing Names, Designations, and Divine Titles

In most modern versions of the Bibles which used the *Alexandrian manuscripts* as their source, the following verses are missing a name, designation, or a divine title, usually at the expense of our Lord and Savior Jesus Messiah (beside each verse address, I have placed in parenthesis the missing name, designation, or divine title):

Matthew: 16 occurrences

8:29 (Jesus); 13:36 (Jesus); 13:51 (Jesus, Lord); 15:30 (Jesus); 16:20 (Jesus); 17:20 (Jesus); 18:2 (Jesus); 19:17 (God); 21:12 (God); 22:30 (God); 22:32 (God); 23:8 (Messiah/Christ); 24:2 (Jesus); 25:13 (Son of man); 28:6 (Lord)

Mark: 5 occurrences

5:13 (Jesus); 7:27; 9:24 (Lord); 11:10 (Who comes in the name of YHWH/Lord); 11:14 (Jesus); 12:27 (God)

Luke: 11 occurrences

2:40 (In spirit); 4:4 (But by every Word of God); 4:41 (You are the Messiah); 7:22 (Jesus); 7:31 (Lord); 9:57 (Lord); 12:31 (God); 21:4 (God); 22:31 (Lord); 23:42 (Jesus, Lord)

John: 12 occurrences

4:16 (Jesus); 4:42 (Messiah/Christ); 4:46 (Jesus); 5:30 (Father); 6:39 (Father); 6:69 (Messiah/Christ, the Son of the living God); 8:20 (Jesus); 8:29 (Father); 9:35 (Son of God); 16:16 (For I return to the Father); 19:38 (Jesus' body)

Acts: 17 occurrences

2:30 (Christ); 3:26 (Son, Jesus); 4:24 (You are God); 7:30 (Lord); 7:37 (Lord); 9:5-6 (Lord); 9:29 (In the name of the Lord Jesus); 15:11 (Messiah/Christ); 15:18 (Known to God are all His works); 16:31 (Messiah/Christ); 19:4 (Messiah/Christ); 19:10 (Jesus); 20:21 (Messiah/Christ); 20:25 (God); 22:16 (Lord); 23:9 (Let us not fight against God)

Romans: 4 occurrences

1:16 (Messiah/Christ); 6:11 (Our Lord); 15:8 (Jesus); 16:18 (Jesus)

1 Corinthians: 7 occurrences

5:4 (Messiah/Christ); 5:5 (Jesus); 9:1 (Messiah/Christ); 9:18 (Messiah/Christ); 15:47 (Lord); 16:22 (Jesus Messiah/Christ); 16:23 (Messiah/Christ)

2 Corinthians: 3 occurrences

4:10 (Lord); 5:18 (Jesus); 11:31 (Messiah/Christ)

Galatians: 4 occurrences

3:17 (In the Messiah/Christ); 4:7 (Through the Messiah/Christ); 6:15 (In Jesus Messiah/Christ); 6:17 (Lord)

Ephesians: 3 occurrences

3:9 (Through Jesus Messiah/Christ); 3:14 (Of our Lord Jesus Messiah/Christ); 5:9 (Spirit)

Philippians: 1 occurrence

4:13 (Messiah/Christ)

Colossians: 4 occurrences

1:2 (In the Messiah/Christ...and our Lord Jesus Messiah/Christ); 1:28 (Jesus); 2:2 (Father)

1 Thessalonians: 3 occurrences

2:19 (Messiah/Christ); 3:11 (Messiah/Christ); 3:13 (Messiah/Christ)

2 Thessalonians: 2 occurrences

1:8 (Messiah/Christ); 1:12 (Messiah/Christ)

1 Timothy: 4 occurrences

1:1 (Lord); 2:7 (In the Messiah/Christ); 3:16 (God); 5:21 (Lord)

2 Timothy: 2 occurrences

4:1 (Lord); 4:22 (Jesus Messiah/Christ)

Titus: 1 occurrence

1:4 (Lord)

Philemon: 1 occurrence

6 (Jesus)

Hebrews: 3 occurrences

3:1 (Messiah/Christ); 10:9 (God); 10:30 (Lord)

1 Peter: 4 occurrences

1:22 (Spirit); 5:10 (Jesus); 5:14 (Jesus, Amen.)

1 John: 1 occurrence

1:7 (Messiah/Christ)

2 John: 1 occurrence

3 (Messiah/Christ)

Revelation: 13 occurrences

1:8 (The beginning and the end); 1:9 (Messiah/Christ...Messiah/Christ); 1:11 (I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last); 5:14 (Who lives forever and ever.); 12:17 (Messiah/Christ); 14:5 (Before the Throne of God); 16:5 (YHWH/Lord); 19:1 (YHWH/Lord); 20:9 (God); 20:12 (God); 21:4 (God); 22:21 (Messiah/Christ)

C. How All This happened: A Defense of the Legitimacy of 1 John 5:7

For there are Three who testify in Heaven:

the Father, the Logos, and the Holy Spirit; and these Three are One.

1 John 5:7 DFT

If you don't have 1 John 5:7 in its entirety in your Bible, then you may be currently using a version which was translated using the corrupt *Alexandrian manuscripts*. 1 John 5:7 is the clearest reference in the Bible to the Divinity of Jesus Messiah and the triune nature of the Godhead. This is the verse that the Gnostics and Arians could not wait to remove, for these truths were simply too much for them to grasp. 1 John 5:7 has been attested to from the beginning, as shall be proved in this treatise. It has been attacked, defended, removed, and restored – all by A.D. 379! Most modern versions of the Bible are

nothing more than the newest wave of Arianism attempting to corrupt God's Word. How did all this happen? Keep reading.

When Athaliah, Ahaziah's mother, saw that her son was dead, she took it upon herself to destroy all the royal seed. But Ahaziah's sister, Jehosheba daughter of King Jehoram, secretly took Jehoash son of Ahaziah from among the king's sons before they were murdered; she hid him and his nurse in a certain bedroom so that Athaliah would not find him and murder him. Thus, Jehoash and his nurse were hidden in the Temple of YHWH for six years while Athaliah reigned over the land. 2 Kings 11:1-3 DFT

Notice how YHWH ensured the survival of the royal seed. Athalia murdered all the royal seed except one, because Jehosheba secretly took and hid Jehoash so that he would survive. YHWH did the same thing with His Word. The majority of the original Greek manuscripts were collected and destroyed by Emperor Diocletian, but not before YHWH ensured that they were translated into Latin. The Latin translations came directly from the Greek manuscripts by the end of the second century – some 200 years before the creation of the *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* (the two highly praised, yet utterly corrupt, copies of the *Alexandrian manuscripts and source of most modern versions*). All the Latin translations contain 1 John 5:7. Here's how it all happened:

- The Bible was completed in the second half of the first century, when John finished the book of Revelation.
- By the end of the second century, the Greek manuscripts were translated and preserved in the *Old Latin*, or *Italic*, copies. They all contain 1 John 5:7.¹ Tischendorf explains, "In fact, the text of the *Old Italic* is that which Tertullian, about the end of the 2nd century, and the Latin translator of Irenaeus still earlier, made use of...We should be able to approach very nearly to the original text which came from the apostles' hands, since it is certain that the text of the 2nd century must resemble them closely."² Miller agrees, saying, "The best of the *Old Latin* were made 200 years before Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and they support the [*Byzantine*] text."³ Scrivener adds, "There is no argument among scholars that [the *Old Latin*] was translated directly from the original Greek manuscripts in the second half of the second century, around A.D. 137."⁴ This is proof positive that 1 John 5:7 was in the original Greek manuscripts, because it was translated without fail into the *Old Italic* manuscripts. The oldest extant Greek manuscript is from A.D. 352; thus, 1 John 5:7 predates the oldest Greek manuscript that we have. This alone proves the legitimacy of 1 John 5:7.
- Emperor **Diocletian**, who reigned from A.D. 284–305, brutally attacked the Church; in fact, his desire was to eradicate the Church. He collected and destroyed every Bible he could find.⁵ Scrivener adds, "When the Church had rest again, the volumes of the Holy Scriptures that could be gathered were comparatively few."⁶
- The *Old Latin* translations survived the attack much better than the Greek copies, because they were more widely distributed and not as easily recognized as Bibles. The majority of the ancient

¹ C.H. Pappas, *In Defense of the Authenticity of 1 John 5:7, 2nd Edition* (Bloomington: WestBow Press, 2016), 6.

² K. Tischendorf, *When Were Our Gospels Written?* (London: Religious Tract Society, 1866) 114.

³ Edward Miller, *Guide to Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Dahlgonega: Old Paths Publications, 2008) 85.

⁴ Frederick H.A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the New Testament Textual Criticism, Vol 2, 4th edition* (New York: George Bell & Sons, 1894), 43.

⁵ Pappas, *Defense*, 30.

⁶ Frederick H.A. Scrivener, *Six Lectures on the Text of the New Testament and the Ancient Manuscripts which Contain it* (Los Angeles: HardPress, 2019), 9.

Greek copies of the Bible were destroyed, but they had been faithfully preserved in the *Old Latin* translations, all of which contain 1 John 5:7.⁷

- The Church made new copies in Greek to replace the ones that had been destroyed, but due to lack of funds, they used inferior material – papyrus – which doesn’t have a long shelf life.⁸
- **Constantine** the Great, who reigned from A.D. 306–337, declared Christianity the state religion and himself high priest and head of the Church. There was now an unholy union of Church and State. In A.D. 325, he gathered all the bishops to Nicaea in what would become known as the Nicene Council. He created a major controversy concerning the Deity of the Lord Jesus Messiah.⁹
- Just before the Nicene Council, **Constantine** commissioned **Eusebius of Caesarea** to produce 50 New Testament manuscripts to replace the ones destroyed by **Diocletian**. **Eusebius of Caesarea** was a student of **Origen** (A.D. 185–253), an early Christian theologian who was born in Alexandria and spent the first half of his career there. **Origen’s** theology at times mingled with what later would be called *Arianism*.¹⁰
- **Arius** (AD 256–336) was a presbyter who preached and studied in Alexandria, Egypt. He denied the Deity of Jesus Messiah and the biblical view of the Trinity. **Arius** was not the inventor of what today is called *Arianism*, but he helped bring the debate to the forefront; therefore, it bears his name.
- **Eusebius of Caesarea** also had *Arian* tendencies – he did not believe in the full Deity of Jesus Messiah or in the triune nature of God – thus, being bankrolled by the state, he produced these 50 “Bibles” on vellum (animal skins), which were much more substantial than papyrus. The quality was so good that, if left unused, they could possibly last indefinitely. These 50 corrupted “Bibles” were universally rejected by the Church. They were all but unused; thus, they survived. **Eusebius** corrupted the 50 “Bibles” to agree with his Arian beliefs.¹¹ Verses such as 1 John 5:7, Acts 8:37, 1 Timothy 3:16, the last 12 verses of Mark, and many others were either completely removed or altered. The *Vaticanus* and the *Sinaiticus* are the two most famous and well preserved of these 50 corrupt copies.¹² The main reason that modern scholars reject 1 John 5:7 is because it is not found in those two corrupt manuscripts, the *Sinaiticus* and the *Vaticanus*, though, as previously stated, we have evidence from 200 years before the creation of the *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* proving the legitimacy of 1 John 5:7.
- **Eusebius of Nicomedia**, who died in A.D. 341, was an Arian priest who baptized Constantine into Arianism. Constantine promoted him as bishop of Constantinople. Thus, the leader of the Greek church was now an Arian who denied and opposed the Deity of Jesus Messiah and the triune nature of God.¹³ In fact, from A.D. 330–379, Arians had complete control over the Greek church.
- The tide began to turn in A.D. 378, when Emperor **Gratian** rose to power. He was very orthodox. He appointed **Theodosius**,¹⁴ who was also very orthodox, as emperor in the east. **Gregory of**

⁷ Pappas, *Defense*, 70.

⁸ Pappas, *Defense*, 31-22.

⁹ Pappas, *Defense*, 32.

¹⁰ Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church, Volume II: Ante-Nicene Christianity. A.D. 100-325* (Broken Arrow: Vision for Maximum Impact, 2017) 551.

¹¹ Pappas, *Defense*, 35.

¹² Pappas, *Defense*, 123.

¹³ Pappas, *Defense*, 35.

¹⁴ Encyclopedia Britannica, *Gratian*, March 8, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Gratian-Roman-emperor>.

Nazianzus was made bishop of Constantinople in A.D. 379;¹⁵ as a result, in A.D. 381, the church began growing again.

- **Gregory of Nazianzus** fought for 1 John 5:7, and it was rightly restored. To this day, 1 John 5:7 is celebrated by the Greek Orthodox Church. Now, if there was a battle ensuing in A.D. 381 to have 1 John 5:7 restored to the Bible, then it must have been part of the Bible before it was removed by **Eusebius of Caesaria**. The common claim that there is no evidence of 1 John 5:7 before the 16th century is absolutely false.
- Unfortunately, the damage had been done. The Arians, during their 50 years of power, evangelized the Goths, the Vandals, the Slavic nations, and other eastern countries. This explains why 1 John 5:7 is missing in many of those particular early translations.
- The legitimacy of 1 John 5:7 was not questioned for the next 1,500 years, until a new, modern wave of *Arians*, masquerading as scholars, celebrated the rediscovery of *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*, though they are nothing more than the two most pristine and complete surviving examples of those 50 corrupt “Bibles” produced on vellum by **Eusebius**. Radiometric dating confirms their antiquity; indeed, they are old, and they are also corrupt. Philip Schaff agrees, saying, “The two most corrupt manuscripts are [*Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*]...and all the critical editions are based on them.”¹⁶
- It is easily proven that 1 John 5:7 was quoted by the Ante-Nicene Fathers (before A.D. 325) and the Post-Nicene Fathers (after A.D. 325). In other words, 1 John 5:7 had been accepted by the church for some 1,800 years! In 1881, some ungodly men subtly infiltrated the Church, some of whom became powerful members of the Revision Committee – those ultimately responsible for the American Standard Version and for influencing the majority of modern Bible translations. Why did they not include 1 John 5:7? Because they only used the corrupted Greek manuscripts produced by **Eusebius**, being convinced of their superiority, ignoring the battles that had already been fought, and silencing some 1,800 years of Church tradition. They were ignorant of or indifferent to the fact that the Church has always attested to the authenticity of 1 John 5:7.
- This lack of judgment also caused the word *God* to be changed to *he* in 1 Timothy 3:16. So now, *he* was manifested in the flesh – referring to Jesus Messiah – instead of *God* being manifested in the flesh. As of 1881, the Arians were back. There were men on these Revision Committees who actually denied fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith: the Deity of our Lord and the Holy Trinity.¹⁷
- These and other such corrupt manuscripts, by and large bearing the names of **B.F. Westcott**, **F.J.A. Hort**, **E. Nestle**, and **K. Aland** – the heroes of modern Arianism and propagators of the godless, corrupt critical text – are the basis for most modern Bibles today.
- **Westcott** and **Hort** convinced academia, through pseudo scholarship, that these newly rediscovered, corrupt manuscripts (**Eusebius of Caesarea’s** surviving 50 corrupted “Bibles,” including the *Sinaiticus* and the *Vaticanus*) were the best manuscripts, when nothing could be further from the truth.
- The Greek Orthodox Church only uses Bibles based on the *Byzantine text*, such as the King James Version (and perhaps soon the Doc Foxx Translation®) when using an English version of the Bible. The Greek Orthodox Church refuses to endorse or use any of the modern versions based on

¹⁵ E.R. Hardy, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus*, Encyclopedia Britannica, March 8, 2024.
<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Saint-Gregory-of-Nazianzus>.

¹⁶ Philip Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament* (London: MacMillan, 1883), 119.

¹⁷ Pappas, *Defense*, 28.

the corrupt *Alexandrian text*. This isn't surprising when you consider the battles they fought to restore 1 John 5:7.¹⁸

1. The Ancient Witnesses Attesting to the Legitimacy of 1 John 5:7

The *received Greek text* (also known as the *Textus Receptus*, referred to in this treatise, for simplicity's sake, as the *Byzantine manuscripts*) has been universally accepted by the Church from the beginning. In the English Bibles, 1 John 5:7 was never questioned until 1881. In fact, the Wycliff Bible, the Tyndale Bible, the Miles Coverdale Bible, the Matthew's Bible, the Taverner's Bible, the Great Bible, the Geneva Bible, the Bishop's Bible, the King James Bible, the New King James Bible, and now the Doc Foxx Translation® all contain 1 John 5:7. One of the more interesting witnesses to 1 John 5:7 is the Celtic Bible. C.H. Pappas explains: "In 2 Timothy 4:21, we are introduced to three people who were in Rome with Paul before he was executed by Nero. They were Pudens, Linus, and Claudia. They are said to have been from Wales and from families of nobility. We learn from Tertullian in A.D. 130 that he sent two ministers to Britain to assist them in the work. Thus, the Celtic translation is a very strong witness to 1 John 5:7 dating back to the time of Paul."¹⁹

God also preserved His Word in the *Italic*, or *Old Latin Bible* of the Waldenses. They date back as far as **A.D. 120**. In fact, the New Testament Scriptures were translated into Latin close to the same time they were completed in Greek. Our Lord never left us without a witness.²⁰ In fact, the witnesses of 1 John 5:7 predate the oldest *Alexandrian manuscripts* by some 200 years. The Church has always attested to its inclusion. 1 John 5:7 is indeed inspired by the Holy Spirit and must be retained in the Bible.

The *Waldenses* are the ones who accused Jerome of corruption when he failed to include 1 John 5:7 in his translation. The translators of the King James Version consulted three *Waldensian* scholars, who confirmed that "1 John 5:7 must be included to be considered a complete Bible."²¹ The *Waldensian*, or *Vaudois* Bibles stretch from about the second century to the fourteenth century. According to John Calvin's successor, Theodore Beza, the *Vaudois* received the Scriptures from missionaries of Antioch of Syria in the **A.D. 120s** and finished translating it to Latin by **A.D. 157**.

This Bible was passed down through the Reformation of the **A.D. 1500s**, when the Protestants translated the *Vaudois* Bible into French, Italian, etc. This Bible carries heavy weight when finding out what God really said. John Wesley and Jonathan Edwards believed, as did most of the Reformers, that the *Vaudois* were true Christians who helped preserve the Christian faith for the Bible-believing Christians today. The *Waldenses* have been persecuted like few others. 1 John 5:7 is in every edition of the *Waldensian Bible*.

Athenagorus of Athens in **A.D. 177** mentioned 1 John 5:7.²²

Tertullian in **A.D. 215** mentioned 1 John 5:7.²³

¹⁸ Pappas, *Defense*, 39-40.

¹⁹ Pappas, *Defense*, 16-17.

²⁰ Pappas, *Defense*, 115.

²¹ Benjamin B. Warfield, *Princeton University: Collections of Opinions and Reviews, Vol 2* (New York: Oxford Press, 1932), 99.

²² Athenagorus of Athens, *Plea for the Christians. Ante Nicene Fathers, Vol II* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), 133.

²³ Tertullian, *Against Praxeas, Chapter 25, Ante Nicene Fathers Vol III* (Aeterna Press, 2015), 621.

Cyprian in **A.D. 250** mentioned 1 John 5:7 100 years before the earliest surviving manuscript. Cyprian writes, “The Lord says, ‘I and the Father are one’; likewise, it is written of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, ‘And these three are one.’”²⁴

Athanasius in **A.D. 350** mentioned 1 John 5:7.²⁵

Gregory of Nazianzus in **A.D. 379** testified of 1 John 5:7 in his Oration 32.

Varimadum in **A.D. 380** testified of 1 John 5:7 in his Varimadum 90:2-21.

Priscillian of Spain in **A.D. 385** testified of 1 John 5:7.²⁶

Idacius Clarus (**A.D. 385**), Priscillian’s principal adversary and accuser, also cited 1 John 5:7.²⁷

Theodorus (4th century) stated in *A Treatise on One God in the Trinity, from the Epistle of John the Evangelist* that John, in his Epistle, presents God as a Trinity. Ben David observes, “This is a remarkable testimony, as it implies the existence and notoriety of the verse about the middle of the fourth century.”²⁸

Jerome (**A.D. 347-420**) wrote, “Much error has occurred at the hands of unfaithful translators contrary to the truth of faith, who have kept just three words – *water*, *blood*, and *spirit* – in this edition, omitting mention of *Father*, *Word*, and *Spirit*, in which...the unity of substance of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is attested.”²⁹ Jerome, between **A.D. 382** and **383**, was commissioned to produce the Latin Vulgate – the definitive version of the Bible in Latin, using the best manuscripts available. There are over 8,000 Latin Vulgate copies, and 1 John 5:7 appears in over 98% of them.³⁰

It is true that Jerome attempted to omit 1 John 5:7, which is why it is not in 100% of the Latin Vulgate editions, but the Latin-speaking world revolted, rejecting Jerome’s omission of it, because it was already known and accepted as part of the Bible. Jerome thought he knew better, but the Church defended God’s Word, and 1 John 5:7 was retained. All this happened in **A.D. 383**, which means that 1 John 5:7 was already universally accepted before **A.D. 383**. When Jerome was commissioned to create the Latin Vulgate from the Old Latin, he compared the *Old Latin* to the available Greek manuscripts. Therein lies the problem. He used the counterfeited Greek manuscripts created by Eusebius over half a century before Jerome was commissioned.

Those counterfeits were missing much more than just 1 John 5:7. The church already knew that 1 John 5:7 should be in the Bible, so when they saw that Jerome’s new Latin Vulgate did not contain it,

²⁴ *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Church Fathers Down to A.D. 325* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), 5:423.

²⁵ John Gill, *John Gill's Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980), 1 John 5:7.

²⁶ Bruce M. Metzger, *A Commentary on the Greek New Testament, 2nd Edition* (New York: American Bible Society, 1993), 64.

²⁷ Edward F. Hills, *The King James Version Defended* (Des Moines: Christian Research Press, 1984), 210.

²⁸ Ben David, *Three Letters Addressed to the Editor of The Quarterly Review, in which is Demonstrated the Genuineness of The Three Heavenly Witnesses: 1 John 5:7* (London: 1825), <http://www.1john57.com/threeletters3.htm>.

²⁹ Thomas Ross, *The Prologue to the Canonical Epistles of Jerome: Ancient Evidence for 1 John 5:7* (<https://faithsaves.net/jerome-1-john-57/>)

³⁰ Scrivener, *Plain Intro*, 403.

there was an outrage throughout the church. Helvidius, the great Waldensian scholar of northern Italy, accused Jerome of using corrupt manuscripts in producing the Vulgate.³¹ He was right! Jerome was forced to include 1 John 5:7 in all subsequent copies, which is why 98% of the Latin Vulgates include 1 John 5:7.³² How could any of this have happened without 1 John 5:7 being known and accepted as part of the original autographs long before **A.D. 382**?

David Cloud quotes Robert Jack: “Until we descend to modern times, no objection was ever advanced against the authenticity of [1 John 5:7]. Jerome complains of the omission of it by unfaithful translators and declares that the best Greek manuscripts of his time contained it. Jerome died in **A.D. 420**; ever since his days, the verse has not only maintained its place in the Scriptures, but it has been uniformly quoted and referred to by writers of the first eminence for learning and integrity in every succeeding age. If we should suppose for a moment that it is spurious, is it not [odd] that this was never discovered till modern times? Is it not [odd] that during the period of one thousand four hundred years, which intervened between the days of Praxeas and the age of Erasmus, not a single author can be mentioned who ever charged this verse with being an interpolation or forgery? Had it been...even suspected to be spurious, would its adversaries, especially the Arians, have been merely silent when it was produced against them? Would they not have exclaimed aloud against those who quoted it? Would they not have filled the Christian world with invectives against them, for their falsehood and impiety, in thus attempting to corrupt the Word of God? That the Arians in those times never pretended to deny the authenticity of the verse in question, is a phenomenon which should be accounted for by those who contend that it is spurious.”³³

It is also interesting that when Jerome omitted it from his Latin Vulgate in **A.D. 385**, there was a huge outcry from the Latin Church, accusing Jerome of corrupting the Bible. How could this be possible if 1 John 5:7 was in no Bible until the 16th century, as some modern pseudo scholars claim?

Augustine (A.D. 354–430) testified of 1 John 5:7 in his *Against Maximinum*, Book 2, Chapter 22.3

The Peshitta, the primary text used in Syriac churches, dating to the **A.D. 400s**, along with the Slavic translations, the Russian translations, the French translations, the pre-Luther German translations, the Telp translations, the Swiss translations, and the Italian translations all contain 1 John 5:7.³⁴

Eucherius of Lyons (A.D. 434) said, “... in a tract, called *Formulae Spiritualis Intelligentiae*, c. 11, para. 3, 4, sets down both the seventh and eighth verses of the fifth chapter of St. John’s first epistle, in the same order as our printed editions have them, precluding thereby the common cavil that the seventh verse is only a mystical explication of the eighth.”³⁵

Cassian (A.D. 435) attests to 1 John 5:7.³⁶

³¹ Benjamin G. Wilkinson, *Our Authorized Bible* (Payson: Leaves of Autumn Books, 1930), 33.

³² Pappas, *Defense*, 10.

³³ David Cloud, *A Defense of 1 John 5:7* (Port Huron: Way of Life Literature, 2017)

<https://www.wayoflife.org/reports/a-defense-of-1-john.php>

³⁴ G.H. Orchard, *Essay by J.R. Graves, History of Baptist* (Texarkana: Bogard Press, 1987), xxi.

³⁵ Leonard Twells, *A Critical Examination of the Late New Text and Version of the New Testament* (The British Library, 1731), 135.

³⁶ Pappas, *Defense*, 109.

Speculum (A.D. 450) attests to 1 John 5:7.³⁷

In A.D. 450–530, several orthodox African writers quoted 1 John 5:7 when defending the doctrine of the Trinity against the gainsaying of the Vandals, including,

A) *Vigilius Tapsensis* (A.D. 484): “...twice in his books concerning the Trinity, printed among the Works of Athanasius...and also in his Tract against Varimadus the Arian, under the name of Idacius Clarus, cites 1 John 5:7.”

B) *Victor Vitensis* (A.D. 484): “...contemporary with Vigilius, writes the History of the Vandalic Persecution, in which he sets down a Confession of Faith, which Eugenius Bishop of Carthage, and the orthodox bishops of Africa, offered to King Hunnerick, a favourer of the Arians, who called upon those bishops to justify the catholic doctrine of the Trinity. In this Confession, presented A.D. 484, among other places of Scripture, they defended the orthodox clause from 1 John 5:7, giving thereby the highest attestation, that they believed it to be genuine. Nor did the Arians, that we can find, object to it. So that the contending parties of those days seem to have agreed in reputed that passage authentic.”

C) *Fulgentius Ruspensis* (A.D. 507): “...another orthodox writer of the same country, cites [1 John 5:7] in three separate places of his works. Which further evinces, that the Arians about Hunneric, had not been able to disprove that text. For if they had, no writer for the Catholic side of the question, would have dared to use a baffled testimony, whilst the memory of that defeat was yet recent.”³⁸

Eugenius at the Council of Carthage (A.D. 485) said, “...that the Holy Spirit is now one divinity with the Father and the Son...is proved by the evangelist John, for he says, ‘there are three which bear testimony in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one.’”³⁹ The bishops, numbering three to four hundred, were from Mauritania, Sardinia, Corsica, and the Balearick Isles, and they stood in defense of the Trinity. They “pawned their lives as well as reputation, for the verity of that disputed passage.”⁴⁰

Butler agrees, “In spite of claims to the contrary by those who oppose [1 John 5:7], it was quoted at the fifth century Council of Carthage, which is a nearly irrefutable argument in favor of its apostolic authenticity.”⁴¹ Boyd agrees, saying, “The African bishops must have had weighty testimony to [1 John 5:7] in their manuscripts. As a result, they were able to successfully employ the passage as they defended their faith before the Arian accusers.”⁴²

It was said about *Cassiodorus* (A.D. 550), “... a patrician of Rome, a person remarkable for zealously recommending the choice of ancient and correct copies of the Bible to the monks under his direction. So affectionately concerned was he for the purity of the sacred text, that whilst he left the correcting of other books to his Notaries, he would trust no hand but his own in reforming the Bible. He wrote his Treatise of Orthography, purposely to promote the faithful transcribing of the Scripture. In *Cassiodorus’ Complexiones*...we have all the satisfaction we can desire, that the contested passage was in *Cassiodorus’* copy. For in his comment on 1 John 5:7 and following verses, he concludes with these

³⁷ Pappas, *Defense*, 109.

³⁸ Twells, *A Critical Examination*, 135-136.

³⁹ Michael Maynard, *A History of the Debate over 1 John 5:7-8* (Collingswood: The Bible for Today. 1991), 29.

⁴⁰ Twells, *A Critical Examination*, 147.

⁴¹ Charles Butler, *Horae Biblicae, Part II, A Short Historical Outline of the Disputes Respecting the Authenticity of the Verse of the Three Heavenly Witnesses of 1 John* (London: Forgotten Books, 2018).

⁴² Jesse Boyd, *And These Three Are One: A Case for the Authenticity of 1 John 5:7-8 Rooted in Biblical Exegesis* (1999, <https://www.ovrind.com/Bible/casefor1john57.html>).

words: The three mysteries testify on Earth: the water, blood, and the spirit, which are read in full in the passion of our Lord. Likewise, in Heaven: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one God.”⁴³

Isidore of Seville (A.D. 636) attests to 1 John 5:7.⁴⁴

Codex Pal Legionensis (A.D. 650) attests to 1 John 5:7.⁴⁵

Maximus, a Greek writer (A.D. 645), author of the Disputes in the Council of Nice (among the works of Athanasius) cites therein 1 John 5:7.⁴⁶

Jaquib of Edessa (A.D. 700) attests to 1 John 5:7.⁴⁷

In the 1100s, the Apostles’ Creed used by the *Waldenses* attests to 1 John 5:7.⁴⁸

1 John 5:7 was in the lectionary *Ordo Romanus* (A.D. 730). The Trinitarian text was to be read between Easter and Whitsuntide, “as we learn from Durandus, a writer of the fourteenth century, in his *Rationale of Divine Offices*.”⁴⁹

Isidore Mercator (A.D. 785) forged the Decretal Epistles, citing 1 John 5:7-8.⁵⁰

Ambrosius Authpertus (8th century) uses the words of 1 John 5:7 as explicatory of Revelation 1:5.⁵¹

The Bible of Charlemagne (A.D. 748–814), revised and corrected by the learned Alcuin, has [1 John 5:7] by the confession of our adversaries, and they have not been able to produce an older manuscript where it is missing. The only pretended one of this sort is *Mabillon’s Lectionary*, which after all is not strictly a New Testament manuscript, nor written in Latin, but in a mixed language, called Teutonick-French, or Gallo-Teutonick.”⁵² This is pivotal, because Emperor Charlemagne assembled all the learned men who were to be found in that age, placed Alcuin, an Englishman of great erudition, at their head, and instructed them to revise the manuscripts of the Bible then in use, to settle the text, and to rectify the errors which had crept into it through the haste or ignorance of transcribers.

He furnished them with every manuscript that could be procured throughout his very extensive dominions. The testimony of the Three (Heavenly) Witnesses is read without the smallest impeachment of its authenticity. This very volume, Baronius affirms to have been extant at Rome in his lifetime in the library of the Abbey of Vaux-Celles.⁵³ David Cloud, quoting Robert Jack, says, “It cannot be supposed

⁴³ Twells, *A Critical Examination*, 136-137.

⁴⁴ Pappas, *Defense*, 109.

⁴⁵ Pappas, *Defense*, 109.

⁴⁶ Twells, *A Critical Examination*, 129.

⁴⁷ Pappas, *Defense*, 109.

⁴⁸ Pappas, *Defense*, 105-109.

⁴⁹ Twells, *A Critical Examination*, 133.

⁵⁰ Twells, *A Critical Examination*, 137.

⁵¹ Twells, *A Critical Examination*, 138.

⁵² Twells, *A Critical Examination*, 153.

⁵³ George Travis, *Letters to Edward Gibbon, Esq.* (London: Forgotten Books, 2015), 24.

that these divines, assembled under the auspices of a prince zealous for the restoration of learning, would attempt to settle the text of the New Testament without referring to the Greek original, especially since we know, that there were, at that time, persons eminently skilled in the Greek language. They must have had access to peruse manuscripts which have long since perished; and their research might in all probability extend even to the age of the apostles. Thus, this verse has been acknowledged as a part of Scripture during more than a thousand years.”⁵⁴

In the *Glossa Ordinaria of Walafrid Strabo* (9th century): “...a work universally approved, we see the passages of the three Witnesses in Heaven, both in the text and the commentary.”⁵⁵

Later Advocates / Witnesses of 1 John 5:7 throughout later history include:

Jaquab of Edessa (A.D. 708), Aquinas (A.D. 1225-1274), John Wycliffe (A.D. 1329-1384), Erasmus (A.D. 1465-1536), Edward Lee (A.D. 1482-1544), Lopez de Zuñiga (A.D. 1465-1564), John Calvin (A.D. 1509-1564), Theodore Beza (A.D. 1519-1605), Elias Hutter (A.D. 1553-1605), and Johann Gerhard (A.D. 1582-1637).

The Byzantine Text in the Early Church:

1. The Apostolic Church used the *Byzantine Text*
2. Middle eastern churches used the *Byzantine Text*
3. The Syrian Church at Antioch used the *Byzantine Text*
4. The Peshitta Syriac Version (A.D. 150) was based on *Byzantine Text*
5. Papyrus #66 used the *Byzantine Text*
6. The Italic Church in northern Italy (A.D. 157) used the *Byzantine Text*
7. The Gallic Church of Southern France (A.D. 177) used the *Byzantine Text*
8. The Celtic Church in Great Britain used the *Byzantine Text*
9. Church of Scotland and Ireland used the *Byzantine Text*
10. The Pre-Waldensian churches used the *Byzantine Text*
11. The Waldenses (A.D. 120 and onward) used the *Byzantine Text*
12. The Gothic Version of the 4th century used *Byzantine Text*
13. The Codex of Matthew 4th-5th century used *Byzantine Text*
14. Codex A 5th century used *Byzantine Text*
15. 5,210 of 5,255 (about 99%) of all New Testament manuscripts came from the *Byzantine Text*
16. The Greek Orthodox Church uses *Byzantine Text*⁵⁶

Author and Pastor D.A. Waite asked the clergy at The Church of the Nativity – the Greek Orthodox church at the supposed site of Jesus’ birth – if they were familiar with the *Byzantine Text* / *Textus Receptus* vs. *Westcott/Hort* controversy, and they said, “We use the [*Byzantine Text*]. We have no confidence at all in the *Westcott/Hort* text.”⁵⁷

The Byzantine Text in the Churches and Bibles of the Early Modern Church:

1. The churches of the reformation

⁵⁴ David Cloud, *A Defense* (<https://www.wayoflife.org/reports/a-defense-of-1-john.php>).

⁵⁵ Twells, *A Critical Examination*, 138.

⁵⁶ D.A. Waite, *Defending the King James Bible. A Fourfold Superiority: Texts, Translators, Techniques, theology. God’s Words Kept intact in English* (Collingsworth: The Bible for Today Press, 1992), 45-46.

⁵⁷ Waite, *Defending*, 46.

2. The Erasmus Greek New Testament (1516)
3. The Complutensian Polyglot (1522)
4. Martin Luther's German Bible (1522)
5. William Tyndale's Bible (1525)
6. The French Version of Oliveton (1535)
7. The Coverdale Bible (1535)
8. The Matthew's Bible (1537)
9. The Taverners Bible (1539)
10. The Great Bible (1539)
11. The Stephanus Greek New Testament (1546)
12. The Geneva Bible (1557)
13. The Bishop's Bible (1568)
14. The Spanish Version (1569)
15. The Beza Greek New Testament (1598)
16. The Czech Version (1602)
17. The Italian Version of Diodati (1607)
18. The King James Version (1611)
19. The Elzevir Brothers' Greek New Testament (1624)⁵⁸
20. The Doc Foxx Translation® (2024)

Dishonest or ignorant pseudo scholars claim that there are only nine Greek manuscripts that contain 1 John 5:7. George Travis pointed out that Stephen catalogued 31 Greek manuscripts containing 1 John 5:7. What they typically fail to admit is that of the 5,500 Greek manuscripts, only about 500 contain 1 John, and many of those are mere fragments. Most that do contain 1 John do not contain any part of the fifth chapter.⁵⁹

Michael Maynard confirms, "When considering the Greek manuscript evidence for or against 1 John 5:7, it is important to understand that there are only five available manuscripts dating from the 2nd to the 7th century that even contain the fifth chapter of 1 John."⁶⁰ None of the papyrus contains this portion of Scripture. When those who think they know better claim that 1 John 5:7 is not found in the oldest manuscripts, they want you to believe that only verse seven is missing, when, in fact, either the whole book is missing, or the entire chapter is missing.

Most interestingly, in 1887, some six years after the corrupt Revised Version was published, Drs. McIntosh and Twymann discovered an *Old Latin* manuscript in Constantinople; it dated back to the time of Constantine, between **A.D. 325–330**. This *Old Latin* manuscript is essentially identical to our Authorized King James Version, and it contains 1 John 5:7! ***This means that 1 John 5:7 was in the Latin Scriptures in the Greek Church that predate the oldest Alexandrian manuscripts we have in our possession.*** This Old Latin Manuscript was of Greek origin and thus the same as the *Byzantine Text*.⁶¹ The *Byzantine manuscripts* represent the persevered Word of God.

The Complutensian Bible, sanctioned in **A.D. 1520**, of which 123 currently remain, was produced by several Catholic scholars and was based on Greek manuscripts obtained from the Vatican library and elsewhere. They included 1 John 5:7 on the authority of *ancient codices* that were in their possession.

⁵⁸ Waite, *Defending*, 48.

⁵⁹ Scrivener, *Six Lectures*, 203.

⁶⁰ Michael Maynard, *The Historical Defense of 1 John 5:7-8. The Unjustly Excised Text of the Three Divine Witnesses* (Collingsworth: The Bible for Today, 1991), 11.

⁶¹ McIntosh and Twyman, *The Archko Volume* (New Canaan: Keats Publishing, 1998), 34, 60-61.

Further, Robert Stephens, who produced several editions of the Greek Received Text, obtained ancient Greek manuscripts from the Royal Library at Paris. He refused to allow even one letter that was not supported by what he considered to be the best Greek manuscripts.⁶²

In the 16th and 17th centuries, both the Catholic and the Reformation editors were convinced of the authenticity of 1 John 5:7 based on the Greek manuscript evidence that was before them. “Can we peruse the account which is given of the labours of Laurentius Valla (he collated the Latin against the Greek in the **15th century**), of the Complutensian Editors of the Old and New Testaments, of Robert Stephens, the Parisian printer, and of Theodore Beza without believing that they found this passage in several valuable Greek manuscripts? The testimonies of their former existence, which have been produced, should overbalance, it is conceived, in the view of every unprejudiced mind any unfavorable presumption arising from this circumstance.”⁶³

1 John 5:7 was in the *Old Latin* that was used by Bible believers in Europe. Dr. Frederick Nolan (1784–1864), who spent 28 years tracing the history of the European *Italic* or *Old Latin* version, published his findings in **1815** in *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament*. In his work, the Greek manuscripts were newly classed; the integrity of the Authorized Text was vindicated; and the various readings were traced to their origins. Nolan believed that the *Old Latin* got its name *Italic* from the churches in northern Italy that remained separated from Rome and that this text was maintained by separatist *Waldensian* believers.⁶⁴

1 John 5:7 stood uncontested in English Bibles for some 500 years. The first English New Testament, completed by John Wycliffe and his co-laborers in **1380**, contained this verse. It was in the *Tyndale New Testament* of **1526**, the *Coverdale* of **1535**, the *Matthew’s* of **1537**, the *Great Bible* of **1539**, the *Geneva* of **1557**, the *Bishop’s Bible* of **1568**, the *King James Bible* of **1611**, and now the *Doc Foxx Translation®* of 2024. The first English Bible of any importance to remove the verse was the *Revised Version* of **1881**. Thus, we see that 1 John 5:7 comes down to us by the hands of Bible believers and churches that held the apostolic faith at great cost through the Dark Ages, through the Protestant Reformation, and up to our very day. Twells adds, “Lastly, we find no one Latin writer complaining of this passage...no just objection could be made to its genuineness. The Preface of Jerome blames some translators for omitting it, but till the days of Erasmus, the insertion of it was never deemed a fault.”⁶⁵

Desiderius Erasmus (A.D. 1466–1536) was considered one of the greatest scholars of the northern renaissance. His **1521** edition of the Latin New Testament and his three later Greek editions all contained 1 John 5:7. He said, “It could not have been in the Latin manuscripts if it were not translated from the Greek.”⁶⁶ In his first two editions in Greek, Erasmus took 1 John 5:7 out, but two things forced him to restore it: the outcry of the church and discovery that it was in virtually every Latin copy.

There are two popular myths regarding Erasmus and 1 John 5:7 that are parroted by modernists, evangelicals, and even fundamentalists today who defend the modern versions against the *Byzantine*-based Bibles, such as the *Authorized version*. The first myth is that Erasmus promised to insert the verse if a Greek manuscript were produced. This is stated as follows by Bruce Metzger: “Erasmus promised that he would insert [1 John 5:7] in future editions if a single Greek manuscript could be found that contained the passage. At length, such a copy was found – or made to order.”⁶⁷ The second myth is that Erasmus challenged Edward Lee to find a Greek manuscript that included 1 John 5:7. This originated with Erika

⁶² Cloud, *A Defense*, <https://www.wayoflife.org/reports/a-defense-of-1-john.php>.

⁶³ Cloud, *A Defense*, <https://www.wayoflife.org/reports/a-defense-of-1-john.php>.

⁶⁴ Frederick Nolan, *Integrity of the Greek Vulgate* (London: Forgotten Books, 2018), xvii–xviii.

⁶⁵ Twells, *A Critical Examination*, 138.

⁶⁶ Roland H. Bainton, *Erasmus of Christendom* (New York: Charles Scribner’s & Sons, 1970), 137.

⁶⁷ Bruce Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament, 1st Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), 101.

Rummel in 1986 in her book *Erasmus' Annotations* and was repeated by James White in 1995 (*The Truth about the KJV-Only Controversy*).

Michael Maynard records that H.J. De Jonge, the Dean of the Faculty of Theology at Rijksuniversiteit (Leiden, Netherlands), has refuted both myths. In 1980, De Jonge, a recognized specialist in Erasmian studies, refuted the myth of a promise, stating that Metzger's view on Erasmus' promise "has no foundation in Erasmus' work. Consequently, it is highly improbable that he included [1 John 5:7] because [of] any such promise."⁶⁸

In the 3rd edition of *The Text of the New Testament*, Bruce Metzger corrected his false assertion about Erasmus as follows: "What is said on page 101 above about Erasmus' promise to include [1 John 5:7] if one Greek manuscript were found that contained it, and his subsequent suspicion that *manuscript 61* was written expressly to force him to do so, needs to be corrected in the light of the research of H. J. De Jonge, a specialist in Erasmian studies who finds no explicit evidence that supports this frequently made assertion."⁶⁹ The problem is that this myth continues to be paraded as truth by those who defend the modern versions.

Jeffrey Khoo observes further, "Yale professor Roland Bainton, another Erasmian expert, agrees with De Jonge, furnishing proof from Erasmus' own writing that Erasmus' inclusion of 1 John 5:7 was not due to a so-called *promise* but the fact that he believed 'the verse was in the Vulgate and must therefore have been in the Greek text used by Jerome.'"⁷⁰ Edward F. Hills, who had a doctorate in textual criticism from Harvard, testifies, "...it was not trickery that was responsible for the inclusion of 1 John 5:7 in the Textus Receptus, but its usage in the Latin speaking Church."⁷¹

Erasmus repented of his ignorance and included 1 John 5:7 in his Latin edition published in **1521**. He also included it in his three later Greek editions, admitting that it could not have been in the Latin manuscripts if it were not translated from the earlier Greek manuscripts. How interesting that when Erasmus tried to omit it from his first two editions of the Greek New Testament, the church caused such an outcry that he was forced to restore it in his subsequent editions. Then, upon discovering that 1 John 5:7 was in the more reliable Greek copies – not the vellum copies commissioned by Constantine – and when he saw that all of the *Old Latin* copies contained 1 John 5:7, Erasmus had no other choice than to restore it in his subsequent editions. Erasmus himself confidently admitted that 1 John 5:7 could only be found in all the Old Latin versions if it had been in the original Greek autographs.⁷²

Why reject 1 John 5:7 in the first place? Obviously, it's not for lack of evidence. There are those who do not understand the reality of the Trinity; therefore, they refuse to confess Jesus Messiah as the second member of the Godhead. There are others who – though they accept the doctrine of the Trinity and acknowledge the Divinity of Jesus Messiah – simply have been swept away by the pseudo-scholarship of this second Arian wave. They believe the lie that 1 John 5:7 isn't found in any manuscripts before the 16th century (A.D. 1500–1599). Most people who argue this are merely regurgitating Arian propaganda disguised as higher scholarship. It has already been proven in this treatise that 1 John 5:7 has been attested to from the beginning. How could it not have been in any Bible before the 16th century if Gregory was fighting for its re-inclusion in **A.D. 379**? By **A.D. 379**, 1 John 5:7 had already been universally accepted by the true Church, removed by the Arians, battled over by the Greek Church, and restored by Gregory. 1 John 5:7 is legitimate!

⁶⁸ Maynard, *Historical*, 236.

⁶⁹ Bruce Metzger, *The Text of The New Testament, 3rd edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 291.

⁷⁰ Jeffrey Khoo, *Kept Pure in All Ages* (Dahlonga: Old Paths Publications, 2001), 88.

⁷¹ Hills, *King James*, 211.

⁷² Bainton, *Erasmus*, 137.

In fact, P. Magdalen Greek 17/P64 – papyrus dated before **A.D. 66** – which contains Matthew 26:23, 31, corresponds to the *Byzantine text* not the *Alexandrian text*.⁷³ Also, 1 Corinthians 8:5-6 – P46 – contains Nomina Sacra for God, Father, Lord, Jesus, Messiah, proving that the original authors – the Holy Spirit guided Apostles – acknowledged Jesus Messiah as Divine.⁷⁴ All of these things point to the *Byzantine manuscripts* being God’s preserved Word, not the *Alexandrian manuscripts*.

2. The Grammatical Proof of the Legitimacy of 1 John 5:7

Beyond the plethora of ancient witnesses, the final nail in the coffin of the Bible-corrupting Gnostics, Arians, and modern pseudo scholars is the Greek grammar of 1 John 5:7-8. Greek grammar proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that 1 John 5:7 does not belong in the margin or in a footnote; without its inclusion in the body of Scripture, 1 John 5:8 suffers irreparable grammatical damage. 1 John 5:7-8 should read as so: “For there are **Three** who **testify** in **Heaven: the Father, the Logos**, and the Holy Spirit; and **these Three** are One. And there are **three** that **testify** on Earth: the **Spirit**, the **water**, and the **blood**; and **these three** agree as one.”

Proper Greek Grammar demands the inclusion of 1 John 5:7. When 1 John 5:7 is removed, the grammar of the passage becomes an impossibility, giving us two options: For some unknown reason, the Holy Spirit intentionally used bad grammar in this passage of Scripture, or 1 John 5:7 has always been part of God’s inerrant Word but was removed by the Arians, as detailed in this treatise. Without 1 John 5:7, 1 John 5:8 becomes a grammatical disaster. In verse 8, we have three masculine words: **three**, **these**, and **testify**. The problem is that, without verse 7, they all refer to three neuter (genderless) nouns: **the Spirit, the water, and the blood**. Three neuter words cannot be solely associated with three masculine designators – it is a grammatical impossibility. The inclusion of verse 7 solves everything. The masculine direction of verse 7 – **three, testify, Heaven, the Father, the Word, these, and three** require the masculine designations found in verse 8. Apparently, the Arians were ignorant of God’s Word and of Greek grammar. The Holy Spirit wins again – game, set, match.

I am not the first to make this argument; in fact, I am toward the end of a very long line of people who have recognized the same impossibility of having verse 8 without verse 7. In **A.D. 379**, Gregory of Nazianzus defended 1 John 5:7 against the Arians, saying, “After using three in the masculine gender, he added three words which are neuter, contrary to the definitions and laws which you and your grammarians have laid down.”⁷⁵ This rebuttal took place when the Church was attempting to retake control from the Arians. Why was Gregory fighting for 1 John 5:7 in **A.D. 379** if it weren’t part of the accepted body of Scripture?

Much later, in **A.D. 1881**, a new wave of Arianism emerged under the deceitful flag of *higher scholarship*. They, like the Arians, did not believe in a Triune God or in the Deity of Jesus Messiah. R.L. Dabney (1820-1898) defended the truth against them. He wrote, “The masculine article, numeral, and participle...are made to agree with the three neuters – an insuperable and very bald grammatical difficulty. But if [1 John 5:7] is allowed to stand, they agree directly with the two masculine and one neuter nouns...where, according to a well-known rule...the masculine among the group controls the gender...then the occurrence of the masculine...in the eighth verse, agreeing with the neuters...may be accounted for by the power of attraction.”⁷⁶

⁷³ Magdalen College: University of Oxford (<https://www.magd.ox.ac.uk/blog/the-magdalen-papyrus-p64-possibly-the-earliest-known-fragments-of-the-new-testament-or-of-a-book/>).

⁷⁴ Munster University (<https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/manuscript-workspace?docID=10046>).

⁷⁵ Gregory of Nazianzus, *The Post Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Erdmann Publishing Company, 1978), 233-234.

⁷⁶ Robert L. Dabney, *Discussions, Vol 1* (Carlisle: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1982), 377-378.

Others who understood this were Fredrick Nolan, Edward Hills, Archdeacon Travis, Charles Foster, Erasmus, Beza, Stephens, and the Elsevier brothers.⁷⁷ I. H. Marshall agrees: “It is striking that although *Spirit*, *water*, and *blood* are all neuter nouns in Greek, they are introduced by a clause expressed in the masculine plural.”⁷⁸ Can there be any doubt whatsoever that 1 John 5:7 belongs in the Bible? My hope is that the Church re-open its eyes so that the corrupted versions of God’s Word might be rightly abandoned, and the complete versions might take their rightful place among God’s people in His Church.

Modern textual critics have all but ignored the grammatical impossibility caused by removing 1 John 5:7. But these great men fully understood it and fought for 1 John 5:7’s rightful restoration:

- Gregory Nazianzus in his *Oration XXXII: Fifth Theological Oration: “On the Holy Spirit,”* in A.D. 390.
- Frederic Nolan in his *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament* in 1815.
- Robert Dabney in his *The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek* in 1891.
- Thomas Middleton in his *The Doctrine of the Greek article: applied to the criticism and illustration of the New Testament* in 1833.
- Matthew Henry in his *Commentary on the Whole Bible* in 1706.
- Edward F. Hills in his *The King James Bible Defended: a Space-Age Defense of the Historic Christian Faith* in 1956.
- Louis Gaussen in his *The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures* in 1934.

3. The Culprits: Ancient and Modern Gnostics and Arians

Paul speaks about these things in all his letters. Some of these things are difficult to understand; thus, uneducated and unstable people twist and distort these things to their own destruction, as they also do with the rest of the Scripture. 2 Peter 3:16 DFT

The root word in *Gnosticism* means *knowledge*. Gnostics were already roaming the Earth in biblical times. They believed that salvation required special, secret, divinely endowed knowledge. They believed that anything physical was inherently evil; thus, Gnostics believed that Jesus could not have come in a human body, because that would have made him inherently evil. They believed that He must have been a phantom or a spiritual representation of a man.

Convinced their error was true, they began changing and mutilating the Scriptures so that the Bible wouldn’t contradict their ridiculous notions. God providentially preserved His Word in the *Byzantine manuscripts*, while the mutilations committed by the Gnostics are available for all to see in the *Alexandrian manuscripts*, which were used to create most modern versions of the Bible. In **A.D. 156**, Irenaeus, speaking of the Gnostics, said, “They and their followers have betaken themselves to mutilating the Scriptures, which they themselves have shortened.”⁷⁹

It seems that John the Apostle, through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, wrote to silence the Gnostic heresy. John uses the verb γινώσκω (ginóskó), which means *to know*, some 25 times in five relatively short chapters. It seems to be a theme in 1 John. 1 John 5:5-6 makes the perfect introduction to the parallelism of 1 John 5:7-8. John systematically presented Jesus as both fully God and fully human. He clearly battles the Gnostic heresy in 1 John 2:16; 4:2,3; and 2 John 7. Jesse Boyd agrees, saying, “If

⁷⁷ Pappas, *Defense*, 52.

⁷⁸ I.H. Marshall, *The Epistles of John* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1978), 237.

⁷⁹ Saint Irenaeus of Lyons, *Against Heresies* (Jackson: Ex Fontibus Company, 2017), 3:12.

these notions are true, then [1 John 5:7] is important to John's polemic. Jesus Messiah, the human Son of God, is the eternal, living Word...The Word, along with the Father and the Holy Spirit, bears witness to 'He who came by water and blood,' even Jesus Messiah (1 John 5:6). This assertion would have flown right into the face of Gnosticism."⁸⁰

According to radiometric dating, the *Codex Sinaiticus* (the oldest complete copy of the New Testament), discovered in A.D. 1830, was produced in A.D. 350. It was discovered at St. Catherine's Monastery. Using the same method, *Codex Vaticanus* (believed to be the oldest copy of the Bible) was produced in A.D. 325. It has been in the Vatican library since A.D. 1481. These two manuscripts are ancient yet corrupt, and they are the basis of most modern versions of the Bible. The *Sinaiticus* and the *Vaticanus*, along with other *Alexandrian manuscripts*, are well preserved because they were not immediately used for copying, having been rejected as frauds from an early date. The *Vaticanus* was stored at the Vatican due to its age and condition, not because of its content, and the *Sinaiticus* was found in a wastepaper basket at St. Catherine's Monastery ready to be burned to keep people warm during winter, because it was of no biblical value.⁸¹

What about the "scholars" at Alexandria, Egypt? They could not even make their few manuscripts agree. How could we believe that they preserved God's Word? Origen, the founder of the Alexandrian school, was notorious for corrupting the Scriptures. Eusebius, Origen's disciple, looked to Origen's work when he produced the 50 manuscripts of the New Testament ordered by Constantine. Origen's corrupted manuscripts, which wholly influenced Eusebius, were brand new – they were the newest manuscripts in their day, but since they were rejected and never used, they survived, and now they are the oldest. So much for the oldest manuscripts being the best. Eusebius used Origen's freshly corrupted manuscripts as his basis for the 50 copies ordered by Constantine. Now, those same 50 copies are lauded as *the oldest and most reliable manuscripts*. Nothing could be further from the truth.⁸²

The irony is that the same manuscripts that were universally rejected by the church when they were first introduced are the same manuscripts that are now praised as genuine by the liberal, heretical school of higher criticism, and, under the false guise of scholarship, they have convinced the last several generations that they are God's true Word! These few corrupt manuscripts, wholly rejected by the ancient Church, have been declared to be more trustworthy than the 5,500 authentic *Byzantine manuscripts*! The *Byzantine manuscripts* are the manuscripts the Church has always used and trusted.⁸³

The Sound of Truth with Brett Maragni lists five reasons why he prefers the *Byzantine*-sourced manuscripts over the *Alexandrian*-sourced manuscripts:

1. While we have no 2nd-Century manuscripts from this family, we see 2nd-Century Church Fathers quoting *Byzantine* readings.
2. The *Alexandrian* family was discovered only in one region of Egypt; the *Byzantine* family was found in all parts of the Mediterranean world.
3. A massive majority suggests that early Christians thought the *Byzantine* renderings were superior and chose to copy from this family rather than the *Alexandrian*.
4. The *Byzantine* family seems complete; the *Alexandrian* does not.

⁸⁰ Boyd, *Three*, <https://www.ovrlnl.com/Bible/casefor1john57.html>.

⁸¹ Waite, *Defending*, 58-59.

⁸² Pappas, *Defense*, 83.

⁸³ Pappas, *Defense*, 84.

5. God has kept the *Byzantine* family preserved and known through the entire history of the Church; the *Alexandrian* family was lost and unknown for over 1,500 years. Contemplate these reasons, then ask yourself if you really want a Bible that God made disappear for some 1,500 years?⁸⁴

In more modern times, the Church has allowed the newest wave of gnostic Arians to rewrite God's Word once again. Brooke Foss Westcott & Fenton John Anthony Hort hated the *Byzantine manuscripts*, because they did not believe in a Triune God, the Deity of Jesus Messiah, or even the truth of the gospel. They changed the traditional Greek in over 8,000 places. Pastor D.A. Waite calls them *apostates* and *heretics* whose works should be wholly abandoned.⁸⁵ Let's learn a little about these two men whose corruption has infiltrated the Church at large:

- In 1881, two heretics, **Bishop Brooke Westcott** and **Professor Fenton John Anthony Hort** (referred to as **Westcott and Hort**), posing as conservatives, published their Greek text that rejected the *Textus Receptus* / *Byzantine manuscripts*, changing no less than 5,604 places, including a total of 9,970 words.⁸⁶
- **Westcott and Hort** first swayed the scholarly world east of the Atlantic, then they infiltrated the Baptist church on this side of the Atlantic, convincing them to discard the [*Byzantine manuscripts*], used for most of the Church's existence.⁸⁷
- **Westcott and Hort** were the prime movers in the construction of an elaborate, yet fictitious, system of New Testament Greek Textual criticism leading to an abandonment of the Received New Testament Greek text in favor of a revised New Testament Greek text. This system is a worship of two documents, the *Vaticanus* and the *Sinaiticus*.⁸⁸
- **Westcott and Hort** discarded over 99% (over 5210) of the extant Greek Manuscripts and evidence for the Greek New Testament [the *Byzantine manuscripts*] in favor of retaining less than 1% (about 45 manuscripts) [the *Alexandrian manuscripts*] of the extant evidence.⁸⁹

Brooke Foss Westcott:

- 1845 – founded the Hermes Club: Messenger of the gods; guide for departed souls.⁹⁰
- 1851 – Started a guild at Cambridge “to conduct serious and earnest inquiry into the nature of supernatural phenomenon.”⁹¹
- Placed his faith in spiritism, according to his son.⁹²
- Believed Darwin's book on evolution and denied the literal reading of Genesis 1.⁹³
- Referring to Hebrews 2:10, said that the Messiah was not perfect until after death.⁹⁴
- Did not believe in the resurrection. He believed the higher life to be now.⁹⁵

⁸⁴ Brett Maragni, *Sound of Truth* (<https://pastorbrett.wordpress.com/2013/11/17/why-i-prefer-byzantine-over-alexandrian/>).

⁸⁵ D.A. Waite, *Heresies of Westcott and Hort* (Collingswood: The Bible for Today, 1998), 50.

⁸⁶ Waite, *Defending*, 38-41.

⁸⁷ Waite, *Defending*, 38-41.

⁸⁸ Waite, *Heresies*, 1.

⁸⁹ Waite, *Heresies*, 2.

⁹⁰ Arthur Westcott, *Life and Letters of Westcott, Vol 2* (London: Forgotten Books, 2015), 46-48.

⁹¹ Westcott, *Westcott*, 118.

⁹² Westcott, *Westcott*, 119.

⁹³ Waite, *Heresies*, 13-14.

⁹⁴ B.F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Whitefish: Literary Licensing, 2014), 49.

- Admitted, “How certainly I should have been considered a heretic.”⁹⁶
- Denied the historicity of Genesis chapters 1-3, and he denied the substitutionary atonement of the Messiah.⁹⁷
- Referred to the historical Cain as only a typical example...as merely a representative rather than being a historical person.⁹⁸
- Denied that God had to be propitiated in the sense of a “propitiated God.”⁹⁹
- Espoused evolution in various ways.¹⁰⁰
- Failed to affirm the personality of Satan, calling him only “a power.”¹⁰¹
- Believed the heresy that the church ordinance of water baptism was the “condition of regeneration.”¹⁰²
- Failed to realize that God the Holy Spirit dwelled within the believer.¹⁰³
- Had an erroneous view of eternal life...that one is never truly a Christian but is always becoming a Christian.¹⁰⁴
- Denied that Jesus is God, claiming that Jesus never affirmed that He is God.¹⁰⁵
- Denied the sinlessness of Jesus Messiah.¹⁰⁶
- Denied that the *Word* refers to Jesus Messiah.¹⁰⁷
- Spiritualized the literal resurrection of the Messiah to mean “the restoration of the Tabernacle of God’s presence with men.”¹⁰⁸
- Taught that it was not necessary to believe in Jesus as the Messiah; instead, one may be saved by merely believing that there is “a Messiah.”¹⁰⁹

Fenton John Anthony Hort:

- Praised Darwin and said his theory was “unanswerable.”¹¹⁰
- Believed the atonement ransom was paid to Satan, speaking of Matt 20:28.¹¹¹
- Twinged in shrinking horror when he heard Heb 9:22, disagreeing wholeheartedly that blood was necessary for our redemption.¹¹²
- Believed that Mary-worship and Jesus-worship were one in the same.¹¹³
- Did not believe the gospel message.¹¹⁴

⁹⁵ B.F. Westcott, *Life of Westcott, Vol 2* (London: Forgotten Books, 2018), 77.

⁹⁶ B.F. Westcott, *Life of Westcott, Vol 1* (London: Forgotten Books, 2018), 233.

⁹⁷ Waite, *Heresies*, 3.

⁹⁸ Waite, *Heresies*, 8.

⁹⁹ Waite, *Heresies*, 12.

¹⁰⁰ Waite, *Heresies*, 13.

¹⁰¹ Waite, *Heresies*, 17.

¹⁰² Waite, *Heresies*, 18.

¹⁰³ Waite, *Heresies*, 20.

¹⁰⁴ Waite, *Heresies*, 27.

¹⁰⁵ Waite, *Heresies*, 35.

¹⁰⁶ Waite, *Heresies*, 36.

¹⁰⁷ Waite, *Heresies*, 37.

¹⁰⁸ Waite, *Heresies*, 42.

¹⁰⁹ Waite, *Heresies*, 43.

¹¹⁰ F.J. Hort, *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, Vol 1* (London: Forgotten Books, 2012), 416.

¹¹¹ Hort, *Life of Hort*, 428.

¹¹² Hort, *Life of Hort*, 122.

¹¹³ Hort, *Life of Hort*, 50.

- Believed in purgatory.¹¹⁵
- Believed Heaven was not literal (based on 1 Peter 1:4), calling it “figurative folly.”¹¹⁶
- Concurred with Charles Darwin’s false evolutionary theory and denied a literal Eden and a real fall of man.¹¹⁷
- Mistook a reference to God the Holy Spirit for merely “a holy spirit.”¹¹⁸
- Spiritualized the “second death” or “Hell” into a combination of the deluge and Sodom.¹¹⁹
- Believed in the Arian definition of the Messiah being the “first thing God ever created,” thus denying the Messiah’s Deity.¹²⁰
- Denied that the prophecies of the suffering Messiah were fulfilled in Jesus Messiah.¹²¹

Would you allow either of these men to teach your Sunday School class? Unfortunately, the Church has allowed them to rewrite the Bible. When researching a Bible translation’s source manuscripts, it is not uncommon to find, especially in most modern Bible translations, the following: **Westcott/Hort**, **Nestle/Aland**. In fact, most of the modern New Testament Bibles are translated from the 1898 **Nestle/Aland** Greek New Testament, which closely resembles the work of **Westcott/Hort**. It has been revised about every 3 years. Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland were both unbelievers, and their committee was made up of unbelievers: Matthew Black, Carlo Martini (a Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church), Bruce Metzger (an apostate), and Alan Wigren (also an apostate). If your Bible says **Westcott/Hort** or **Nestle/Aland** on the page disclosing the source *manuscripts*, then you are reading a Bible translated from the corrupt work of these godless men.

Dr. Bruce M. Metzger is one of the leading textual critics of the 21st century. He doesn’t even believe that Moses wrote Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, or Deuteronomy, even though Jesus Himself said that he did (John 5:46). Metzger also claims that only through higher criticism of the Bible can harmony be brought to the four Gospels.¹²² Many of the American Standard Version committee members, who corrupted the Scriptures, are ungodly men.

One of the committee members was Dr. Philip Schaff, who was the head of the American Standard Version. He denied the inspiration even in the original autographs. This man was tried twice for heresy! Dr. Schaff not only headed the committee, but he also selected those who would revise the Scriptures. He only selected those who likewise denied the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. One was Joseph Henry Thayer, who denied the Deity of Jesus Messiah. The member of the committee most praised by Schaff was Joseph Henry Thayer, who was a devout Unitarian – he denied the Trinity and the Deity of our Lord Jesus Messiah!¹²³

The Jehovah’s Witnesses embraced the American Standard Bible until they wrote their own corrupt version, the New World Translation, which was not so different from the American Standard. The American Standard fit right in with the corrupt beliefs of the Jehovah’s Witnesses – the denial both of the Trinity and of the Deity of Jesus Messiah. What most evangelicals don’t realize is that, while it is

¹¹⁴ Hort, *Life of Hort*, 76-77.

¹¹⁵ Hort, *Life of Hort*, 233-241.

¹¹⁶ F.J.A. Hort, *The First Epistle of Peter* (Minneapolis: James & Klock, 1976), 39.

¹¹⁷ Waite, *Heresies*, 3.

¹¹⁸ Waite, *Heresies*, 21.

¹¹⁹ Waite, *Heresies*, 23.

¹²⁰ Waite, *Heresies*, 35.

¹²¹ Waite, *Heresies*, 37.

¹²² Reader’s Digest Association, *The Bible Through the Ages* (Pleasantville: Reader’s Digest, 1996), 13.

¹²³ Pappas, *Defense*, 96-97.

comfortable to criticize the Jehovah's Witnesses for their corrupt New World Translation, virtually all of the modern translations also come from corrupt manuscripts. There are very few differences between the Jehovah's Witnesses' New World Translation and the popular modern translations of the Bible used by most evangelicals.

Now, were all the committee members evil? Were they all bent on corrupting the Scriptures? Dr. Newth, one of the committee members, said, "The men on the committee did not have all the facts set before them. We were not aware of the character of the two ancient witnesses set before us – the *Vaticanus* and the *Sinaiticus*. We discovered their corruption only after the work was completed."¹²⁴ The Unreliability of the *Alexandrian manuscripts*, including *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* are among the worst manuscripts known.¹²⁵

Bible scholarship of the past 150 years has placed much attention on a very small number of manuscripts. While there are over 5000 known New Testament manuscripts, attention has been placed on less than ten. Of these, *Codex Sinaiticus* and *Codex Vaticanus* have been exalted as the "oldest and best" manuscripts. When a footnote in your Bible says something like, "*This verse is not in the best, oldest, and most reliable manuscripts*," they're talking about the uber corrupt *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*! Contrary to what has been taught in most seminaries, these two manuscripts are worthless and hopelessly corrupt. Dean John Burgon, a highly respected Bible scholar of the mid to late 1800's, wrote of these manuscripts, "The impurity of the Texts exhibited by [*Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus*] is not a matter of opinion but a matter of fact."¹²⁶

Scholars have designated these manuscripts as *Alexandrian*, linking them with Alexandria, Egypt, the region responsible for early heresies such as *Gnosticism* and *Arianism*. *Vaticanus* is the sole property of the Vatican; it has been a part of the Vatican library since at least **1475** and comes to us without a history – without recommendation of any kind – except that of its antiquity. It bears traces of careless transcription on every page. The mistakes which the original transcriber made are of perpetual recurrence.¹²⁷

The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible concurs, "It should be noted that there is no prominent Biblical manuscript in which there occur such gross cases of misspelling, faulty grammar, and omission, as in [*Vaticanus*]."¹²⁸ *Vaticanus* omits Mark 16:9-20, yet there is a significant blank space here for these verses.¹²⁹ *Sinaiticus* also lacks these verses but has a blank space for them. These two manuscripts are the only Greek manuscripts that omit these verses!

The *Sinaiticus* was discovered by Constantine Tischendorf in the Greek Orthodox Monastery of St. Catherine, on the Sinai Peninsula. Tischendorf found the prized *Sinaiticus*...in a trash can, waiting to be burned! Tischendorf gives his personal testimony: "It was at the foot of Mount Sinai, in the Convent of St. Catherine, that I discovered the pearl of all my research. In visiting the library of the monastery, in the month of May, 1844, I perceived in the middle of the great hall a large and wide basket full of old parchments; and the librarian...told me that two heaps of papers like these...had been already committed to the flames. What was my surprise to find amid this heap of papers a considerable number of sheets of a

¹²⁴ Pappas, *Defense*, 120.

¹²⁵ Luke Mounsey, *The Unreliability of the Alexandrian Manuscripts* (Preserved Word Ministries: July 24, 2009) <https://www.preservedword.com/content/the-unreliability-of-the-alexandrian-manuscripts/>.

¹²⁶ John William Burgon, *The Revision Revised* (London: John Murray, 1883), 315.

¹²⁷ John William Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Oxford and London: James Parker and Co., 1871), 73.

¹²⁸ Henry Snyder Gehman and John D. Davis, *The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible* (London: Westminster Press, 1970), 792.

¹²⁹ Burgon, *Last Twelve Verses*, 86-87.

copy of the Old Testament in Greek, which seemed to me to be one of the most ancient that I had ever seen.”¹³⁰

Why would the monks of St. Catherine’s throw out such a valuable manuscript? Perhaps because of its low-quality transcription and its “heavily corrected text.”¹³¹ Concerning its sloppy penmanship, Burgon writes, “On many occasions, 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through gross carelessness.”¹³² His colleague, Frederick H. Scrivener, goes into detail: “Letters and words, even whole sentences, are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately canceled. That gross blunder – technically known as *Homoeoteleuton*...whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same words as the clause preceding – occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament. Tregelles has freely pronounced that ‘the state of the text, as proceeding from the first scribe, may be regarded as very rough.’”¹³³

Sinaiticus has also been corrected by “...at least ten revisers between the fourth and twelfth centuries...”¹³⁴ *The Codex Sinaiticus Project* readily admits: “No other early manuscript of the Christian Bible has been so extensively corrected. A glance at the transcription shows just how common these corrections are...They range in date from those made by the original scribes in the fourth century to ones made in the twelfth century. They range from the alteration of a single letter to the insertion of whole sentences.”¹³⁵

As for the text of these two manuscripts, it is notably an inferior text (when one is able to determine the true text in the light of all the corrections). Scholar Dean Burgon writes, “As for the origin of these two curiosities, it can...only be divined from their contents: that they exhibit fabricated texts is demonstrable. No amount of honest copying – preserved for any number of centuries – could possibly have resulted in two such documents. Separated from one another in actual date by 50–100 years, they must have branched off from a common corrupt ancestor and straightway become exposed continuously to fresh, depraving influences. The result is that [*Sinaiticus*], which evidently has gone through more adventures and fallen into worse company than its rival, has been corrupted to a far graver extent than [*Vaticanus*], and is even more untrustworthy.”¹³⁶

Why would one of the top Bible scholars of his day make such remarks of manuscripts considered the “*oldest and best*” by others? Burgon had personally examined these two manuscripts and noted that their texts differed greatly from that of 95% of all manuscripts. When examining the Gospels as found in *Vaticanus*, Burgon found 7578 deviations from the majority, with 2370 of them being serious. In the Gospels of *Sinaiticus*, he found 8972 deviations, with 3392 serious ones.¹³⁷ He also checked these manuscripts for particular readings, or readings that are found *only* in that manuscript. In the Gospels alone, *Vaticanus* has 197 particular readings, while *Sinaiticus* has 443.¹³⁸ Burgon observed: “...they

¹³⁰ Constantin von Tischendorf, *When Were Our Gospels Written? An Argument by Constantine Tischendorf. With a Narrative of the Discovery of the Sinaitic Manuscript* (New York: American Tract Society, 1866), <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/extras/tischendorf-sinaiticus.html>.

¹³¹ <https://codexsinaiticus.org/en/codex/>.

¹³² Burgon, *Last Twelve Verses*, 75.

¹³³ Frederick H. Scrivener and Frederick Henry Ambrose, *A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text of the New Testament* (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1864), pg xv.

¹³⁴ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, 13.

¹³⁵ British Library, Leipzig University Library, St Catherine's Monastery at Sinai, the National Library of Russia, *Codex Sinaiticus* (<http://www.codexsinaiticus.org/en/codex/significance.aspx>)

¹³⁶ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, 318.

¹³⁷ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, 12-14.

¹³⁸ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, 14.

render inconsistent testimony in every verse...”¹³⁹ and, “...it is easier to find two consecutive verses in which the two manuscripts differ the one from the other than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree...”¹⁴⁰

- *Codex Vaticanus*, in the gospels alone, omits at least 2877 words, adds 536, substitutes 935, transposes 2098, and modifies 1132.
- *Codex Sinaiticus*, in the gospels alone, omits at least 3455 words, adds 839, substitutes 1114, transposes 2299, and modifies 1265.¹⁴¹

Therefore, *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* are worthless manuscripts. They disagree with the vast majority of manuscript evidence and even among each other. They are false witnesses of the Word of God. The text found therein is not the preserved Word of God. If it was the true Word of God, then it would have been readily available to all generations. Burgon explains, “I am utterly unable to believe, in short, that God’s promise [of preservation] has so entirely failed, that at the end of 1800 years much of the text of the Gospel had to be picked by a German critic out of a waste-paper basket in the convent of St. Catherine; and that the entire text had to be remodeled after the pattern set by a couple of copies which had remained in neglect during fifteen centuries, and had probably owed their survival to that neglect; whilst hundreds of others had been thumbed to pieces and had bequeathed their witness to copies made from them.”¹⁴² God’s preserved Word is found in the *Byzantine manuscripts*, not the *Alexandrian*.

D. The Legitimacy of the Last 12 Verses of the Book of Mark

After having risen, Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene early on the first day of the week (out of whom He had cast seven demons). She then went and told those who had been with Him. They were mourning and weeping, and when they heard that He was alive, and that she had seen Him, they did not believe it. Jesus later appeared in a different form to two of them as they were walking to the country, but when those two went and told the others, they did not believe them either. After that, Jesus appeared to the eleven disciples as they were sitting at the table. He scolded them for their unbelief and their hardness of heart, because they did not believe those who had seen Him after He had risen. Then Jesus said to them, “Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; those who believe and are baptized shall be saved, but those who do not believe shall be condemned. These signs shall follow those who believe: In My name, they shall cast out demons; they shall speak in new languages; they shall pick up serpents; should they drink anything deadly, it shall not harm them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” Once the Lord Jesus had finished speaking to them, He was taken up to Heaven and sat at the right hand of God. They went and preached everywhere, the Lord Jesus working with them and confirming the Word through the accompanying signs. Amen.

Mark 16:9-20 DFT

Many modern Bibles cast doubt on the legitimacy of the last 12 verses of Mark. Some versions remove them completely; others put them in brackets; and others explain in a footnote that there is doubt concerning them. They would rather Mark end with the disciples in fear. Removing these verses also casts doubt on one of the clearest *Great Commission* passages concerning the preaching of the gospel,

¹³⁹ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, 31.

¹⁴⁰ Burgon, *Last 12 Verses*, 78.

¹⁴¹ Philip Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament* (London: MacMillan, 1883), 119.

¹⁴² John William Burgon and Edward Miller, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1896), 12.

Mark 16:15-16. The last 12 verses of Mark, as you shall learn below, are as legitimate as every other passage of Scripture.

- 1,653 Greek manuscripts include Mark 16:9-20...that means that 99.8% of the Greek manuscripts include the “disputed verses.” The three notorious manuscripts that lack the last 12 verses are the *Codex Vaticanus* and *Codex Sinaiticus*, from the 4th century, and the *GA 304* from the 12th century.
- Irenaeus (*Against Heresies*, 3:10:5), Tatian (*Diatessaron*), and Justin Martyr (First Apology 45) quoted excerpts from [Mark 16:9-20] in the 2nd century, as early as **A.D. 150**. This all but proves that they were deleted later in the *Alexandrian texts* and not added to the *Byzantine texts*.
- The **pre-A.D. 150** *Epistula Apostolorum* also testifies of the last 12 verses of Mark.
- Hippolytus (**A.D. 235**) supported Mark 16:9–20.
- De Rebaptismate (**A.D. 258**) supported Mark 16:9-20.
- The pagan author Hierocles (**A.D. 305**) quoted Mark 16:18.
- The Syriac writer Aphrahat (**A.D. 337**) quoted from Mark 16:9-20.
- Acts of Pilate (**4th century**) quoted from Mark 16:9-20.
- The Latin commentator Fortunatianus (**A.D. 350**) quoted from Mark 16:9-20.
- Epiphanius (**A.D. 375**) quoted from Mark 16:9-20.
- Ambrose (**A.D. 385**) quoted from Mark 16:9-20.
- Apostolic Constitutions (**A.D. 380**) quoted from Mark 16:9-20.
- Palladius (**late 300s**) quoted from Mark 16:9-20.
- Augustine (**A.D. 430**) mentioned Greek copies containing the last 12 verses of Mark.
- The *Old Latin* (**3rd–5th centuries**) contains Mark 16:9-20.¹⁴³

E. The Legitimacy of Acts 8:37

Philip answered, “You may, if you believe with all your heart.”

The eunuch replied, “I believe that Jesus Messiah is the Son of God.” Acts 8:37^{DFT}

Why is Acts 8:37 so important? It gives us the requirement for water baptism. Philip the evangelist was sent by the Holy Spirit to evangelize the Ethiopian eunuch, who was reading Isaiah 53, the *Jesus chapter* of the Old Testament. Philip preached the gospel of Jesus Messiah to the eunuch and was then asked if there was anything preventing him from being baptized in water. Philip answers with verse 37, stating emphatically that baptism is only for one who, after hearing the gospel, trusts in Jesus Messiah with all his or her heart (*compare with Mark 1:8; Ephesians 1:13-14; 4:5; and 1 Corinthians 12:13*). Because of the eunuch’s professed faith, Philip was able to baptize him in water. Acts 8:37 has been removed from the *Alexandrian manuscripts*, but, as you shall soon learn, it is as legitimate and as absolutely necessary as every other verse of God’s Word.

- **Irenaeus Bishop of Lyon**, who died in A.D. 203, cited Acts 8:37 in *Against Heresies* 3:12:8, circa A.D. 180. “Philip declared that this was Jesus, and that the Scripture was fulfilled in Him; as did also the believing eunuch himself: and, immediately requesting to be baptized, he said, “I believe Jesus Messiah to be the Son of God.”

¹⁴³ James Snapp, Jr., *A Case for the Longer Ending of Mark* (Text and Cannon Institute, 2022), <https://textandcanon.org/a-case-for-the-longer-ending-of-mark/>.

- **Cyprian**, who died in A.D. 258, cited Acts 8:37 in *The Treatises of Cyprian* (Treatise 12, 3:43). It is likely that Cyprian and his deacon Pontius were both utilizing the same manuscript of Scriptures. In the Acts of the Apostles: “Lo, here is water; what is there which hinders me from being baptized? Then said Philip, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.”
- **Augustine** (A.D. 354–430) cited Acts 8:37 in Homily 49:11. While he was in Africa, he referenced the passage: “The eunuch believed on the Messiah, and said when they came unto a certain water, ‘See water, who doth hinder me to be baptized?’ Philip said to him, ‘Dost thou believe on Jesus Messiah?’ He answered, ‘I believe that Jesus Messiah is the Son of God.’ Immediately he went down with him into the water.”
- **Erasmus** (A.D. 1466–1536) providentially included Acts 8:37 in the first and subsequent editions of *Erasmus’ Novum Instrumentum*. It was then included in the Protestant printed editions of the Textus Receptus like those of Stephanus and Beza and became part of the Reformation era vernacular.
- We not only have the ancient citations of Irenaeus, Cyprian, and Augustine testifying to Acts 8:37’s genuineness; we also have an extremely old surviving piece of physical evidence: **Codex Laudianus** (Uncial 08 [Ea]), dating to circa A.D. 534 – 550.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Now you, the serious student of God’s Word, understand the absolute necessity for the Doc Foxx Translation® of God’s perfect Word. My prayer is that it be a life-changing blessing to you, leading you to a deeper understanding and appreciation of God’s perfect Word. YHWH’s name is restored; Jesus’ name is magnified with every title of Deity that the Holy Spirit originally purposed; and clarity is afforded through the differentiation of *will* and *shall*, *helpful headings*, *defined words*, and the use of *standard weights & measures*. The Doc Foxx Translation® is faithful to the God-breathed *Byzantine manuscripts*; thus, it is missing no verses. The legitimacy of 1 John 5:7, Mark 16:9-20, Acts 8:37, and other verses and passages has been proved, and the culprits have been exposed.

I pray you find the Doc Foxx Translation® to be the most accurate, complete, and readable translation of the Bible in the English language. To you, the serious student of God’s Word: “May YHWH bless you and keep you. May YHWH make His face to shine upon you and be gracious to you. May YHWH look upon you with favor and give you peace” (Numbers 6:24-26 DFT).

In the hands of YHWH,
Dr. John Foxx