

# THEY SAY “YOUR BIBLE HAS NOT BEEN CORRUPTED”. REALLY?

By *Halil Ibrahim*. Edited by *Mohd Elfie Nieshaem Juferi*

*As-salaamu `alaykum wa rahmatullahi wa barakatuh;*

What do the differences between Bible manuscripts reveal? This paper is divided into the following sections:

1. They require you to produce evidence on: WHEN, HOW and WHY was the Bible corrupted
2. Once upon a time, there was a myth about Bible manuscripts
3. Evidence: more than 50 verses either omitted or added, hundreds of others changed
4. Evidences from second and third century about Bible corruption
5. Do the changes and corruptions of manuscripts affect doctrine?
6. “For God so loved the world...”

## 1. They require you to produce evidence on: WHEN, HOW and WHY was the Bible corrupted

My fellow countryman, Hilki Berisha, in an article published in “The Live Paper” with the aim of evangelizing Kosovar Albanian Muslims, writes:

“...Many Muslims wrongly presume that the Qur’an was revealed to replace Hebraic and Christian Holy Writ because of the alleged reason that these last scriptures were corrupted, changed and lost...

Questions that are raised now are:

1. **When and where did the change happen?**
2. **How did the change happen...?”<sup>1</sup>**

And so on and so forth, continuing with Christian prominent logic of “tell me how the original uncorrupted specific scripture read”. His brother in Christ from one anti-Islamic website makes two more specific questions:

3. **What changes were made?**
4. **Where is the "original" Bible that we can compare it with to prove the change happened?<sup>2</sup>**

We were asked these questions and we will now answer them.

“A layman in New Zealand, Evan Saddler, concerned about the formation of modern Bible versions which he believed to have been prepared from corrupted manuscripts, was challenged by a pastor concerning his competence to make such a judgment. "How many languages do you know?" asked the pastor. Mr. Saddler, a man of good humor, promptly replied, "Two!— New Zealand and Australian."

Unfazed by this humorous rejoinder, the pastor pressed his point. "How can you make yourself an expert on Bible translation if you do not know Greek or Hebrew?" Mr. Saddler replied by asking a question himself. "Do *you* understand Greek?" When assured that the pastor did, Mr. Saddler requested an analysis of the Greek wording upon which the New

<sup>1</sup> ‘Was the Bible changed’ from H. Berisha, “Letra e Gjallë”, viti IV, nr 2, Nëntor 2001-Janar 2002

<sup>2</sup> <http://members.aol.com/alnour/biblechange.html>

International Version translation of Matthew 18:11 was based. The pastor diligently set about his assigned task, but soon discovered that it was not easily fulfilled. Looking up from his Bible in confusion and amazement, the minister exploded, "But there is no Matthew 18:11!" His observation was correct. The tenth verse is present, and the twelfth, but the eleventh is entirely omitted. Quietly, Mr. Saddler replied, "Now what use is your knowledge of Greek when the text is missing?"<sup>3</sup>

A lot of noise has been raised, pro and contra on Bible corruption. You may have heard that the corruption issue is all about hearsay, prejudices and nothing else. The above-cited fragment from the book "*Modern Bible Translations Unmasked*" by Dr. Russell R. Standish tells us a lot. It shows gently the ongoing war between "King James Version Only" supporters and the rest of Christendom on the issue of which Bible *version*<sup>4</sup> to use, since the discovery of different Bible manuscripts faced us with a lot of problems and cleaned out the mythology of One Unchanged Bible. A missing verse tells us about textual corruption; it either shows that once the verse was there and then somebody removed it or opposite, the verse was never there but somebody added. But is it only a verse? If that would be the case, there would be no need to lose so much energy on that. However, what if the number is being multiplied badly and that several other changes in manuscript readings arise beside the omission/additions that may put faith in the Bible as an unchanged scripture in a real mess? You are then advised to prepare yourself in dealing with such chaos when reading what follows, for it may shatter whatever previous beliefs you may hold about the Bible.

## 2. Once upon a time, there was a myth about Bible manuscripts

My fellow countryman cited at the beginning of this article will than continue by mentioning evidence of manuscripts, yes the famous 'argument' that is supposed to prove the Bible to be the most well-preserved scripture-book of ancient times. In the same manner as Josh McDowell who had a touching story about discovery of Codex Sinaiticus, he will mention it too and also the discovery of Codex Vaticanus etc. in order to prove the Bible is True and Unchangeable. What they don't tell you is that from 341 uncial manuscripts (being older than cursive ones) about 10 % date before Emperor Constantine. The vast majority of manuscripts come after the period when are present accusations of textual corruption. They keep repeating like popinjays the alleged evidence of more than 5000 Greek New Testament manuscripts thus trying to vend and firmly establish the story that since we have so much manuscripts its not even to be considered to argue on weather the Bible was changed or not.

The gospel truth is that **we have no manuscript from the first century** and those we do have from second century are very fragmentary and with a lot of variances than later manuscripts. P 52 manuscripts which dates from 125 after Christ, for example, contains parts of John 18:31-34 and John 18:37 and compared with later manuscripts there are differences; different wording and absence of two consecutive words. It is only from third century when we have somehow more complete NT manuscripts. Many manuscripts from the same periods contain apocryphal writings together with New Testament books, some of them omit complete NT books, some other have different rendering within the same book of within NT as total. So the myth about Bible manuscripts will never reveal to you that there is a doze of corruption in each and every of the manuscripts since at times there is a huge difference between these manuscripts as we will see later through the comparison of some of them.

As mentioned before, today there is a continuous whacking verbal war going on between partisans of the "King James Version Only" (or Textus Receptus manuscripts) and those using as a base for their Bible versions other manuscripts such as C. Sinaiticus, C. Vaticanus, etc.

According to Colwell:

"...No scholar today employs this text (Textus Receptus manuscript) for any scholarly purpose except as he may use it in writing the history of the Greek New Testament. The King

---

<sup>3</sup> "*Modern Bible Translations Unmasked*" Dr. Russell R. Standish Evangelist/Revivalist, Dr. Colin Standish President, Hartland College, Chapter 7  
[www.sundaylaw.net/books/other/standish/bibletrans/mbtu07.htm](http://www.sundaylaw.net/books/other/standish/bibletrans/mbtu07.htm)

<sup>4</sup> **A NOTE TO THE READER:** Whenever we mention in this paper about versions or cite something in that regard, we do not mean the differences in translations. The term "versions" is used for different Bible manuscripts.

James Version is undoubtedly the most inaccurate English New Testament in common use today....”<sup>5</sup>

Edward F. Hills while talking about C. Sinaiticus and C. Vaticanus, in his “The King James Version Defended” comments:

“...old corrupt manuscripts, which had been discarded by the God-guided usage of the believing church, were brought out of their hiding place and re-instated...and today thousands of Bible- believing Christians are falling into this devils trap through their use of modern speech versions”<sup>6</sup>

Through the same myth about Bible manuscript evidence we were told that differences in manuscripts are only slight trifling unintentional changes of some words and that’s it. For example Ron Rhodes in his paper “Manuscript Support for the Bible’s Reliability” tries to put ash in our eyes by giving following example of Bible manuscript differences:

**“Manuscript #1: Jesus Christ is the Savior of the whole worl.**

**Manuscript #2: Christ Jesus is the Savior of the whole world.**

**Manuscript #3: Jesus Christ s the Savior of the whole world.**

**Manuscript #4: Jesus Christ is th Savior of the whle world.**

**Manuscript #5: Jesus Christ is the Savior of the whole world.”<sup>7</sup>**

If this above would be the case and if manuscripts are supposed to be comprehensible support for Bible authenticity, why would one label *Textus Receptus* manuscripts as not being worth for use today but only as *history* or *the most inaccurate* version, and why would another one classify almost all other Bible versions based upon Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus and other as a *fall into devil’s trap*?

The truth is that the differences in manuscripts are sometimes so gigantic and so successful tools on putting doubt into different Christian doctrines, that beyond any vagueness they testify to us about the corruption of the scriptures.

What is the exact word for what is described below on the differences between several Bible manuscripts?

“B (C.Vaticanus) agrees with the Textus Receptus only about 50% of the time. It differs from the Majority Greek in nearly 8,000 places, amounting to about one change per verse. It omits several thousand key words from the Gospels, nearly 1000 complete sentences, and 500 clauses. It adds approximately 500 words, substitutes or modifies nearly 2000 and transposes word order in about 2000 places. It has nearly 600 reading that do not occur in any other manuscript. These affect almost 1000 words.”<sup>8</sup>

“It (C. Vaticanus) agrees essentially with Origen's *Hexapla*, omitting the deity of Christ frequently and making other Gnostic or Arian alterations.”<sup>9</sup>

“In the light of such carelessness in transcription, it is not surprising that a good many correctors (as many as nine) have been at work on the manuscript (C. Sinaiticus) ...Tischendorf’s edition of the manuscript enumerates some 14,800 places where some alternation has been made to the text...(With) more recent detailed scrutiny of the

<sup>5</sup> Colwell “What Is The Best New Testament”, pp 99, 100, University of Chicago Press, 1951.

<sup>6</sup> “The King James Version defended”, Eduard F. Hills, Chapter nine [http://www.biblebelievers.com/KJV\\_Defended\\_Hills.html](http://www.biblebelievers.com/KJV_Defended_Hills.html)

<sup>7</sup> Ron Rhodes, “Manuscript Support for the Bible’s Reliability” <http://home.earthlink.net/~ronrhodes/Manuscript.html>

<sup>8</sup> “New Age Bible Versions” by G.A. Riplinger <http://www.ekkom.com/one-prct.htm>

<sup>9</sup> “New Age Bible Versions” by G.A. Riplinger <http://www.ekkom.com/one-prct.htm>

manuscript...by the use of ultra-violet lamp, Milne and Skeat discovered that the original reading in the manuscript was erased...[in places].<sup>10</sup>

“There are about 9000 changes in this text from that of the Majority and Traditional Text, amounting to one difference in every verse. It omits some 4000 words from the Gospels, adds 1000, repositions 2000 and alters another 1000. It has approximately 1,500 readings that appear in no other manuscript: this affects nearly 3000 words.”<sup>11</sup>

Yeah really, what is the word to describe all this? What word would better fit this than the word **CORRUPTION**? Yet they tell us their Bible is not corrupted. Do we need more proof?

### 3. Evidence: More than 50 verses either omitted or added, hundreds of others changed

You neither need to know Greek nor have you to be specialist on manuscripts to realize that there are more than 50 complete verses that are either added or are omitted by scribes. This is only regarding New Testament. And you can see this just by comparing different Bible manuscripts (scholars has done this for us) or by checking Bible versions available everywhere today. How many changes, omissions, additions or alternations occurred in the period between Jesus’ oral transmission of his teachings and the first written scriptures, and than from first written scriptures until the period when we have first manuscripts only God knows.

Below you have the list of these verses:

(Abbreviations used for different Bible manuscripts):<sup>12</sup>

S	Stephens 1550 (Estienne 1550)
E	Elzevir 1624
G	Griesbach 1805
L	Lachmann 1842
T	Tischendorf 1869
Tr	Tregelles 1857
A	Alford 1849 as revised in 1871
W	Wordsworth 1856 as revised in 1870
WH	Westcott & Hort 1881
NA	Nestle-Aland 1979 (Aland et al. 1979)
HF	Hodges & Farstad 1982 as corrected in 1985
Vul	Clementine Vulgate, third edition (Clement 1592)
C	Complutensian Polyglot (Stunica 1522)
Er	Erasmus 1527
B	Bezae 1598
E	Elzevir 1624

Corrupted (added or omitted) verses	Number of verses	Comment
Matthew 12:47	1	Omitted in Tm WHt Nm NAm
Matthew 16:2	2	Omitted in Tm Am WHmm Nm

<sup>10</sup> Bruce Metzger's in “Manuscripts of the Greek Bible” pp 77, quoted in “New Age Bible Versions” by G.A. Riplinger <http://www.ekkcom.com/one-prct.htm>

<sup>11</sup>As per Scrivener's Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text of the New Testament and other researchers like Dean Burgon's The Revision Revised, quoted in “New Age Bible Versions” by G.A. Riplinger <http://www.ekkcom.com/one-prct.htm>

<sup>12</sup> Most of the data given below in the table are from **Bible Researcher** at [www.bible-researcher.com](http://www.bible-researcher.com) (ed. Michael Marlowe)

		Nam
Matthew 16:3	3	Omitted in Tm Am WHmm Nm Nam
Matthew 27:35	4	The whole of this quotation should be omitted, as making no part originally of the genuine text of this evangelist. It is omitted by almost every MS. of worth and importance, by almost all the versions, and the most reputable of the primitive fathers, who have written or commented on the place. The words are plainly an interpolation, borrowed from John xix. 24 <sup>13</sup>
Matthew 17:21	5	The whole verse is wanting in the famous Vatican MS., one of the most ancient and most authentic perhaps in the world; and in another one of Colbert's, written in the 11th or 12th century. It is wanting also in the Coptic, Ethiopic, Syriac, Hieros., and in one copy of the Itala. But all the MSS. acknowledge it in the parallel place, Mark ix. 29, only the Vatican MS. leaves out nhsteia, fasting. I strongly suspect it to be an interpolation; but, if it be, it is very ancient, as Origen, Chrysostom, and others of the primitive fathers, acknowledged it. <sup>14</sup>
Matthew 18:11	6	This verse is omitted by five MSS., two versions, and three of the fathers
Matthew 21:44	7	This whole verse is wanting in the Codex Bezae, one other, five copies of the Itala, and Origen;
Matthew 23:14	8	Omitted in L T Tr A WH N NA
Mark 7:16	9	Omitted in T Trm Am WH N NA
Mark 9:44	10	Omitted in T Trm WH N NA
Mark 9:46	11	Omitted in T Trm WH N NA
Mark 11:26	12	Omitted in T Tr WH N NA
Mark 15:28	13	Omitted in T Trm A WH N NA
Mark 16:9-20	25 (12 verses)	Omitted in most of the old manuscripts and those who include it, have it with a variety of differences
12 verses		
Luke 5: 39	26	Omitted in WHm
Luke 9:56	27	Omitted in G L T Tr A WH N

<sup>13</sup> From Adam Clark's commentary on Matthew 27:35

<sup>14</sup> From Adam Clark's commentary on Matthew 17:21

		NA
Luke 17:36	28	Omitted in S G L T Tr A W WH N NA HF
Luke 22:43	29	Omitted in Lm WHmm Namm
Luke 22:44	30	Omitted in Lm WHmm Namm
Luke 23:17	31	Omittd in Lm T Tr Am WH N NA
Luke 24:12	32	Omitted in Lm T Trm WHmm
Luke 24:40	33	Omitted in T Trm WHmm
John 5:4	34	Omitted in Gm T Tr A WH N NA
John 7:53 - 8:11 12 verses	46 (12 verses)	Not present in most of the old manuscripts. Some manuscripts add it in different places of the Gospels
Acts 8:37	47	Omitted in G L T Tr A WH N NA HF
Acts 15:34	48	Omitted in L T Tr A W WH N NA HF
Acts 24:7	49	Omitted in L T Tr Am WH N NA HF
Acts 28:29	50	Omitted in L T Tr A WH N NA
Romans 16:24	51	Omitted in L T Tr Am WH N NA
1 John 5:7	52	Omitted in Er1516 Er1519 G L T Tr A W WH N NA HF

The following omissions (or later additions in other scriptures) are characteristics for Codex Sinaiticus among others mentioned:

**The end of Mark and John.**

**Thirty-nine words from John 19:20, 21;**

**Twenty words from John 20:5, 6;**

**Nineteen words from Mark 1:32-34;**

**Fourteen words from Mark 15:47.**

**Genesis 23:19-24, 46,**

**Numbers 5:27- 7:20,**

**I Chron. 9:27-19:27.**

**Exodus,**

**I and II Joshua,**

**I and II Samuel,**

**I and II Kings,**

**Hosea, Amos,**

**Micah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Judges.**

**In Luke 8, for example, 19 out of 34 words are changed.**

**In Matthew chapter one, sixty words are changed.**

Regarding the end of Mark some Bibles list three endings for the Gospel of Mark. The earliest Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian and Latin manuscripts end the Gospel of Mark at 16:8. For some scribes or Christian communities, that would not be a very convinced end so they added paragraphs harmonized with their doctrines. Some other manuscripts add only two or three verses to this sudden ending.

Now look out world, how can the Bible be an unchangeable word of God with so many differences in manuscripts? How can we still listen 'preservation tales' while we have as many as 50 complete verses corruption (not mentioning now other changes)?

Codex Bezae is one of the famous Bible manuscripts. Some scholars date it from sixth or even fifth century. Look what Encyclopedia Britannica has to say about it:

“...Codex Bezae...has a text that is very different from other witnesses. Codex Bezae has many distinctive longer and shorter readings and seems almost to be separate edition. Its Acts, for example is one tenth longer than usual...”<sup>15</sup>

*The Catholic Encyclopedia* adds on to this:

“...There are missing, however, from the manuscript of the original scribe, in the Greek, Matt., i, 1-20; [iii, 7-16]; vi, 20-ix, 2; xxvii, 2-12; John i, 16-iii, 26; [xviii, 14-xx, 13]; [Mk. xvi, 15-20]; Acts, viii, 29-x, 14; xxi, 2-10, 16-18; xxii, 10-20; xxii, 29-xxviii, 31; in the Latin, Matt., i, 1-11; [ii, 21-iii, 7]; vi, 8-viii, 27; xxvi, 65-xxvii, 1; John, i, 1-iii, 16; [xviii, 2-xx, 1]; [Mk., xvi, 6-20]; Acts viii, 20-x, 4; xx, 31-xxi, 2, 7-10; xxii, 2-10; xxiii, 20- xxviii, 31. The passages in brackets have been supplied by a tenth-century hand.”<sup>16</sup>

It is marvelous how these early manuscripts has survived in order to give us an idea how blatant and typical was the corruption of the Bible text during first centuries of Christian era. Somebody once wrote something; call it Mark, Q or whatever. Then later everybody according to his own doctrine and beliefs added to it what was suitable for the. So we now have a Bible that is said to be “...almost....separate edition”! Are we not told that there is only One Unchangeable Bible?

Even the fundamentalist, Christian evangelist authorities admit that there is a corruption in the Biblical text. Dr Thomas Holland in his book *Crowned with the Glory* writes:

“Through the ages several corrections in transmission (the copying of manuscripts over the generations) have crept into the various manuscripts. .... The vast majority of these textual variants came into existence before the beginning of the third century; [George D. Kilpatrick, *The Principles And Practice Of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1990), 34.] this is significant because the majority of existing manuscripts date after this period.....Whether these variants were deliberate or simply cases of copying the text incorrectly is open for debate. Most likely examples of both can be found in the numerous manuscripts”<sup>17</sup>

We have often come across pompous statements that Dead Sea Scroll manuscripts, discovered later on in history are an unambiguous proof about the preservation of the Bible text. They will mention you the Book of Isaiah of later manuscripts and how miraculously it agrees with Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts. But they will never comment other books such as Jeremiah, Job or Proverbs from DSS and their considerable difference with later manuscripts. One have to bear in mind that many manuscripts found in Dead Sea Scrolls are of the same family with Masoretic text, hence the Christian claim that Masoretic text is a medieval redaction done by the Jews to undermine Christian prophecies and doctrines contained within the Old Testament is a mere childish accusation. Therefore differences between Masoretic Text Manuscripts and Septuaginta Manuscripts are also without any doubt proof of the corruption of bible text as both families of manuscripts are at least of the same age. Concerning the Book of Jeremiah and its difference between Septuaginta, Masoretic text and some other manuscripts we can mention that LXX Jeremiah is about 1/8 shorter than the Masoretic text. Important omissions in the LXX are 29:16-20, 33:14-26, 39:4:13, 52:28-30.

“According to one scholars computation the LXX lacks some 2700 words that are represented in the MT, while adding no more than about 100 that are not represented there... Nor can it be assumed that the translators of the LXX were responsible for them [omissions]... It now seems clear from discoveries at Qumran, where manuscript fragments representing both the longer and shorter forms of the text have been found, the the MT and the LXX of Jeremiah are based on different recensions of the Hebrew text of that book.”<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Encyclopedia Britannica under *Texts and Manuscripts (from biblical literature) - Codex Bezae*.

<sup>16</sup> Catholic Encyclopedia under Codex Bezae, Online Edition at

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04083a.htm>

<sup>17</sup> “Crowned with the Glory” by Dr. Thomas Holland, Chapter One at

<http://members.aol.com/DrTHolland/Chapter1.html>

<sup>18</sup> From “Jeremiah, The Anchor Bible”: John Bright (1965), quoted by Steve Carson Rowland in “Textual reliability – Jeremiah” at <http://www.errantyears.com/1997/aug97/000354.html>

Dead Sea Scrolls as a matter of fact revealed several essentials concerning the book of Jeremiah at this point. Not only there are signs of scribal changes on the manuscripts of Jeremiah but also several redactional actions took place on it throughout the ages.

James W. Watts in his paper “*TEXT AND REDACTION IN JEREMIAH'S ORACLES AGAINST THE NATIONS*” notes:

“Nevertheless, the distinction between scribal and redactional changes remains important and useful because it serves to distinguish changes which were introduced by a variety of scribes for various reasons at different times ("scribal") from changes which were made intentionally all at one time by a single scribe for identifiable reasons ("redactional"). Because the latter changes seem more "editorial" or "authorial" than the former, the label redactional often raises the value of that form of the text in the eyes of modern critics. A scribal change is usually considered a corruption of the "original" text. A redactional change, however, may be considered an improvement leading up to the "final form" of the text. Of course, such broad generalizations about contemporary biblical criticism should not be allowed to obscure the fact that there are critics who regard scribal additions as further developments of the authentic biblical tradition as well as those who dismiss redactional changes with the same contempt as scribal errors. Nevertheless, it remains a convenient myth of most biblical scholarship that the redaction critic's "final form" is the same as the textual critic's "original text." In Jeremiah, and probably in most other biblical books as well, this is not the case. Scribal transmission of the text, including all the accidental and intentional changes to which this process is prone, began when the earliest part of the book was first written down and continued throughout all of Jeremiah's subsequent redactions”<sup>19</sup>

James Watts then goes on by giving some examples of the Bible corruption on Jeremiah by giving differences between manuscripts:

**“Not only does the internal arrangement of the OAN differs in the MT and LXX, but the list of nations in MT 25:18-26 / LXX 32:4-12 differs from both, though it is closer to the MT.”**

<i>LXX OAN</i>	<i>MT OAN</i>	<i>MT 25:18-26 / LXX 32:4-12</i>
Elam	Egypt	Judah
Egypt	Philistia	Egypt
Babylon	Moab	[MT adds Uz]
Philistia	Ammon	Philistia
Edom	Edom	Edom
Ammon	Damascus	Moab
Kedar	Kedar	Ammon
Damascus	Elam	Tyre
Moab	Babylon	Sidon
		Coastlines
		Dedan
		Tema
		Buz
		[MT reads Arabia]
		[MT adds Zimri]
		Elam
		Media

<sup>19</sup> “TEXT AND REDACTION IN JEREMIAH'S ORACLES AGAINST THE NATIONS” by James W. Watts in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1992): 432-47. <http://web.syr.edu/~jwwatts/Jer-oafn.htm>



rest of the nations  
[MT adds Babylon] “<sup>20</sup>

Some other facts regarding Bible manuscripts in connection with Dead Sea Scrolls are:

“The evidence shows that 4Q Num (b) and the Samaritan Pentateuch preserve a very ancient form of the biblical text – one that sometimes differs from our Bibles.” (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible Translated with Commentary* by Martin Abegg, Jr., Peter Flint & Eugene Ulrich, page 119).<sup>21</sup>

Another example of the corruption of bible text shown through Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts is recovery of a fragment from the Book of Solomon not known in our Bibles for centuries, thus documenting missing text in what is considered by Christian apologetics to be unchangeable word of God.

“...passage in 4QSam (a) is one of the single most dramatic discoveries among the biblical scrolls. 4QSam (a) has an entire three-and-a-half-line paragraph missing from the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, and all other biblical manuscripts. The first-century historian Josephus, however, documents that the passage was in the ancient form of the Bible that he used. The New Revised Standard Version of the Bible has incorporated the passage into its translation.” (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible, Translated With Commentary* by Martin Abegg, Jr., Peter Flint & Eugene Ulrich, page 224,225)<sup>22</sup>

A difference between Masoretic text manuscripts and LXX ones is a separate chapter in itself. These differences affect the doctrine as well as having in mind the New Testament Writers quoting several times from corrupted translation of LXX reveals that unnatural self-contradictory ‘inspiration’.

Look what *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* has to say briefly about this:

“Not a verse is without its array of variant readings. An indication of the amount of "mixture" which has taken place is afforded by the numerous "doublets" or alternative renderings of a single Hebrew word or phrase which appear side by side in the transmitted text.

Textual corruption began early, before the Christian era. We have seen indications of this in the letter of Aristeas (III, 5, (9) above). Traces of corruption appear in Philo (e.g. his comment, in *Quis Rer. Div. Her.* 56, on Genesis 15:15, shows that already in his day *tapheis*, "buried," had become *trapheis*, "nurtured," as in all our manuscripts); doublets already exist. Similarly in the New Testament the author of Hebrews quotes (12:15) a corrupt form of the Greek of Deuteronomy 29:18.”<sup>23</sup>

Below we will give only few examples of the corruption of Bible text through some differences between these two types of Old Testament manuscripts in book of Genesis.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> “TEXT AND REDACTION IN JEREMIAH’S ORACLES AGAINST THE NATIONS” by James W. Watts in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1992): 432-47. <http://web.syr.edu/~jwwatts/Jer-oafn.htm>

<sup>21</sup> Quoted by James Juris in his “A Fairly Thorough Study of Variants of Bible Manuscripts” at [http://sol.sci.uop.edu/~jfalward/James\\_Juris.htm](http://sol.sci.uop.edu/~jfalward/James_Juris.htm)

<sup>22</sup> Quoted by James Juris in his “A Fairly Thorough Study of Variants of Bible Manuscripts” at [http://sol.sci.uop.edu/~jfalward/James\\_Juris.htm](http://sol.sci.uop.edu/~jfalward/James_Juris.htm)

<sup>23</sup> Orr, James, M.A., D.D. General Editor. "Entry for 'SEPTUAGINT, 1'". "International Standard Bible Encyclopedia" at [http://www.searchgodsword.org/enc/isb/view.cgi?number=T7825\\_1915](http://www.searchgodsword.org/enc/isb/view.cgi?number=T7825_1915).

<sup>24</sup> Taken from “Notes on The Septuagint” by R. Grant Jones, Chapter “Noteworthy Differences between the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text in Genesis” at <http://www.geocities.com/Heartland/Pines/7224/Rick/Septuagint/spindex1.htm>

	From the <b>Septuagint</b>	From the <b>Hebrew Masoretic</b>
<b>1.9</b>	And God said, "Let the water which is under the heaven be collected into one place, and let the dry land appear." And it was so. <b>And the water which was under the heaven was collected into its places, and the dry land appeared.</b>	And God said, Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so.
<b>2.12</b>	And the gold of that land is good; there also is <b>carbuncle and the trading stone.</b>	and the gold of that land is good: there is <b>bdellium and the onyx stone.</b>
<b>2.14</b>	And the third river is <b>Tigris</b> , this is that which floweth forth over against the Assyrians	And <b>the name of</b> the third river is <b>Hiddekel</b> : that is it which goeth in front of Assyria.
<b>3.24</b>	And he cast out Adam and <b>caused him to dwell over against the paradise of delight, and stationed the cherubim</b> , and the fiery sword that turns about, to keep the way of the tree of life.	So he drove out the man; and <b>he placed at the east of the garden of Eden the Cherubim</b> , and the flame of a sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Hast thou not sinned if thou hast brought it rightly, but not rightly divided it? Be still</b> , unto thee shall be <b>his recourse</b> , and thou shalt rule over <b>him</b> ."	<b>If thou doest well, shall it not be lifted up? And if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door; and unto thee shall be its desire; but do thou rule over it.</b>
<b>4.13</b>	And Cain said unto the Lord, "My <b>crime is too great for me to be forgiven.</b>	And Cain said unto Yahweh, My <b>punishment is greater than I can bear.</b>
<b>5.3</b>	And Adam lived <b>two hundred and thirty years</b> , and begat a son after his own form, and after his own image, and he called his name Seth.	And Adam lived <b>a hundred and thirty years</b> , and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth:
<b>5.4</b>	And the days of Adam after he begat Seth were <b>seven hundred years</b> ; and he begat sons and daughters.	And the days of Adam after he begat Seth were <b>eight hundred years</b> : and he begat sons and daughters.
<b>5.6</b>	Now Seth lived <b>two hundred and five years</b> , and begat Enos.	And Seth lived <b>a hundred and five years</b> , and begat Enosh:
<b>5.7</b>	And Seth lived after he begat Enos, <b>seven hundred and seven years</b> , and he begat sons and daughters.	and Seth lived after he begat Enosh <b>eight hundred and seven years</b> , and begat sons and daughters:

5.9	And Enos lived <b>an hundred and ninety years</b> , and begat Cainan.	And Enosh lived <b>ninety years</b> , and begat Kenan:
5.10	And Enos lived after he begat Cainan, <b>seven hundred and fifteen years</b> , and he begat sons and daughters.	and Enosh lived after he begat Kenan <b>eight hundred and fifteen years</b> , and begat sons and daughters:
5.12	And Cainan lived <b>an hundred and seventy years</b> , and he begat Maleleel.	And Kenan lived <b>seventy years</b> , and begat Mahalalel:
5.13	And Cainan lived after he begat Maleleel, <b>seven hundred and forty years</b> , and he begat sons and daughters.	and Kenan lived after he begat Mahalalel <b>eight hundred and forty years</b> , and begat sons and daughters:
5.15	And Maleleel lived <b>an hundred and sixty and five years</b> , and he begat Jared.	And Mahalalel lived <b>sixty and five years</b> , and begat Jared:
5.16	And Maleleel lived after he begat Jared, <b>seven hundred and thirty years</b> , and he begat sons and daughters.	And Mahalalel lived after he begat Jared <b>eight hundred and thirty years</b> , and begat sons and daughters:
5.21	And Enoch lived <b>an hundred and sixty and five years</b> , and begat Mathusala.	And Enoch lived <b>sixty and five years</b> , and begat Methuselah:
5.22	And Enoch <b>was well-pleasing to God</b> after he begat Mathusala, <b>two hundred years</b> , and he begat sons and daughters.	and Enoch <b>walked with God</b> after he begat Methuselah <b>three hundred years</b> , and begat sons and daughters:
5.24	And Enoch was <b>well-pleasing to God</b> : and he was not found, for God <b>translated</b> him.	and Enoch <b>walked with God</b> : and he was not; for God <b>took</b> him.
5.25	And Mathusala lived <b>an hundred and sixty and seven years</b> , and begat Lamech.	And Methuselah lived <b>a hundred eighty and seven years</b> , and begat Lamech:
5.26	And Mathusala lived after he begat Lamech <b>eight hundred and two years</b> , and begat sons and daughters.	and Methuselah lived after he begat Lamech <b>seven hundred eighty and two years</b> , and begat sons and daughters:
5.28	And Lamech lived <b>an hundred and eighty and eight years</b> , and begat a son.	And Lamech lived <b>a hundred eighty and two years</b> , and begat a son:
5.30	And Lamech lived after he begat	And Lamech lived after he begat

	Noah, <b>five hundred and sixty and five years</b> , and begat sons and daughters.	Noah <b>five hundred ninety and five years</b> , and begat sons and daughters:
<b>5.31</b>	And all the days of Lamech were <b>seven hundred and fifty and three years</b> , and he died.	And all the days of Lamech were <b>seven hundred seventy and seven years</b> : and he died.
<b>6.3</b>	And the Lord <b>God</b> said, “My Spirit shall certainly not <b>remain among these men</b> for ever, because they are flesh, but their days shall be an hundred and twenty years.”	And Yahweh said, My Spirit shall not <b>strive with man</b> for ever, for that he also is flesh: yet shall his days be a hundred and twenty years.
<b>6.19</b>	And <b>of all cattle and of all creeping things and of all wild beasts, even of all flesh, thou shalt bring by pairs of all</b> , into the ark, <b>that thou mayest feed them</b> with thyself: male and female they shall be.	And <b>of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring</b> into the ark, <b>to keep them alive</b> with thee; they shall be male and female.
<b>7.3</b>	And of clean flying creatures of heaven by sevens, male and female; <b>and of all unclean flying creatures by pairs, male and female</b> , to maintain seed on all the earth.	of the birds also of the heavens, seven and seven, male and female, to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth.
<b>7.11</b>	In the six hundredth year of the life of Noah, in the second month, on the <b>seven and twentieth</b> day of the month, ...	In the six hundredth year of Noah’s life, in the second month, on the <b>seventeenth</b> day of the month, ...
<b>8.4</b>	And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the <b>seven and twentieth</b> day of the month, on the mountains of Ararat.	And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the <b>seventeenth</b> day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat.
<b>9.1</b>	And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, “Increase and multiply, and fill the earth, <b>and have dominion over it</b> .”	And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.
<b>10.22</b>	The sons of Sem: Elam, and Assur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram, <b>and Cainan</b> .	The children of Shem; Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram.
<b>10.24</b>	And Arphaxad begat <b>Cainan, and Cainan</b> begat Sala. And Sala begat Heber.	And Arphaxad begat Salah; and Salah begat Eber.
<b>11.12</b>	And Arphaxad lived <b>an hundred and five and thirty years</b> , and begat <b>Cainan</b> . [See Luke 3.36]	And Arphaxad lived five and thirty years, and begat <b>Salah</b> :

11.13	and Arphaxad lived after he had begotten Cainan, four hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters, and died. And Cainan lived an hundred and thirty years and begat Sala: and Canaan lived after he had begotten Sala, three hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters, and died.	And Arphaxad lived after he begat Salah four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.
11.14	And Sala lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat Heber.	And Salah lived thirty years, and begat Eber.
11.15	and Sala lived after he had begotten Heber, three hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters, and died.	And Salah lived after he begat Eber four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.
11.16	And Heber lived an hundred and four and thirty years, and begat Phalec	And Eber lived four and thirty years, and begat Peleg
11.17	And Heber lived after he had begotten Phalec three hundred and seventy years, and begat sons and daughters, and died.	And Eber lived after he begat Peleg four hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters.
11.18	And Phalec lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat Ragau	And Peleg lived thirty years, and begat Reu
11.20	And Ragau lived an hundred and two and thirty years, and begat Seruch:	And Reu lived two and thirty years, and begat Serug
11.22	And Seruch lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat Nachor	And Serug lived thirty years, and begat Nahor
11.24	And Nachor lived nine and seventy years, and begat Tharrha:	And Nahor lived nine and twenty years, and begat Terah:
11.25	and Nachor lived after he had begotten Tharrha, an hundred and nine and twenty years, and begat sons and daughters, and died	And Nahor lived after he begat Terah an hundred and nineteen years, and begat sons and daughters
13.11	And Lot chose for himself all the country round Jordan; and Lot went from the east	So Lot chose him all the Plain of the Jordan; and Lot journeyed east
14.5	And in the fourteenth year came Chodollogomor, and the kings that were with him, and cut to pieces the giants in Astaroth Carnain, and strong nations with them, and the	And in the fourteenth year came Chedorlaomer, and the kings that were with him, and smote the Rephaim in Ashteroth-karnaim, and the Zuzim in Ham, and the

	Ommaeans in <b>the city</b> Save,	Emim inShaveh- <b>kiriathaim</b> ,
<b>14.11</b>	And they took all the <b>cavalry</b> of Sodom and Gomorrha, and all their provisions, and departed.	And they took all the <b>goods</b> of Sodom and Gomorrah, and all their victuals, and went their way.
<b>14.21</b>	And the king of Sodom said unto Abram, "Give me the men, and take the <b>horses</b> to thyself."	And the king of Sodom said unto Abram, Give me the persons, and take the <b>goods</b> to thyself.
<b>15.11</b>	And birds came down upon the bodies, even upon the divided parts of them, and Abram <b>sat down by them</b> .	And the birds of prey came down upon the carcasses, and Abram <b>drove them away</b> .
<b>18.12</b>	And Sarrha laughed within herself, saying, " <b>The thing hath not as yet happened to me, even until now</b> , and my lord is old."	And Sarah laughed within herself, saying, <b>After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure</b> , my lord being old also?
<b>20.2</b>	And Abraham said of Sarrha his wife, "She is my sister," <b>for he feared to say, "She is my wife," lest the men of the city should kill him on her account</b> . So Abimelech king of Gerara sent, and took Sarrha.	And Abraham said of Sarah his wife, She is my sister: and Abimelech king of Gerar sent, and took Sarah.
<b>21.33</b>	And Abraham planted <b>a field</b> at the well of the oath, and called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God.	And Abraham planted <b>a tamarisk tree</b> in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of Yahweh, the Everlasting God.
<b>25.3</b>	And Jazan begat Saba, <b>and Thaman</b> , and Dedan. And the sons of Dedan were <b>Raguel and Nabdeel</b> and the Assurians and the Latusians, and Laomim.	And Jokshan begat Sheba, and Dedan. And the sons of Dedan were Asshurim, and Letushim, and Leummim.
<b>26.8</b>	And he remained there a long time, and Abimelech the king of Gerara looked <b>in through the window</b> , and saw Isaac sporting with Rebecca his wife.	And it came to pass, when he had been there a long time, that Abimelech king of the Philistines looked <b>out at a window</b> , and saw, and, behold, Isaac was sporting with Rebekah his wife.
<b>26.32</b>	And it came to pass in that day, that Isaac's servants came and told him of the well which they had digged, and said, "We have <b>not</b> found water."	and it came to pass the same day, that Isaac's servants came, and told him concerning the well which they had digged, and said unto him, We have found water.
<b>29.1</b>	And Jacob started, and went to the land of the east <b>to Laban, the son of Bathuel the Syrian, and the brother</b>	Then Jacob went on his journey, and came to the land of the <b>children of the east</b> .

	of Rebecca, mother of Jacob and Esau.	
31.34	Now Rachel had taken the idols, and cast them among the camel's packs, and sat upon them.	Now Rachel had taken the teraphim, and put them in the camel's saddle, and sat upon them. <a href="#">And Laban felt about the entire tent, but found them not.</a>
31.44	Now therefore come, let me make a covenant, I and thou; and it shall be for a witness between me and thee." <a href="#">And he said unto him, "Behold, there is no one with us; behold, God is witness between me and thee."</a>	And now come, let us make a covenant, I and thou; and let it be for a witness between me and thee.
31.46	And Jacob said unto his brethren, "Gather stones." And they gathered stones and made an heap, and ate there upon the heap. <a href="#">And Laban said unto him, "This heap witnesseth between me and thee today."</a>	And Jacob said unto his brethren, Gather stones; and they took stones, and made a heap: and they did eat there by the heap.
31.48	And Laban said <a href="#">unto Jacob, "Behold this heap, and the pillar, which I have set between me and thee; this heap witnesseth, and this pillar witnesseth."</a> (Therefore its name was called, The Heap Witnesses,	And Laban said, This heap is witness between me and thee <a href="#">this day</a> . Therefore was the name of it called Galeed:
31.51	Not in LXX.	<a href="#">And Laban said to Jacob, Behold this heap, and behold the pillar, which I have set betwixt me and thee.</a>
31.52	For if I should not cross over unto thee, neither shouldst thou cross over to me, beyond this heap and this pillar, for mischief.	<a href="#">This heap be witness, and the pillar be witness, that I will not pass over this heap to thee, and that thou shalt not pass over this heap and this pillar unto me, for harm.</a>
32.1-2	And Jacob departed for his journey; <a href="#">and he looked up, and saw the host of God encamped;</a> and the angels of God met him. And Jacob said, when he saw them, "This is <a href="#">the Camp of God.</a> " And he called the name of that place, Encampments.	And Jacob went on his way, and the angels of God met him. And Jacob said when he saw them, This is <a href="#">God's host</a> : and he called the name of that place Mahanaim.
35.16	<a href="#">And Jacob removed from Baethel, and pitched his tent beyond the tower of Gader, and it came to pass</a>	<a href="#">And they journeyed from Beth-el; and there was still some distance to come to Ephrath: and Rachel</a>

	when he drew nigh to Chabratha, to enter into Ephratha, Rachel travailed; and in her travail she was in hard labour.	travailed, and she had hard labor.
35.21	Not in the LXX.	And Israel journeyed, and spread his tent beyond the tower of Eder.
35.22	... And Israel heard, and the thing appeared grievous before him.	... And Isreal heard of it.
43.28	And they said, “Thy servant our father is well; he is yet alive.” And he said, “Blessed be that man by God”; and they bowed, and did him reverence.	And they said, Thy servant our father is well, he is yet alive. And they bowed the head, and made obeisance.
46.20	And there were sons born to Joseph in the land of Egypt, whom Aseneth the daughter of Petephres priest of Heliopolis, bare unto him, even Manasses and Ephraim. And there were sons born to Manasses, which the Syrian concubine bare to him, even Machir. And Machir begat Galaad. And the sons of Ephraim, the brother of Manasses: Sutalaam and Taam. And the sons of Sutalaam: Edem.	And unto Joseph in the land of Egypt were born Manasseh and Ephraim, whom Asenath, the daughter of Poti-phaera priest of On, bare unto him.
46.21	And the sons of Benjamin: Bala, and Chobor, and Asbel. And the sons of Bala were Gera, and Noeman, and Anchis, and Ros, and Mamphim, and Ophimin. And Gera begat Arad.	And the sons of Benjamin: Bela, and Becher, and Ashbel, Gera, and Naaman, Ehi, and Rosh, Muppm, and Huppm, and Ard.
46.22	These are the sons of Rachel, which she bare to Jacob: all the souls eighteen.	These are the sons of Rachel, who were born to Jacob: all the souls were fourteen.
46.27	And the sons of Joseph, who were born to him in the land of Egypt, were nine souls; all the souls of the house of Jacob, who came into Egypt, were threescore and fifteen souls.	And the sons of Joseph, who were born to him in Egypt, were two souls: all the souls of the house of Jacob, that came into Egypt, were threescore and ten.
47.5	And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, “Let them dwell in the land of Gesem. And if thou knowest that there are among them able men, make them overseers of my cattle.” So Jacob and his sons came into Egypt, unto Joseph. And Pharaoh,	And Pharaoh spake unto Joseph, saying, Thy father and thy brethren are come unto thee:



	king of Egypt, heard of it. And Pharaoh spake unto Joseph, saying, “Thy father and thy brethren are come unto thee:	
47.6	Behold, the land of Egypt is before thee; in the best land settle thy father and thy brethren.”	The land of Egypt is before thee; in the best of the land make thy father and thy brethren to dwell; in the land of Goshen let them dwell: and if thou knowest any able men among them, then make them rulers over my cattle.
49.10	A ruler shall not fail from Judah, nor a prince from his loins, until his cometh for which it is reserved; and he is the expectation of nations.	The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler’s staff from between his feet, until Shiloh come; And unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be.
49.14	“Issachar hath desired that which is good; resting between the inheritances.	Issachar is a strong ass, Couching down between the sheepfolds:
49.21	“Nephthalim is a spreading stem, bestowing beauty on its fruit.	Naphtali is a hind let loose: He giveth goodly words.
49.22	“Joseph is a son exalted; my dearly loved son is magnified; my youngest son, turn to me.	Joseph is a fruitful bough, A fruitful bough by a fountain; His branches run over the wall.
49.23	Against whom men taking evil counsel reproached him, and the archers pressed hard upon him.	The archers have sorely grieved him, And shot at him, and persecuted him:
49.24	But their bows were mightily broken, and the sinews of their arms were slackened by the hand of the mighty one of Jacob; thence is he that strengthened Israel	But his bow abode in strength, And the arms of his hands were made strong, By the hands of the Mighty One of Jacob (From thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel),
49.27	“Benjamin is as a ravening wolf; in the morning he shall eat still, and at evening he giveth food.”	Benjamin is a wolf that raveneth: In the morning he shall devour the prey, And at even he shall divide the spoil.
50.19	And Joseph said unto them, “Fear not, for I am God’s servant.	And Joseph said unto them, Fear not: for am I in the place of God?

This is not all. Another manuscript text of Old Testament is so called Samaritan one. ‘The Samaritan text has distinctive features, and even though it holds almost two thousand differences in common with

the Septuagint, it is in no way identical to the Septuagint; many of its changes are unique and in many places it differs from the Septuagint and agrees with the Masoretic Text.<sup>25</sup>

Early mentioned Thomas Holland in his book notes and mentions another example of corruption:

“Additionally, modern scholarship suggests that some of the original readings have forever disappeared. In 1 Samuel 13:1, scholars believe the original reading of the verse has been lost in the process of transmission. [The Revised Standard Version reads: "Saul was . . . years old when he began to reign; and he reigned . . . and two years over Israel." The footnotes for these omissions inform us that, "The number is lacking in Heb[rew]" and "Two is not the entire number. Something has dropped out."] In the New Testament, we have the example of Mark 16:9-20. Most scholars believe the original ending to Mark's gospel was lost and that the current longer and shorter endings were added in the second century. [Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary On The Greek New Testament*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1994), 102-106.] Obviously, redefining preservation leaves us on shaky ground”<sup>26</sup>

Now as we have seen the belief of Bible corruption is not a mere unreasonable claim raised up by Muslims in order to reconcile deprecation of their faith with the Bible. It is an obvious fact. We have dozen of added/omitted verses, we have a whole fabricated stories (the end of Mark and adulterous story from John), we have the most important Christian doctrines such as ‘only begotten son’, resurrection and crucifixion altered (as we will see later on).

Above we have shown only the complete verses that are added or omitted by scribes during the process of the Bible transmission and a few of other differences. If we were to show all other differences such as a parts of sentences added, or different words added/omitted this paper would become a vast book. We like it or not, the reality is that preservation of the Bible is an imaginary doctrine. The Bible was never written with the aim of being preserved as it was. God never made such a promise. As W. Eduard Glenn, former professor at Central Baptist Seminary, Minneapolis, Minnesota says:

“The doctrine of the preservation of Scripture was first included in a church creed in 1647. As we have argued above IT IS NOT A DOCTRINE THAT IS EXPLICITLY TAUGHT IN SCRIPTURE, nor is it the belief that God has perfectly and miraculously preserved every word of the original autographs in one manuscript or text--type. It is a belief that God has providentially preserved His Word in and through all the extant manuscripts, versions and other copies of Scripture. ... not only does no verse in Scripture explain how God will preserve His Word, but THERE IS NO STATEMENT IN SCRIPTURE FROM WHICH ONE CAN ESTABLISH THE DOCTRINE OF THE PRESERVATION OF THE TEXT OF SCRIPTURE. ... it is also obvious from the evidence of history that GOD HAS NOT MIRACULOUSLY AND PERFECTLY PRESERVED HIS WORD IN ANY ONE MANUSCRIPT OR GROUP OF MANUSCRIPTS, OR IN ALL THE MANUSCRIPTS”<sup>27</sup>

The table given earlier above together with next paragraphs on the effect of Bible corruption on doctrine and arguments from second and third century shows the way Bible was corrupted.

#### 4. Evidences from second and third century about Bible corruption

Unfortunately the corruption of bible scriptures began very soon after something was put on the writing form. We have several evidences from early centuries of Christianity.

---

<sup>25</sup> Excerpt from an essay by Menachem Cohen, Professor of Bible, Bar-Ilan University, <http://www.mediahistory.umn.edu/indextext/BibleWriting.html>

<sup>26</sup> “Crowned with the Glory” by Dr. Thomas Holland, Chapter one at <http://members.aol.com/DrTHolland/Chapter1.html>

<sup>27</sup> Glenn, *The Bible Version Debate*, pp. 93,95,99, quoted in “FUNDAMENTALISTS FOLLOWING TEXTUAL CRITICS IN DENYING/QUESTIONING BIBLICAL PRESERVATION” “Updated December 16, 2002 (first published as “Preservation Is Missing in Standard Works on Textual Criticism,” March 30, 1999) (David Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service)

Benjamin G. Wilkinson, in his *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, pp. 16, 17 notes:

“Beginning shortly after the death of the apostle John, four names stand out in prominence whose teachings contributed both to the victorious heresy and to the final issuing of manuscripts of a corrupt New Testament. These names are, 1, *Justin Martyr*, 2, *Tatian*, 3, *Clement of Alexandria*, and 4, *Origen*.”<sup>28</sup>

Dionysius for whom Eusebius says that was converted to faith by apostle Paul himself writes in one of his letters:

"As the brethren desired me to write epistles, I wrote. And these epistles the apostles of the devil have filled with tares, cutting out some things and adding others. For them a woe is reserved. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at if some have attempted to adulterate the Lord's writings also, since they have formed designs even against writings which are of less accounts." <sup>29</sup>

As we see the manner of corrupting writings, including the Lord's ones, was so common for Christians since its very beginning. Eusebius of Caesarea (265-340) further reveals the true story of corruption:

“For this reason is it they have boldly laid their hands upon the divine Scriptures, alleging that they have corrected them. And that I do not state this against them falsely, any one who pleases may ascertain. For if any one should choose to collect and compare all their copies together, he would find many discrepancies among them. The copies of Asclepiades, at any rate, will be found at variance with those of Theodotus. And many such copies are to be had, because their disciples were very zealous in inserting the corrections, as they call them, i.e., the corruptions made by each of them. And again, the copies of Hermophilus do not agree with these; anti as for those of Apollonius, they are not consistent even with themselves. For one may compare those which were formerly prepared by them with those which have been afterwards corrupted with a special object, and many discrepancies will be found. And as to the great audacity implied in this offence, it is not likely that even they themselves can be ignorant of that. For either they do not believe that the divine Scriptures were dictated by the Holy Spirit, and are thus infidels; or they think themselves wiser than the Holy Spirit, and what are they then but demoniacs? Nor can they deny that the crime is theirs, when the copies have been written with their own hand; nor did they receive such copies of the Scriptures from those by whom they were first instructed in the faith, and they cannot produce copies from which these were transcribed.” <sup>30</sup>

Another church father Augustine of Hippo (354-386) gives this testimony through his advice:

“For those who are anxious to know what the Scriptures ought in the first place to use their skill in the correction of the texts, so that the uncorrected ones should give way to the corrected, at least when they are copies of the same translation.” <sup>31</sup>

In Tertulian's words:

“One man perverts the Scriptures with his hand, another meaning by his exposition.”

What we see too obvious from church fathers is their mutual accusation for corrupting scriptures. Tertulian accuses Marcion, Iraeneus also accuses him, and Marcion accuses both of them.

Why are we so sure that each of them was using corrupted scripture? Tertulian in his writings quotes Jesus' words “Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfill” as being contained in Gospel according to Luke. Open your Bible and find these words in

---

<sup>28</sup> Quoted in <http://www.adventist4truth.com/index2.php?LivingstonPages=gc-04>

<sup>29</sup> Hist. Eccl., Bk. 4. 23 at Catholic Encyclopedia <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/>

<sup>30</sup> *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 5, Chapter 28 at Catholic Encyclopedia

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/>

<sup>31</sup> De Doctrina Christ., II. 14 at Catholic Encyclopedia <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/>

Luke. This verse in Tertulian's scriptures preceded what remains in our Bibles at Luke 16:17, which read:

**“And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one little of the law to fail”.**

Tertulian also quotes the verse at Matthew 15:24 which read:

**“But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel”**

as also contained in his copy of Luke. Don't be shocked if you don't find this in your Bible. This is what Muslims have been saying for centuries. We are using another Bible, not the same one preached by Jesus and the Prophets.

The long saga of Bible corruptors starting from the very early days of Christianity puts in a funny position those who still claim that the Bible was never changed, and that the differences in manuscripts are only of this kind of nature 'he went' instead of 'as he went' or 'he wen'. We have given enough material so that you can judge for yourself.

## **5. Do the changes and corruptions of manuscripts affect doctrine?**

First they will tell you that the Bible is not corrupted and that it is 100% Word of God. After they found that you will not buy these discounted tails they will try to convince you that differences/corruptions in bible manuscripts do not affect the doctrine. But is this really true?

There are a dozen of quotations from OT in New Testament writings. Most of them are assumed to be prophecies about Jesus. But when you consult present Old Testament in its original language u start finding difficulties that greatly affect doctrine. Most of the time you will find that the quotation in New Testament does not agree with Hebrew Old Testament, and that it comes from a corrupted translation manuscript known as LXX. Without underlying epochal importance of translated OT into Greek (LXX), one realizes here in the best possible way the immature Christian wrapping up statement about Bible being inspired word of God, because translation errors are quoted in New Testament as being Word of God. Are we not told that both Old and New Testament have the same origin from God? The translation quality in LXX differs from book to book. Every scholar who is familiar with this topic agrees that LXX at many places misunderstands greatly the Hebrew Text. This has a huge impact in New Testament doctrine for it not only quotes LXX but also uses it for theological arguments.

Below we will give several examples where changes in manuscripts undeniably affect the doctrine. The first example belongs to the group of dozen of cases where New Testament writers use corrupted form of Old Testament in order to prove their doctrinal reasons.

**Example 1.** Paul in Hebrews 10:5 tries to prove a theological matter by quoting Old Testament, precisely Psalm 40:6. What we read in Hebrews is: “Consequently when he came into the world he said, ‘Sacrifices and offerings thou hast not desired but a body hast thou prepared for me...’ The following passage than is a quotation from Psalms 40:7ff. In Hebrew we read it “Sacrifice and offering thou dost not desire but thou hast given me an open ear...” Psalms 40:6

Paul's point here is about alleged preparation of a body for the Christ to come into the world what we read further in Hebrews 10:10 “And by that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all”. But look for yourself if you can find anything about a body in Hebrew quoted Psalm. Not really. Didn't Paul know what God had earlier 'inspired' the Psalm author? Why would he quote the corrupted LXX? The word was 'ears' in Hebrew, it was correctly translated into Greek as 'ears', but in the transmission of the Greek came to be misread and then wrongly copied as *soma*, 'body'. This mistaken reading was then used by the letter to the Hebrews; it was also, supported by the use of it in Hebrews, and transmitted in many manuscripts of the Greek Psalms'.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> James Barr (p142-143 of 'Escaping from Fundamentalism' quoted by Helen Willis at <http://www.errantyears.com/1997/sep97/000589.html>

**Example 2. 1 John 5:6-8**

<b>1 John 5:6-8</b>	
<b>Corrupted verse</b>	<b>As it is found in other manuscripts</b>
This is He who came by water and blood--Jesus Christ; not only by water, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit who bears witness, because the Spirit is truth. <sup>7</sup> For there are three that bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one. <sup>8</sup> And there are three that bear witness on earth: the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree as one.	This is He who came by water and blood--Jesus Christ; not only by water, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit who bears witness, because the Spirit is truth. <sup>8</sup> And there are three that bear witness on earth: the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree as one.

The words in blue are not found in any of ancient Biblical manuscripts. If we impose again upon you confession that changes in the Bible manuscripts **indeed** affect the doctrine it would be unnecessary. It's obvious. No further detailed comment is needed. The corruption/addition above is a culmination of the changes in the Bible. In 1960 famous Isaac Newton wrote a paper regarding the corruption of this fragment. The corrupted verse above is not only found in any manuscript previous to fourth century but it is a clear evidence how different alien doctrines crept into bible text without having any support from Jesus' teaching itself.

**Example 3. Matthew 28:19**

<b>Matthew 28:19</b>	
<b>Corrupted verse</b>	<b>As it is found in other manuscripts</b>
"Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"	"Therefore go and make disciples of all nations in my name"

Since previous corruption from 1 John 5:7 did not occur until fourth century, initiators of the belief on trinity until then had only one verse where Father, Son and Holy Ghost were mentioned altogether, where they could base their Trinitarian theology, and this is Trinitarian baptism formula from Matthew 28:19 "Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"

This is favorite verse in mouth of Trinitarians because according to them the singular 'in the name' and then Father, Son and Holy Ghost mentioned after that is a firm proof about trinity. But unfortunately this verse is also one of corrupted ones. The famous Eusebius (died in 340 after Christ) quotes this verse 18 times in his writings in the first part of the 4th century in this form "Therefore go and make disciples of all nations in my name", not mentioning the Trinitarian formula not even any baptism. Then we have pagan Emperor Constantine and Nicean Council. After this Eusebius quotes Matthew 28:19 three times and all three times with Trinitarian formula contained there. Here we see impact of Pagan Nicean Councils. Another proof that Matthew 28:19 never contained any Trinitarian formula and that it is a corrupted verse upon which rely important Christian doctrines is Justin Martyr and Aphrates of Nizibis.

**Example 4.** Many New Testament manuscripts such as Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and the Codex Ephraemus Rescriptus claim in Matthew 27:49 that Jesus was pierced by a spear and blood and water came out **before** he died, and not **after** as it is in other manuscripts and in our Bibles today. So although these ancient manuscripts proclaim contrary most New Testament translations of today do not use the exact meaning as it is in manuscripts (before) but continue to use 'after' because what these old manuscripts reveal is in horrible contradiction with Gospel according to John. What we see here is the attempt to 'harmonize' contradicted gospels, this well known term from the works of Clement. To say that blood and water came before is a burial of Christian myth about Bible being inspired by God because God is not author of confusion, for sure he would not inspire one gospel writer to write *before* and another one (John) *after*. Hence differences in manuscripts affect doctrine for certain.

**Example 5, 6, 7 and 8**

<b>Mark 1:1</b>	
<b>Corrupted verse</b>	<b>As it is found in other manuscripts</b>
“The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, <b>Son of God</b> ”	“The beginning of Gospel of Jesus Christ”

<b>John 1:34</b>	
<b>Corrupted verse</b>	<b>As it is found in other manuscripts</b>
I have seen and I testify that this is <b>the Son of God.</b> ”	“I have seen and I testify that this is the Chosen One of God”

<b>Luke 9:35</b>	
<b>Corrupted verse</b>	<b>As it is found in other manuscripts</b>
And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, <b>This is my beloved Son: hear him</b>	A voice came from the cloud, saying, "This is my Son, whom I have chosen; listen to him."

<b>Luke 3:22</b>		
<b>Corrupted verse</b>	<b>As it is found in other manuscripts</b>	<b>As it is found in some other manuscripts</b>
“and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form, like a dove; and a voice came from heaven, "You are my beloved Son; with you I am well pleased”	“and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form, like a dove; and a voice came from heaven, "You are my beloved Son; <b>today I have begotten you</b> with you I am well pleased”	“and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form, like a dove; and a voice came from heaven, "You are my beloved Son; with you I am well pleased and <b>today I have become your Father.</b> ”

Sometimes very small changes here and there throughout the Bible make their giant effect on the doctrine. At the very beginning after Christ finished his mission in Palestine, different doctrines began to take place and unfortunately at many times bible manuscripts are a battleground for these different doctrines, we see traces of the fight between different beliefs everywhere in the Bible different manuscripts. Adoptionism was a belief who thought Jesus was human elected by God at specific time, for example at his baptism or at his alleged resurrection. Anti-adoptionism at another side guarded the belief that Jesus has always been son of God. It is obvious from old found manuscripts that Holy Christian Writ saw Jesus as a devoted man elected by God at specific time for specific mission. Nowhere in old manuscripts is found at Mark 1:1 the addition “Son of God’. This is for sure a trace of anti-adoptionists who saw Jesus as a son of God even before his birth. Impact on doctrine of further three examples of corruption John 1:34, Luke 9:35 and Luke 3:22 is undeniably huge. What we understand from most likely uncorrupted version manuscripts from Luke 9:35 is that Jesus become Son of God at his baptism. That was when God ‘begot’ him. This is a symbolic exposé, just same as Jesus taught us that we can all be Sons of God.

This kind of corruption makes it clear to us that Jesus became Son of God at a certain time and he was not in some special Trinitarian way a second head of threefold God. Corruption from John 1:34 back this up. Many manuscripts in this verse instead Son of God have Chosen one of God. The change is obvious. Being elected is very different from being always second part of Trinity, son of God or God the Son. Jesus was so elected among others of his same kind: “*This is my Son, whom I have chosen from*” (Luke 3:22) as it was found in very important old manuscripts is an unambiguous verification for this. He was chosen to be God’s son. He found love and affection in God’s eyes and he became Gods son same way we can be children of God by walking according to His will as taught by Jesus. So do the changes in manuscripts really affect the doctrine?

### Example 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13

Mark 16:9-20	
Twelve verses about supposed post resurrection occurrences are wanted in the most reliable ancient manuscripts of Mark and in other witnesses as well.	

Luke 24:6	
Corrupted verse	As it is found in other manuscripts
“He is not here; he has risen! Remember how he told you, while he was still with you in Galilee.”	Verse missing from Codex Bezae and most of the old Latin texts.

Luke 24:12	
Corrupted verse	As it is found in other manuscripts
However, Peter ran to the tomb to look. Stooping, he peered in and saw the empty linen wrappings; then he went home again, wondering what had happened	Verse missing from dozen of important ancient manuscripts.

Luke 24:40	
Corrupted verse	As it is found in other manuscripts
As he said this, he showed them his hands and feet	Verse missing from dozen of important ancient manuscripts.

Luke 24:51	
Corrupted verse	As it is found in other manuscripts
While he was blessing them, he left them and was taken up into heaven.	While he was blessing them, he left them

What we see above is tampering with the so-called Word of God in order to make the Resurrection and Ascension story more believable. At Mark we see whole 12 fabricated verses revealing as such the clear evidence about falsehood of resurrection and ascension event. Gospel according to Mark is said to be the first one from four canonical gospels. In the most clearly way we see here the technique how different unfamiliar doctrines and stories crept into biblical text. Do we need a clearer way to show us that crucifixion, resurrection and ascension never occurred but they were later invented with addition of huge portions to the Gospels and other Biblical books? Discovery of ancient manuscripts exposed this to us.

Furthermore, the Gospel of Mark comes with several different endings. Luke 24:6, 24, 12, 24:40 and 24:51 all show us how, step by step, small additions were made to fabricate the wholly untrue stories. Luke 24:40 is a clear tampering to make it look harmonized with John 20:22 and to try selling the story of physical resurrection. Also Luke 24:12 is an obvious addition with the same aim of harmonizing Gospels because it is similar with Peter's rushing to the tomb in John 20:3-10. The word used here for linen clothes, *onthonia*, is the same one used in John 20:5 while Luke earlier uses *sindoni* for it at 23:53. We see again the battleground of different doctrines.

Some believed that Jesus was only resurrected spiritually. That is why some irresponsible scribe added Luke 24:40 about hands and feet in order to make it clearer that Jesus resurrected with same body physically.

### Example 14

1 Corinthians 15:47	
Corrupted verse	As it is found in other manuscripts
The first man was of the dust of the earth, the second man <b>the Lord</b> from heaven	The first man was of the dust of the earth, the second man from heaven

Very small tampering and addition making its point in doctrine by making us believe that Jesus is Lord from heaven.

### Example 15

Ephesians 3:9	
Corrupted verse	As it is found in other manuscripts
And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things <b>by Jesus Christ</b>	And to make all men see what the fellowship of the mystery is, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things.

First Jesus was made the one through whom the things were created. Later on he became the second part of trinity and the very God in his nature.

### Example 16 and 17

Luke 22:19-20	
Corrupted verse	As it is found in other manuscripts
<sup>19</sup> Then he took a loaf of bread; and when he had thanked God for it, he broke it in pieces and gave it to the disciples, saying, "This is my body, given for you. <b>Do this in remembrance of me.</b> " <sup>20</sup> After supper he took another cup of wine and said, "This wine is the token of God's new covenant to save you--an agreement sealed with the blood I will pour out for you.	<sup>19</sup> Then he took a loaf of bread; and when he had thanked God for it, he broke it in pieces and gave it to the disciples, saying, "This is my body, given for you.

Colossians 1:14	
Corrupted verse	As it is found in other manuscripts
In whom we have redemption <b>through his blood</b> , even the forgiveness of sins:	In whom we have redemption even the forgiveness of sins:

They put on your neck the dogma of salvation through the blood of Christ. But did uncorrupted biblical manuscripts taught that? If you have read Gospels without prior prejudiced vision you may have been amazed how the most basic Christian dogma of Christ's shed blood for salvation of sins, is not present anywhere in the words of Jesus. If this is so important for salvation of humankind we should have had it mentioned frequently in the speeches of Jesus. But why it is not like that?

Discovery of Codex Bezae was shocking one regarding this. Second part of 19<sup>th</sup> verse and whole verse 20 are missing from Luke chapter 20. Words on which relies salvation of Christians and liturgical dogmas in Christian churches seem to be fabrication as many other beliefs. Jesus had many occasions to say such kind of words but Luke never mentions anything like that. Acts of Apostles is attributed to Luke too. Here too Luke could have say that Jesus died for sinners and that his blood brings salvation to the world, but nothing is said anything of this kind. Much more we can say that the author of Acts of Apostles rejects this dogma. While dealing with famous 'prophecy' from Isaiah 53, Luke ignores connection of 'wounded for our transgressions' or 'bruised for our iniquities' with Jesus' supposed death. It's so clear that salvation of millions of Christians rely upon fictitious verses and doctrines.

There are more examples like these. They firmly prove that changes into Biblical text and variances of Biblical manuscripts affect greatly the Christian doctrine.

## 6. "For God so loved the world...."

They knock on your door, they disturb your privacy, and they push on your neck 'salvation' with verses such as "*The son of man came to save what was lost*" (Matthew 18:11) or "*For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten son, that whoever believes in Him shall not perish, but have eternal life*" (John 3:16). They expect you to be the unknowledgeable and to believe in everything they sell you.



First they tell you that Bible is 100% the word of God, unchangeable and everlasting will of God. If they find that you know more about the subject, that you know that Bible has been changed through the ages and that there are dozens of important differences between different manuscripts, they will try to convince you that nothing of it affects doctrine. They will never tell you that Matthew 18:11 is a forgery, added long after Jesus left this world. Even the most-quoted Biblical verse, namely John 3:16, could not escape from this corruption. Some manuscripts 'omit' *his* at the verse, other manuscripts add/omit/corrupt the word *begotten*, still others say *only begotten*.

But was this the Will of God? To have you be saved with corrupted verses, with corrupted scriptures? We have seen in the above evidences that show the Bible has been changed indeed, and that these changes affect doctrine for sure.

Now, coming back to their questions and dilemmas cited at the beginning of this paper: it is not that **Muslims wrongly presume that Bible was corrupted, changed or had been lost**; it is the Bible itself through its thousand of variant manuscripts that divulges this fact. We have seen dozens of verses that were either added or omitted to the original Holy Writ; we have seen examples of dozens of verses which are changed in order to prove a doctrine related to the Deity of Christ, Salvation through his blood, his crucifixion and resurrection, etc. We have seen examples of Biblical paragraphs that are lost forever as Metzger notes.

- **When and where did the change happen?** It began as soon as it was put into writing form. As James W Watts said, as quoted earlier in Jeremiah's case "...*scribal transmission of the text, including all the accidental and intentional changes to which this process is prone, began when the earliest part of the book was first written down.*" It occurred everywhere throughout the places where Christian gathering communities lived. Where Asclepiades lived you had one version, while at Hermophilus' place you could read a different version; Tertulian used other manuscripts, Marcion different ones.
- **How did the change occur?** In a very sad enough way: everyone by putting traces of their hands and by this their own doctrines into the biblical text. Different alien doctrines such as deism, adoptionism, anti-adoptionism, separatism, etc. crept into the Bible through sometimes very slight additions or corruptions, as seen earlier. They are not even ashamed to make further questions like:
- **What changes were made?** Didn't we show what changes were made through a bulky number of examples?
- **Where is the "original" Bible that we can compare it with to prove the change happened?** Unfortunately, there is no 'original' Bible today. It has been lost forever. We can only compare copies of the copies of the corrupted original and through their differences, prove that **their claim of Bible being one and unchanged is nothing less than a lie.**

Yes, God really loved the world, and because He loved humankind so much, He sent His Last Messenger, Muhammad<sup>(P)</sup> in order to be made known to us the truth that some irresponsible scribes altered what was believed to be the Word of God. So, the next time they come knocking on your door and claim about the Bible being the unchanged word of God, you can count for them the countless examples of alterations in the Bible and their effect on doctrine.

And only God knows best!

**Halil Ibrahimi** is the editor for the Albanian mirror of Bismika Allahuma (<http://albanian.bismikaallahuma.org>) and lives in Kosovo. **Mohd Elfie Nieshaem Juferi** is co-founder and executive editor for Bismika Allahuma (<http://www.bismikaallahuma.org>) and currently resides in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.