

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier
Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

In this paper I wish to show that the Higher Critical method is a product of unbelief, one of the schemes used by Satan to destroy God's word, by insinuating error or doubt. I will begin with a description of what it is, before giving reasons why it is satanic and, in fact, anti-intellectual in aim, methodology and content. Hopefully, I can do so without entering into sterile or complex argument.

It is sometimes argued that we should avoid talking about translators or other men, in case we glorify them. Believe me, I do not glorify Westcott and Hort or any of the Higher Critical men! To them belongs the ignominy of being against God, His enemies and ours. Such men must be kept in our sights, to be avoided at all costs and shunned. And we must reject all that they write or influence, that we retain any purity given to us by the Lord. They are darts aimed at our souls and spiritual eyes.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.

For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." (Romans 16:17,18)

Higher Criticism

This form of unbelief is also known as 'Historical Criticism', or the 'Historical-Critical Method'. In this paper I will refer to it, and Higher Critics, as HC. It is a branch of Literary Criticism, which attempts to obtain the 'real meaning' behind ancient texts. The inference is that the original writers did not mean what they said, and that they had to be full of errors. Thus, God did not know what He was talking about, and it takes men two thousand years later to put Him right! The idea is to treat scripture, the very word of God, protected from error of transmission for almost two thousand years, with the same disdain as any book of human origin.

HC, when examining scripture, *looks* for error. It then constructs what is considered to be a 'better' form, using an entirely separate source from the true source, to bring out what the authors 'really' meant. If the original author wrote "The cat sat on the mat", the HC would rewrite it to say "Every valley contains trees and shrubbery", because another book said so! To these men, the fact that the original said nothing of the kind, is irrelevant! It is not what the original said, but it best fits what the modern Critic believes it OUGHT to say! And they invented many

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

rules and evidences to 'prove' they are right. Or, so they claim.

The HC will look at the Bible (or, rather, a corrupt alien source that changed the originals) text very broadly, and add to the melting pot the widest texts on the history of the period, the society it describes, the writing methods of the period, and so on. They will then de-construct what the Bible says, mix every other variable into it, and re-construct the text after their own imagination. The finished product, they say, is better and more accurate, than the original!

Inevitably, the HC is unsaved, for no saved person will dare to tamper with what God says. But, the HC regards the Bible as just another book. He believes it is therefore filled with error, as is any other book. It is his self-appointed task to cut through the fog he says was created by the original writer to rewrite the content as it should 'really' read. To do this he will use a variety of means, cobbling together many sources, whether holy or not. He will deduce many things by hypothesis and not from the original. He will reconstruct dates and time scales, moving this bit to an earlier time, and that bit to a later time. All without true reason or proof, apart from what is in his human, unsaved mind.

Because this treatment of scripture is done on a literary basis, it can also be called Biblical Criticism, and today Rome uses this term as a battering ram against Protestant beliefs. The term 'Lower Criticism' is also used (Soulén, Richard N. 'John Knox', pp 108,190), but is now referred to mainly as 'Textual Criticism'; this practice looks at individual words, sentences and chapters rather than the broader scheme of dates, authorship, etc. HC began slowly in the 1600s alongside the time of the KJAV, because liberal unbelievers did not like to be constrained by 'traditional' sources (e.g. Gerhard Ebeling, 'Word and Faith', Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1963). Today, this has evolved into outright 'Biblical' atheism.

This generalised type of unbelief widened out into several forms; Source Criticism, Form Criticism, Redaction Criticism, Tradition Criticism, Canonical Criticism, and others. The overall idea is that scripture is NOT an actual word from God, but is a record of what believers WANTED God to say – if God exists at all. So, even before the HC approaches a single word he assumes that it does not say or mean what it says or means in the text. It is his task to provide that proper meaning, even if it totally destroys the original source. But, those who are unsaved begin with a very real inability – they cannot by any means understand what they are reading. They can only read the words. They have human knowledge but no understanding.

How It Is Done

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

HC looks at the Hebrew and Greek of scripture, comparing them to other extant sources from philosophy, other religions, politics, and so on. Whether Old or New Testaments, these unbelievers 'deconstruct' what has been said plainly, and replaces it with their own ideas of what they think 'ought' to be in the text. In other words, they know better than the original authors or God Himself. Indeed, they do not accept that God has anything to do with it.

If a statement in, say Genesis, is also found in texts in the day of, say, Daniel, then to the HC this is 'proof' that Genesis 'must' have been written about 400 years before the time of Christ. And so on. This is like looking at a modern racing car and saying that because it is so advanced and fast, with amazing technical performance, that all cars before it are either a myth or misplaced in time, or that all earlier mention of cars 'must' have been related to this advanced one!

This kind of illogic was used by Westcott and Hort, who wrote the first 'revision' after the KJAV: they went to 'other' texts to disprove the KJAV, using the Alexandrian sources, which every church for almost two thousand years knew were corrupt. And if these corrupt sources said something different from the sources for the KJAV (which they invariably did, because the writers were heretics), then the KJAV 'must be wrong'... which, of course, suited W&H. because they loathed the KJAV anyway.

History of HC

Erasmus and Spinoza are often said to be the 'fathers' of HC, because they used similar methodology. Like so many in his day, Erasmus was a Catholic priest, and because of his tolerance for free thought (even about scripture) he was called the "prince of Humanists", which is hardly an epithet any true theologian would want to have. By using humanistic techniques he thus published new editions of the New Testament, disregarding the growing influence of Luther *et al*, and continued to accept the total authority of the pope. Because of this he rejected Luther's theology of salvation by faith alone, and kept belief in free will.

Spinoza, a Jewish-Dutchman, born after the arrival of the 1611 KJAV, was a philosopher. He has the godless sad distinction of preparing the world for the Enlightenment, which was, in essence, a darkening of souls by way of slowly removing God from life. This helped enormously in the formation of the German-led heretical Higher Critical movement.

As you can see, neither Erasmus nor Spinoza can be regarded in Christian terms, because they were enemies of God's truth and God Himself. Yet, these two men are pivotal to the growth of

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

HC, which is a child of its age, unbelieving and humanistic, making man the centre of all things, and giving him all authority in every matter, loving Darwinism and hating the Creator. And so, man alone decided what God said, because 'God' is only a figment and so the original writers of the scriptures were similarly humanistic and prone to error. For this reason humanistic methods can be used to 'decipher' scripture. After all, for these unbelievers the Bible is 'only another book' like any other!

The error these people make is that they do not understand what scripture is; it is the actual word of God to mankind. The Bible is NOT understood by unbelievers, because the book is for believers. Unbelievers may only look from the outside, for, having no spiritual life within, they can only read the words and not gain understanding. Spiritual knowledge and understanding come in steps...

Firstly, a man is born again, then he is saved. After this the Holy Spirit communes with the saved man's spirit, unlocking the mysteries of God to his soul and heart. The unsaved man is not born again and so does not have the means of understanding what he reads in scripture - the Holy Spirit Who alone gives us the divine privilege of knowing God. Because of his lack, the unsaved man has to look to his own mind and ideas. And this is what Higher Critical analysis is - a feeble human attempt at understanding what scripture says, without firstly having the key to achieving his goal. His heart and mind are dead in sins, so he is easy prey for Satan, who delights in creating all manner of theories to burn God from people's minds.

Rome Loves HC

Roman Catholic thinkers usually refer to HC as 'Biblical Criticism' (BC), as if this lends credibility to it. They say that BC is predicated on scientific methods (always a magnet for theistic philosophers, who see 'science' as greater than theology, even though theology proper is true science).

They claim that BC uses 'severe tests' to determine the truth of scripture. But, Romanism is a lie in itself, so it cannot recognise truth even if it slapped it across its face. Roman BCs acknowledge that BC tends to strip traditional teachings to the bone, removing substance. Thus, they, like any other HC, usually deny God's inspiration of scripture and the existence of genuine doctrine.

For them, scripture is just a random patchwork of unaligned teachings based not on God (if He exists) but on the whims of the writers... like any other book. The only difference between

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

Roman and other HCs is that the Roman HCs/BCs cannot lawfully undermine or oppose traditional teachings of Rome (newadvent.org). Scripture itself can be ditched, but not Roman dogma!

Rome sees the work of BCs as 'moral-psychological', a science "though its processes and results do not admit of nicety of control and demonstration" (newadvent). To put it another way, it is undisciplined. I have shown this to be the case in my examination of a BBC series on archaeology and the Bible, in which the author and presenter, though an 'expert', put out wild assumptions and very bad academic conclusions. This was because she approached the subject not from the actual evidence of scripture (or even science), but from the theory of HC! She misused biblical words and terms and generally made a hash of the subject matter.

Those who examine HC conclusions can only see a hotch-potch of guesses and blatant unbelief, not academic excellence or truth. In many ways, HCs are the theological storm-troopers of atheism. But, Romanists can sometimes be surprising in their grasp of some truths:

"The early ecclesiastical writers were unconscious of nearly all the problems to which criticism has given rise. Their attention was concentrated on the Divine content and authority of sacred Scripture, and, looking almost exclusively at the Divine side, they deemed as of trifling account questions of authorship, date, composition, accepting unreservedly for these points such traditions as the Jewish Church had handed down, all the more readily that Christ Himself seemed to have given various of these traditions His supreme confirmation." (newadvent)

It is my firm conviction that scripture must be read and analysed as it is written. Thus, we read the texts as given and accept them as God's truth. Everything contained in the text, whether content, authorship, dates, and so on, must conform to what is written rather than to what external sources say. This is because God is the actual author, and gave His word to human hands to be written down. Therefore, nothing can contradict what is written. If the external does not agree with the internal, then it is the external that is wrong, not scripture. The reason HCs/BCs do not accept this is because they are atheistic, even if they claim to be otherwise.

'Higher' and 'Lower' – or are *both* wicked?

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

I should leave the reader in no doubt; I see HC/BC as satanic because it undermines truth and rips scripture apart. It has no basis on which to do this, but joins Satan by casting grave doubt on all of scripture. It has led to many versions of scripture, all founded on the sins of HC/BC, casting doubt on the veracity of God's word.

You have been shown, broadly, what HC is. Lower Criticism is the study of actual texts of scripture, by researching the various versions (made possible by the introduction of unbelieving HC), verses, words and manuscripts. Today, this is usually called 'Textual Criticism'. Westcott and Hort are listed as 'lower critics', but their impetus firstly came from the unbelieving HC theologians, who gave them courage (sin) to oppose the KJAV and its true path backwards to original sources.

The Anglican clergy have led the way in HC and lower criticism, which should not surprise us as it is the small brother of Romanism. As such, its clergy love HC. Canon Dyson Hague of Ontario, said:

"It is a very valuable branch of Biblical science, and is of the highest importance as an auxiliary in the interpretation of the Word of God. By its researches floods of light may be thrown on the Scriptures." (eaec.org)

No science is 'valuable' unless it works within what God says. I mean word for word, and in principle. Evolution is possibly the worst example of bad science, because it ignores both true science and scripture. How can we place any reliance on this "auxiliary" when interpreting God's word? We cannot, because it does evil to it. Floods of light are indeed thrown onto the scriptures by HC and Lower Criticism. But, there is the pure light of God and the dark light of Satan. For example, read Luke 11:34-36,

"The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when [thine eye] is evil, thy body also [is] full of darkness.

Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness.

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

If thy whole body therefore [be] full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light.”

HC is not full of light, but is an evil eye, drawing in darkness because it is dark in itself. It cannot see the truth, even if it tried, because it cannot see at all! And it has made the whole Body (of Christ) dark as a result... how else can the majority of them read and rely on new versions of scripture based on HC and W&H?

Hague postulates that HCs are devout and pure (though W&H said otherwise):

“No study perhaps requires so devout a spirit and so exalted a faith in the supernatural as the pursuit of the Higher Criticism. It demands at once the ability of the scholar, and the simplicity of the believing child of God. For without faith no one can explain the Holy Scriptures, and without scholarship no one can investigate historic origins.” (eaec.org)

I fear the Canon, too, is deceived by the same dark spirit, shrouding it in pious language. The only thing ‘devout’ in HC is its ability to destroy scripture! The scholars of HC do not exhibit faith or anything like it. Let me put it this way: if an HC scholar is truly holy he will work within and from scripture, and will not introduce alien thoughts into it, dismembering its structure with humanism. But, importantly, such a man, if faithful, should NOT retain any link to the broader HC movement. Rather, he must come away from it, just as a man must come away from heresy and heretics. The Canon appears to be of mixed mind. For he also agrees with me on this point:

“... anybody can understand that the Bible is the last book in the world to be studied as a mere classic by mere human scholarship without any regard to the spirit of sympathy and reverence on the part of the student. The Bible, as has been said, has no revelation to make to unbiblical minds. It does not even follow that because a man is a philological expert he is able to understand the integrity or credibility of a passage of Holy Scripture any more than the beauty and spirit of it.”

Because...

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

“The qualification for the perception of Biblical truth is neither philosophic nor philological knowledge, but spiritual insight. The primary qualification of the musician is that he be musical; of the artist, that he have the spirit of art. So the merely technical and mechanical and scientific mind is disqualified for the recognition of the spiritual and infinite. Any thoughtful man must honestly admit that the Bible is to be treated as unique in literature, and, therefore, that the ordinary rules of critical interpretation must fail to interpret it aright.”

Early HC was the domain of German theologians. It is not without significance that Germany, especially in the 19th century, was the very centre of witchcraft (read Kurt Koch on this). Furthermore, he says,

“It is notorious that some of the most learned German thinkers are men who lack in a singular degree the faculty of common sense and knowledge of human nature. Like many physical scientists, they are so preoccupied with a theory that their conclusions seem to the average mind curiously warped. In fact, a learned man in a letter to Descartes once made an observation which, with slight verbal alteration, might be applied to some of the German critics: “When men sitting in their closet and consulting only their books attempt disquisitions into the Bible, they may indeed tell how they would have made the Book if God had given them that commission. That is, they may describe chimeras which correspond to the fatuity of their own minds, but without an understanding truly Divine they can never form such an idea to themselves as the Deity had in creating it.”

So, here, all at once, is a man both defending HC and contradicting it! We are either for the Lord or against him. There is no compromise or ‘in between’. The same Canon also quoted Newton, who said *“Non fingo hypotheses”*. That is ‘I do not frame hypotheses’. HCs work from their hypotheses inwards towards scripture. They form their ideas and then force scripture to fit. **True theology does not work this way. Rather, it arises solely from scripture, working outwards, allowing God’s word to work its way through all resultant arguments and proposals.**

These early HC professors, in their dusty archives, tried to read ancient works as though they were modern, applying their own thoughts, limited to their own day, to ancient minds. In reality they had no idea what they were doing, and still do not. They had no inkling of ancient Oriental thought and so warped their own findings. (Sayce, “Early History of the Hebrews,” pages 108-112). This is because they were rationalists who denied the ‘supernatural’ (divine). It stands to reason that if a man does not accept the existence of the divine, he will instantly dismiss any talk of God! So, anything he reads containing divine mention will be dismissed as well.

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier
Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

The Canon gives a good summary of the theories held by HCs, and these are reproduced below:

“The Pentateuch consists of four completely diverse documents. These Completely different documents were the primary sources of the composition which they call the Hexateuch:

The Yahwist or Jahwist,

the Elohist,

the Deuteronomist,

and the Priestly Code, the Grundschrift, the work of the first Elohist (Sayce Hist. Heb., 103), now generally known as J. E. D. P., and for convenience designated by these symbols.

These different works were composed at various periods of time, not in the fifteenth century, B.C., but in the ninth, seventh, sixth and fifth centuries; J. and E. being referred approximately to about 800 to 700 B.C.; D to about 650 to 625 B.C., and P. to about 525 to 425 B.C. According to the Graf theory, accepted by Kuenen, the Elohist documents were post-exilic, that is, they were written only five centuries or so before Christ. Genesis and Exodus as well as the Priestly Code, that is, Leviticus and part of Exodus and Numbers were also post-exilic.

These different works, moreover, represent different traditions of the national life of the Hebrews, and are at variance in most important particulars.

And, further. They conjecture that these four suppositive documents were not compiled and written by Moses, but were probably constructed somewhat after this fashion: For some reason, and at some time, and in some way, some one, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where,

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

wrote J. Then someone else, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, wrote another document, which is now called E. And then at a later time, the critics only know who, or why, or when, or where, an anonymous personage, whom we may call Redactor I, took in hand the reconstruction of these documents, introduced new material, harmonized the real and apparent discrepancies, and divided the inconsistent accounts of one event into two separate transactions. Then some time after this, perhaps one hundred years or more, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, some anonymous personage wrote another document, which they style D. And after a while another anonymous author, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, whom we will call Redactor II, took this in hand, compared it with J. E., revised J. E., with considerable freedom, and in addition introduced quite a body of new material. Then someone else, no one knows who, or why, or when, or where, probably, however, about 525, or perhaps 425, wrote P.; and then another anonymous Hebrew, whom we may call Redactor III, undertook to incorporate this with the triplicated composite J. E. D., with what they call redactional additions and insertions. (Green, page 88, cf. Sayce, *Early History of the Hebrews*, pages 100-105).

It may be well to state at this point that this is not an exaggerated statement of the Higher critical position. On the contrary, we have given here what has been described as a position "established by proofs, valid and cumulative" and "representing the most sober scholarship." The more advanced continental Higher Critics, Green says, distinguish the writers of the primary sources according to the supposed elements as J1 and J2, E1 and E2, P1, P2 and P3, and D1 and D2, nine different originals in all. The different Redactors, technically described by the symbol R., are Rj., who combined J. and E.; Rd., who added D. to J. E., and Rh., who completed the Hexateuch by combining P. with J. E. D. (*H. C. of the Pentateuch*, page 88).

A DISCREDITED PENTATEUCH

These four suppositive documents are, moreover, alleged to be internally inconsistent and undoubtedly incomplete. How far they are incomplete they do not agree. How much is missing and when, where, how and by whom it was removed; whether it was some thief who stole, or copyist who tampered, or editor who falsified, they do not declare.

In this redactory process no limit apparently is assigned by the critic to the work of the redactors. With an utter irresponsibility of freedom it is declared that they inserted misleading statements with the purpose of reconciling incompatible traditions; that they amalgamated what should have been distinguished, and sundered that which should have amalgamated. In one word, it is an axiomatic principle of the divisive hypothesizers that the redactors "have not only misapprehended, but misrepresented the originals" (Green, page 170). They were animated by "egotistical motives." They confused varying accounts, and erroneously ascribed them to different occasions. They not only gave false and colored impressions; they destroyed valuable elements of the suppositive documents and tampered with the dismantled remnant.

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

And worst of all. The Higher Critics are unanimous in the conclusion that these documents contain three species of material:

The probably true.

The certainly doubtful.

The positively spurious.

“The narratives of the Pentateuch are usually trustworthy, though partly mythical and legendary. The miracles recorded were the exaggerations of a later age.” (Davidson, Introduction, page 131). The framework of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, says George Adam Smith in his “Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament,” is woven from the raw material of myth and legend. He denies their historical character, and says that he can find no proof in archaeology for the personal existence of characters of the Patriarchs themselves. Later on, however, in a fit of apologetic repentance he makes the condescending admission that it is extremely probable that the stories of the Patriarchs have at the heart of them historical elements. (Pages 90-106).

Such is the view of the Pentateuch that is accepted as conclusive by “the sober scholarship” of a number of the leading theological writers and professors of the day. It is to this the Higher Criticism reduces what the Lord Jesus called the writings of Moses.”

If you read the claims made by HCs concerning, for example, the dating of various parts of the Old Testament, it will be immediately apparent that their work is spurious, rooted more in their own hypotheses than on scriptural evidence. Of course, they do not accept that the evidence is factual or correct or written properly. For them, the ancients were too stupid to write accurately! Thus, HCs build assumption upon assumption without giving a sideways glance at proof. This is because they HAVE no proof. They have the luxury of attacking what God said because no-one from the era of either Old or New Testament is now alive to argue against them.

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

The Canon gives an excellent coverage, though he is also mixed in his approach to HC. He is a true child of his Anglican background. But, he is infinitely more acceptable than the NIV and its copyright owners! Do you know who owns the NIV? No, not God, because He did not write it. It is owned by a [Rupert Murdoch company](#), which uses the output of the Comcast cable network, that broadcasts hard-core pornography. Still wish to use and buy the NIV?

A collector of original manuscripts (Scott Jones), who has copies of sources used by W&H, speaks of the same collections by a 19th century man, Herman Hoskier, who was an "extraordinarily diligent textual critic". The collector said this:

"Hoskier's collation of Vaticanus B and Sinaiticus Aleph -- the two manuscripts which modern bibles are primarily based on, and which continue to hold a superstitious reign to this day over mainstream bible scholars -- is simply devastating. Anyone who has examined Hoskier's collation with care cannot fail to see the depravity of these two manuscripts and the Alexandrian tradition as a whole. If they deny this depravity, they are either blind or liars. I have personally collated B and Aleph as well, and I know whereof I speak. (For example, Hoskier was being kind when he demonstrated that these two manuscripts -- Aleph and B -- disagree with each other over 3,000 times in the gospels alone. Had Hoskier not excluded numerous categories, the number would run astoundingly higher)" (lambliion.net)

AND

"Be it known, however, that this blindness and deceit by mainstream biblical scholarship is fulfilled prophecy, for both the Holy Ghost and His Word have made the truly born again believer know that the blind and the deceitful will control the field of biblical scholarship in the several generations immediately preceding the return of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Accordingly, the jaundiced defense of B and Aleph by the modern divines is just one of the many reasons why this generation of bible scholars, along with their immediate predecessors, will go down as the most inept and incompetent -- not to mention one of the most wicked - generations in the history of biblical scholarship.

Furthermore, not only are these two manuscripts depraved with unspeakable blasphemies and inaccuracies throughout, but the scribes of these manuscripts knew little or no Greek

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

themselves. And yet, the "pidgin" Greek of these two manuscripts has controlled Anglo-biblical Greek scholarship for the past one hundred years. Anglo-grammars, lexicons, and other devices are based on the "pidgin" Greek of these two manuscripts."

These are the manuscripts used by W&H and that underpin both Higher and Lower Criticism, and therefore which feed all new versions with lies. I have said repeatedly that W&H used corrupt sources. The romantic idea that Aleph and B are somehow gloriously true and godly is simply not the case – they are as corrupt as pornography!

Scott quotes from Hoskier, who studied the gross errors found in the sources used by W&H, whose work relied heavily on Aleph and B. He was able to confidently argue against W&H because he had access to his own copies of Aleph and B:

"The text printed by Westcott and Hort [based almost exclusively on B and Aleph] has been accepted as the true text, and grammars, works on the synoptic problem, works on higher criticism, and others, have been grounded on this text. If the Hort text makes the evangelists appear inconsistent [and it does], then such and such an evangelist errs. Those who accept the W-H text are basing their accusations of untruth as to the Gospellists upon an Egyptian revision current 200 to 450 AD and abandoned between 500 to 1881, merely revived in our day and stamped as genuine." (Codex B & Its Allies, Vol I, p 468)

"Modern scholars love to touch on the forbidden ground of the speculative philosophies St. Paul so often condemns in his pastoral epistles. They touch upon it and withdraw, but the harm for the reader is done." (Codex B & Its Allies, Vol I, p 478)

"The claims put forward by us are that B does not exhibit a neutral text... That B is guilty of laches, of a tendency to "improve," and of "sunstroke" amounting to doctrinal bias. That the maligned Textus Receptus served in large measure as the base which B tampered with and changed, and that the Church at large recognised all this until the year 1881 -- when Hortism (in other words Alexandrianism) was allowed free play -- and has not since retraced the path to sound tradition." (Codex B & Its Allies, Vol I, p 464)

"There remains one argument to be dealt with, and that concerns the possibility of someone saying that, after all, the variations of B are few in number and probably less than in most MSS.

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

That is hardly so. If the reader wants a tenth-century example of a MS true to the Church type let him examine Matthaëi's k, a most beautiful and neat MS, one of our very early cursives, and in this MS will be found a true exponent of the Koine. Had Erasmus used this, no fault could have been found, and yet but little difference is to be found between k and the textus receptus, while b and his group differ infinitely more among themselves at a period much more remote." (Codex B & Its Allies, Vol I, p 456)

"I present therefore an indictment against the MS B and against Westcott and Hort, subdivided into hundreds of separate counts... If I now throw some bombs into the inner citadel, it is because from that Keep there continues to issue a large amount of ignorant iteration of Hort's conclusions, without one particle of proof that his foundation theory is correct." (Codex B & Its Allies, Vol I, p i-ii)

"Now in the following pages I submit a vast number of other instances where B has a doctored text, plainly, indubitably doctored." (Codex B & Its Allies, Vol I, p vi)

"The Church at large disagreed with Origen's conclusions. Westcott-Hort after nearly 1700 years merely wish to replace us textually in the heart of an Alexandrian text, which after AD 450 or thereabouts fell into discredit and disuse." (Codex B & Its Allies, Vol I, p 9)

"We do not necessarily recover Origen's manuscripts when we are inclined to follow Aleph and B and Origen, but very likely only Origen himself." (Codex B & Its Allies, Vol I, p 10)

"Now as B does not change all these datives, it might be thought that Antioch for some reason had made a harmonious whole and turned some genitives into datives in the supposed revision. It is just here that Aleph offers its important testimony, for Aleph does not use the genitive on the first occasion, thereby showing that it was Egypt which revised some of St. Matthew's datives, and not Antioch which cancelled some genitives." (Codex B & Its Allies, Vol I, p 35)

"Finally, observe that up to the time of Westcott and Hort the lower criticism had kept itself quite apart from so-called higher criticism. Since the publication of Hort's text, however, and of that of the Revisers, much of the heresy of our time has fallen back upon the supposed results acquired by the lower criticism to bolster up their views. By a policy of indecision in the matter of fundamental truths of the Christian religion - truths specifically set forth by its Founder - and by

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

a decided policy, on the other hand, of decision in the matter of heresy in the field of lower criticism, the beliefs of many have been shaken not only to their foundations, but they have been offered free scope to play the Marcion and excise whatever appeared extra-ordinary or unintelligible to them. Many, who should have raised their voices against the mischief wrought, have sat by in apathy or have willfully fostered these heresies." (Codex B & Its Allies, Vol I, p 422).

Use of the new versions is so widespread that we can safely state that the majority of churches and Christians are poisoned by them. This is particularly true of pastors and preachers trained in Bible schools that advocate their use. Though some will enthusiastically embrace the heresies of W&H, especially in Pentecostal and charismatic circles (because they use and study new versions), the majority of these past students inadvertently swallowed the same poison, and now teach it to others. Is this really what they want to do, if they claim to love the Lord and do His work?

W&Hs Sources

Westcott and Hort based their beliefs not on scripture as faithfully reproduced in the KJAV, but on two very odd sources – the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus. Sinaiticus was not a faithfully copied text passed on from generation to generation as true. Rather, like any old rubbish, it was found screwed up in a waste basket in a monastery! It was found by a leader of the HC movement, Constantin von Tischendorf. And, anyway, it was not written until the fourth century AD... so how can it possibly be 'older' than the sources used by the KJAV, which go back to the very beginning of the early Church, with the very oldest dating to the time of the still-living apostles?

The Vaticanus was not found until 1475 and then 're-found' in 1845, in the depths of the Vatican library. It should be noted that this library does not just contain the same sources as were used by the KJAV, but also sources that can be easily considered to be corrupt and satanic, including books not suitable for human consumption. Do you not think it strange that this 'important' source should be hidden in a Vatican library, when Rome claims to have the true sources of God's word? It cannot have been that important, after all! How many cults have claimed that only they have rediscovered the 'real' word of God! How clever of them.

Hort took both sources and claimed they were superior and older, without offering a shred of proof that this was so. He invented the hypothesis that his claim was true, rather like a novelist who writes his own cast of characters and brings them to life, though it is just a figment of imagination.

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

Hort based much on the supposed 'Lucian Recension'* , which existed only in his own mind, there being no historical evidence for it at all. (* This says that the Christian School at Antioch in the second century AD badly translated the true biblical text, thus creating an unreliable source – called the Textus Receptus. Of course, to enable him to 'sell' his new versions, Hort had to discredit the originals, even with lies and deception. Thus, he 'proved' his hypothesis with something that was not proved!).

"K.W. Clark writes, "... the Westcott-Hort text has become today our Textus-Receptus. We have been freed from the one, only to become captivated by the other... The psychological chains so recently broken from our fathers have again been forged upon us, even more strongly."

E.C. Colwell writes, "The dead hand of Fenton John Anthony Hort lies heavy upon us. In the early years of this century Kirsopp Lake described Hort's work as a failure... But Hort did not fail to reach his major goal. He dethroned the Textus Receptus... This was a sensational achievement, an impressive success. Hort's success in this task and the cogency of his tightly reasoned theory shaped - and still shapes - the thinking of those who approach the textual criticism of the New Testament through the English language."

Zane Hodges, a long time professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, writes, "Modern textual criticism is psychologically addicted to Westcott and Hort. Westcott and Hort in turn, were rationalists in their approach to the textual problem in the New Testament and employed techniques within which rationalism and every other kind of bias are free to operate."

Alfred Martin, former Vice-President at Moody Bible Institute, wrote in 1951, "The present generation of Bible students having been reared on Westcott and Hort have for the most part accepted this theory without independent or critical examination... if believing Bible students had the evidence of both sides put before them instead of one side only, there would not be so much blind following of Westcott and Hort. The two most popular Greek manuscripts today, Nestles-Aland and UBS (United Bible Society), differ very little from the Westcott and Hort text."
(All quotes above from graceway.com)

I believe there is sufficient evidence in these few pages to completely obliterate W&Hs Higher and Lower Criticism, and the new versions of the Bible. Those who argue are welcome to hundreds of pages of objective facts found in the critical works of truly believing theologians of

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

our day and from the past. Do not be fooled! As Jesus warned, “take heed”.

God told Moses to warn the Hebrews not to approach the holy mountain:

“And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, [that ye] go [not] up into the mount, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death.” (Exodus 19:12)

Westcott and Hort, and the Higher Critics approached the holy writ of God. They touched its borders and truth was put to death at that moment. They dared to take holy words and refashion them in man’s own image, and this grave blasphemy passed on to every new version since. Take heed, reader! Do not dare to follow these godless men, for you will surely die spiritually. When you read and use new versions, rooted as they are in both higher and lower critical methods, you have been snared by Satan:

“Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee.” (Exodus 34:12)

You, the reader, are now culpable before God, for you have read this paper. You cannot escape God’s judgment if you ignore the words found herein. You have thereby made a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, those who live outside God’s command, by meddling with His word. Now you know the truth, you must act against those who have deceived you. Rather than submit to their fake authority you must oppose them...

“But ye shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves:

For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name [is] Jealous, [is] a jealous God:

Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and [one] call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice; “

Higher Criticism: The Evil Eye

Written by K B Napier

Monday, 07 January 2013 18:15

(Exodus 34:13-15)

You must now do what you can to tear down the falsity of the new versions, instead of kow-towing to blind experts who try to destroy God's holy word. God's word leads us to the true and only God. The words of HCs and W&H lead us to whoring with the false gods of Satan. This is strong language, but necessary, for *God* is our Lord, not W&H or humanistic academic achievement. The Lord is jealous over His word and His people. Repent and turn from the false leaders of men. Adhere to the genuine word of God, passed down through the centuries in perfect form until the KJAV.

"Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." (1Timothy 4:16)

The KJAV continues the authentic teaching of the original sources, and so gives the reader true doctrine, and words that save. The new versions and their corrupt sources can only lead to destruction and hell. Take heed! The eye of new versions is evil, dark and foul, blind to truth. Be rid of them.

© December 2012

---oOo---

{loadposition btm_address}